Price (GA)	Schiff	Tierney
Price (NC)	Schneider	Tipton
Quigley	Schock	Titus
Rahall	Schrader	Tonko
Rangel	Schwartz	Tsongas
Reed	Schweikert	Turner
Reichert	Scott (VA)	Upton
Renacci	Scott, Austin	Valadao
Ribble	Scott, David	Van Hollen
Rice (SC)	Sensenbrenner	Vargas
Richmond	Serrano	Veasey
Rigell	Sessions	Vela
Roby	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Roe (TN)	Shea-Porter	Visclosky
Rogers (AL)	Sherman	Wagner
Rogers (KY)	Shimkus	Walberg
Rogers (MI)	Shuster	Walden
Rohrabacher	Simpson	Walorski
Rokita	Sinema	Walz
Rooney	Sires	Wasserman Schultz
Ros-Lehtinen	Slaughter	Waters
Roskam	Smith (MO)	Waxman
Ross	Smith (NE)	Weber (TX)
Rothfus	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)
Roybal-Allard	Smith (TX)	Welch
Royce	Smith (WA)	Wenstrup
Ruiz	Southerland	Westmoreland
Runyan	Speier	Whitfield
Ruppersberger	Stewart	Williams
Rush	Stivers	Wilson (FL)
Ryan (OH)	Stockman	Wittman
Ryan (WI)	Stutzman	Wolf
Salmon	Swalwell (CA)	Womack
Sánchez, Linda T.	Takano	Woodall
Sanchez, Loretta	Terry	Yarmuth
Sanford	Thompson (CA)	Yoder
Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)	Yoho
Scalise	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Schakowsky	Thornberry	Young (IN)
	Tiberi	

NOT VOTING—5

Hall	Negrete McLeod	Wilson (SC)
Miller, Gary	Nunnelee	

□ 1504

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 604 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. 4745.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) kindly take the chair.

□ 1506

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. 4745) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. MARCHANT (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 Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 156, line 16.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. 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. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Housing Trust Fund established under section 1338 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4568).

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise, yet again, to raise the alarm over taxpayer-funded housing policy.

This straightforward amendment that you have before you would prohibit Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac from using funds to pay housing advocacy groups or others through the housing trust fund at a time when they continue to owe money to the American people.

Beginning in 2008, the U.S. taxpayers bailed out the GSEs to the tune of $189 billion. That number is expected to grow to over $200 billion by 2015; but as the housing market has begun to recover, so, too, have Fannie's and Freddie's profits.

At the first sign of money rolling in, some housing advocates are pressuring the Federal Housing Finance Agency to get a piece of the taxpayer-funded pie. They have gone to extraordinary lengths, even filing a lawsuit last summer to try to force contributions to the trust fund.

Originally slated to receive funds siphoned off from the GSEs, the trust fund was never capitalized due, of course, to the fact that the GSEs went into conservatorship. Without passage of this amendment, the director of the FHFA could turn on that spigot at any moment.

Contrary to what Fannie and Freddie apologists may claim, the GSEs have yet to repay any of the taxpayer-funded bailout. The cash injection into the GSEs was made in the form of a draw from the U.S. Treasury, not a loan to be repaid. No so-called repayment can be made as long as American taxpayers are on the hook for future losses.

Let us also not overlook the fact that the failure of this public-private housing scheme was at the center of the financial crisis, a collapse that destroyed trillions of dollars in household wealth and left millions unemployed. How much money would it take to repay those losses?

It is clear to any observer that the money that is now coming in from the GSEs is a small pittance for what they have cost the American economy. Any profits remain directly attributable to extensive and continued taxpayer support. That is the point, hence the need for this amendment.

I would urge an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The underlying bill contains no funds for the housing trust fund, yet the gentleman's amendment would create a prohibition on using funds that don't exist in the bill. This is simply a messaging amendment that has no practical purpose.

I oppose 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. ROYCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, as cochair of the Native American Caucus, I am standing with my colleagues here today to support investing in Native American housing.

The United States cannot fulfill its Federal trust obligation to Indian Country without increasing investments in Native American housing.

Here are two facts about Indian country: almost 9 percent of the homes in Indian country still lack complete plumbing facilities and 30 percent of the homes in Indian Country rely on wood for heating.

Another fact is that Native Hawaiian grants have been completely zeroed out of this bill. The Native American Housing Block Grant is a primary Federal source to address housing backlogs and provide sufficient maintenance throughout Indian Country, but this bill flat-funds this account from 2014 at $650 dollars.

While level funding is better than a cut, my colleagues should know that this is the same level of funding provided in fiscal year 2004. We can and we must do better.

Again, to meet its treaty obligations, the United States must increase this investment for Indian housing.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentlelady. Housing is important for the American Indian community. It should be funded. This bill is a decent bill, but flatlining

this funding back to the 2004 level is not acceptable.

We need this housing in rural areas, as the gentlelady mentioned. I represent approximately 400 small villages. Most do not have running water and the facilities that you are used to every day when you get up. They have the problem of many diseases because of the lack of good facilities. We need new housing. We need the money to be spent.

My argument is, if we are putting money in Afghanistan like we have done in the last few years, we ought to be able to put the money into our own Nation and States to have the housing for the native communities.

This is an important piece of legislation, but we ought to fund it to the full extent. It is time that we recognize that we have to help those who do not have, especially our first citizens of the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in order to keep a new, healthy housing market, we must be committed to affordable housing. All citizens should have access to it.

For 16 years, NAHASDA has provided funding for tribes to implement their own strategies to address housing needs that are, quite frankly, unique to their own communities.

Under the program, they can use funds to address their housing needs through a variety of activities, including construction, rehabilitation, modernization, rental assistance, lending programs, crime prevention, and a host of other strategies.

The Puyallup Tribe in my own home State and district recently used NAHASDA funds to construct housing that reflects their culture with a traditional longhouse design and structure.

It is a 10-unit building that is environmentally friendly and features energy-efficient systems that keep costs out. It is beautiful. It is cost effective. It is economical. Most importantly, it meets a basic need.

□ 1515

In fiscal year 2012 alone, the 369 tribal recipients of grants used that funding to build or acquire more than 1,450 affordable homes and rehabilitate another 4,700. Since the inception of the program, recipients have built, acquired, or rehabilitated more than 110,000 homes; but as has been suggested, the funding has failed to keep up with inflation, and it has not met the demonstrated need for the program. In fact, a lot of the funds end up being used for maintenance and operation because it has been flatlined. Meanwhile, the need for the program grows as the money, in relative terms, shrinks. In the 10 years between 2002 to 2012, the number of overcrowded households increased by 14 percent, and 10 percent of all homes in Indian Country are overcrowded. It is notably higher than the national average.

The Federal Government has a trust obligation to promote the wellbeing of Native Americans. It is a trust obligation. It is a legal obligation. Frankly, it is a sacred obligation. Ensuring the proper funding of NAHASDA is a critical component towards meeting those obligations.

As you consider the 2015 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, I ask all of you to please support the robust funding for NAHASDA.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in support of this important NAHASDA program within this appropriations bill.

As has been stated, our country—this Nation, this government—has an important trust responsibility that it is obligated to live up to, and the full funding of NAHASDA is an important way to manifest that obligation.

Just as in any community, housing is an essential component of a civil society. What NAHASDA provides is to not only deal with the backlog of housing needs, which are many—certainly, the dollars that are presently available are not keeping up with the need that is out there in these tribal communities, for sure—but to also allow for the maintenance of the housing that is currently in place.

The difficulty, of course, with a funding level which is the same as it was a decade ago and with a backlog of housing needs is that, as the housing that has been developed ages, more and more of the dollars are necessarily placed into maintaining and improving existing housing, which further increases the backlog of available housing.

I would just suggest to my colleagues—and I know many of my colleagues have done this—to visit the communities. Talk to them about their housing needs, and take a look at the conditions that many are left to live in. You will find that, while this program has been quite successful, as has been said, in providing 110,000 housing units since its inception, there is so much more that needs to be done. We have an obligation as Members of Congress to make sure that we live up to the commitments that we have made, to the trust obligation that we have. It is more than words. In this case, it actually means putting our money where our mouth is and putting the resources behind this program as it should be.

This is an important program. It is one that we are obligated to fund. Obviously, I would prefer that we meet the full obligation that we have committed to. This appropriation does not go as far as it should in doing that. We really need to make sure that, in the future, we do.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chairman, the speakers before me have all said the fundamental issue that we are looking at here, which is of the trust and treaty obligations that this great Nation has created with the native people—the indigenous people and the first people—of this Nation. Yet, for now and for many years, the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to remove any and all funding from a critical program that greatly benefits my home State of Hawaii, and that is the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant.

This program is an essential source of funding because it not only helps the native people on their own land, but it fulfills a trust obligation created by Congress in 1920 by way of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. The act recognized the importance of returning Native Hawaiians to the land to preserve their culture, their traditions, and their values, and the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant has helped to facilitate that.

Similar to what NAHASDA has done for American Indians and Alaska Natives, the Native Hawaiian title of NAHASDA has opened the door to increased partnerships with financial institutions and has enabled the Federal policy of self-determination to be extended to all native populations across this great Nation.

Through the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands has been able to assist over 400 low-income families through infrastructure development, down payment assistance, and direct loans for first-time home buyers, construction programs, and the development of renewable energy projects. There are Native Hawaiian housing lots on each of the Hawaiian Islands. These funds have also been able to address the growing issue of homelessness by rehabilitating older units to make them safe and sanitary.

As we all know, the foundation for the success of millions of American families is a secure home. The Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant has given hundreds of Native Hawaiian families that same foundation to succeed by assisting them with affordable homeownership opportunities in Hawaii, which serve as the groundwork for self-sufficiency and future prosperity.

A disruption to the stream of funding for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant would have a dire impact on dozens of ongoing development projects, including alternative energy resources for homes, investments in infrastructure, and low interest rate loans that seek to benefit the thousands of families living on Hawaiian homelands.

I ask the committee to reconsider its decision to remove this vital program from the bill every year, and I pledge to work with the committee to see that it is restored.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concern about the need for fully supporting Native American housing programs.

I recognize that my colleagues faced a number of difficult choices when crafting this bill, and I specifically want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their work in fully funding the President's request for Native American Housing Block Grants at $650 million. I am pleased to stand here today along with such strong advocates for Indian housing programs, and I am grateful for the leadership that each of the speakers today has shown.

I do share my colleagues' concerns over the adequate funding for our Native Hawaiian housing needs, and I am hopeful that, as this legislation moves forward, Congress can work to address this need as well as to resolve some serious issues with other parts of the bill.

Now, as the members of this committee well know, the challenges facing adequate housing for Indian Country are profound. The district that I represent is home to nine tribes. I have seen firsthand what a difference these housing programs make to individual families and to their communities, and the statistics bear out just how substantial the need is here.

In 2012, the Department of Housing and Urban Development found that more than 25 percent of Indian housing units lack basic facilities, are overcrowded, or cost more than 50 percent of residents' incomes. There is a need today for 200,000 more housing units in Indian Country. That is why I am hoping that this body will soon hold a hearing on the reauthorization of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act, or NAHASDA.

I know that there has been bipartisan work both in the House and in the Senate on identifying ways to increase the effectiveness of these programs and to reduce duplicative bureaucratic requirements; but there is another element of NAHASDA that I think is absolutely important not only to Indian Country but also to those who have worn the uniform in service to our country. That element is homelessness among our tribal veterans.

In December 2012, the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness found that, while Native Americans make up 0.7 percent of the total population of veterans, they represent 2½ percent of veterans experiencing homelessness. In other words, homelessness disproportionately affects our tribal veterans.

Unfortunately, as I stand here today, we don't have the tools we need to help fight homelessness among our tribal veterans. The HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing program, which has made real and significant progress in tackling veterans' homelessness, does not have the authorities and flexibilities to provide support to the native veterans who are facing homelessness.

That is why I was pleased to join with Representative COLE—a true champion for Indian Country—in introducing H.R. 3418, the Housing Native Heroes Act. Our legislation doesn't cost any new money, but it would, instead, authorize existing funds to support a demonstration project that would allow tribes to manage this voucher program directly. In both the House and the Senate, the proposed reauthorization bills advance this proposal, making critical progress in the fight to reduce homelessness among tribal veterans.

We have an obligation—a trust obligation—to our tribes but also a sacred obligation to all of our veterans, which is to take care of them when they return home. We simply cannot turn a blind eye to the needs of our native veterans. If this Chamber can make progress in advancing the NAHASDA reauthorization, I am confident that we can end this anomaly that leaves our tribal veterans without the support they need.

I would like to conclude by noting that the underlying bill before us today provides $75 million for the HUD-VASH program, which is in line with the President's budget request.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their continued support for this program.

I ask, as this committee continues its work of combating homelessness among our veterans, that the challenges facing our tribal veterans not be forgotten.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

Mr. DENHAM. 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 high-speed rail in the State of California or for the California High-Speed Rail Authority.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. Again, it reads: ''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.''

As chair of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, I am a big supporter of high-speed rail. I have seen some of the greatest high-speed rail in other countries, and here, even in the United States, we are going to see the first high-speed rail in Texas and then in Florida—two projects that are moving forward with private dollars.

Yet, in California, in 2008, we passed Proposition 1A, which was a guarantee to the voters that a $33 billion project would not only be built but would be built on time, with equal parts of funding from the State voters, from the Federal Government, hopefully, and then from the private investors. Today, 5 years later, after $3.8 billion in stimulus funds for shovel-ready projects were dedicated to this, still not one shovel is in the ground. It is a project that has been held up in court. The $9.95 billion cannot be used, and there are no private investors.

So the question is: Why should the Federal Government be putting more money into a project that is nonexistent today?

It is a project that, even by its own definition, is $32 billion short, not in the project, but in the initial operating segment, which is guaranteed to the voters to be completed. This is a project that has grown out of control. When they found out that they were in default in April, rather than fixing the problem, they committed to next year's budget, utilizing $250 million in cap-and-trade funding.

There is a reason the judges have struck this down to this point, and there is a reason that voters wanted to have this go back before them: it is a project that has no end in sight. Again, no shovels have been put into the ground even though the Federal Government has obligated $3.8 billion—money that could be used for other priorities. Today, we are in a situation. With a $32 billion shortfall, there is no proposal from the President to fill that gap, and there is no proposal from the Governor to fill that gap. Yet there is the hope that the Federal Government will continue to find new money to throw at something that is nonexistent.

This doesn't meet the Prop 1A guarantee. There is no State match, and the cost has more than doubled. Again, the jobs that have continued to be talked about for the last 5 years are nonexistent.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge an ''aye'' vote on this amendment. We have got to stop this train wreck.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the California Democratic congressional delegation, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This misguided amendment would prohibit additional Federal investment in California's high-speed rail project. As we know, California is in the midst of constructing the Nation's first truly high-speed rail system.

The project was approved by a strong majority of California voters in 2008 because we Californians know that high-speed rail is the most effective and environmentally sustainable way to increase mobility across the State.

Now, the project is already creating jobs for Californians. In fact, more than 70 firms that have committed to performing work on this project have offices in the Central Valley, and many of these firms, happily, are veteran-owned.

In San Jose, the California high-speed rail project is already providing immediate benefits by investing $1.5 billion in the Caltrain Modernization Program. This program will create over 9,500 jobs, over 90 percent in the San Francisco Bay area.

Now, the government's independent watchdog, the GAO, conducted an extensive audit of the project. And you know what? They gave high marks to the authority's business plan for high-speed rail.

Members of Congress are right to conduct proper oversight of infrastructure projects across the country. However, regardless of your views on the merits of this project, I think most of us would agree that attempting to kill a single project through the appropriations process is bad public policy and sets a horrible precedent.

I would note that electrified trains are really part of the future. China already has 5,000 miles of high-speed rail, and they intend to double that. Spain has 1,600 miles of high-speed rail, and they are building more. More than a dozen other countries have their own successful high-speed rail systems. Even Morocco is building a high-speed rail system. But we don't have anything in the United States except for what California is doing.

I would note that California is almost always on the leading edge of progress for our country. We are leading in energy conservation. We are leading in alternative energy, and we have the best public university, the University of California, in the entire United States. We always lead.

Now, it is important that the State of California has identified an ongoing source of funds to support high-speed rail, and that is the cap-and-trade funds. Is that appropriate?

Yes, it is, because the cap-and-trade funds are generated through energy conservation, and the high-speed rail system is going to help move Californians in an environmentally suitable way.

It is important to be visionary here. You know, when we started building the interstate highway system, when the first mile of highway was built, we didn't know that 50 years later we would still be identifying interstates to build.

We need to begin with high-speed rail in California. California is behind this project. The California Democratic delegation is behind this project.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment, put our neighbors back to work, and allow California to continue building the Nation's first true high-speed rail project. We will all be proud of that project as it nears completion.

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

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

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. DENHAM's amendment.

High-speed rail has been a boondoggle in California pretty much since day one. The voters, when they had it presented in front of them as Prop 1A in the 2008 election, they were shown a $33 billion project that would connect San Francisco to Los Angeles with a continuous high-speed rail project.

What we found out, within 3 years, was after the price went up initially $45 billion, that a true audit turned out it would be $98.5 billion. After that, the Governor real quick decided to change the project and use the connectivity of the Bay Area and Los Angeles, their local systems, to make up for it, which is illegal under Prop 1A. It has to be continuing from San Francisco to LA. You can't use local transit systems under Prop 1A.

So now what we see is that they were able to downsize the cost to only $68 billion over what the voters, by a 52 percent, not an overwhelming margin, merely 52 percent, approved.

They were sold a bill of goods. That is why we shouldn't spend another Federal dollar or State dollar which enables—the Federal dollars enable the State dollars to be spent. We need to stop that here until they come up with a real plan that shows the financing.

They haven't shown the financing yet. We can identify $3 billion worth of Federal money, $9.95 billion worth of State money, approximately $13 billion for a project in the downsized illegal form that is only $68 billion, they say.

Where does the other $55 billion come from?

They have no idea. There is no private sector money. There is no more Federal money that is going to happen, other than the $3 billion that has been captured from the stimulus package of a couple of years ago.

We need to take that money and channel that into something else that we need to do desperately, such as our transportation infrastructure which we are speaking about here this week. Or in California we have a desperate need for water supply during our drought, instead of a boondoggle which is going to pave through a bunch of our ag land in California, as well as important other infrastructure.

What do we hear about it?

Oh, it is going to save CO_2. It is going to be a panacea for global warming. You know, for 30 years it won't even help toward this project of global warming. Instead, part of their plan is they are going to have to plant trees to offset the construction of high-speed rail because it is going to have a higher CO_2 footprint than what we already have.

It is boondoggle after boondoggle. We talk about jobs. These aren't real jobs. The numbers have been inflated since day one. They tried to tell us 3 years ago that it was going to cause a million new jobs for California.

When we finally pinned them down in a State committee, they said, well, that means a million job years. It turns out to be it might be 5,000, 10,000 jobs under construction, not a million jobs. It is deceit after deceit.

We need to plow this money that we have federally back into something that would help our transportation infrastructure in California or in the Nation, help build water supply, anything but this project here, which is full of deceit and empty promise after empty promise.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

I just wanted to make a couple of quick points. First, it is easy to be a critic and it is hard to be a builder. The high-speed rail project is a big project, it is difficult to do, but we are going to get it done.

Sometimes I wonder, when people say don't do high-speed rail, how they plan to deal with the millions of additional Californians that are anticipated to clog our roads and need transportation infrastructure.

It has been suggested by dispassionate engineers that we would need at least two or three additional airports in California. We would need several, as many as five, additional lanes, north-south, in the middle of California to match the capacity of high-speed rail.

How are we going to do that?

Do we think that that is not going to be expensive?

The alternative to high-speed rail is not nothing. That is impossible for a State as vibrant as California, with an economy as booming as it is, and a future as bright as we have.

I would note also that the idea that it is inappropriate to use cap-and-trade funds, I just simply disagree with. California is among the first in the Nation, I would say, and it has got wide approval in the State, to do this cap-and-trade system, to bring down carbon emissions.

Funds will be generated through that project. Some of those funds will go to this very worthy project.

So I disagree very much with this amendment. I don't believe that we will be successful—my God, I hope we

are not—in stopping this visionary project that is going to allow the State of California to continue to prosper and for transportation north-south needs to be met into the future.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, 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 question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DENHAM. 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.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to highlight the tragic shortage of suitable housing on tribal lands, and to call for increasing funding for the highly successful Native American Housing and Self Determination Act.

Now, in 1996, Congress reorganized native housing programs into NAHASDA, a block grant system administered by tribes in cooperation with HUD. NAHASDA has proven to be an extremely effective tool for tribes to help tribal members increase the quality and quantity of housing.

NAHASDA not only works, but fosters tribal self-determination and affirms the trust relationship that exists between Congress and tribal nations.

Mr. Chairman, a bipartisan coalition of Members, Representatives COLE, HANABUSA, HECK, KILDEE, and Representative YOUNG and I, have introduced a bipartisan reauthorization NAHASDA, which is extremely similar to a draft that Representative PEARCE has introduced.

Now, both bills, Mr. Chairman, make prudent changes to increase the efficiency of the delivery of the program dollars, and I strongly believe that the changes will have a very positive impact.

But, Mr. Chairman, increased efficiency will not replace the need for more money. The top three poorest counties in the United States of America are primarily populated by Native Americans.

However, despite overwhelming need, we are not increasing funding for the program, and the current appropriation bill does not include funding for all Native peoples. The program funding has been flat for years and, at current level funding levels, we are falling way behind.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of NAHASDA reauthorization point to the slow spend-down rate of a single tribe, giving the false sense that there is a surplus. However, the overall spend-down rate in NAHASDA exceeds that of other HUD programs, indicative of the dire housing needs.

The first people of this Nation suffer in crushing poverty on remote reservations, outside of the view of most Americans. The National Congress of American Indians finds that 40 percent of on-reservation housing is substandard, compared to 6 percent outside of Indian Country.

The homes are overcrowded, and too many basic utilities like access to the sewer system or even indoor plumbing is missing.

I call on Congress to put these first Americans in their hearts and to consider helping these communities by supporting both NAHASDA reauthorization and increased funding for this extremely successful Native housing program.

By supporting funding for the Native American Housing and Self Determination Act, we are working towards increasing the quality of housing for Native Americans, and that is good for all of our districts.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 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. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the committee for the diligent work that they have done to do their part to get this funding bill, this appropriations bill, to begin to bring the costs down. I think that it truly shows how dedicated many of us on this side of the aisle are to having government get its spending under control.

□ 1545

We all know Washington does not have a revenue problem. It has an acute spending and priority problem. We see it every single day. My constituents in Tennessee see it, and they talk about it a lot.

Last week, I heard a lot about the outside spending that takes place in this town, and the thing that really offends my constituents is that Congress spends, D.C. spends money that they don't have. All of it is taxpayer money, and it is so inappropriate that the spending continues to grow year by year, and the taxpayer has to pay more.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think that there is something immoral about citizens and taxpayers struggling to live within their means, so they can pay taxes to a government that refuses to live within its means.

That is why, every year, I come to the floor and offer bills for 1, 2, and 5 percent across-the-board cuts, and then during appropriations season, I know I kind of wear a path in the carpet here, offering amendments that would cut a penny on the dollar, 1 percent across the board, and that is the nature of this amendment that I offer today.

I do it because my constituents know that Washington spends too much money, that we borrow too much money and, therefore, what we are doing is capping and trading our children's future to the people that own our debt because we couldn't be spending it if we weren't borrowing it.

Go talk to China, Japan, OPEC, the top holders of our debt, and they own a lot of it right now. They are the ones who will be making the decisions—probably decisions we won't like—and at some point, they may call that bill due.

Now, across-the-board spending cuts are not a partisan issue. In 2010, Peter Orszag, who was the President's pick for Director of the Office of Management and Budget, turned to the executive departments and agencies and said: I want you just to go in and cut 5 percent across the board.

Governor Christie of New Jersey is well known for turning around that State. It was a 9 percent across-the-board cut; Governor Cuomo of New York, a 10 percent across-the-board cut; Governor Perry of Texas, a 10 percent across-the-board cut.

States do it because it works. What it does is it engages the rank-and-file employees who know where you can make these cuts, so I think it is time for the Federal Government to begin to do this.

In our history, we have had six across-the-board cuts. They have ranged from 0.22 percent to 1 percent of covered appropriations. At those times, it saved us from $1.1 billion to $8.5 billion.

For this bill, we need to be doing the same thing; and yes, we are below the funding levels, to the credit of the appropriators who have worked on this. We are below the 2014 funding levels. That is a good thing, but we need to do a little bit more because we are borrowing way too much.

It is time to get our spending under control. I encourage my colleagues to support the 1 percent across-the-board spending reduction to this bill, and let's take one more step to bring this spending problem under control and move to a balanced budget.

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

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have already crafted this bill to our 302(b) allocation, which is in compliance with the Ryan-Murray budget agreement.

While I agree with the gentlewoman's desire to reduce spending, the proper time to consider reductions to overall spending is when the budget is being crafted, not on individual appropriations bills.

This bill continues the investment in our Nation's transportation infrastructure, as well as serving as a critical safety net for some of our most vulnerable populations by trying to make sure all Americans have a roof over their head.

This amendment would cut the FAA air traffic controllers, cut infrastructure, highway spending, transit grants, section 8 vouchers, VASH vouchers for our homeless veterans, safety inspectors for all modes of transportation, and also homeless grants.

We have done our cutting based on hearings, meetings with the departments and the stakeholders, and analyzing the budget justifications, rather than just an arbitrary across-the-board cut.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I would urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, just to remind my colleagues, this bill is $1.8 billion below the 2014 bill in spending.

We had a number of our colleagues speak about the lack of funding for their particular programs, and throughout this evening, we are going to have other speakers talk about the lack of funding and programs.

This amendment would cut programs in transportation and housing, without any thought to the relative merit of the programs contained in the bill, so for that reason, I would oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman 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 gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. 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. 417.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of this section or the amendments made by this section.

(b) BUY-AMERICAN PREFERENCES.—Chapter 501 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the chapter heading and inserting ''**BUY AMERICA**''.

(c) ENHANCEMENTS TO BUY AMERICA REQUIREMENTS.—Section 50101 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 50101. Buy America

''(a) DOMESTIC SOURCE REQUIREMENT FOR STEEL, IRON, AND MANUFACTURED GOODS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as provided in paragraph (2), funds made available to carry out section 106(k), 44502(a)(2), or 44509, subchapter I of chapter 471 (except section 47127), or chapter 481 (except sections 48102(e), 48106, 48107, and 48110) of this title may not be obligated for a project unless the steel, iron, and manufactured goods used for the project are produced in the United States.

''(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT.—With respect to a project for the procurement of a facility or equipment, funds made available to carry out the provisions specified in paragraph (1) may not be obligated for the project unless—

''(A) the cost of components and subcomponents produced in the United States—

''(i) for fiscal year 2015 is more than 60 percent of the cost of all components of the facility or equipment;

''(ii) for fiscal year 2016 is more than 70 percent of the cost of all components of the facility or equipment;

''(iii) for fiscal year 2017 is more than 80 percent of the cost of all components of the facility or equipment;

''(iv) for fiscal year 2018 is more than 90 percent of the cost of all components of the facility or equipment; and

''(v) for fiscal year 2019, and each fiscal year thereafter, is 100 percent of the cost of all components of the facility or equipment; and

''(B) final assembly of the facility or equipment occurs in the United States.

''(3) SCOPE.—The requirements of this section apply to all contracts for a project carried out within the scope of the applicable finding, determination, or decision under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), regardless of the funding source of such contracts, if at least one contract for the project is funded with amounts made available to carry out a provision specified in paragraph (1).

''(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(1) ISSUANCE OF WAIVERS.—The Secretary of Transportation may waive the requirements of subsection (a) only if the Secretary finds that—

''(A) applying subsection (a) would be inconsistent with the public interest, as determined in accordance with the regulations required under paragraph (2);

''(B) the steel, iron, or manufactured goods required for a project are not produced in the United States—

''(i) in sufficient and reasonably available quantities; or

''(ii) to a satisfactory quality; or

''(C) the use of steel, iron, and manufactured goods produced in the United States for a project will increase the total cost of the project by more than 25 percent.

''(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than October 1, 2015, the Secretary shall issue regulations establishing the criteria that the Secretary shall use to determine whether the application of subsection (a) is inconsistent with the public interest for purposes of paragraph (1)(A).

''(3) LABOR COSTS.—For purposes of this section, labor costs involved in final assembly are not included in calculating the cost of components.

''(4) REQUESTS FOR WAIVERS.—An entity seeking a waiver under paragraph (1) shall submit to the Secretary a request for the waiver in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(5) PREFERENCE FOR AMERICAN-ASSEMBLED FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT.—In the procurement of a facility or equipment subject to a waiver issued under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give preference to a facility or equipment for which final assembly occurred in the United States.

''(6) LIMITATION ON WAIVER AUTHORITY.—In the procurement of a facility or equipment, if the Secretary finds that a component of the facility or equipment is not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities or to a satisfactory quality, the Secretary may issue a waiver under paragraph (1) with respect to such component.

''(c) WAIVER REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) PUBLIC NOTIFICATION OF AND OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT ON REQUEST FOR A WAIVER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary receives a request for a waiver under subsection (b), the Secretary shall provide notice of and an opportunity for public comment on the request at least 30 days before making a finding based on the request.

''(B) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—A notice provided under subparagraph (A) shall—

''(i) include the information available to the Secretary concerning the request, including whether the request is being made under subsection (b)(1)(A), (b)(1)(B), or (b)(1)(C); and

''(ii) be provided by electronic means, including on the official public Internet Web site of the Department of Transportation.

''(2) DETAILED JUSTIFICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—If the Secretary issues a waiver under subsection (b), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed justification for the waiver that—

''(A) addresses the public comments received under paragraph (1)(A); and

''(B) is published before the waiver takes effect.

''(d) STATE REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may not impose a limitation or condition on assistance provided with funds made available to carry out a provision specified in subsection (a)(1) that restricts—

''(1) a State from imposing requirements that are more stringent than those imposed under this section with respect to limiting the use of articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured in foreign countries for projects carried out with such assistance; or

''(2) any recipient of such assistance from complying with such State requirements.

''(e) CONSISTENCY WITH INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall be applied in a manner that is consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

''(2) TREATMENT OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES IN VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall prohibit the use of steel, iron, and manufactured goods produced in a foreign country in a project funded with funds made available to carry out a provision specified in subsection (a)(1), including any project for which the Secretary has issued a waiver under subsection (b), if the Secretary, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that the foreign country is in violation of the terms of an agreement with the United States by discriminating against steel, iron, or manufactured goods that are produced in the United States and covered by the agreement.''.

(d) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING UPON FALSIFICATION OF LABEL.—Section 50105 of such

title is amended by inserting ''steel, iron, or manufactured'' before ''goods''.

(e) REVIEW OF NATIONWIDE WAIVERS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and at least every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall review each standing nationwide waiver issued under section 50101 of title 49, United States Code, to determine whether continuing such waiver is necessary.

Mr. GARAMENDI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, 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.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady from Tennessee spoke about the American taxpayer and the money that is being spent by Congress, and I would like to pick up on that subject because I am deeply concerned about where and how we spend our taxpayer money. It is not our money. It is the American public's money, and it ought to be spent wisely, and it ought to be spent on American-made goods and services.

This amendment would build off of the current law dating back to 1933, the Buy American laws. This amendment is necessary, and I will tell you why it is necessary.

This is a picture of the new San Francisco Bay Bridge, built by the Chinese Government—several billion dollars of American taxpayer money, California bridge tolls, and Federal taxpayer dollars spent to buy steel products to build this bridge from the Chinese Government. It was a steel company in Shanghai, owned by the Chinese Government—actually, by the Chinese military—that built this bridge.

This bridge should have been built by Americans—American steel companies, American workers. It should not have been built by the Chinese Government. Three thousand jobs in Shanghai, zero jobs in America—and a very shoddy job done on the bridge, thousands upon thousands of faulty welds, over budget, and it went over on time.

We need to strengthen the Buy American laws. We need to bring it home. We need to Make It In America, and this amendment would strengthen the Buy American laws in the transportation portion of this bill.

It would simply say that 60 percent is good. 70, 80, 90, and 100 percent is where we ought to be. We ought not any longer contract out to foreign companies and specifically not to the Chinese Government to build American bridges.

We are going to spend $50 billion in this bill. Is that money going to be spent here in America on American-made goods and services? Or is it going to be spent somewhere overseas, perhaps China?

No more, I say. Build it in America. Use American taxpayer dollars to buy American goods and services. This ought to be the mantra of this Congress: Buy America. Employ Americans. Give American companies here in the United States the opportunity to bid on these jobs.

It is not going to be more expensive, and this is the proof, way over budget, way beyond the timeframes, and way beyond what is reasonable.

Build it in America, American jobs, spend American taxpayer money on American-made equipment, goods, and services. That is what this amendment does.

It also eliminates one of the problems that led to the segmentation, but we will not go there. We will simply say it is going to be made in America. That is what this amendment is all about.

I know we are going to get a point of order, but really, we ought to waive that point of order and put on the floor the issue: Is this House willing to Make It In America, to bring the American jobs back home? Is this House willing to allow American taxpayer money to be spent on American-made goods and services? Or are we simply going to do a point of order and avoid the fundamental question that was raised by my colleague in her previous discussion, how are we to spend the American taxpayer money? I say spend it on American-made goods and services.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment directly amends existing law.

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. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we could use the rules of this House to promote policies that are beneficial to the American Government, beneficial to the American taxpayer, and, most importantly, beneficial to the American workers, whether they are employed in the steel industry or the construction industry, or we could use the rules of the House to deny American workers the opportunity for jobs.

We are spending $50 billion in this legislation, and we ought not use the rules of this House to deny American workers, to deny American companies the opportunity to use the American taxpayer dollars to build America. The rules of this House are flexible. They can be used to benefit America and American workers or they can be used to the detriment.

The question the Chair has before it is, How will we use those rules? Will we, in this House, strengthen the American economy by requiring that the American taxpayer dollars be used here in America? Or will we use the rule in the opposite way, to the harm of American workers?

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, you rule in favor of American workers and override the request.

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 Chair finds that this amendment directly amends existing law.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

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

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman of the T-HUD Subcommittee to rise and engage in a colloquy.

First of all, I have to commend Chairman LATHAM, Ranking Member PASTOR, and the Appropriations Committee staff for their great efforts in bringing this measure to the floor.

□ 1600

I would like to take just a moment at this opportunity to share with the committee and my colleagues a concern that I have regarding the recommendation in report language that is contained in this bill that provides funding for capital investment grants that have signed a full funding grant agreement, FFGA, by the start of the 2015 fiscal year on September 30, 2014.

Unfortunately, some delays and miscommunications with the Department of Transportation on several projects, including an important Florida project, has caused the signing of a FFGA, full funding grant agreement, to be delayed several months beyond the date in the report language. And, again, without congressional action, Florida's project and other national projects could be impacted.

I have received assurances that this issue can be resolved in the final legislation.

Mr. Chairman, would you join us in our effort to ensure that these critical national infrastructure projects continue to move forward?

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman. As we move forward to conference, we will work with the gentleman to ensure that any project ready for full funding grant agreements will receive funds under our conference allocation.

Mr. MICA. I thank the chairman and look forward to working with him to maintain and expand our national infrastructure. I am pleased to yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. BLACK). 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.''.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, no hardworking 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. My amendment would deny Federal contracts to those who violate the Fair Labor Standards Act to deny workers the pay that they have earned.

The amendment ensures that those in violation of the law do not get taxpayer support. We should be in the business of rewarding good actors and not rewarding cheaters.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. We would accept the amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the gentleman.

Madam 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. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHOCK

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam 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 paragraph (c)(3) of section 982.503, Code of Federal Regulations.

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

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the T-HUD appropriation bill really to address a problem that we have identified in our State of Illinois. Many of us are familiar with the Housing Choice Voucher program, often known as section 8. Throughout our communities, over 2 million households in America receive some form of benefit through section 8 vouchers. In many localities around the country, and particularly in my home State of Illinois, there are long wait lists of people who would qualify for and desperately need access to affordable housing and particularly the assistance they get under section 8 vouchers through the T-HUD appropriations bill.

Unfortunately, there have been some abuses and stretching of permission that Congress has given specifically to the Housing and Urban Development Secretary. I am speaking about a program commonly referred to as super vouchers, where the agency has basically used Congress' latitude it has given it to allow it to go up to 125 percent of what is deemed to be the cost of affordable housing in a particular community.

Obviously, from community to community, the cost of affordable housing differs, and the value of a voucher differs for a family member. But we have seen in the city of Chicago, for example, in my home State, of vouchers now going up to over 300 percent of the average cost of affordable housing and a voucher value approaching over $4,000 a month for a single voucher recipient.

Now, I know that each State's real estate values are different, each State's rental costs are different, and certainly Illinois may be more expensive than other States, but I would submit to my colleagues that for every one of these super vouchers that we give out, for every family that is given over 300 percent of what they should be given, there are tens of thousands of families waiting in line patiently and desperately needing some assistance, and there is only so much money in the pot that Congress appropriates.

So what my limited amendment really does is instruct the Secretary to go up to that 125 percent limit, but really to allow that those dollars of money that Congress appropriates in a bipartisan way for section 8 housing ensure that we help as many families as possible, and that we don't allow some families to, in essence, hit the lottery and get over $4,000 a month when others—for example, in the city of Chicago, we have over 40,000 people on a waiting list who meet the qualifications for section 8 housing.

It is time that they get the assistance that they need and their families need. It is time that they get into and have access to affordable housing, and it is time that we eliminate these super vouchers, which, really, reward a few at the expense of so many.

So, with that, I would urge a ''yes'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, reluctantly I must rise in opposition to the amendment. I share the gentleman's concern, and that is why we have included language in our committee report directing HUD to review instances of payments for housing that exceed 120 percent of fair market rates.

The big problem is I have concerns about the potential unintended consequences of this funding prohibition, in particular, the elderly and disabled populations which could be displaced with an amendment such as this.

I really appreciate the gentleman's attention to this issue and will continue to work with HUD to address any excessive, unwarranted overpayments for assistance to our most vulnerable citizens.

I reluctantly must urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, we rise also in opposition to this 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. SCHOCK).

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

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam 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 Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS

Mr. HIGGINS. 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 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).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Chair, since the creation of the Community Development Block Grant in 1974——

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIGGINS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. We will accept the amendment.

Mr. HIGGINS. 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. HIGGINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GERLACH. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GERLACH. Madam Chairman, I rise to engage the gentleman from Iowa, Chairman LATHAM, in a colloquy.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERLACH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I would be happy to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the chairman. First of all, Mr. Chairman, thank you for your hard work on this legislation, but I do have a concern about funding for the Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety, or DADSS, program that supports research of advanced alcohol detection technology. MAP–21 authorized and Congress provided $5.44 million for this program in fiscal year 2014. For fiscal year 2015, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration requested $5.72 million. Unfortunately, the report attached to the T-HUD bill specifies only $2.72 million for this program.

The DADSS program supports a cooperative agreement between the Automotive Coalition for Traffic Safety and the National Traffic Highway Safety Administration to work together to create a passive, in-vehicle technology that can determine the driver's—and only the driver's—blood alcohol content. If the driver is at or above 0.08, the illegal limit in all 50 States, the car would be inoperable.

The current operating plan for the program runs through 2018, and the goal at this time would be to have ready a commercially viable technology by then. While great progress has been made, more research must take place. Full funding for this research should be a priority for this Congress because each year, over 10,000 Americans are killed due to drunk driving—nearly one-third of all traffic fatalities.

Madam Chairman, Mothers Against Drunk Driving has called the DADSS program its highest legislative priority. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety has looked at the potential of this technology and said it could save over 7,000 lives per year. Every major traffic safety group in this country supports this, including the National Transportation Safety Board. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has identified this project as one of its highest priorities.

The authorized funding level is not a tremendous sum when you consider the fact that drunk driving costs Americans over $132 billion each year, and I believe that fully funding this project and including the administration's request of $5.72 million—which is already included in the Senate fiscal year 2015 Transportation-HUD Appropriations bill—is a small price to pay for a project with this much potential.

I would respectfully ask the chairman that we work together to restore this critical funding.

Mr. LATHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's attention to this important safety issue and for highlighting the promise of this research initiative. I look forward to working with you as our bill moves through the legislative process to make certain DADSS research is adequately funded.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the gentleman.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam 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 in 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.

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

□ 1615

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, this is simply a good government amendment that is reflected in a different form in the Senate Transportation-Housing bill. I am seeking to provide a similar provision in the House bill.

This was offered in a different form yesterday. There were objections to it that were sustained. We have worked with the Parliamentarian to overcome those objections.

This provision refers to none of the funds available in this act may be used for incentive payments pursuant to a particular regulatory provision to contractors for contracts that are behind schedule under the terms of another regulatory provision or over the contract amount as indicated in a standard form used in contracting.

That is standard form 33, box 20, subject to modification in standard form 30, box 14—sorry, box 12. This will rein in contractors who are late and working over budget and prevent them from getting extra payments.

We are simply speaking about extra payments here, payments they would not normally be receiving, except for the fact that they are asking for them and claim some entitlement to them. Too often, the government engages in waste, fraud, and abuse with contracting. This will help to rein that in.

I respectfully ask for the support of my colleagues on 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. 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. ____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development—Management and Administration—Executive Offices'' is hereby reduced by $2,000,000.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to save taxpayers money and to hold a disorganized and wasteful department accountable for its actions and inactions.

My amendment is very simple. It reduces the funding to the executive offices at the Department of Housing and Urban Development by $2 million, which brings their funding levels back to fiscal year 2014 levels.

As always, I appreciate the work the committee does to put these bills and committee reports together. It is not an easy job, but I am also glad that Members are able to read their work and offer further input here on the House floor.

Since Republicans took the House majority in 2012, we have done our best to bring regular order and an open process to the House proceedings. I am happy to see a return to regular order, and I am further grateful that I and my colleagues are able to participate in the appropriations process.

For the second year in a row, I have read the committee's report on the administrative offices at HUD and was stunned to see that, yet again, HUD is running in an inefficient manner and has, again, likely violated the Antideficiency Act.

Further, HUD did not notify or request permission from Congress for certain budget reprogramming activities and hired more people than they could afford to pay.

I would like to quickly cite excerpts from the committee report on this issue:

HUD must have systems in place to track fundamental budgetary resource data, including budget authority and FTE levels.

A lack of essential information at HUD has, in the past, led to Antideficiency Act violations in which HUD hired more people than it had resources to pay.

While the committee recognizes deficiencies caused by antiquated enterprise systems and acknowledges HUD's effort to address these deficiencies, proper management of agency resources is a fundamental responsibility and antiquated systems are no excuse for the violation of Federal law.

The committee also directs HUD to clearly identify in its budget justifications the movement or transfer of budgetary resources from one account to another account, so that year-over-year comparisons are possible.

The fact that the committee must specifically spell out and direct an executive department or agency to conduct its affairs properly is, quite frankly, embarrassing and deplorable.

Then again, I suppose government inefficiency is the status quo these days. These same inefficiencies have been identified year after year now. HUD cannot get its affairs in order. As such, Congress should not be increasing funding for paper pushers and other bureaucrats.

I would also demand that HUD stop hiring more people than they can pay, stop reprogramming money within their accounts to fix self-imposed mistakes and then withhold that information from Congress, and finally, stop breaking Federal law. Congress must not reward bad behavior with increased funding levels.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office stated this amendment reduces both the budget authority in the bill and the 2015 outlays by $2 million. With a Federal debt surpassing $18 trillion, it is irresponsible to throw more money at a department that cannot manage its own affairs.

I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment. I thank the chairman and ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment. While I appreciate the gentleman's effort to further reduce spending, this account is already below the enacted funding level, and further cuts in this account are unwarranted.

This account primarily funds employee salaries and benefits, and an additional 14 percent reduction would result in the furlough or layoff of key HUD employees. Disruption of the leadership offices at HUD would jeopardize the welfare of millions of vulnerable families and billions of dollars in taxpayer investments. Therefore, I cannot support the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I oppose the amendment.

The levels provided for salaries and expenses at HUD in the base bill are insufficient. Many offices will need to furlough or terminate employees to make these levels work, and this amendment would aggravate this problem further.

As it is, the funding level in this bill will require HUD to furlough its personnel in this office for 12 days. This amendment would increase the number of furlough days required. At these levels, HUD's ability to carry out their mission would be jeopardized. I oppose the 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. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. 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. ____. Each amount otherwise made available by this Act for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development—Management and Administration—Administrative Support Offices'' is hereby reduced by 4.2 percent.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer one last amendment to save taxpayers money and hold a disorganized and wasteful department accountable for its actions and inactions.

Following to the heels of my previous amendment, this amendment reduces funding for ineffective bureaucrats at HUD by $21 million, bringing their funding levels to the level recommend by the House Appropriations Committee in fiscal year 2014.

The current bill funds these HUD bureaucrats through the administrative support offices at a staggering $500 million. My amendment reduces each subaccount by 4.2 percent, so that the sum of each reduction to each subaccount equals the $21 million reduction to the overall account. Again, this is the amount recommended by this committee for the overall account in fiscal year 2014.

As I mentioned, I appreciate the work that the committee does to put these bills and committee reports together, but the committee report associated with the appropriations bill, once again, for the second year in a row, highlighted major deficiencies in the Housing and Urban Development management Offices.

At minimum, this mismanaged agency should at least include those reprogramming efforts in their budget justifications. They failed to do so and are far from being considered a model of transparency.

HUD's bureaucracy is not only massive, it is extremely wasteful and inefficient. The associated committee report—which I cited in my comments on my previous amendment a moment ago—is quite harsh to HUD and rightfully so.

These same inefficiencies within the agency have been identified year after year after year. Again, Congress must not reward bad behavior with increased finding levels.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office stated this amendment reduced budget authority in the bill by $21 million and reduces the 2015 outlays by $16 million. With an $18 trillion debt that continues to grow, it is irresponsible to throw more money at a department that cannot manage its own affairs.

I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I must rise in opposition to this amendment also. While I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to further reduce spending, this account is already $6 million below the enacted level from last year and over $30 million below the President's request.

Additional cuts would require HUD to furlough or lay off employees which undermines the Department's ability to adequately serve millions of low-income, elderly, and disabled households and puts billions of taxpayer dollars at risk.

Unfortunately, the way the amendment is written, it would not reduce the deficit at all. It doesn't go to the deficit reduction account. It would basically just stay in the bill, to be spent by someone else, somewhere else; so it doesn't really save the taxpayers any money in the end. I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment. Again, the levels provided for salaries and expenses at HUD in the base bill are insufficient. As it is, the funding level in this bill will require HUD to furlough its personnel in these offices for up to 90 days. Nearly all will be under a hiring freeze.

This amendment would increase the number of furlough days required and would lead to reductions in force. At these levels, HUD's ability to carry out its mission would be jeopardized. I oppose the 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. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

Mr. SCHIFF. 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 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 operator of Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, California.

Mr. SCHIFF (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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the amendment I am offering, along with my southern California colleagues, Mr. BRAD SHERMAN and Mr. HENRY WAXMAN. The amendment would allow the Burbank Bob Hope Airport to implement a nighttime curfew between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

Thousands of residents of southern California's San Fernando Valley, who live under the flight paths or near the terminals at Bob Hope Airport, endure the house-shaking noise of air traffic during the day and suffer the jarring interruption of their sleep caused by roaring jets, sometimes late at night.

To address the concerns of those affected by airport noise across the Nation, the FAA established a process to consider an individual community's request for a curfew. However, the process was designed to be difficult, so difficult that, in the decades since it was established by the FAA, only one airport in the Nation has successfully completed an application—Bob Hope Airport—and then it was summarily turned down.

When Congress enacted the 1990 Airport Noise and Capacity Act, ANCA, it intended for ANCA to permit airports to obtain 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 noise problems.

Bob Hope Airport, located in Burbank, California, was one of the first airports in the country to impose a curfew and has a long history of curfews, but was unfortunately not given the protection of the grandfather provision of ANCA that several other similar airports received.

My 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 by correcting the omission of not allowing Bob Hope Airport to implement, on a permanent and mandatory basis, the curfew which it had in effect informally since the 1980s.

□ 1630

After spending $7 million and 9 years of effort, the FAA rejected Bob Hope's request for a curfew, erroneously contending that the small number of flights impacted by the curfew would impose too great a strain on the country's aviation system and impose too great a cost on users. In reality, the FAA approached the process in reverse, beginning with its conclusion, the one it wanted to reach, and working backwards to try to justify its intended and desired result.

It is important that my colleagues understand the impact of this amendment on aviation in southern California. There will be no impact on commercial flights. Almost all commercial airlines already voluntarily abide by the voluntary nighttime curfew of Bob Hope; and the impact on general aviation will be limited to 2 nighttime landings, 4 days a week by large jet aircraft, and a handful of nighttime turboprop takeoffs.

Because of the FAA's dismissive attitude toward legitimate local concerns, it is clear to us the only way to provide relief to our residents is through this legislative action. Madam Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment to correct an omission in ANCA. Local problems require local solutions, not solutions imposed by a Federal agency with a predetermined agenda.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I withdraw my reservation, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Unfortunately, I wish the gentleman would have brought it up maybe in full committee as a member of the committee to address it then. I don't believe that this bill is really the venue to address what is a local issue.

The affected airport serves the Greater Los Angeles area. I simply don't know the impact of this action that it would have on trans-Pacific flights, trade, or commerce throughout the area. So, for those reasons, I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I rise 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 California (Mr. SCHIFF).

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

Mr. SCHIFF. 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 NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Chair, I offer an amendment.

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 promulgate or enforce rules, orders, or consent agreements or to fund approved projects under the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Discretionary Grant program unless the Department of Transportation implements the recommendations provided in the preliminary report of the Government Accountability Office numbered GAO–14–628R TIGER Grants.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Chair, the point of this amendment is to bring transparency and accountability to the process of awarding TIGER grants. Now, TIGER grants were created in 2009 with money from the stimulus bill to provide competitive grants that were to fund infrastructure projects and supposedly on a merit-based criteria.

There has been about $3.6 billion in TIGER grants awarded since 2009 going to States, local governments, and other entities for highway, transit, rail, and port authorities. DOT is currently reviewing grant applications to award $600 million for a sixth round of TIGER grant funding, applications due April 28, 2014.

Last month, the GAO reported numerous problems with the awarding of TIGER grants. The findings found in the report that DOT continued to accept specific applications for 30 days after the notice of funding availability deadline and did not notify the public. The DOT policy office did not follow its own guidelines and advanced projects with lower technical ratings instead of more highly-rated projects, providing no documentation or evidence of the factors that led to these decisions.

This leads me to why we are offering this amendment, again to bring transparency and accountability to the process of awarding TIGER grants.

In 2011, GAO recommended that DOT should develop a strategy to document decisions and work with Congress to disclose how it makes its decisions. The Government Accountability Office further recommended that the DOT limit the influence of geographic considerations and instead have a merit-based process. In their most recent report, the Government Accountability Office again made similar recommendations to provide transparency to the process.

Now, my amendment does not do away with TIGER grants. Private sector partners, State and local governments, metropolitan planning organizations, transit agencies in Louisiana and elsewhere have applied for these. This amendment will not prevent them from the opportunity to receive funding, nor do I wish to prevent consideration of the hundreds of applications that have been offered for this current cycle. However, this amendment requires that the Department of Transportation follow the Government Accountability Office recommendations to be transparent and objective in the management and decisionmaking process when selecting applications for funding under the TIGER grant program.

We cannot have DOT have a process which is suspected to be political and not merit-based when there are Federal tax dollars at stake and when communities in Louisiana and elsewhere with meritorious projects are having theirs not considered when those with less merit are receiving prioritization. That is wrong. It is not what we should be pushing. Again, I push this amendment to bring transparency and accountability to the awarding of TIGER grants.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I have great appreciation for the gentleman's point. The report was very shocking as far as the transparency and how some of these grants have been given. I am in a position where I must insist on being consistent in opposing all legislation on the appropriation bill.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment imposes additional duties.

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 on the point of order.

The amendment imposes new duties on the Department of Transportation to implement a Government Accountability Office report.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

Ms. TITUS. 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 issue rules or regulations to allow an individual on an aircraft to engage in voice communications using a mobile communications device during a flight of that aircraft in scheduled passenger interstate or intrastate air transportation except for use by a member of the flight crew on duty on an aircraft, flight attendant on duty on an aircraft, or Federal law enforcement officer acting in an official capacity.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chair, after speaking with the committee, I plan to withdraw my amendment, but I want to take a moment to speak on the underlying issue because I think it is very important.

Madam Chair, my amendment would prohibit the Department from engaging in rulemaking to allow the use of voice communication devices in flight, in other words, cell phones.

When the Federal Communications Commission first floated the idea of allowing cell phone usage on airplanes, the response from the American people was so clear you could hear a pin drop, something that would not be possible if you were surrounded by people chatting on their phones on an airplane. Polling has consistently shown 2–1 opposition to allowing passengers to make voice calls in flight.

In February of this past year, I, along with my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, voted unanimously to approve H.R. 3676, which was introduced by Chairman SHUSTER, that has the same goal of the amendment I put forward today.

At a time when we document every moment of our lives over Twitter and Facebook and Instagram, the last thing the traveling public needs is to sit next to someone having a loud, one-sided conversation on a cross-country flight.

Now, this isn't just a matter of comfort and good manners; it is also a matter of safety. For our flight attendants who are charged with the safety and security of travelers in-flight, cell phone use will exacerbate potential conflict among passengers and will create distractions from crew instructions both prior to takeoff and during flights, so it would be dangerous for all on board.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for this opportunity to speak on this important issue, and I hope that although this amendment doesn't move forward, H.R. 3676 will receive floor consideration in due time.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. TITUS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I really appreciate the gentlewoman bringing this issue to our attention. I know the authorizing committee has looked into the issue of voice communications on flights and unanimously voted out a bill out of the committee addressing the same concerns. I look forward to working with the gentlewoman and the authorizers as we move forward on this very, very important issue as far as you and I and all travelers are concerned.

So, thank you very much.

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. 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 promulgate, implement, or enforce any regulations that would mandate Global Positioning System (GPS) tracking or event data recorders in light-duty noncommercial passenger motor vehicles.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOHO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I would gladly accept your amendment.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

My amendment would prohibit any funds made available under this act to be used to implement any Administration mandate for GPS or event data recording devices in ''light-duty, non-commercial'' passenger motor vehicles.

In the recent past, the Department of Transportation and the President have both indicated their support of a mandate, a mandate which would require every car to have a recording device installed. These recording devices are more commonly referred to as ''black boxes.'' Within the past year, our nation has been rocked by evidence of surveillance techniques that have been used, unconstitutionally, by government agencies to collect information on law-abiding Americans. It is understandable then, that the revelation that a black box installed in a vehicle, often times without consumer knowledge, is concerning.

Additionally, there is a need to provide clarity to the confusion surrounding who is the owner of the data collected by these event data recorders. I believe that ownerships resides with the owner of the vehicle. However, until such time as this issue is resolved, I must defer to my constituents back home who are adamantly opposed to these black boxes. I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting my amendment to protect the personal liberties of a public that is increasingly weary of government surveillance and privacy intrusions.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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:

Page 156, after line 16, insert the following new section:

PROVIDING FUNDING FOR AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES BY IMPROVING TARGETING OF MORTGAGE INTEREST DEDUCTION

SEC. 417. (a) REPLACEMENT OF MORTGAGE INTEREST DEDUCTION WITH MORTGAGE INTEREST CREDIT.—

(1) NONREFUNDABLE CREDIT.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 25D the following new section:

"SEC. 25E. INTEREST ON INDEBTEDNESS SECURED BY QUALIFIED RESIDENCE.

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to 15 percent of the qualified residence interest paid or accrued during the taxable year.

''(b) QUALIFIED RESIDENCE INTEREST.— For purposes of this section:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified residence interest' means interest which is paid or accrued during the taxable year on—

''(A) acquisition indebtedness with respect to any qualified residence of the taxpayer, or

''(B) home equity indebtedness with respect to any qualified residence of the taxpayer.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, the determination of whether any property is a qualified residence of the taxpayer shall be made as of the time the interest is accrued.

''(2) OVERALL LIMITATION.—The aggregate amount of indebtedness taken into account for any period for purposes of this section shall not exceed $500,000 ($250,000 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return).

''(3) ACQUISITION INDEBTEDNESS.—The term 'acquisition indebtedness' means any indebtedness which—

''(A) is incurred in acquiring, constructing, or substantially improving any qualified residence of the taxpayer, and

''(B) is secured by such residence.

Such term also includes any indebtedness secured by such residence resulting from the refinancing of indebtedness meeting the requirements of the preceding sentence (or this sentence), but only to the extent the amount of the indebtedness resulting from such refinancing does not exceed the amount of the refinanced indebtedness.

''(4) HOME EQUITY INDEBTEDNESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'home equity indebtedness' means any indebtedness (other than acquisition indebtedness) secured by a qualified residence to the extent the aggregate amount of such indebtedness does not exceed—

''(i) the fair market value of such qualified residence, reduced by

''(ii) the amount of acquisition indebtedness with respect to such residence.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The aggregate amount treated as home equity indebtedness for any period shall not exceed $100,000 ($50,000 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return).

''(c) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section:

''(1) QUALIFIED RESIDENCE.—The term 'qualified residence' means—

''(A) the principal residence (within the meaning of section 121) of the taxpayer, and

''(B) 1 other residence of the taxpayer which is selected by the taxpayer for purposes of this subsection for the taxable year and which is used by the taxpayer as a residence (within the meaning of section 280A(d)(1)).

''(2) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS FILING SEPARATE RETURNS.—If a married couple does not file a joint return for the taxable year—

''(A) such couple shall be treated as 1 taxpayer for purposes of paragraph (1), and

''(B) each individual shall be entitled to take into account 1 residence unless both individuals consent in writing to 1 individual taking into account the principal residence and 1 other residence.

''(3) RESIDENCE NOT RENTED.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), notwithstanding section 280A(d)(1), if the taxpayer does not rent a dwelling unit at any time during a taxable year, such unit may be treated as a residence for such taxable year.

''(4) UNENFORCEABLE SECURITY INTERESTS.—Indebtedness shall not fail to be treated as secured by any property solely because, under any applicable State or local homestead or other debtor protection law in effect on August 16, 1986, the security interest is ineffective or the enforceability of the security interest is restricted.

''(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of determining whether any interest paid or accrued by an estate or trust is qualified residence interest, any residence held by such estate or trust shall be treated as a qualified residence of such estate or trust if such estate or trust establishes that such residence is a qualified residence of a beneficiary who has a present interest in such estate or trust or an interest in the residuary of such estate or trust.

''(d) COORDINATION WITH DEDUCTION.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in calendar years 2014 through 2018, the taxpayer may elect to apply this section in lieu of the deduction under section 163 for qualified residence interest.''.

(2) PHASEOUT OF DEDUCTION.—Section 163(h) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) PHASEOUT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2013, the amount otherwise allowable as a deduction by reason of paragraph (2)(D) shall be the applicable percentage of such amount.

''(B) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the applicable percentage shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

''For taxable years beginning in calendar year:	The applicable percentage is:
2014	100%
2015	80%
2016	60%
2017	40%
2018	20%
2019 and thereafter	0%.''.

(3) PHASEDOWN OF MORTGAGE LIMIT.—Subparagraph (B) of section 163(h)(3) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) PHASEDOWN.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in calendar years 2014 through 2018, clause (ii) shall be applied by substituting the amounts specified in the table in subclause (II) of this clause for '$1,000,000' and '$500,000', respectively.

''(II) PHASEDOWN AMOUNTS.—For purposes of subclause (I), the amounts specified in this subclause for a taxable year shall be the amounts specified in the following table:

''For taxable years beginning in calendar year:	Amount substituted for $1,000,000:	Amount substituted for $500,000:
2014	$1,000,000	$500,000
2015	$900,000	$450,000
2016	$800,000	$400,000
2017	$700,000	$350,000
2018	$600,000	$300,000

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after section 25D the following new item:

''Sec. 25E. Interest on indebtedness secured by qualified residence.''.

(5) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to interest paid or accrued after December 31, 2013.

(b) USE OF MORTGAGE INTEREST SAVINGS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMS.—

(1) USE OF SAVINGS.—For each year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the amount of revenues accruing to the general fund of the Treasury by reason of the enactment of subsection (a) of this section and shall credit an amount equal to such remaining revenues as follows:

(A) HOUSING TRUST FUND.—The Secretary shall credit the Housing Trust Fund established under section 1338 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4568) with an amount equal to 40 percent revenues.

(B) SECTION 8 RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall credit an amount equal to 40 percent of the amount of such remaining revenues to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for use only for providing tenant- and project-based rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(C) PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND.—The Secretary shall credit an amount equal to 20 percent of the amount of such remaining revenues to the Public Housing Capital Fund under section 9(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(d)).

(2) CHANGES TO HOUSING TRUST FUND.—Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall revise the regulations relating to the Housing Trust Fund established under section 1338 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4568) to provide that such section is carried out with the maximum amount of flexibility possible while complying with such section, which shall include revising such regulations—

(A) to increase the limitation on amounts from the Fund that are available for use for operating assistance for housing;

(B) to allow public housing agencies and tribally designated housing entities to be recipient of grants amounts from the Fund that are allocated to a State or State designated entity; and

(C) to eliminate the applicability of rules for the Fund that are based on the HOME Investment Partnerships Act (42 U.S.C. 1721 et seq.).

(3) EXPANSION OF RENTAL ASSISTANCE DEMONSTRATION.—The fourth proviso in the heading ''Rental Assistance Demonstration'' in title II of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (division C of Public Law 112–55; 125 Stat. 673) is amended by striking ''60,000'' and inserting ''250,000''.

Mr. ELLISON (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask that the amendment be considered read.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1645

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, the budget for the Department of Housing and Urban Development we consider today does not meet our Nation's affordable housing problems.

If this budget passes, more than half of the renters will still pay more than one-third of their income for housing. If this budget passes, fewer than four in 10 low-income elderly will receive the housing assistance they are entitled to. If this budget passes, we will still only provide housing assistance to one in four families who are eligible—tens of thousands will continue to linger on waiting lists for an affordable rental apartment that will never arrive. If this budget passes, there will still be more than 11 million families, Madam Chairman, paying more than half of their income for rent and utilities. There will still be a significant gap between incomes and housing costs.

The HUD budget is tens of billions short in order to meet American families' housing needs. That is why my amendment replaces the mortgage interest deduction with a flat-rate 15 percent tax credit.

My amendment lowers the maximum amount of mortgage interest that can receive a tax offset from $1 million to $500,000. About 4 percent of homes in this country sell for more than $500,000.

My amendment dedicates the revenue generated from these changes to increasing our investments in affordable rental housing for extremely low-income families.

My amendment provides for housing for veterans who find themselves homeless. It provides housing for people who are elderly and people with disabilities who cannot find affordable appropriate housing. It provides money to repair public housing facilities to provide homes to low-income families with children, seniors, and people with disabilities. It funds the national housing trust fund, repairs public housing, provides thousands of new vouchers, and raises the rental assistance demonstration cap.

Unfortunately, my amendment will likely be ruled out of order today. Why? Because the rules set by the majority in the House refuse to allow any tax changes to pay for a change in the appropriated budget.

This technical decision made by the majority in this Congress is inconsistent with previous Congresses, which realized that money is fungible.

By refusing to allow tax changes to offset the cost of needed programs, Congress stacks the deck.

Congress preserves the generous tax benefits for most financially successful households while ensuring that there is never anywhere close to the level of affordable rental housing we need.

For every dollar we spend on housing programs through the appropriations side of the budget, we spend more than $3 on the tax side.

The mortgage interest deduction itself is more than twice as large as the entire HUD budget we consider today. Yet, the vast majority of the mortgage interest deduction benefit the top income quintile—about 80 percent of the benefit goes to 20 percent of the households.

I want to keep a tax benefit for homeownership. I want one that is more accessible and more generous to working families. Nearly half the homeowners with a mortgage do not benefit from the deduction. That is because almost half of the people who pay mortgage interest do not itemize. Only 5 percent of the homeowners with incomes of $50,000 take a deduction. Contrast the 5 percent of homeowners with incomes beneath $50,000 and the two-thirds of households with incomes above $125,000 who get a tax benefit. The flat rate credit will benefit about 16 million current homeowners who do not currently benefit from a deduction but who will benefit from a flat tax credit.

I know that my amendment will be ruled out of order today.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY OF GEORGIA

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, No. 28.

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 provide mortgage insurance under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) for any mortgage on a 1- to 4-family dwelling to be used as the principal residence of a mortgagor who provides only an individual taxpayer identification number (ITIN) for identification.

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that will prohibit funds in the underlying bill from being used to provide mortgage insurance under title II of the National Housing Act for any mortgage on a single-family dwelling—to be used as a principal residence—to a potential borrower who provides only an individual taxpayer identification number—called ITIN—for identification.

This includes usage for mortgage loans available under the FHA to ensure that an individual must use a Social Security number rather than an ITIN—individual taxpayer identification number—in order to secure government-backed mortgage insurance.

The ITIN was first implemented by the IRS and is a 9-digit tax processing number. The IRS issues the ITIN to individuals who are required to have a taxpayer identification number but who do not have—and are not eligible to obtain—a Social Security number. The IRS has indicated that the ITIN's only purpose should be Federal tax reporting. However, that has not always been the case.

Unfortunately, Madam Chairman, it is relatively easy for illegal immigrants to attain an ITIN because proof of legal residency in the United States is not a requirement. Due to this practice, illegal immigrants have the incentive to obtain an ITIN as a means to become permanent residents by showing the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services that they have been paying taxes while residing illegally in the country.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Of course I will yield to the chair.

Mr. LATHAM. We will gladly accept your amendment.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment solves a problem that does not exist.

Currently, the FHA requires a Social Security number and legal citizenship for all insured loans. FHA does not allow for individual taxpayer identification numbers to be used for mortgages.

What this amendment does is create uncertainty in the FHA underwriting process. It would allow FHA to use individual taxpayer identification numbers only with loans on investment properties.

The FHA has already addressed this issue, and this amendment would create unintended consequences.

I oppose 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 Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Madam 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 pay any FHA mortgage insurance claim or in connection with the sale of any mortgage insured by the FHA before compliance with existing FHA loss mitigation requirements, documentation of such compliance by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and provision of such documentation to the mortgagor.

Mr. CONYERS (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Ladies and gentlemen, this amendment fights foreclosures by limiting payment of the FHA insurance claims in cases in which borrowers have not been through the full FHA loss mitigation process.

Our Nation's foreclosure crisis is not only an economic calamity, but it is also a social and public health calamity as well.

While we all know that foreclosures cause downward spirals in property values and tax revenue, new research has shined a light on foreclosures as a cause of massive and debilitating anxiety and illness.

According to a recent study in the American Journal of Public Health, foreclosures have even been a likely cause of an increase in suicides in America. I offer this amendment today to help end the terrible scourge of foreclosures.

When the Nation's largest banks—Bank of America, Wells Fargo, and Chase—sell delinquent FHA-insured loans into the Distressed Asset Stabilization Program, HUD pays them the outstanding balance of the loan. Only the loans that have fully complied with HUD's foreclosure provision and loss mitigation requirements are supposed to be sold through the Distressed Asset Stabilization Program. Yet, many of the loans banks are selling through the program have not met this standard.

I with great pleasure yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chairman, I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding.

I rise to ask for support for our amendment to stop unnecessary foreclosures and ensure oversight of HUD's Distressed Asset Stabilization Program, the DASP.

When the Nation's largest banks sell delinquent FHA-insured loans into DASP the taxpayers have to pay the outstanding balance on the loan. HUD turns around and sells the loans at deep discounts to private investors. Many times banks don't comply with the law, and FHA inappropriately pays out claims. This is not an insignificant issue.

HUD has sold more than 70,000 of these mortgages in the past 3 years. Despite ongoing efforts to improve the program, HUD has not exercised sufficient oversight in this matter.

Our amendment would help ensure more rigorous oversight of the DASP so that only loans that have met all of HUD's loss mitigation requirements are sold through this DASP program.

Mr. CONYERS. Ladies and gentlemen, this amendment would help ensure prudent oversight over the program so that only loans that have truly met all of HUD's loss mitigation requirements are sold through the Distressed Asset Stabilization Program.

I hope my colleagues on the other side will join us in supporting this very commonsense amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment imposes additional duties.

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. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, I wish to speak on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, my initial response to the point of order made by the distinguished gentleman is that this is already in the law. To argue now that a modification of it is inappropriate I do not think should allow this point of order to be sustained.

The amendment is a straightforward attempt to ensure that our Federal agencies are in full compliance with their own codes of conduct related to foreclosure prevention. These foreclosures and evictions are not only responsible for massive anxiety, but also for downward spirals in property values.

My response to the point of order is that this provision is totally in order and that the point of order should not be sustained.

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

The Chair finds that this amendment imposes new duties to provide documentation of certain activities to mortgagors.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY OF GEORGIA

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, No. 29.

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 pay a Federal employee for any period of time during which such employee is using official time under section 7131 of title 5, United States Code.

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment to H.R. 4745.

The Gingrey-Bridenstine amendment would prohibit funds in the underlying bill from being used to pay a Federal employee for any period of time that such an employee is using official time.

□ 1700

As the author of H.R. 107, the Federal Employee Accountability Act, this amendment is a continuation of the work I have done over the last three Congresses to repeal the government-wide use of official time.

Under current law, Federal employees can use official, taxpayer-funded time to perform union functions or to participate in union activities when they would otherwise be on official duty status.

Madam Chair, according to a FOIA request by the Americans for Limited Government, there are 35 employees at the Department of Transportation alone—making an average, by the way, of almost $140,000 a year—who spend 100 percent of their workday working on behalf of a union.

These employees were hired to perform duties on behalf of the taxpayer—several are engineers or air traffic controllers—yet they are working exclusively for the union at the taxpayers' expense.

In fiscal year 2011, the most recent year for which we have official time data, the Department of Transportation spent more than $17 million on official time.

In the same year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development spent more than $2 million on official time.

Across the entire Federal Government, more than 3 million official time hours were used in collective bargaining or arbitration of grievances against an employer—who, by the way, is us—in fiscal year 2011. These union activities were performed at taxpayer expense to the tune of $155 million for the same time period.

While we are not voting on veterans funding today, it is timely, given recent events, to mention the impact that the use of official time has on the

Department of Veterans Affairs. The VA is one of the largest abusers of official time, spending more than $42.5 million on this cost in fiscal year 2011.

In 2012, more than 250 VA employees worked 100 percent of their day for the union, rather than working on behalf of our Nation's heroes. Over 100 of those same employees were health care professionals, including nurses, technicians, and mental health therapists.

In the wake of the nationwide scandal of the VA, it is unthinkable that employees there are allowed to work on behalf of the union, rather than focusing on serving our veterans.

It is particularly shocking that the use of official time by medical professionals and others at the VA continues, when the VA claims a shortage of health care professionals is what is contributing to the problems like the long waiting lists for people that are suicidal because of traumatic brain injury and posttraumatic stress syndrome.

Madam Chair, we must demand accountability at the VA and across government to be sure civil servants are focusing on their positions of record, not serving unions at taxpayer expense.

That is why stand-alone legislation I have introduced, H.R. 107, would repeal the governmentwide use of official time, saving over $1.5 billion over 10 years.

While we are not considering my stand-alone legislation on the floor today, I am proud to offer this amendment as a small step toward reining in the use and abuse of official time.

Simply put, a Federal employee hired to work as an air traffic controller should spend his or her time at work performing his or her duties as an air traffic controller, not serving as a taxpayer-funded union official.

Madam Chair, I want to make it very clear that I am not proposing to do away with unions. However, I am working diligently to increase the efficiency of the Federal workforce. This amendment limits Federal activity during normal business hours to simply working, not carrying out union activities.

We should not be forcing taxpayers to support private and often very politically active organizations. At $140,000 a year, Federal employees should spend their days performing the duties for which taxpayers hired them.

While families all over the Nation are tightening their belts and cutting their own spending, it should not be the practice of the Federal Government to allow expensive, special interest handouts; rather the Federal Government should be reining in its spending and looking for ways to save money and function more efficiently. This amendment is an important first step.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gingrey-Bridenstine amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this purely ideological amendment by my colleague from Georgia, which aims to eliminate the use of official time for representational activities for employees covered by the T-HUD bill before us.

This is yet another attempt to accelerate a race to the bottom and to deny workers their fundamental right to bargain collectively. Specifically, this amendment aims to prevent effective union representation by attacking the use of official time by employees.

Use of reasonable amounts of official time has been supported by government officials of both parties for 50 years.

In exchange for the legal obligation to provide the same services to those who pay as those who choose not to pay, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 allowed Federal employee unions to bargain with agencies over official time.

Under this law, Federal employees who volunteered to serve as union representatives are permitted to use official time to engage in negotiation and perform representational activities while on duty status.

Using official time increases efficiency and is beneficial to both Federal employees and the Federal Government. These types of informal meetings save the government money by allowing the parties to avoid costly arbitration and other less efficient means of dispute resolution.

At the FAA, for example, official time is essential for the collaborative process between employees and management. At a time when we are overhauling our Nation's air traffic control system, eliminating official time is inappropriate, fiscally irresponsible, and an unnecessary violation of workers' basic rights.

At a time when we face so many challenges, when we are in massive need of infrastructure improvements, I wish that the majority would find something more constructive to do than attack the fundamental right to bargain collectively.

I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairwoman, I also rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

First of all, this amendment violates a collective bargaining agreement that has been negotiated by the Federal Aviation Administration and other agencies within the Department of Transportation and HUD.

For example, there are three groups at FAA that utilize official time: air traffic controllers, the inspectors, and the technicians that repair the air traffic control system.

Official time has been helpful in allowing controllers and technicians to participate in workgroups with the FAA management team to advance NextGen technologies, which all of us are supportive of. It is critical to modernize our air traffic control system.

I oppose this amendment because it would violate collective bargaining contracts, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. 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 enter into any contract with an incorporated entity if such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, and such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity was previously incorporated in the United States.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, my amendment would prohibit Federal contracts issued by the agencies under the jurisdiction of this bill—namely, the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development—from going to entities that were incorporated in the United States, but reincorporated in the most notorious tax havens—Bermuda and the Cayman Islands.

According to a joint study issued last week by the U.S. Public Interest Research Group and Citizens for Tax Justice, 70 percent of the companies in the Fortune 500 used tax havens last year. These companies stashed nearly $2 trillion offshore for tax purposes, with almost two-thirds of that total—62 percent—being hidden away by just 30 companies.

According to that same study, approximately 64 percent of U.S. companies with subsidiaries in tax havens registered at least one in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands.

The profits these companies claimed were earned in these two island nations in 2010 totaled over 1,600 percent of these countries' entire yearly economic output.

Of course, it defies logic and credulity to believe these companies conducted such a large amount of business there. What these companies are really doing is avoiding U.S. taxes by stashing profits in these tax havens.

According to a 2009 GAO report, 63 of the 100 largest publicly traded U.S.

Federal contractors reported having subsidiaries in tax havens in 2007. I and others have long fought for—and succeeded in passing through the appropriations process—a ban on Federal contracts for inverted corporations.

These are U.S. companies that acquire a business in a lower tax jurisdiction and claim their headquarters there, despite still being a U.S. company, yet U.S. companies can still simply claim to the IRS that their profits were made in places like Bermuda and the Cayman Islands, and companies incorporated in these and other tax havens still find ways to receive Federal contracts.

We need to stop allowing companies to game our system. They take advantage of our education system, our research and development incentives, our skilled workforce, and our infrastructure—all supported by U.S. taxpayers—to build their businesses and then turn around and invert or otherwise avoid paying taxes by abusing these tax havens.

These companies should not be allowed to pretend that they are an American company when it is time to get contracts, then claim to be an offshore company when the tax bill comes.

We can start putting an end to this right here, right now, with this amendment. It will ensure that future contracts are not awarded to U.S. companies that incorporate in the most egregious tax havens—Bermuda and the Cayman Islands.

Madam Chairman, in 2010, U.S. companies earned $129 billion on three tiny island nations—Bermuda, the Cayman Islands, and the British Virgin Islands.

As The New York Times recently pointed out, these islands have a total population of 147,400 individuals. That means, if you believe U.S. companies really earned that much in these locations, their profits worked out to be $873,000 per person. This is, of course, nonsense.

Some of my colleagues may echo the cries of these tax-avoiding companies and say the real need here is for corporate tax reform, but many of these companies are currently paying a tax rate of zero percent—zero percent—so unless you believe corporate tax reform should eliminate taxes for U.S. companies, the argument simply does not hold water.

Again, the amendment simply bans corporations, once incorporated in the United States, but have since incorporated in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands—a maneuver that is undertaken to avoid taxes—from receiving Federal contracts.

We need to send a clear message that, if a company is going to abuse tax loopholes at the expense of businesses that are paying their fair share, they will not be rewarded with government contracts.

I urge my colleagues to make a stand with me and pass this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I am in favor of the amendment. Hopefully, from the silence that we have heard, there is bipartisan support for this amendment because I know there is a bipartisan commitment here that competition is very much the American way.

If you have two companies, as happens all over America, competing on different government contracts, we usually come out with the best result from that competition. But the question with this amendment, which I am pleased to join the gentlelady from Connecticut in offering today, is whether we ought to advantage companies that renounce their American citizenship in favor of finding an office on the beach in Bermuda or in Ugland House in the Cayman Islands.

□ 1715

The other company is an American company, not only when it comes time to put its hand out for a government contract but also when it comes time to put its hand out to pay the taxes that it earned on its American business.

Which one of these companies should have a competitive advantage?

I think it is the one that stayed home and was an American, patriotic company and did not dodge its part of the responsibility for paying for our national security, which is so important to international commerce, and for other vital services.

American companies that stay and contribute to building America and that keep her secure at home and abroad deserve a level playing field, and that is all that this amendment does. If a Cayman company doesn't have to pay taxes on some of its income, of course it can underbid the company that stayed in America, that made it in America, that paid its taxes, and then asked to have a level playing field to compete for American business.

The history in this Congress, unfortunately, is that many very large companies pay their lobbyists more to lobby this Congress than they pay to the Treasury in taxes, and it has been a very wise investment because they have been able to have one loophole, one special preference, one advantage, one exception—one more bit of complexity to our Tax Code—in order to avoid paying their fair share.

The companies that are operating in the Cayman Islands and in Bermuda are reporting huge amounts of income earned in those countries, largely from stripping off earnings that they have here in America and shifting them there through interest gimmicks, through dividend gimmicks, through intellectual property gimmicks. They avoid paying taxes not only on the tiny amount that they might have earned from an occasional sale in the Cayman Islands but from all of the sales from which they are able to strip off earnings and shift them to this island paradise.

They are looking for, basically, a shell game. I am not talking about seashells on the beach in the Cayman Islands. I am talking about the shell game that exists when these companies come in, renounce their American citizenship, keep the form and operation of their business here in America, but claim that they are suddenly no longer citizens under the American flag that we honor but are under the flag of some foreign nation. They basically are sending Uncle Sam a postcard that reads: ''Sorry. You can find me on the beach. Glad you are not here.'' That is the answer that they give when it comes time to pay their taxes, but then they have the audacity to come and ask other taxpayers—other taxpaying businesses and individuals who have done their fair share, and then some, for American security—they ask for government business at taxpayer expense.

This amendment is set to send the executives a message: they can play all they want to on the beach to avoid taxes, but Congress is not going to put its head in the sand. They can have fun in the sun, but Congress refuses to let the rest of the Americans, who are working hard to pay their taxes, get burned by having to pay not only for the taxes that these tax dodgers haven't paid but for government contracts that are paid for with taxpayer money.

Let's support competition, and let's support American companies that are paying their fair share. Let's adopt this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY OF GEORGIA

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Chair, as the designee of Mr. MICA of Florida, 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. 417. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 24305(c)(4) of title 49, United States, Code.

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 4745. This amendment would prohibit funds from being used to subsidize Amtrak food and beverage service.

As my colleagues know, Amtrak operates at a loss every year, partially due to millions lost in the food service cost. In 2012, Amtrak lost $72 million

on its food and beverage service, and that loss is just one in a consistent series of losses. This loss on its own would be cause for concern, but even more concerning is that the loss directly violates the law.

Madam Chairwoman, in 1981, Federal law mandated that Amtrak break even on its food and beverage service by the following year, 1982. Despite this, Amtrak not only failed to break even, but it contracted with high-end chefs to develop gourmet recipes for Amtrak meals, to the tune of more than $905 million in the last decade.

Heavily subsidized routes feature dishes such as lamb shank and Atlantic salmon, and Amtrak has a Culinary Advisory Team to develop new high-end recipes. In 2012, a hamburger cost Amtrak $16.15, with riders paying $9.50. This means that we, the taxpayers, are forced to pick up the tab for the remaining $6.65 through subsidies provided to Amtrak. On some routes, first-class passengers are offered complimentary cheese, wine, and champagne. While the passenger may enjoy these luxury items, it is not fair that the taxpayer is forced to subsidize these extravagances.

Each spring, Amtrak brings together some of the best chefs in the country for a retreat of sorts. These chefs—several of them, of course, award-winning—come together for what The Washington Post has called ''an intensive 3-day session of cooking and brainstorming.'' At last year's gathering, chefs tasted more than 100 offerings. Of the recipes tested, including recipes for braised pork chop and a spinach and mushroom frittata, several will be deemed unsuitable for offering on Amtrak either due to kitchen limitations or due to a lack of cohesiveness with the rest of the menu.

Madam Chairwoman, I ask you: When the average American is struggling to make ends meet, why are we throwing away money at Amtrak for these luxuries, especially when Amtrak consistently operates at a loss?

If a private company wants to host a brainstorming weekend for top chefs, that is its prerogative, but the taxpayer should not be on the hook for a getaway focused on developing lavish meals for Amtrak passengers.

Taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize Amtrak, and they certainly should not be forced to cover tens of millions of dollars in costs to pay for gourmet meals and first-class service on Amtrak. Amtrak's food and beverage losses violate the law. Yet this is flagrantly disregarded. Rather than taking steps to correct the problem, the service goes after more upscale options.

We must end this cycle of wasteful spending and enact real change to get our fiscal house back in order. With a national debt of more than $17 trillion, we cannot afford to keep throwing money away, particularly on luxuries such as gourmet meals on a federally subsidized train service.

For that reason, Mr. MICA and I are offering this amendment to prohibit funds made available by this act from being used to subsidize Amtrak food and beverage service. I urge my colleagues to support the Gingrey-Mica amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, in the last 5 years, moving crude oil by train has grown exponentially from a virtually nonexistent industry to a booming one with no signs of slowing down; but after a number of high-profile derailments, the need for increased safety regulations on shipping hazardous materials via rail could not be clearer.

Last week, I had the privilege of attending a first responder training course that was focused on crude oil trains at the Port of Albany, which has become a major hub for crude oil shipments, processing more than 40,000 carloads last year. I know rail carriers and emergency planners are taking it upon themselves to prepare for handling hazardous materials in increased volumes, but regulatory steps are also needed.

We need a comprehensive approach to address this issue, including expanding route planning and selection requirements, requiring response plans for rail carriers and ensuring shippers and rail carriers are testing and classifying their shipments appropriately. Many of these suggestions have been recommended by the National Transportation Safety Board.

Many of the reforms I support are common sense. For example, comprehensive oil spill response plans are currently required for oil shipments greater than 1,000 barrels per tank car, but most tank cars only hold 700 barrels; therefore, trains, some with as many as 120 cars that are carrying crude oil, are not required to have comprehensive response plans because of this outdated threshold. Among other safety issues, tank car safety, particularly in regard to the DOT–111s, is a major concern for many of my constituents.

Every day, trains transporting Bakken crude oil move and idle next to public housing and the highway near Albany's South End before entering the Port of Albany. Everyone agrees—railroads, suppliers and the NTSB, to name a few—that we need a higher safety standard on new tank car orders and an aggressive phaseout or retrofit of the old DOT–111s, which have no business transporting hazardous materials. Only 14,000 of 92,000 DOT–111 tank cars are currently built to the latest industry standards. The remaining 78,000 have demonstrated that they are prone to splitting open during derailments.

The rail industry has taken meaningful and voluntary steps to account for the DOT–111s' inadequacies, including raising the industry standard for cars built after October of 2011, but we need higher Federal standards. This is long overdue, and DOT must act.

I know this is an issue my good friend from New York, Ranking Member LOWEY, is passionate about as well. Earlier this year, we sent a letter to Secretary Foxx, urging him to move forward with a rulemaking process that includes phasing out the DOT–111s. We should harmonize our regulations with Canada's already announced plan, which includes a 3-year phaseout or retrofit of DOT–111s. Just this morning, I had the opportunity to speak with Secretary Foxx about DOT's rulemaking process. I know this is a top priority for him, and I have been assured that it is moving forward aggressively. I encourage a speedy but appropriate resolution.

I also appreciate that the chair included language urging a comprehensive approach to rail safety. The language directs the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to update emergency spill response planning thresholds and to finalize a rule on tank cars by the end of this fiscal year. The bill also fully funds the President's request for FRA's safety and operations account and PHMSA's hazardous materials account.

Finally, the manager's amendment, during the full committee markup, designated some funds to hire additional safety staff to monitor routing and to make safety improvements on grade crossings that carry energy products. This, indeed, is a positive step. However, I would have preferred the inclusion of $40 million, as in the President's budget request, to establish a safe transportation of energy products fund within the Office of the Secretary of Transportation in order to support prevention and response activities.

Aside from the crude-by-rail issues, I understand the challenges of the current funding allocations, but I must strongly oppose this bill's shortfalls in numerous infrastructure and transit accounts. The FTA's Capital Investment Grant program is $809 million below the request. Amtrak's capital grants are cut by $200 million, and TIGER only receives $100 million, shamefully shortfalling what we need.

It is my hope that we can improve this bill during conference, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to include appropriate levels for underfunded programs while building upon this bill's rail safety provisions.

Again, I want to thank Chairmen Rogers and Latham and Ranking Members Lowey and Pastor for their attention to this critical rail safety issue.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1730

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Madam 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. 417. 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 2013–2017 Five Year Plan from May 2013.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, my amendment is really straightforward and one which I have offered year after year after year after year on the floor of the House of Representatives.

It would eliminate funding for the absolute worst performing line, one line, on the Amtrak system, a line that is known as the Sunset Limited, and it runs from New Orleans to Los Angeles.

Madam Chairman, the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 required that Amtrak operate without any Federal assistance after 2002. Amtrak was supposed to be free of Federal operating subsidies.

Yet, despite this commonsense requirement that Amtrak cease their financial irresponsibility and mismanagement, instead, it costs the taxpayers $396.31 per rider, per year, on this line. That is $396.31 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.

Madam Chairman, we could buy everybody a free ticket on an airline from New Orleans to Los Angeles and probably end up saving money.

However, according to Amtrak's most recent performance report, the Sunset Limited only arrives on time 46 percent of the time. So it might even make sense for somebody to get there not only quicker, but also cheaper.

This places the Sunset Limited as one of the top 10 worst on-time routes for any of Amtrak's routes in its latest performance report.

Madam Chairman, taxpayers should be happy that the train really doesn't run more often. But when it does run, the route loses an average of $40 million a year.

So my amendment is the first step, once again, in instilling just a small measure, joining the gentleman from Georgia, in fiscal discipline that Amtrak should be told today that it has to establish.

If it cannot manage itself with its worst, most expensive performing line, then God help us all. If they won't do it, we are going to. Failure to do so will only allow Amtrak to continue misusing and wasting taxpayer dollars.

Look, it is just very simple. I am asking that my colleagues join with me and say that the worst-performing, the most cost-prohibitive line would be stopped by Amtrak. So, I think it makes sense to say, no more Sunset Limited.

So I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This Amtrak route, the Sunset Limited, runs through 8 States, Arizona, California, New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, and if we start picking lines, individual lines in terms of terminating, what we begin doing is a downward spiral for the demise of Amtrak.

So, for the reasons that I want to ensure that my colleague from Texas, his constituents are able to travel on this line, as well as the ones from Arizona, I rise in opposition.

Madam Chairman, 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 amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MS. BASS

Ms. BASS. 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 in this Act may be used by the Secretary or 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. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BASS. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that will spur local job creation through federally-funded transit projects nationwide.

Specifically, this amendment would provide the necessary flexibility for transit agencies to implement geographically targeted hiring and procurement preferences.

My amendment will help to ensure construction and operations jobs contribute to the local economic development and of cities and towns where the transportation projects exist, instead of outsourcing these new jobs. Flexibility to implement local hire policies will also provide local and State agencies the ability to address unemployment in our hardest-hit regions.

For example, the Los Angeles Transit Corridor Light Rail Line is currently under construction in Los Angeles. This project is expected to be a significant economic engine for development, generating an estimated 7,000 jobs during its 5-year construction period.

Los Angeles Metro, our local transit agency, would like to encourage construction contractors to hire within the local community in order to help address unemployment in the area.

However, according to current regulations, local transit agencies are restricted from implementing local hiring and procurement policies for federally-funded transportation projects, even when the vast majority of the project funds are State or locally generated.

This is a commonsense amendment. It will limit burdensome regulations placed on local government agencies, and it will allow State and local agencies to more easily generate employment and economic development, and it preserves the competition mandates in our current grant rules governing Federal transit projects.

Again, this is not a mandate. This just allows local agencies the flexibility.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It would allow transportation agencies to advance construction projects through the use of local workers.

Every year, cities and local communities must contribute their own resources in the form of a local match for projects that receive Federal funds. At a time when many communities are still struggling from the economic distress, it is understandable that these local agencies would want transportation dollars to benefit local workers and benefits businesses.

It will help ensure construction and operation jobs contribute to the local economic development within the cities and towns where the transportation projects exist, instead of outsourcing jobs to other countries or States.

Madam Chairman, I support the 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. BASS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam 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. 417. 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 2013-2017 Five Year Plan from May 2013.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, once again I stand up in a continuing theme of what I believe fiscally responsible Members who come to the floor should look at—the operation of Amtrak.

Today, once again, I come to the floor to offer my ideas about how we can help, especially during troubling financial times for the American taxpayer with our Federal Government, that we can look at and find ways to where we work with Amtrak.

Years ago I met with the chairman of the board, who openly acknowledged that there were challenges that Amtrak faced, not just safety issues, but many other issues that dealt with their financial integrity.

I told him I would continue doing these kinds of amendments, and he considered this, in a sense, an opportunity for the people who provide money, meaning the taxpayers of the United States, to have a say about the operation of how their money would be used. That is the same spirit that I am here on the floor today.

Madam Chairman, my amendment would eliminate funding for Amtrak routes that have total direct costs that are more than twice the revenue that they produce. That means, if the cost is twice as much as the revenue, I think that that should be a solid reason why someone should consider eliminating those routes.

They are all over the place, and I believe that Amtrak continues to provide these, accept government money, and they don't give two flips about what we think about the use of the taxpayer money. And so I think it is worth our time to be here.

Every single long-distance route that Amtrak provides over 400 miles in length operates at a loss every single month. If they have got a route that is more than 400 miles, I mean, we are helping them out here, Madam Chairman.

We are helping out Amtrak, and we are saying to them, if you have got something more than 400 miles, you are operating at a loss.

Now we are saying, however, if it is twice the cost of the revenue, that is what we would like to have you look at. And I think that it would be an argument for us, as a provider of money, to say, look, we think that you should help people. Maybe when they call in to you to take Amtrak, if it is one of those routes, why don't you suggest to them that they fly aircraft, that they take a bus, that they do something where the American taxpayer is not on the line.

The bottom line is, if you combine seven routes that are taken in this parameter, the American taxpayer pays $332.8 million for this subsidy. $332 million is maybe not a lot of money to Amtrak, but that is a darn lot amount of money for the American people to be putting into Amtrak to have them waste.

I believe it is a waste. I believe it could be not only better allocated, but utilized in a better way, like shifting people who are coming to you—let's take an alternative. Let's maybe take an airplane.

It is clear that the government subsidizes rail service on Amtrak, and it does not make economic sense that they take advantage of that.

So, Madam Chairman, it is real simple. This is an opportunity for the people who represent taxpayers to simply come forth and say, let's have a vote on this, that we believe that that is too much money. 332 million bucks should not be used on these seven routes, and that is why I am here today.

So, Madam Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support what I think is a commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. While I support the efforts and reforms to move Amtrak to operate in a more efficient and effective manner, I must oppose this amendment.

I appreciate very much the gentleman from Texas, my good friend, and his raising this issue. The gentleman's amendment would eliminate seven Amtrak routes and eliminate rail service to dozens of cities and towns of all sizes across America.

Just to list, those would be California Zephyr, which goes from Chicago to Emeryville, California, which happens to go through Iowa; Cardinal Hoosier line, which is Chicago to New York; Coast Star Light, from Seattle to Los Angeles; the Crescent, from New York City to New Orleans; Silver Star, from New York City to Miami; Southwest Chief, from Chicago to Los Angeles; and the Sunset Limited, from Los Angeles to New Orleans.

□ 1745

Again, I appreciate very much what the gentleman is trying to do. I just think we need to work on efficiency at Amtrak.

We have been trying very, very hard, through all of our hearings and through our contact with Amtrak, to get efficiency and to modernize and to try to get them to a profitable state; but unfortunately, I must oppose this amendment, just because of the vast impact it would have on so many people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I also agree with the chairman for the reasons he stated.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. It would dismantle Amtrak, the only resemblance of a rail system that we have in this Nation.

Obviously, we need to work with them, so that Amtrak becomes more efficient, but this amendment would dismantle it, and for that reason, I oppose 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. SESSIONS).

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam 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. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. 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 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. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that requires 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 Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles, except in accord with the President's memorandum.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I would be happy to accept your amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman, and 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.

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:

An amendment by Mr. DENHAM of California.

Amendment No. 1 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mr. SCHOCK of Illinois.

An amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

An amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

An amendment by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

An amendment by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) 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 227, noes 186, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

AYES—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—186

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Cantor
Culberson
Delaney
Doyle
Gerlach
Hall
Horsford
Kaptur
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Owens
Pocan
Sires
Wasserman Schultz
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)

□ 1820

Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CHU, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLUMENAUER was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF REYNOLDS HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, Reynolds High School in Troutdale, Oregon, is a terrific institution in my district. I was there recently, and the kids gave me a wooden bowtie with a bicycle on it.

In a scene that is achingly familiar, this morning at Reynolds, a shooting occurred. A student was killed. The shooter died. A teacher was wounded.

The school and law enforcement recently completed drills to deal with these sad circumstances. Luckily, it went off without a hitch, and there were no further injuries. It went as well as could be expected under the circumstances, with a massive regional response from law enforcement on the scene.

I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that the House observe a moment of silence in support for the victims, their families, and the community.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

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 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 159, noes 260, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—159

Amash
Amodei
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Campbell
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cooper
Cotton
Crawford
Daines
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nunes

Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wittman
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—260

Aderholt
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Cantor
Delaney
Doyle
Hall
Horsford
Kaptur
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1828

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. SCHOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) 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 210, noes 209, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—210

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—209

Aderholt
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney

Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack

NOT VOTING—12

Cantor
Delaney
Doyle
Hall
Horsford
Kaptur
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1833

Messrs. POE of Texas, GARCIA, and MAFFEI changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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 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 190, noes 232, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—190

Amash
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—232

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachus
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Nugent
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Cantor
Delaney
Hall
Horsford
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1838

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 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 181, noes 240, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—181

Amash
Bachmann
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—240

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Nugent
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Cantor
Delaney
Gutiérrez
Hall
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Moran
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1841

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHNER was allowed to speak out of order.)

RECOGNIZING REPRESENTATIVE LATHAM ON HIS YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HOUSE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chair, I will have the Members know that the gentleman from Iowa has announced that this will be his last term in Congress.

On behalf of the House, I want to thank Mr. LATHAM for his 20 years of service to the House, thank him for all those years of service on the Appropriations Committee, and thank him for being one of my best friends. Congratulations.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

RECOGNIZING REPRESENTATIVE LATHAM AND REPRESENTATIVE PASTOR ON THEIR YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HOUSE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, first I want to say to Mr. LATHAM, with whom I had the opportunity of serving on the Appropriations Committee for some years, thank you for your service. We obviously didn't always agree, but I always found you to be a gentleman and conscientious and honest in your leadership and willing to work together where we could work together, and I want to thank you for that.

□ 1845

Mr. Chairman, not only is Mr. LATHAM retiring, but his partner, the ranking member, Mr. PASTOR, who is standing at the back of the Chamber, is also retiring.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say about ED PASTOR, ED PASTOR is a quiet man, a little bit like John Wayne in ''The Quiet Man,'' but a very effective man who worked very hard not only for his constituents, but for the citizens of our country.

I also had the opportunity to serve many years with Mr. PASTOR on subcommittees together and on the full committee together. We owe a debt of gratitude to both of these gentlemen who worked together to produce products that America could be proud of and work forward on. Perhaps we didn't always get there, any of us, but they worked as a team trying to get the best job possible within the constraints on which they were operating, and we thank them both for that.

Thank you, Mr. PASTOR. We are proud of you.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

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 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 208, noes 212, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—208

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gibson
Goodlatte
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—212

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Cantor
Cole
Delaney
Gutiérrez
Hall
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Moran
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1849

Ms. DUCKWORTH changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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 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 167, noes 250, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—167

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Camp
Campbell
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Culberson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—250

Barber
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richmond
Roby
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Bilirakis
Blackburn
Cantor
Delaney
Gutiérrez
Hall
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Moran
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Royce
Ruiz
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1853

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The Clerk will read the last three lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015''.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, 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 (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, 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. 4745) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, 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 House Resolution 604, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on Gingrey amendment No. 29.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other 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 Clerk will redesignate the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 254, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—167

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—254

Amodei
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Cantor
Delaney
Gutiérrez
Hall
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Moran
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Wilson (SC)

□ 1903

Messrs. HURT and HASTINGS of Florida changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. ESTY. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4745 to the Committee on _____ with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 37, line 13, (related to National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Operations and Research), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 48, line 5, (related to Federal Transit Administration, Administrative Expenses), after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Ms. ESTY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the 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.

Mr. Speaker, we owe Americans a safe transportation system. Drivers

need to know that their cars are safe. Parents shouldn't have to worry about a faulty accelerator propelling them at speeds of 100 miles an hour as they drive to work or pick up their children from soccer practice. None of us should be concerned about a faulty switch turning off power steering, our brakes, or airbags.

Tragically, as recent news reports and congressional investigations have shown, Americans are justifiably worried. The costs of inadequate safety oversight are real.

My friend and senior Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL shared the following story with me.

A woman from Fairfield County was driving one of the recently recalled car models on a major highway. She wound up under a freight dump truck, and her airbags failed to deploy. Her head hit the steering wheel, and she was knocked unconscious. Nine months and two surgeries later, she still suffers from postconcussion syndrome.

In her own words, she said:

> I had to move back home . . . giving up the dream I had been pursuing.

Mr. Speaker, the free market won't protect consumers by itself. We have learned over the decades that consumer safety depends not only on our automakers, but also on our Department of Transportation having the resources to conduct investigations and enforce our recall system.

I am a mother of three children, all of them young drivers. I know how important product safety oversight can be to keeping our children safe.

In fact, just before coming on the floor this afternoon, I learned that two school buses in my district were involved in a multivehicle accident, sending dozens of students to the hospital.

I also know oversight won't save lives, unless we provide investigators the resources they need to keep our vehicles safe. We can do better. We must do better. Do you know why? We need to save lives.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today provides millions less than the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has requested for operations and research. My motion to recommit adds $5 million for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's vehicle safety enforcement program. This amendment would not add one penny to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, it shouldn't take a record settlement, after years of litigation, to bring some small measure of closure to victims and their families following a preventable defect, nor should it take 10 years to issue a recall once a major problem is discovered.

Whatever your position is on the underlying bill, I ask you to support my amendment in the name of common sense. I ask you to support this proposal in the name of auto dealers in my State and in yours, who have reported difficulty getting replacement parts that are desperately needed for these recalls.

I ask for your support on behalf of the thousands of Connecticut car-owners and millions across this country affected by recent recalls.

Safety is—and should be—a bipartisan issue. We can do better. We should do better. We must do better.

I ask for your support as someone who believes that we can write better legislation without spending more money. Let's do the right thing. Let's do the reasonable thing. I ask all House Members to join me to vote for this motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say thank you to Speaker BOEHNER and Mr. HOYER for the kind words earlier and to also express my appreciation to my counterpart here, Mr. PASTOR, who has been such a great partner through this whole process. It has been a real pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we considered is a good piece of legislation that adequately funds critical transportation and housing programs, programs that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support, and it does so within the confines of a reduced budget.

The motion specifically adds money to NHTSA's administration account. Unfortunately, simply throwing money at a problem will not solve the problem. We have an opportunity in the next surface reauthorization bill to look at NHTSA's authority and regulatory ability.

It is kind of a surprise to have this motion now. We have gone through 2 days under a totally open rule. This could have been considered in regular order. Mr. Speaker, this is just an effort to grind the appropriations process bills to a halt.

I urge my colleagues to reject this motion and pass H.R. 4745 today, and 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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 227, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

AYES—195

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)

Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Cantor
Delaney
Hall
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Moran
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Wilson (SC)

□ 1917

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.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 192, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—229

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—192

Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Cantor
Delaney
Hall
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Moran
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Speier
Wilson (SC)

□ 1924

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4800, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4457, AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4453, S CORPORATION PERMANENT TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–472) on the resolution (H. Res. 616) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4800) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4457) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4453) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the reduced recognition period for built-in gains of S corporations, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 286, I voted ''yes'' inadvertently. I would like the RECORD to reflect that my vote would have been ''no.''