United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 2015 No. 88

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 3, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GARRET GRAVES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

HONORING BRENT WINN LAYTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to acknowledge and honor the life of a personal friend and Gold Star Father Brent Winn Layton. The beloved father, son, brother, and uncle died unexpectedly at the age of 47 on Saturday, May 23, 2015, in Longmont, Colorado.

Brent was born on October 23, 1967, in Berkeley, California, to Shirley Hughes and A. Winn Layton. Although Brent lived in many cities throughout his life, he was a longtime resident of the Escalon area and considered it home.

Brent was a very gifted man with many levels. He served as a deputy sheriff in Kern County, California, and Clark County, Arkansas. He also served as a peace officer for the Escalon Police Department. In addition to his commitment to law enforcement, Brent was committed to God. He was a very spiritual man and found great comfort in his faith.

Unfortunately, in 2009, Brent became a Gold Star Father when his firstborn son, James, was killed in action in Kunar province, Afghanistan, serving during Operation Enduring Freedom. Since then, Brent's mission in life was to embrace other Gold Star families and help them through the grieving process.

Brent had many friends that loved him, and he had a heart full of love for them. His laugh, his sense of humor, and his big bear hugs will be missed forever. In addition, his friends and family admired his honest pride in his Cherokee Nation citizenship and will miss listening to him play guitar. There is peace in knowing that he is now with his son as well as the family and friends that have gone before him.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing Brent for his friendship, faith, and unwavering support for other military families. He had a genuine love for people, community, and country and will be missed by many. God bless him always.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week, we started the 33rd extension of the highway spending program. The 33rd time that we failed to deal meaningfully with the crisis in funding our transportation system. It is a symbol of Congress' failure to deal with a country that is falling apart and falling behind.

No country became great building its infrastructure 7 months at a time.

It prompts silly ideas. One recently, an op-ed page of The Wall Street Journal, talks about ''Taxing for Highways, Paying for Bike Lanes'' as the problem. Well, as is pointed out in letters to the editor today, it is not spending on bike paths which Dr. Pete Ruane, head of the American Road & Transportation Builders Association, pointed out is about 1 percent of the total Federal transportation highway budget, if you include sidewalks as well.

No, the problem is that we are paying for 2015 infrastructure with 1993 dollars. We have not raised the gas tax in 22 years. Now, I would suggest that what we ought to do is to look at the broad coalition that is represented by the authors on that page from the roadbuilders and the cyclists—they are representative of the broadest coalition on any issue in American politics today—from the AFL–CIO to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the truckers—represented eloquently by Governor Bill Graves, who is not just president of the American Trucking Associations, he was the Republican Governor of Kansas who raised the gas tax not once, but twice.

There is an opportunity for us to break the logjam. I would suggest that maybe the House Ways and Means Committee could, for the first time in the 55 months that the Republicans have been in charge, actually meet to discuss transportation funding. That is our job.

Let's dedicate an entire week to solving this problem. Let's invite in representatives of that broad coalition: people who build, maintain, and use our transportation system. Let's hear from the six Republican States that already this year have raised the gas tax,

Printed on recycled paper.

red Republican States: Utah; Georgia; South Dakota; Idaho; Iowa; and, most recently, Nebraska, where the legislature overrode the Governor's veto to raise their gas tax.

It is time for Congress to do its job and to be in partnership with those States who expect us to maintain the Federal responsibility. Let's hear from the broad array of people and then allow the Ways and Means Committee to follow regular order.

There is more support for raising the gas tax. The public is already paying the price. The bill I have, which would provide 210 billion additional dollars over the next decade, would cost the average motorist just about $90 a year. At a time of declining gas prices, that is not that great, but motorists are now paying $350 a year on average in damage to their cars. The country paid $125 billion in the cost of congestion.

Let's stop beating around the bush. Let's pass the first 6-year transportation reauthorization, the first since 1998. The first step is for the Ways and Means Committee to do its job, bring these people in, work together on a bipartisan basis, raise the gas tax, index the gas tax, then abolish the gas tax, replace it with something that is sustainable.

In the meantime, let's rebuild and renew America and put hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs while we strengthen communities from coast to coast.

HOLDING THE VA ACCOUNTABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about our veterans.

Memorial Day was just this past weekend, and we honored those who paid the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation.

This weekend also, veterans from around our great country journeyed here to our Nation's Capital to visit the monuments that were publicly erected in their honor. I am so proud that a group of over 60 veterans living in south Florida—including David Millan, Don Lowe, and Augustine Fernandez—were able to make the trip on the first-ever Honor Flight from Miami International Airport, located in my congressional district.

They, like all veterans, are true American patriots, courageous and brave, putting others before themselves, willing to stand up and fight for our Nation's ideals and for the spread of freedom, peace, and prosperity abroad. That is who they are. It is in their DNA.

My family and I, we know the sacrifice and the courage and the resolve that is required to dedicate one's life to the service of our country. My husband, Dexter, proudly served in Vietnam as a U.S. Army Ranger, earning a Purple Heart. My stepson, Douglas, and his wife, Lindsay, both served tours of duty as Active Duty Marine Corps aviators in Iraq, with Lindsay also having served in Afghanistan. They are still serving our Nation as Marine reservists.

I could not be prouder of them and their fellow veterans and have the highest respect for the families and caregivers who support our vets after they return home from their missions. I recognize that we can never repay our veterans in full for their contributions, but we must certainly try. I would like to think that all Americans feel the same way.

A key part of our Nation's commitment to our veterans has always been providing them with quality health care, especially with respect to injuries suffered in the line of duty; but, more than a year after the most recent VA health system scandal rocked this administration and forced the replacement of a Cabinet Secretary, the VA's commitment on health care continues to fall tragically short.

A year later, the number of patients facing long wait times is still the same, and somehow, the number of patients waiting more than 90 days has actually doubled. A year later, the VA health system continues to fail our veterans. We know that these veterans have the right stuff, the selflessness, the courage, and the pride that they demonstrate in defense of the American way of life; but what must they think of our government now?

Unconscionably long wait times, bureaucratic mismanagement, top-down rationed care are all well below the bare minimum standards any American should expect; yet this is exactly what the VA, under this administration, continues to offer our veterans.

At least this Congress has pushed for reform, for access, for choice. In the last year, we have passed laws that set out to improve access for veterans seeking medical care and mental health services. Congress also provided the VA with $16 billion to shorten wait times and improve healthcare quality.

I have joined many of my colleagues to demand that the VA publicly release the findings of 140 internal healthcare investigations conducted since 2006 to enforce accountability at the VA. I have also joined a bipartisan contingent of my House colleagues to offer to help the VA staff focus on providing health care by allowing congressional staff to serve as the primary point of contact for veterans asking about their claims and their long appointment times.

Over and over again, Congress' efforts have been met by a stubborn bureaucracy that looks to skirt legislative intent on expanding veterans access and choice and reforming the way that the VA health system does its business.

I am committed to holding the VA under this administration responsible for the continued failings of our VA health system, and I will continue to fight alongside my colleagues in Congress for the reforms that will provide our veterans with the quality health care they deserve.

We know that our veterans should not have to wait another year. The time is long past; the time is now. The next time that south Florida residents come to D.C. on Honor Flights to visit their war memorials, they will truly know that our Nation honors their service by providing quality health care at all of our VA facilities.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for allowing me to precede them.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida. Of course, I am always glad to hear her speak on the floor. I wanted her to know that.

Mr. Speaker, we are now less than a month from the deadline for Congress to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

In 2012, this House came together under the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Cantor, who worked with my office, and we put a bill on the floor that reauthorized the Bank and increased its lending authority with a bipartisan vote of 330–93. This should not be and is not a partisan issue.

Helping small- and medium-sized American businesses access new overseas markets and compete on a level playing field is something that Democrats and Republicans have long agreed that Congress ought to do.

That is why it is deeply concerning to read comments from Majority Leader MCCARTHY that Congress should ''wind down'' the Bank and allow its charter to expire. That, in my view, is a minority opinion on the floor of this House, and that would be a profound mistake.

□ 1015

The Export-Import Bank is a critical tool that helps our businesses compete successfully in global markets. We are going to talk about trade, apparently, next week, but what we need to make sure is that we can export goods that are made in America, that we will make in America, and that we will sell abroad. The Export-Import Bank facilitates that effort. It is a critical tool that helps businesses compete successfully in global markets.

Last year alone, it supported $27.5 billion in export activity. About 90 percent of its transactions support thousands of small businesses that otherwise would have difficulty accessing markets.

The Ex-Im Bank has supported 1.3 million private sector jobs since our economic recovery began, including 164,000 jobs just last year, and it does all this without costing the taxpayers

a single cent. In fact, it brought $675 million in profits to the Treasury last year and more than $2 billion over the past two decades. We cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, to let the bank expire.

Even more than just preventing a lapse, we ought to be providing exporters and potential exporters with certainty by enacting a multiyear reauthorization.

With the Export-Import Bank's future uncertain, businesses that could be reaching new customers abroad have been holding back making investments in growth that would create more jobs here at home. We are going to hear a lot about jobs here at home next week as we debate the fast-track authority. This deals with jobs here in America. With the Export-Import Bank's future uncertain, we are seeing uncertainty in the marketplace.

A multiyear extension and an increase in the bank's lending authority would give a green light to these businesses that it is time to invest and expand.

We all talk about investing. We all talk about expanding jobs. I want to quote: ''There are thousands of jobs on the line that would disappear pretty quickly if the Ex-Im Bank were to disappear.'' Let me repeat that for my colleagues. ''There are thousands of jobs on the line that would disappear pretty quickly if the Ex-Im Bank were to disappear.'' Those are not my words. That is a quote. They are the words of Speaker JOHN BOEHNER on April 30 of this year, just a few weeks ago.

He is not the only Republican who wants to save the bank. Representative STEPHEN FINCHER, Republican of Tennessee, has said that ''a majority of RSC members support the bank's reauthorization.'' RSC members are amongst the most conservative members of their party in this House. In fact, there are 59 cosponsors on Mr. FINCHER's bill. They are Republicans.

All of my party, the last time we reauthorized it and this time, will vote to create jobs in America by voting for the Export-Import Bank. Now, we have 188 members. You don't have to be much of a mathematician to know if you have 188 and 60, that is 248. All you need is 218 to pass the bill.

The Speaker has said he wants to let the House work its will. He said that in 2011 when he became Speaker. And he said the House works best when the House can work its will. If we bring the Export-Import Bank bill to the floor, it will pass. Together with 180 Democrats, or 188—180 who have sponsored the 7-year reauthorization bill introduced by Ms. WATERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HECK, and myself—it is clear that a majority of the House supports a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, we should act. We should act now before we find ourselves at the eleventh hour, before the June 30 deadline. Now, we have just seen shutting down the security apparatus to protect America for a couple of days. Let's not put at risk the economic security of our country.

Governors of both parties from across the country have written in support of taking action. Business leaders, the Chamber of Commerce, and organizations like the National Association of Manufacturers have all asked Congress to reauthorize the bank. There are now just 13 legislative days until the deadline by which we must do so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our Speaker, I ask our majority leader, let the House work its will and vote on a multiyear reauthorization that will restore certainty for thousands of small businesses. Help them compete in new markets. Support the growth of good jobs here in our country, and contribute to deficit reduction. There will be a lot of debate next week about jobs. The Speaker believes that we will lose jobs if we don't pass the Export-Import Bank reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leader, bring the Export-Import Bank reauthorization bill to the floor. It will pass. It will be good for America. It will be good for Americans. It will be good for our economy. Pass this bill.

REFOCUSING ON THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks 1 year since the Veterans Affairs Secretary, Eric Shinseki, resigned amid a scandal that shook this country to its core. When President Obama reluctantly accepted Secretary Shinseki's resignation, he had a lot to say about his commitment to fix the VA and where the buck stops. He said: ''We're going to do right by our veterans across the board, as along as it takes.'' And then: ''This is my administration. I always take responsibility for whatever happens.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, a lot has happened over the past year, and here are some of the highlights:

Last June, reports emerged that patient scheduling manipulation had been particularly egregious inside the central Alabama VA. During a meeting to discuss these findings, the director of the central Alabama VA led me to believe that appropriate action had been taken to remove the employees that were responsible for this. That wasn't true.

So I began to dig a little bit deeper into the problems, working with very courageous whistleblowers and the press to uncover major instances of misconduct, negligence, and mismanagement inside the central Alabama VA. What we were able to expose was more than 1,000 patient x rays, some showing problems, went missing for months and years. A pulmonologist was called, not once but twice, for falsifying more than 1,200 patient records but somehow given a satisfactory review. An employee took a recovering veteran to a crack house, bought him drugs and prostitutes, all to extort his veteran's benefits. When caught, that employee, as extraordinary as this is, was never fired. Not until a year and a half later, when it was reported in the press and exposed publicly, did the VA take action.

What else happened last year? Congress passed a historic VA reform law providing unprecedented authority for holding employees accountable. The director of the central Alabama VA who lied to me became the first manager fired under the new reform law. Other managers were also removed, and the southeast regional director quietly retired when an investigation into central Alabama VA was expanded at my request to include him.

So again, a lot has happened over the past year. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot that hasn't happened over the past year.

Improvement to access for patient care, the one thing that we really need for our veterans, hasn't happened. It really hasn't happened nationally, and certainly it hasn't happened in central Alabama. In fact, VA medical centers in Montgomery and Tuskegee were recently identified number one and number two, respectively, the worst hospitals in the Nation for extended delays in patient appointment completions. The first and the second worst hospitals in the country are in the central Alabama VA.

A workload report at the end of April showed that more than 6,500 consults over 90 days were still pending, including more than half awaiting approval for non-VA care. So not enough improvement has happened where it matters most for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't mention some of the progress the central Alabama VA has made. What was a major staff shortage is beginning to be filled, and that includes the mental health side. I appreciate very much the new acting director of the region, Tom Smith, keeping me updated on the latest. I am grateful for him stepping into this important role in a difficult situation, trying to rebuild, trying to rebuild some of the trust that has been lost.

As I have told him, the progress isn't enough. One reason I believe it isn't enough is that Washington has demonstrated something of a short attention span when it comes to these problems. We got their attention last year and a lot of nice promises have been made in terms of the national VA's commitment to improve in central Alabama, but once our problems leave the front page, there hasn't been sufficient follow-up. Mr. Speaker, maybe that is because we are depending on a broken bureaucracy to fix itself. Maybe it is because we have been asking VA leaders to intervene rather than requiring them to intervene. Maybe it is time that we change that.

You know, when a public school continues to fail to meet basic standards, what happens? The State Department of Education comes in to take over and

start to turn the place around. It is a process that isn't pleasant, but everyone from principals to teachers to students to parents, they understand the consequences of the failure of that school system to improve. I believe that we need a similar mechanism at the VA when medical centers continue to fail our veterans. That is why I am preparing legislation that will allow the Washington VA to do that.

My constituents, my veterans in Alabama, are getting the worst healthcare services that this country could provide. They deserve better.

TEXAS AND THE IMMIGRATION DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. What does that bumper sticker say? ''Don't mess with Texas.'' Well, I am about to not follow that advice.

You see, Texas has put itself front and center in the national debate over immigration and is leading the way among the 26 States suing the Federal Government to stop the lawful and sensible executive actions introduced by the President. The court case that has gotten so much national attention is Texas v. The United States.

The 25 other States with Republican Governors and attorneys general who are suing the country play second fiddle to Texas. A week ago, in the Fifth Circuit in New Orleans, a three-judge panel issued a split decision. They did not issue a stay to the injunction of the President's executive actions imposed by a lower court, you guessed it, in Texas. Two out of three judges ruled that Texas would likely be found to have standing to bring the lawsuit because Texas would have to issue more driver's licenses to long-term Texas residents.

Now, please note that we are not talking about free driver's licenses. We are talking about driver's licenses at the same cost everyone else pays. As a matter of fact, they could raise the price of the driver's licenses. Somehow, having more licensed drivers who can drive legally in Texas and across the country and who know the rules of the road is an unreasonable burden on the State of Texas, according to the politicians who run the State.

So Texas is holding up the implementation of the program around the country for as many as 4 million people who live in American families. Who would these licensed drivers be? They would be immigrants who have U.S. citizen children. They would have lived and worked in American neighborhoods for years, shopped at the same grocery stores, and taken their kids to the same parks and schools as citizens do. They would have submitted their fingerprints for a criminal background check at their own expense.

So while most Americans no longer believe we should be trying to deport all 11 million undocumented immigrants, and especially not those with deep roots in the U.S. with families, the politicians who run the State of Texas believe we should.

Lived in the U.S. for 5 years or more? 10? 15? Driving to work anyway? Own a business that employs citizens? Too bad. The Republican leaders in Texas do not want you to be able to work on the books, pay your full share of local and Federal taxes, and pay for a driver's license so you could drive legally. No. That would be a burden.

□ 1030

Reality and Texas should really get to know one another.

Now, let's remember that this is the same set of Texas politicians—including the Governor and some Republican Members of Congress—who are reluctant to tell some of their voters that no, in fact, President Obama does not have a secret plan to use Walmart department stores as internment camps for gunowners, which is the latest conspiracy theory promoted by Chuck Norris.

We can all get a chuckle about Operation Jade Helm—the alleged U.S. military invasion of Texas—but it is not as funny when we begin to realize that for many Republicans in the Republican Party in Texas, crazy is a constituency that must be dealt with delicately.

So I want to end by speaking directly to the millions of families who are waiting for Texas politicians and judges to stop the delay tactics.

And I will use the language many of them speak and which God understands as well, or at least I assume he speaks Spanish because he named his only son Jesus.

I will summarize my remarks first in English.

The message is that we will not give up hope and cannot stop pushing for the implementation of the President's executive actions just because politicians have prevented something important from happening—again.

That is why I am inviting people in Chicago to join me on Saturday in Little Village so we can renew our commitment to prepare ourselves for DACA and DAPA.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Don't give up.

There are Republican politicians in Texas and elsewhere trying to block our way towards implementation of DACA and DAPA and they want us to lose heart, lose patience, and lose our resolve.

But we must stay strong and prepare ourselves and our brothers and sisters and our neighbors to be ready when—eventually—the court rules in favor of America's immigrants.

I will continue fighting and I need your help. If you live in Chicago come join us on Saturday morning in Little Village at Iglesia Santa Inez de Bohemia.

And wherever you live, continue fighting and preparing your neighbors and yourselves to keep our families together and make sure we are not deporting those who are assets to our country.

¡No se rinden!

Hay politícos republicanos en Tejas y en otros lugares tratando de bloquear nuestro camino hacia la implementación de DACA y DAPA y quieren hacernos perder la esperanza, perder la paciencia y perder nuestra determinación.

Pero hay que permanecer fuertes y preparándonos a nosotros mismos, a nuestros hermanos y hermanas y a nuestros vecinos para estar listos cuando la corte finalmente resuelva a favor del Presidente y de los inmigrantes en Estados Unidos.

Voy a seguir luchando y necesito su ayuda. Si usted vive en Chicago venga y únase a nosotros el sábado en la mañana en la Iglesia de Santa Inés de Bohemia en La Villita.

Y dondequiera que ustedes vivan, sigan luchando y preparando a sus vecinos y a ustedes mismos para mantener a nuestras familias unidas y asegurarnos de que no estemos deportando aquellos que son un gran valor a nuestro país.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks.

BERTIE'S RESPECT FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, our national military cemeteries are hallowed ground. And I ask my colleagues to agree and support my bill, H.R. 2490, Bertie's Respect for National Cemeteries Act.

On October 15, 1969, in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, a man named George Emery Siple shot and killed Bertha Smith, known to everyone as ''Bertie.'' Siple was convicted of the murder and sentenced to life in prison without parole. Thirty years later, he died in prison. Because he was a military veteran, he was buried in Indiantown Gap National Cemetery in 1999.

He was buried there despite a Federal law that was passed in 1997. That law said that veterans convicted of Federal or State capital crimes are not permitted to be buried in Veterans Affairs national cemeteries or Arlington National Cemetery.

For Bertie Smith's family, this is a heart-wrenching situation that has gone on for three decades. Jackie Katz, Bertie's daughter, has called it ''hell'' and a ''horror'' to live with the fact that George Siple was memorialized and buried with full military honors.

When I first began to look into this issue, it was clear to me that it was as frustrating as it was heartbreaking.

Back in 1997, led by our Pennsylvania Senators, Congress passed a law that

said that veterans found guilty of capital crimes could not be buried in our national veterans cemeteries. At the time, you may remember, the country was still reeling from the Oklahoma City bombing. And veterans everywhere were justifiably appalled that Timothy McVeigh, a military veteran, could be buried with full military honors.

Now, McVeigh did not receive that burial. But a major problem we discovered was that the law was not actively enforced for others until 2006.

Since then, the VA has relied on an ''honor system,'' which requires family members to willingly report their relative's criminal record.

In 2013, Congress once again sought to protect our VA national cemeteries by passing a law to explicitly allow the VA to remove veterans from cemeteries if they had been convicted of a Federal or State capital crime. However, this law does not extend to veterans buried between 1997 and 2013, a time period that includes George Emery Siple.

That is why I have introduced Bertie's Respect for National Cemeteries Act. What this law will do is require Veterans Affairs to take every reasonable action to ensure that a veteran is eligible to be buried, including searching public criminal records. It will clarify Congress' original intent by providing Veterans Affairs the explicit authority to remove veterans convicted of capital crimes who were wrongly buried after 1997. And it will specifically provide for the removal of George Emery Siple from Indiantown Gap National Cemetery.

This bill really only reaffirms what Congress intended in the first place. And it enjoys the support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

There were precedents for the removal of convicted murderers from veterans cemeteries—from Arlington National Cemetery and VA cemeteries in Michigan and Oregon, to name just a few.

Additionally, nothing in the bill would withdraw previous military honors, such as Purple Hearts or medals for valor, otherwise earned by the deceased veterans.

The discussion of military veterans who have been convicted of murder often raises the issue of mental health treatment and posttraumatic stress disorder. There is no question that PTSD is a real condition affecting many servicemen and -women, and I have always stood for funding the evaluation and treatment of those who may be afflicted.

That said, those who have been convicted of capital murder by our judicial system have been declared guilty of the worst offense possible, and any mitigating factors would have been considered at trial and sentencing.

I don't think it is too much to say that murderers should not be buried next to true American heroes. And the memories of victims like Bertie Smith should not be disregarded.

I ask my colleagues for their support in saying that real, true honor really means something in our national military cemeteries.

HONORING OFFICER GREGG BENNER OF THE RIO RANCHO POLICE DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Gregg Benner of the Rio Rancho Police Department, who was killed in the line of duty on May 25.

I offer my heartfelt condolences to the family and loved ones of Officer Benner as they mourn the loss of a husband, father, grandfather, and friend who was taken from them far too soon.

Officer Benner dedicated his life to protecting his community and his country. From his career in the United States Air Force to his last 4 years serving as a member of the Rio Rancho Police Department, Officer Benner put his health and safety on the line to make us safer.

The same was true last week. When most of us were settling down after a long Memorial Day weekend with family and friends, Officer Benner was doing his duty to protect the people of Rio Rancho. When he didn't return that evening, Officer Benner left behind a legacy of valor of service.

The loss of any police officer is a painful reminder of the dangers that they face each and every day. While we are shaken by Officer Benner's loss, we can take comfort in the memories that he left behind for all who knew him and the example that he set for all those in the community.

Rio Rancho is a tight-knit community, and while a tragedy such as this is unexpected and shocking, the response has brought out the best of its residents, who have displayed an outpouring of support and sympathy. My thoughts and prayers are with Officer Benner's family, friends, fellow officers, and the entire Rio Rancho community, and I hope that they find peace in this most difficult time.

Officer Benner, thank you for your service, and may you rest in peace.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, costs simply explode on anything that the Federal Government subsidizes because there are simply not the same incentives or pressures to hold down costs as there are in the private sector.

Over the last several weeks, many thousands of young people have graduated from our colleges and universities burdened with sizable student loan debts.

It shocks the students of today when I tell them that tuition cost only $90 a quarter my freshman year at the University of Tennessee in 1965–66—$270 for a whole school year. I once heard House Minority Whip STENY HOYER say it cost only $87 a semester when he started at the University of Maryland.

Students today think the Federal student loan program is one of the best things that ever happened to them. Actually, it may be one of the worst. Until that program started in the mid-1960s, college tuition and fees went up very slowly, roughly at the rate of inflation.

After the Federal Government decided to ''help'' students and start subsidizing these costs, tuition and fees started going up three or four times the rate of inflation almost every year.

Last year, columnist Kathleen Parker wrote in The Washington Post that since 1985, the cost of higher education has increased 538 percent, while the Consumer Price Index—inflation—over the same period has gone up 121 percent.

Colleges and universities were able to tamp down opposition to fee increases by telling students not to worry, they could just borrow the money.

When I was an undergraduate at UT and later in law school at George Washington, students could work part time, as I always did, and pay all their college expenses. No one got out of school with a debt because of tuition and fees. Now almost everyone does.

Now, 40 million Americans owe money on student loans. Outstanding student loan debts now total over $1.3 trillion. Some analysts think it may be a bubble about to burst.

Floyd Norris, writing in the International New York Times, said: ''Student loans are creating large problems that may persist for decades. They will impoverish some borrowers and serve as a drain on economic activity.''

Hedge fund manager James Altucher wrote that ''we're graduating a generation of indentured students.''

Ohio University economist Richard Vedder several years ago wrote a book entitled, ''Going Broke by Degree.''

Richard Vedder, in an article last August, wrote that ''a political storm is brewing in Washington over the consequences of rising college costs.'' He added that ''the biggest single cause of this financial problem, and a contributor to many other weaknesses in our economy, is the dysfunctional, Byzantine system of Federal financial assistance for college students.''

Mr. Vedder pointed out that before the late 1970s, Federal financial aid programs for colleges were modest in size, and tuition went up an average of only 1 percent above the inflation rate.

''Since 1978,'' he wrote, ''in an era of rapidly growing Federal financial assistance programs, annual tuition increases have been 3 to 4 percent a year beyond the inflation rate.''

In 1987, William Bennett, the Secretary of Education, said: ''Increases in

financial aid have enabled colleges and universities to raise their tuition, confident that Federal loan subsidies will help cushion the increase.''

From 1939–1964, Federal student aid—mainly the GI bill—averaged just 2.5 percent of university spending.

From 2002–2014, Federal student loan aid spending averaged a whopping 33 percent of university spending.

Several things, Mr. Speaker, could and should be done to start helping solve this problem.

First, Federal and State legislators, parents, and even students themselves should speak out against tuition increases higher than the rate of inflation.

Secondly, colleges and universities that hold these increases down, or hopefully someday even lower their costs, should be given priority and rewarded in Federal and State grants and appropriations.

Third, the Congress and State legislatures should hold hearings that feature people who have been victimized by taking on heavy student loan debts at the start of their careers.

Fourth, every college or university that receives Federal money—99.9 percent—should be required to give financial counseling or at least some type of simple, easy-to-understand document to every person receiving a student loan warning about potential problems.

□ 1045

Lastly, but most important of all, Federal and State governments should give incentives to schools that require professors to teach classes rather than writing for obscure journals or doing esoteric research that produces no tangible results.

Too many professors have lost their desire to teach. They seem to think 6 hours a week is heavy load. The result is that too many students cannot get the classes they need to graduate, and it is now taking 5 or 6 years to get a 4-year degree.

This is a very serious, fast-growing problem, Mr. Speaker, that needs major reforms sooner rather than later.

PRIORITIZING ONLINE THREAT ENFORCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, imagine waking up every morning with the dread that you will face hundreds of violent threats as soon as you get to work.

Imagine that, while you are in your office, people threaten to sexually assault you, and they know where you live, when you are home, and who your family members are. Maybe they even show you the weapon they will use in the future to harm you. We would never tolerate this in our offices, but this is a daily reality for women online.

Right now, millions of women and girls are online, navigating their personal and professional lives; yet women will be targeted with the most severe types of online threats and harassment at a rate 27 times higher than that of men. Although these threats occur online, there is nothing virtual about their devastating impacts on women's lives.

Meet Jessica Valenti, a journalist who founded a site that features topics like women in the media, women's health, and LGBT rights. The price Jessica pays for creating this forum and expressing a feminist point of view on the Internet is an unrelenting barrage of rape and death threats.

After threats forced her to leave her home, to change her bank accounts, and to change her phone number, she contacted the FBI. The FBI advised her to never walk outside by herself and to leave her home until the threats blow over. The threats continue today, 4 years later.

In Pennsylvania, a women described her terror after her abuser announced on Facebook that he planned to tie her up, put her in a trunk, pull out her teeth one by one, and then her nails, chop her into pieces, but keep her alive long enough to feel the pain.

Then there is the story of my constituent, Brianna Wu, a video game developer who had to flee her home with her family in the middle of the night after specific threats to rape and to kill her and her husband. Her online attackers released her home address and described in graphic detail the acts of violence they were planning.

Another woman moved nine times in an 18-month period out of fear of online threats. She moved across the country and changed her job four times just to stay safe.

None of the people who made these threats has been prosecuted, and most of the examples I have of online threats that women, including myself, have received are too vile and obscene to share on the House floor. In Jessica Valenti's words: ''When people say you should be raped and killed for years on end, it takes a toll on your soul.''

For Jessica and Brianna and other victims of severe threats online, there are huge financial and professional impacts. They have lost work opportunities and have spent money on legal advice, protective services, and temporary housing.

They have had to pay to have their personal information scrubbed from Web sites. This is a significant price to pay just to remain an active participant of an online economy.

What has been our response? In a 3-year period, of an estimated 2.5 million cyber stalking cases, only 10 were federally prosecuted. A judge in Massachusetts recently told one victim who works in technology and has suffered terrifying threats from an ex-boyfriend to simply go offline.

When I asked the FBI about the investigation and prosecution of online violence against women, they told me it is not a priority. By failing to address the realities of changing technology and a changing economy, we are failing these women.

It is not okay to call this an Internet problem. It is not okay to say to women that this is just the way things are. It is not okay to tell women to change their behavior, to withhold their opinions, and to stay off the Internet altogether, just to avoid severe threats.

For decades, women who have been victims of sexual assault and abuse have been told they have provoked their abusers by what they wore or what they have said. We have worked hard to change that culture; yet, by not taking these cases seriously, we send a clear message that, when women express opinions online, they are asking for it.

That is why I am calling on the Department of Justice to enforce the laws that are already on the books and take these investigations and prosecutions seriously. The Prioritizing Online Threat Enforcement Act would give the Department of Justice and the FBI the resources and the mandate to investigate and enforce the Federal laws on cyber threats.

It is not Congress' job to police the Internet, but we have a responsibility to make sure that women are able to fully participate in our economy. I urge my colleagues to support this crucial bill.

Let's keep the Internet open and safe for all voices.

FUNDING THE STRATOSPHERIC OBSERVATORY FOR INFRARED ASTRONOMY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the House Appropriations Committee for fully funding the Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy, SOFIA, program.

The SOFIA program is something that is stationed in my district. It is a 747 airplane with a 100-inch telescope in the back. Some people ask why we would need this or why this is something that NASA is so excited about. It is because we have certain programs that are in the atmosphere, and on the ground today, many of them have restrictions, but SOFIA doesn't. SOFIA does things that other telescopes just can't do.

First, it flies at 40,000 feet, so it gets above the water vapor. That is something that we just can't do from the ground. We can't do that type of science, those observations—we just can't do it—yet SOFIA does something that many other telescopes can't do.

It does something that the Hubble can't do. It does something that our beloved James Webb Space Telescope, which is going to be launched in the next couple of years, cannot do. It

lands, and we can upgrade it. If there is something new in 2015, we can put it on SOFIA. SOFIA can take off. We can do our projects, and we can do our experiments. It can land. If we have something new in 2016, we can do the same thing and so on and so forth.

For the next 20 years, we will be flying SOFIA if this Congress continues to fund it. Last year, SOFIA was on the chopping block, and without the good leadership of our majority leader, it might have gone away.

What I wanted to bring to everyone's attention is, if we are going to fund NASA, if we are going to fund projects for our new generation, if we are going to explore, if we are going to do all of the things that make America great and that make America the exploration country that we have been for the last 100-plus years, then we have to invest a little bit.

When the administration threatened to shut down SOFIA in fiscal year 2015, Congress showed strong support to make sure that SOFIA would continue; but, as we move forward, we understand what these types of projects bring.

As I look into the crowd, I see an awful lot of young folks who have either visited Washington, D.C., or they are on a tour, or they are doing something. That is what SOFIA brings. Every year, we put fifth and sixth and seventh grade teachers in SOFIA for a 9- or 10-hour mission.

They get to work with NASA. They get to work with scientists from America and from Germany because this is a joint project, and they get to see what projects and what experiments NASA is doing. They also get to work with NASA hand in hand.

They get to bring that back to the classroom, and they get to teach their fifth through seventh grade students about astronomy, about learning, about new planets, about new stars, about dying stars, about new solar systems. They take that at a practical level not just what is in the book, but what they learn, what they see, and what they do with NASA itself.

Also, I greatly appreciate the language that the committee included in the report accompanying the fiscal year 2016 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill, which reaffirms our support for SOFIA and rejects NASA's plan to conduct a senior review of the mission at such a premature stage.

If we are going to look at what SOFIA and other projects from NASA do, we have to allow them to bring us some real data. That data takes time. If we are going to do that on a 1- or 2-year status and then, maybe, cancel a project, then all of the money that we have injected into this project will be for naught.

Given that SOFIA achieved full operating status just this last year, in 2014, it has been designed for a lifespan of up to, like I said, 20 years. A senior review should not be at a 2-year stand, but it should go to a 5- or an 8-year stand so that we can collect the data and make sure that this program is worth the money the taxpayers spend on it.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle because they have supported this project just like they have supported many projects for NASA and for our experiment community.

Without the support from both sides of the aisle, it is really going to be difficult for America to continue to be the leader in space exploration and exploration abroad.

IMPROVING TREATMENT OF U.S. TERRITORIES UNDER FEDERAL HEALTH PROGRAMS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a comprehensive bill to improve the treatment of Puerto Rico and the other territories under Medicaid, traditional Medicare, and Medicare Advantage.

This is the first time that a Member of Congress has filed legislation to address the range of challenges that patients, physicians, hospitals, and insurance providers in the territories face as a result of the unequal treatment the territories receive under Federal health programs.

The bill serves as a blueprint for policymakers in identifying the various problems that exist under current Federal law and in proposing fair, realistic, and technically precise solutions to each problem.

Based on my conversations with congressional leaders and officials in the Obama administration, I believe there is bipartisan recognition that Federal health laws do not do justice to American citizens living in the territories.

I recognize that Republicans and Democrats have different opinions regarding the virtues of the Affordable Care Act, but it is my hope that policymakers can agree that it is in the national interest to take concrete steps to eliminate or reduce the numerous disparities that the territories confront under Medicaid and Medicare. These inequalities were enshrined in law long before 2010 and remain in place today.

Stated simply, if the will exists among officials in the legislative and executive branches to improve the treatment of the territories under Federal health programs, as I believe it does, then my bill provides a way forward. After today, no Federal policymaker can say: I want to help, but I don't know how.

Rather than summarizing the bill's 16 sections, I will highlight the provisions relating to Medicaid, the program for low-income individuals, which is jointly funded by the Federal Government and each State or territory government.

In the States, there is no limit on Federal funding for Medicaid as long as the State provides its share of matching funds. The Federal contribution, known as an FMAP, can range from 50 percent for the wealthiest States to over 80 percent for the poorest States.

By contrast, the funding that the Federal Government provides for Medicaid in each territory is capped. When I took office in 2009, Puerto Rico's cap was only $260 million a year, and the Federal Government was covering less than 20 percent of the cost of the territory's Medicaid Program.

During my tenure, the Federal Government has increased Medicaid funding for the territories, but that funding remains capped. Especially in the case of Puerto Rico, it is still profoundly inequitable. Most problematic, this funding expires in 2019, and in Puerto Rico, it will be depleted well before then.

This funding cliff is unique to the territories. The bill I am filing today would avert this cliff and provide a more stable and equitable level of Medicaid funding for the territories. Starting in fiscal year 2017, the bill would provide the territories with State-like treatment within well-defined parameters.

□ 1100

Specifically, each territory's Medicaid program could cover individuals whose family income is at or below the Federal poverty level. As long as a territory covers individuals within these income limits, the Federal Government would fund the territory's Medicaid program as if it were a State Medicaid program. The annual funding caps would be eliminated, and each territory would receive an FMAP based on its per capita income. However, the limiting principle is that if a territory wants to cover individuals earning above the Federal poverty level, it will generally be required to use territory dollars, not Federal dollars.

The rationale behind this new proposal is simple. Residents of the territories are American citizens. At the very least, the Federal Government should provide each territory with the funding necessary to provide health coverage to their residents who live at or below the Federal poverty level. Anything less is unacceptable from a moral and public policy standpoint.

I invite my colleagues to support this comprehensive bill and to work with me to enact its provisions into law.

RECOGNIZING JESSE HILL AND DELAWARE VALLEY VIETNAM VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, for decades Vietnam veteran and Levittown, Bucks County, resident Jesse Hill has dedicated himself to preserving the memory of those lost in Vietnam and bringing awareness to those still missing.

In Vietnam, Jesse served with distinction with the Army 1st Cavalry Division for two tours of duty between 1967 and 1969, when he earned a Purple Heart for his service and his personal sacrifice. Upon returning home, he became a founding member of the Delaware Valley Vietnam Veterans, or DV3, as they call themselves.

Today, Jesse continues to recognize the service and sacrifice of all who fought and fell in that war and others since, especially Iraq and Afghanistan, through the Donald W. Jones Flag Memorial. Named after a fellow cofounder, Jesse's leadership has sustained this impressive display for 30 years. The Flag Memorial has been located in various sites across Bucks County over the years, including the Washington Crossing Historic Park, Core Creek Park, Silver Lake Park, and now at Falls Township Community Park, where it draws an annual crowd of thousands of veterans and grateful community members.

Having participated in planting flags at this powerful memorial with members of my staff for several years, I am always humbled by the sacrifice that each flag represents and grateful for Jesse's commitment to remembering those we have lost in conflict.

I thank Jesse and all the members of the Delaware Valley Vietnam Veterans for their continued work and support of the veterans in our region and their service to our Nation and our community.

WATERS OF THE U.S. RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the recently finalized waters of the U.S. rule.

Documents show that the EPA crafted the waters of the U.S. rule behind closed doors, leaving no seat at the table for farmers, business leaders, county and State officials, homebuilders, livestock producers, ranchers, and many others who are concerned by this Federal overreach, and it affects their lives.

Everybody wants clean water—let's all be on the record for that—but we need to respect this process. Stakeholders should have been consulted. The people whose lives are affected by this rule should have been consulted. The EPA's final rule is flawed, and despite attempts by Congress, it is not an improvement over the proposed rule.

The rule still requires farmers and ranchers to get permits for activities on their own land. On their own land. The rule still expands the waters under the EPA's jurisdiction. The rule still hurts manufacturers and States and counties looking to expand economic development projects and looking to expand opportunity.

This rule remains flawed and should be thrown out. I urge Members of Congress to support efforts to stop this job-killing, farm-killing rule that invites lawsuits instead of real solutions. I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to support efforts to create a new rule that will truly improve water quality for all Americans and put stakeholders in the process and respect private property.

TRAGIC FLOODING IN CENTRAL TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, over the Memorial Day weekend, the communities of central Texas suffered a terrible tragedy after heavy rains and powerful storms hit the Lone Star State, resulting in the deaths of 24 people, including a number from Corpus Christi and the district that I represent.

Though I don't represent Hays County, where some of the major flooding happened and one of the hardest hit parts of the State, nearby Caldwell and Bastrop Counties are in the 27th District of Texas, and I have pledged my help to the entire area in every way possible.

Immediately after the floods, I visited the Bastrop County Emergency Operations Center and have been in contact with leaders throughout the district to help in the recovery and aid efforts and to make sure that the resources are available and that we are looking for ways to improve our response and readiness in the future.

But, you know, it wasn't just tragedy that I saw during this. It was not just devastation. I also saw the hope and spirit of a community that came together in aid and rescue efforts. I was moved, touched, and inspired by what I saw.

Hundreds of volunteers, including my wife Debbie, joined emergency personnel and law enforcement folks to help however possible. Debbie came home with stories of hundreds of people who drove over 3 hours from Corpus Christi to search for some of the victims who were from Corpus Christi, including my daughter's elementary and middle school tutor, who perished in the flood.

Despite this tragedy, it is amazing how people came together in the spirit of America and how it showed through. This gives me hope for the entire country, and it makes me proud to be an American.

At the request of a constituent, I will also be working with local officials to investigate how we can make our emergency notification systems better and how it can make sure people have access to accurate and timely disaster information so we can prevent tragedies like this in the future.

Obviously, we can't stop Mother Nature, but we can be prepared. We can make sure the public has the information they need to keep themselves safe, and we can help those devastated by these sorts of tragedies.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and everyone join me in continuing to pray for the victims of these floods and these tragedies, their friends, their families, and the volunteers who gave so selflessly of their time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend William Rice, Calvary Baptist Church, Clearwater, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Father, we praise You as the author of life and affirm with our Founders that You are the giver of liberty.

We ask that You would direct these who gather as Members of Congress to help govern our land. Grant them wisdom beyond themselves. Grant them the humility to remember Whom they serve and to Whom they must give an ultimate account. Grant them a deep burden for righteousness and a burning passion for justice.

Forgive us, Lord, as a people, for walking in pride and imagining that we can long stand without Your blessing. Awaken us to a reverence for Who You are as the living God and for Your eternal truths.

You, O Lord, are a great and mighty God, yet You are also compassionate and gracious. Be gracious to us still, and grant us a spiritual awakening that will renew our Nation from within.

In Jesus' Name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND WILLIAM RICE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce to my colleagues our guest chaplain for the U.S. House of Representatives today, Pastor Willy Rice of Clearwater, Florida's Calvary Baptist Church.

Pastor Willy is a Florida native, attending Calvary as a young man and returning to the church years later in 2004 to become the church pastor. Pastor Willy is joined in ministry by his wife, Cheryl, and together they have three children.

Mr. Speaker, Calvary Baptist Church is a church that is indeed alive. Pastor Willy and the entire church family minister each day through worship services, through Calvary Christian School, by serving those in need through Calvary Cares, and through ministries that support families, the elderly, supporting foster care and adoption services, providing grief counseling and ministry, and ministries to the deaf community.

In each of these ministries, Pastor Willy and the Calvary family remain focused on sharing the saving grace and the love of the Christ in Whom we put our faith, living out this faith each day with a spirit of evangelism, a humble compassion, and a heart of Christian ministry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues today to welcome Pastor Willy and his wife Cheryl. May God bless the Rice family, and may God bless the church family at Clearwater's Calvary Baptist Church.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ALLEN AMERICANS HOCKEY TEAM IN THE PLAYOFFS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because I would like to congratulate some very talented individuals in my district—the Allen Americans hockey team.

I am proud to represent the city of Allen in Washington, D.C., and everyone in Collin County is lucky because we are able to call the Allen Americans our home team. They have had a stellar season, and they are now on their way to winning their third straight championship. Today the Allen Americans will play the South Carolina Stingrays in game 3 of the Kelly Cup Playoffs.

I would like to say to the Allen Americans: Congratulations for making it this far. Good luck tonight. Your hometown believes in you, and we can't wait to see you bring home your third championship. You have worked hard, so go show them why you don't mess with Texas. Go get the Stingrays.

HONORING THE ALLIED TROOPS WHO LANDED ON THE BEACHES OF NORTHERN FRANCE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 71 years ago this week, 160,000 Allied troops landed on the beaches of northern France. Nine thousand were killed or wounded on D-day. Their bravery and sacrifice made possible the liberation of a continent and the defeat of an evil ideology.

The American heroes who fought at Normandy are examples of what we want our country to be: courageous, generous, and undeterred by a commitment to freedom. But we owe every veteran from D-day to today more.

We should remove the expiration dates in the GI bill so that veterans have access to education and training at any point in their career. We should pass an infrastructure plan with a preference for hiring veterans in the building and construction trades. We should help veterans keep medical appointments by providing child care at the VA clinics. And we should make sure that our veterans hospitals are state-of-the-art facilities.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend I will join all Americans and remember our soldiers who fought on D-day. May our country always be worthy of their sacrifice.

CONGRATULATING BAKER ELMORE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere gratitude I have the opportunity to recognize Baker Elmore, legislative director of South Carolina's Second Congressional District. I will always appreciate Baker for his service on behalf of the people of South Carolina.

A native of Cheraw, South Carolina, and formerly of the award-winning USC golf team, Baker has faithfully served on the staff for 6 years in various roles, including legislative director, legislative assistant, and special assistant. His expertise on nuclear energy, trade, and foreign affairs, combined with his ability to connect with constituents and eagerness to assist them, has made a difference, especially promoting the missions of the Savannah River site.

It is with mixed feelings, but great happiness, that I bid Baker farewell. Baker is moving on next week to serve as director of Federal programs at the Nuclear Energy Institute, NEI. This is a tremendous vote of confidence in his capability, his competence, dedication, and integrity.

Congratulations to his parents, Mike and Debbie Elmore, along with his grandparents, Sam and Gina McCuen and Harriet Elmore, for raising such a talented staff member.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Godspeed, Baker Elmore.

RECOGNIZING THE ABILITYONE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support and admiration for the AbilityOne Program, this country's single largest provider of employment for people who are blind or have significant disabilities.

AbilityOne currently works with approximately 4,600 blind individuals and over 44,000 disabled people, 3,000 of whom are military veterans or wounded warriors, helping them gain greater independence and a higher quality of life. This is accomplished by providing them with both the skills and training necessary to find valued jobs with good wages and benefits.

Mr. Speaker, Congress first recognized the need for this type of program in 1938 and expanded upon it in 1971. Today AbilityOne delivers more than $2 billion in quality products and services to the Federal Government at fair market prices. It also provides critical support to the U.S. armed services for both military and humanitarian operations. With a national network of nearly 600 community-based nonprofit agencies, AbilityOne contracts projects in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

With the participation of more of its citizens in the workplace, every community benefits from greater cultural diversity and awareness.

SECURING THE RULE OF LAW

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

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 26 States, including my home State of Texas, for stopping an imperial White House dead in its tracks.

For far too long, this President has forced his will on the American people with his pen and his phone. Well, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals has said enough is enough. Last week, the Court of Appeals upheld an injunction to stop the President's unilateral actions that would have granted 5 million illegal aliens work permits and eroded the foundation of our system of government.

Mr. Speaker, I am not anti-immigration. The Constitution of the United States is clear: immigration and naturalization are issues for Congress and the American people to decide, not a self-declared king sitting in the White House.

Lawlessness breeds lawlessness. Last week, Texas and the Fifth Circuit secured the rule of law, and I thank them for it.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AND T-HUD

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share that the Nation is desperate for a long-term, 21st century transportation and infrastructure system that provides sustainable solutions to our Nation's infrastructure crisis. We can't kick the can down the road anymore. Patching our roads and our budgets will not reverse the serious decline in our infrastructure.

In April of this year, I joined elected officials and community leaders in my district at the Central Ohio Transit Authority's new Spring Street Terminal to ''Stand Up 4 Transportation'' and call for a long-term funding bill.

Short-term patches like the one that was rushed through Congress last month fail to meet the challenge of our Nation's crumbling roads and bridges—even as other nations advance their infrastructure by leaps and bounds.

Mr. Speaker, without meaningful long-term transportation bills that provide forward thinking and predictable investments for our infrastructure, we are slamming the brakes on the economy and jobs.

It is time to act. The clock is ticking.

ROME HIGH SCHOOL ON BEST HIGH SCHOOLS LIST

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rome High School, which was ranked as one of the ''Best High Schools in America'' by U.S. News & World Report for the fourth year in a row. It also earned a silver ranking, meaning Rome High is one of the top 10 percent of schools nationwide.

These high achievements are evidence of the commitment, the dedication, and the hard work put forth by Rome High students, their faculty, and the staff. In fact, when the Rome News Tribune asked him about the rankings, Principal Evans noted: ''We are striving for a gold rank of course.''

Mr. Speaker, this commitment to hard work and doing the best you can embodies the values that make northwest Georgia a great place to live, to work, and to raise a family.

Congratulations to all those involved in the Rome High School community. Enjoy your summer break. You have earned it.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram, with the help of ISIS, has made a dangerous comeback. Just yesterday, Boko Haram attacked again, using a suicide bomber to kill 20 more people.

In his inauguration speech last Friday, President Buhari vowed to defeat Boko Haram. I hope and pray that President Buhari remains committed to this vow because we here in Congress will certainly remain committed to holding him accountable.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to wear red in solidarity with the thousands affected by the evils of Boko Haram. We will continue to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls.

Listen to these headlines: ''Kidnapped Nigerian Girls Likely Being Used by Boko Haram as Suicide Bombers''; ''U.S. Signals Willingness to Widen the Role in Fighting Boko Haram in Nigeria''; ''Boko Haram and ISIS Are the Worst Sexual Abusers''; ''How Boko Haram Is Turning Children into Weapons''; ''With Help from ISIS, a More Deadly Boko Haram Makes a Comeback''; ''Nigerian Girls Kidnapped by Boko Haram May Be Held in Underground Bunkers''; ''Boko Haram Militants Raped Hundreds of Female Captives in Nigeria.''

Continue to tweet. Tweet #bringbackourgirls.

□ 1215

REMEMBERING ARLENE BUSH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember and celebrate a wonderful public servant from Bloomington, Minnesota, Arlene Bush.

Arlene Bush served on the Bloomington School Board for 33 years and volunteered for many more. But the longevity of Arlene's service is just part of the story. Arlene was known for the kindness she showed to everyone whom she interacted with.

Superintendent of Bloomington Public Schools Les Fujitake remembered how Arlene always approached decisions that the school board faced by asking, ''What is best for the children?'' Arlene was a fixture at school events and at the annual Congressional Art Competition in Bloomington. In fact, she often took the time to tag along with me when I visited schools.

Arlene's positive, kind, and supportive spirit was contagious to those around her. Her legacy will be remembered far beyond the Bloomington School Board meeting room and the Minnesota School Boards Association award that bears her name.

My condolences go out to Arlene's family, to the Bloomington Public Schools, and to the entire Bloomington community who mourn the loss of Arlene but who celebrate a wonderful public servant.

HIRE A HERO ACT

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support an important initiative.

We celebrate and show honor to our veterans, fallen servicemembers, and those in the Armed Forces during Memorial Day and Veterans Day, and then in some respects we go on about our business.

Those veterans and the men and women in the National Guard and Ready Reserve need our continued support. We do that through health care, educational initiatives, and other ways. We must do it as well to support them economically with jobs.

Too many American servicemembers remain unemployed. Although the overall veteran unemployment rate has dropped in recent years, the rate of unemployment among our post-9/11 veterans is 7.2 percent.

As our economy continues to improve, we must be sure that those who fight to defend this country are not left behind. The men and women who serve in the National Guard and Reserve are highly trained, well-qualified individuals who add tremendous value to our employer's workforce.

Let's make it easier for those employers—and even incentivize them—to bring the men and women who continue to serve in the National Guard and Reserve on their payroll. Through the Hire A Hero Act, H.R. 2457, employers would receive a tax incentive to hire our National Guardsmen and Reservists. This would support small businesses by providing them with highly skilled workers and assist our great men and women.

Please join me in supporting the Hire A Hero Act.

ENDING ALZHEIMER'S

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the 5.3 million Americans living with Alzheimer's disease as we observe Alzheimer's Awareness Month.

Families affected by this illness know firsthand Alzheimer's takes more than just memories; it takes the lives of loved ones.

Despite being the sixth-leading cause of death in the United States, Alzheimer's is the only disease in the top

ten causes of death that cannot be slowed, stopped, or prevented.

The time to take action is now. It is our duty as Members to work on behalf of the families who lose their loved ones to this devastating disease and on behalf of those individuals who slowly lose those pieces of themselves that made up who they once were. No one should have to go through such an emotionally tolling process.

As a member of the Congressional Alzheimer's Caucus, I am devoted to raising awareness and devising solutions to once and for all end Alzheimer's.

Together we can, and must, fight this important fight.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLUE LIGHTNING INITIATIVE

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the second anniversary of the Blue Lightning Initiative, a DHS and DOT program to equip airline personnel with the tools to identify and save victims of human trafficking.

I represent Las Vegas, which attracts more than 42 million visitors every year. As a premier global destination, we are sadly all too familiar with the impact of this heinous crime.

Clearly, we must engage in an all-hands-on-deck approach to identify and apprehend traffickers, which includes our airline personnel who are on the front line.

That is why I am introducing legislation to ensure all our airlines take on this challenge and close off the skies to those engaged in this modern-day slavery.

Human trafficking is not the only issue that is facing our aviation industry, so I will be hosting industry leaders from across the country at an aviation symposium in my district next week to discuss how we can work together to strengthen our Nation's aviation, create new job opportunities, and foster economic growth.

CACHE VALLEY TRANSIT

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Cache Valley Transit District in Logan, Utah, has received an Excellence in Motion award by the national Community Transportation Association and has been named as the ''Urban Community Transportation System of the Year.'' Among other criteria, this award is given to a transportation system that demonstrates creative and innovative services that are responsive to community needs and serves an urban area of more than 50,000 people.

The Cache Valley Transit District has a 19-year legacy of fare-free riding, a precedent for the Nation. They have cultivated close relationships in the community through traditional and nontraditional partnerships, such as support for a community art program, a new medical voucher program, and Call-A-Ride buses which provide curbside service for the elderly and disabled.

For these and other reasons, they certainly merit the Excellence in Motion award.

THE VETERAN WELLNESS ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, right before the Memorial Day holiday, Congressman TIM RYAN of Ohio and I introduced H.R. 2555, the Veteran Wellness Act, a bipartisan bill that will improve Veteran Service Organizations' ability to promote good health among our Nation's veterans. This is critical at a time when an average of 22 veterans take their lives by suicide each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, veterans across the country turn to these organizations to participate in a wide variety of programs to build and cultivate a community of support among fellow veterans. These facilities are a place of comfort and familiarity for thousands of men and women and their families.

The Veteran Wellness Act will expand upon what these organizations are currently doing and create a greater number of opportunities for veterans to access wellness programs and therapies.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to be there for our Nation's heroes as they begin transitioning back to civilian life.

I ask my colleagues to join me and Congressman RYAN in supporting this bipartisan bill. We owe these brave men and women no less.

USA FREEDOM ACT

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President signed into law the USA Freedom Act. It is a bill I oppose because I believe it continues to allow unwarranted intrusions into the innocent lives of Americans in contradiction to the vision of our Founders and our Constitution.

But what is most important to remember about this debate is that even with the reforms in the USA Freedom Act, a provision of law in the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, on the books since 1986, still allows government investigators to read the emails, texts, and information stored in the cloud or on any server of all Americans, at any time, without a warrant, without probable cause, and without any due process.

Our Federal law gives digital communication little to no protections under the Fourth Amendment, regardless of the reforms signed into law yesterday.

A lot has changed in email communication since 1986, and that is why we must pass the Email Privacy Act, a broad bipartisan bill with over 270 cosponsors which would give email, digital communication, the same Fourth Amendment protections as paper mail or letters on our desks.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass this legislation. Let's pass H.R. 699, and let's assure the American people that government has moved into the 21st century and not forgotten the Constitution along the way.

REMEMBERING HADIYA PENDELTON

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Hadiya Pendelton, a young woman from my home State of Illinois who was shot tragically in Chicago when she was only 15.

Hadiya would have been 18 years old yesterday. In her memory, her friends asked their classmates to commemorate her life by wearing orange. Yesterday, I joined with my colleagues in the House to honor her memory in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, every single day in the United States, nearly 300 people are victims of handgun violence. Yesterday, gun owners, sportsmen, lawmakers, faith leaders, teachers, students, and more wore orange to bring attention to the issue of handgun violence.

It is my hope that this nonpartisan unifying action will show that victims of gun violence like Hadiya are not forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, we must set aside our partisan differences so that we may honor the victims of this tragic and unnecessary violence and come together to make our homes, our businesses, schools, and communities safer.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2289, COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 288 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 288

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-

users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-18. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Friday, June 5, 2015, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1230

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, H. Res. 288, providing for the consideration of a very important piece of legislation, H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2289 under a structured rule and makes five amendments in order—two Democrat and two Republican, as well as one bipartisan amendment—allowing for a balanced debate on these important issues.

H.R. 2289 is essential to the smooth functioning of the American economy and is long overdue for an enactment into law. This important legislation will reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, also known as the CFTC, which had its statutory authority lapse in September of 2013.

The House passed, with strong bipartisan support, a very similar version of this legislation on June 24 of last year. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to take up the House-passed bill despite its strong bipartisan support in the House, leading us to reconsider this legislation again today.

After the financial crisis of 2008, almost everyone agreed that changes needed to be made to our financial services sector in order to protect our economy and prevent another crisis in the future. Like many of my colleagues, I have concerns with some of the reforms that were instituted in response to this financial calamity because they have put overly burdensome restrictions on our business communities.

However, it is important to note that this legislation keeps intact the overarching reforms made in title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act. Every witness who appeared in front of the Agriculture Committee was supportive of the clearing, margining, and execution requirements that are the heart of title VII; yet, like every major comprehensive law—and this was very comprehensive—there are always unintended consequences that need to be addressed, and H.R. 2289 does just that.

For example, the authors of Dodd-Frank would likely argue the law's main purpose is to reduce systemic risk to the economy. However, I don't think anyone would argue that farmers, who are simply trying to lock in a good price for their corn or for their wheat, are a systemic risk to our economy.

It is just as restaurant chains that are looking to make sure they have enough beef or pork or potatoes to sell to their patrons also do not pose a systemic risk. Utility companies that are seeking to ensure that they have enough power to meet the needs and demands of their customers did not cause the financial crisis.

Unfortunately, though, the current law imposes rules that treat all of these entities as major risks to our economy, and it imposes overly burdensome capital and paperwork requirements on them.

Mr. Speaker, critics may claim this bill undermines consumer protections. However, this could not be further from the truth. Title I of H.R. 2289 puts in place greater consumer protections, like requiring brokerage firms to notify investors before moving funds from one account to another in order to prevent abuses like those that occurred at MF Global prior to its bankruptcy.

It would also require firms that become undercapitalized to immediately report to regulators and work with them to restore adequate capital and financial security. These title I provisions are commonsense reforms that will protect consumers.

Title II would make reforms to the CFTC itself, such as strengthening the cost-benefit analysis the CFTC must perform when considering the impacts of its rules and appointing a chief economist to assist with compiling and analyzing financial data.

Critics may claim that requiring cost-benefit analyses will open up the CFTC to lawsuits, which could be costly. However, such critics also ignore the endless cycle of the proposal and reproposals of rules that are rushed, poorly conceived, and unworkable.

This work requires the CFTC to waste staff time and Commission funds to redraft rules or to provide workarounds for impacted parties. This requirement merely gives the CFTC a standard for writing good rules the first time that will benefit our economy and the users.

Title II would also require the CFTC to take steps to invest in IT to protect sensitive market data against cyber attacks, a very real issue given the recent breaches we have seen at the IRS and at various national retailers. Most importantly, this section reauthorizes the CFTC until 2019, which has been operating without our authorization, to spend money for a year and a half.

Title III now gets to the heart of what I mentioned earlier, providing relief to the end users or the farmers, the restaurants, the manufacturers, the utilities, and other entities that rely on a steady supply of commodities that have been caught up in the unintended consequences of Dodd-Frank's reforms.

These users have a genuine need to use markets to hedge against bad weather, natural disasters, inflation, price shocks, and other unforeseen circumstances that could jeopardize their ability to serve their customers. These entities inherently want to avoid risk and, thus, shouldn't be subjected to the same requirements as financial and investment entities.

Mr. Speaker, title III of H.R. 2289 makes significant reforms to aid these end users, such as preventing utility companies from being inappropriately classified as ''financial entities'' and being treated like banks under the law.

It exempts end users who are not otherwise regulated by the CFTC from having to keep records of every email, phone call, fax, or letter with regard to every trade, a huge recordkeeping burden. It would prevent nonbank swap dealers from having to hold more capital than banks do, which would put them at an unfair disadvantage in the market.

Additionally, this section would allow end users operating in rarely traded markets not to have to disclose trade data, which can be a serious disadvantage if they must publicly show all of their trading partners what they are buying and selling.

Title III would also require the CFTC to determine if the rules for foreign swaps are equivalent to U.S. rules and create a workable system of substituted compliance for market participants whose activity crosses multiple jurisdictions. This would ensure that businesses which trade internationally do not have to comply with two sets of divergent rules.

Mr. Speaker, the most important thing to remember about H.R. 2289 is that the farmer who grows the food that you eat for dinner did not cause the financial crisis, neither did the people you buy your electricity from or the people who provided the wood for your desk or the metal used in your car. I do not know of any reason we should continue to treat them as if they did, which is what the current law does, and it is what H.R. 2289 is seeking to correct.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule, allowing for the consideration of important legislation that will help grow our economy. I support its adoption, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation.

Since my friends on the other side of the aisle have assumed the majority, they have made it their mission to undermine the Dodd-Frank Act and hamstring the ability of our regulators to put in place strong rules to prevent another financial crisis, and this legislation is no exception.

H.R. 2289 reauthorizes the Commodity Futures Trading Commission through 2019 while making substantial changes to the CFTC's internal operations and rolling back key Dodd-Frank provisions intended to strengthen our financial regulatory framework.

I have specific concerns with the new cost-benefit requirements imposed in title II of the legislation. The CFTC already conducts cost-benefit analyses on its rulemakings, and this provision could significantly slow down the rulemaking process while also creating openings that will put the CFTC at the risk of increased litigation.

Title II of H.R. 2289 also proposes several unnecessary changes to the Commission's internal operations that can make it more difficult to manage the agency.

According to CFTC Chairman Massad, the provisions contained in title II could weaken the Commission's ability to respond in a timely and effective manner. For example, if these measures were currently in place, it would have made it more difficult for the agency to positively respond over the past 10 months to concerns raised by market participants. Also included in this bill are substantial changes to rulemakings taking place at the Commission under the Dodd-Frank Act.

I am particularly concerned by the cross-border language contained in the bill, which will undercut the efforts already underway by the Commission to negotiate on an international system of safe and robust derivative rules that are necessary to apply to the global derivatives market.

H.R. 2289 requires the CFTC to create a rule that will automatically allow U.S. banks and foreign banks conducting business in the U.S. to do so under the rules imposed by foreign jurisdictions, all of which are currently more lenient than our own. We have seen this kind of race to the bottom before, and we all know how it ends.

Worse yet, Mr. Speaker, is that this legislation hamstrings an agency that is already woefully underfunded. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the CFTC will need 30 additional personnel annually to handle the increased workload imposed by both the new cost-benefit analysis requirements and the mandated cross-border rule contained in this legislation.

Will my friends on the other side of the aisle provide the necessary funding increases to the CFTC to carry out these requirements? I doubt it.

Dodd-Frank significantly expanded the CFTC's role in overseeing our financial markets, and they have already completed over 80 percent of their required rulemakings, the best rate of any financial regulator. They have done so despite the fact that Congress has not done its part to provide the agency with the resources it needs to police these incredibly complex markets, populated by highly sophisticated and extremely powerful entities.

Remember AIG, the insurer brought down by derivatives trades that the CFTC is now policing? If that memory is fuzzy, I am sure you will remember the funds we provided to bail AIG out, which came to a total of $67.8 billion. That would be enough to fund the CFTC at the level requested in the President's budget for over 200 years.

The Commission needs a reauthorization, but it certainly doesn't need one saddled with changes that will hamstring its internal operations, prolong its rulemakings through an inflexible cost-benefit analysis requirement that opens it up to litigation risk, and force it to allow a race to the bottom on international rules governing a global market.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to make one comment in response to those of my colleague from Massachusetts in considering the underfunding of CFTC.

In the last 5 years, through the reductions of Federal spending and the efforts that have been going on, I think anyone would be hard-pressed to find another agency that has received an almost 50 percent increase in its budget over that period of time.

I will just point out that, certainly, they have received a lot of new responsibilities under Dodd-Frank, but also a large increase in their available resources.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to provide for the consideration of H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

I want to start by thanking Chairman SESSIONS and the entire Rules Committee for their time and work in preparing this rule. Yesterday's hearing was spirited but fair, and they have produced a rule that reflects the tremendous work the Agriculture Committee has put in on this issue.

Over the past few years, the Agriculture Committee has heard from dozens of witnesses at over 10 hearings. These witnesses, many of whom are market participants struggling to comply with the needlessly burdensome rules and ambiguous portions of the underlying statute, have been consistent in their call to action. To address their concerns, H.R. 2289 makes targeted reforms that fall into three broad categories: customer protections, Commission reforms, and end-user relief.

Title I of the bill protects customers and the margin funds they deposit at their FCMs by codifying critical changes made in the wake of the collapses and bankruptcies of MF Global and Peregrine Financial.

Title II makes meaningful reforms to the operations of the Commission to improve the agency's deliberative process. In doing so, it also requires the Commission to conduct more robust cost-benefit analyses to help get future rulemakings right the first time and to avoid the endless cycle of reproposing and delaying unworkable rules.

□ 1245

While the CFTC is already required to consider costs and benefits of the rules it proposes, this rule attempts to legitimize that practice, a practice that has been called into question. The current practice has been called into question by the Commission's own inspector general, who reported the agency seemed to view the process as more of a legal one than an economic one.

Finally, title III of the bill fixes real problems faced by end users who rely on derivatives markets to manage

their risks. When it is more costly for those who need these markets to use them, it discourages the exact kind of prudent risk management activities Congress intended to protect with the end user exemption in Dodd-Frank.

Accordingly, the bill provides relief to agricultural and commercial market participants struggling to comply with overreaching and costly recordkeeping requirements and allows utility companies to continue using contracts that allow for a change in the volume of the commodity delivered without the worry of needlessly complying with the swaps regulations.

H.R. 2289 will preserve end users' ability to hedge against anticipated business risk by providing a more workable definition of bona fide hedging. The bill also addresses serious concerns regarding the lack of harmony and clarity in global derivatives regulation by requiring the CFTC to publish a rule addressing how the U.S. swaps requirements apply to transactions occurring outside the United States and with non-U.S. persons.

To be clear, H.R. 2289 makes these meaningful improvements for market participants without undermining the basic goals of title VII of Dodd-Frank, the Holy Grail, to bring clearing, reporting, and electronic execution requirements to swaps transactions.

In closing, I would like to thank the members of the Committee on Agriculture who have worked hard, including Mr. NEWHOUSE, to advance this important legislation. I am especially appreciative of Mr. LUCAS, who worked on reauthorization last year, which was our starting point for this year, as well as some of our newest members. I also owe particular thanks to Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT and Mr. DAVID SCOTT, the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, respectively, that oversees the CFTC. Both of these gentlemen have joined me as original sponsors and have held a series of hearings on reauthorization.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CONAWAY. They did outstanding work helming a new subcommittee focused on these issues, and I look forward to their diligent oversight work throughout the rest of the Congress.

Similar to the CFTC reauthorization bill passed by the House with overwhelming bipartisan support last year, the Commodity End-User Relief Act is comprised of narrowly targeted changes to the Commodity Exchange Act. The committee has again put together a bill that earned the bipartisan support of our members because we brought the right relief to the right people.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule and support for the underlying act.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to my colleague from Washington State with regard to the funding of the CFTC that the agency has never received the funding that it has requested, and that is just a fact. Here we are imposing new requirements, new mandates. CBO, as I mentioned in my opening, estimates that the CFTC will need an additional 30 personnel annually to handle the increased workload imposed by the new cost-benefit analysis requirements of the mandated cross-border rule contained in the provisions in this bill, and so we are asking an agency that has never been properly funded to even do more and not provide it with the proper funding. I don't think that is a smart way to move forward when it comes to an issue so important.

I also want to point out to my colleagues that they should have received a letter from the Consumer Federation of America strongly opposing this bill. Let me just read you the first paragraph. It says:

> We are writing on behalf of the Consumer Federation of America to ask you to oppose H.R. 2289, which the House is expected to vote on this month. This legislation would hamstring the Commodity Futures Trading Commission from effectively overseeing and regulating commodities and derivatives markets, leaving consumers exposed to fraud, manipulation, and abusive practices, and putting the safety and stability of the U.S. financial system at risk. The language in this bill largely mirrors the language offered in last year's CFTC reauthorization bill, which the Obama administration strongly opposed because it undermined the efficient functioning of the CFTC and offered no solution to address the persistent inadequacy of the agency's funding. We urge you to resist this relentless attack on the CFTC by voting against this misguided and harmful legislation.

I would tell my colleagues who are observing this debate that each one of them received a copy of this letter from the Consumer Federation of America strongly opposing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include the statement for the RECORD.

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
June 2, 2015.

Re Oppose H.R. 2289

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are writing on behalf of the Consumer Federation of America (CFA) to ask you to oppose ''The Commodity End User Relief Act'' (H.R. 2289), which the House is expected to vote on this month. This legislation would hamstring the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) from effectively overseeing and regulating commodities and derivatives markets, leaving consumers exposed to fraud, manipulation, and abusive practices, and putting the safety and stability of the U.S. financial system at risk. The language in this bill largely mirrors the language offered in last year's CFTC reauthorization bill, which the Obama Administration strongly opposed because it undermined the efficient functioning of the CFTC and offered no solution to address the persistent inadequacy of the agency's funding. We urge you to resist this relentless attack on the CFTC by voting against this misguided and harmful legislation.

First, this bill would impose an assortment of new, onerous cost-benefit analysis requirements on the CFTC which are likely to delay and obstruct agency action. Under the Commodity Exchange Act, the CFTC already has a statutory mandate to evaluate the costs and benefits of its actions in light of numerous considerations, including the protection of market participants and the public, efficiency, competitiveness, financial integrity, price discovery, and sound risk management practices. This bill would add seven new considerations for the CFTC to undertake. Included in the new economic analysis regime is a requirement for the Commission to assess available alternatives to direct regulation and to determine whether, in choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, those alternatives to direct regulation maximize the net benefits. The practical effect is a further tilting of the regulatory process in favor of adopting an approach that best benefits industry rather than the public.

Essentially, if this bill is adopted, the CFTC will be required to undertake an in-depth, burdensome economic analysis for each regulation it proposes and compare its proposal to every conceivable alternative. Such a framework likely will create insurmountable barriers that cripple the agency from putting forth rule proposals and finalizing them in a timely manner so as to effectively protect market participants and the overall economy. In addition, the CFTC would be required to evaluate the cost to the Commission of implementing the proposed action, including providing a methodology for quantifying the costs. While this provision is clumsily worded, it appears that the practical effect of requiring the CFTC to consider costs to itself and its staff will be to paradoxically add time and costs to the cost side of the equation, thereby hindering rulemaking. It is also disturbing that this legislation would require the CFTC to undertake exhaustive cost-benefit analyses without providing the agency with the necessary resources to fulfill those obligations.

The new cost-benefit analysis requirements also are likely to result in increasing opportunities to thwart CFTC regulations through legal challenges. The practical effect of the new heightened requirements will be that any time an industry participant objects to new rules, it will have several new bases for a lawsuit, and it will seek to defeat those rules by claiming that the agency did not undertake a proper economic analysis by considering, and then disposing of, all the possible theoretical alternatives. It is reasonable to believe that armed with such strong ammunition, industry-supported lawsuits seeking to dismantle any new regulations will be successful, a problem again made worse by the agency's lack of funding to effectively defend against such suits.

This legislation also subverts the CFTC's authority to regulate foreign derivatives activities that have a direct and significant effect on U.S. commerce. As our nation has learned painfully and repeatedly from the collapses of Long Term Capital Management, AIG, and Lehman Bros., and from the JPMorgan London Whale trading debacle, even when derivatives contracts are booked through a foreign subsidiary of a U.S. financial institution, the risks of those derivatives often flow back to the United States, threatening the U.S. economy and potentially putting U.S. taxpayers on the hook for any resulting losses. That is why Dodd-Frank gave the CFTC broad authority to regulate overseas derivatives when they put our national economic interests in peril.

Pursuant to that cross-border framework, the CFTC allows a foreign host country's regulations to substitute for U.S. regulations only after the CFTC has made a finding that the foreign host country's regulations are comparable to U.S. rules. However, this bill

would create a presumption that each of the eight foreign jurisdictions with the largest swaps markets automatically have swaps rules that are considered to be comparable to and as comprehensive as U.S. swaps requirements. The bill makes this determination despite the fact that the CFTC has found only six jurisdictions to be comparable for certain entity-level requirements, and has declined to make comparability determinations for transaction-level requirements for jurisdictions other than the European Union and Japan. Switching the presumption will subjugate the CFTC's authority and expertise on the matter. Furthermore, combining the reversed presumption and overwhelming cost-benefit analysis requirements could mean that the CFTC is effectively thwarted from applying the appropriate regulatory safeguards to certain foreign derivatives transactions. As a result, the CFTC's ability to protect the U.S. economy from the dangers resulting from foreign derivatives transactions could be impaired.

Derivatives markets affect the U.S. economy in profound ways, and the risks that derivatives pose to the U.S. economy are well-known. The Dodd-Frank Act brought meaningful reforms to increase transparency and accountability in the derivatives markets and provided the CFTC the necessary authority to properly oversee and regulate the market. However, this legislation would put those reforms at risk and hamper the CFTC's ability to adequately protect consumers, market participants, and the U.S. economy. We cannot afford to suffer the grave consequences of another derivatives-laced financial crisis, but this legislation makes it more likely that we will. Accordingly, we urge you to oppose H.R. 2289.

Sincerely,

MICAH HAUPTMAN,
Financial Services Counsel.
BARBARA ROPER,
Director of Investor Protection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that, as the gentleman just mentioned, I do serve as the ranking member of the jurisdictional committee on commodities and futures and trading that the CFTC comes under. I say that only to say that I have been in the vineyards on this issue and have been struggling with it and working on it over many, many years.

The whole derivatives and commodities and futures markets have changed dramatically. We have had a downfall in our economy because of a lot of activity that was wrong going on on Wall Street and in our financial community, out of which we are now emerging.

Mr. Speaker, what is urgent here is the fact that we cannot delay any longer. It is very important for people to understand that no legislation is perfect. I am the first one to say that. This is a glass that looks to be half empty or maybe half full. I look at it as half full.

I look at it as an urgent, urgent issue. We have got to get end-user relief. That is the major component of this reauthorization for the CFTC because it is the end users—our manufacturers, our farmers, those who produce the products, those who had nothing to do with the downfall of Wall Street, why should they be consistently held to the same intrinsic regulations and rules that our financial institutions have? We have got to have those financial institutions under strong regulation, but it is important that we move, and it is important meat of this bill that we give end-user relief.

Now, I share Mr. MCGOVERN's concerns about the financial situation, but let me just assure everyone, this is a reauthorization piece of legislation. It is not a funding mechanism. That is in the bosom, in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations; and nobody, absolutely nobody, has been a stronger champion, more consistent about getting the CFTC the funding they need. I bring it up all the time. I will still be a champion, but this isn't the bill in which to address that.

The other point is this, Mr. Chairman, once we get the funding out of the way. We talked about the cost-benefit analysis in this. We worked on it. This bill received bipartisan support in the last session. Mr. MCGOVERN brings up a very good point about possible litigation. We address that by adding a Democratic amendment by Ms. DELBENE that addresses that issue to make sure that there is no litigation.

As far as the cost-benefit analysis is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we put the same sort of cost-benefit analysis into this agency that the Obama administration has in every one of their executive agencies. Furthermore, it is not a mandate; it is an assessment. It is saying to assess the efficiencies, make sure we do it, and it does not put a requirement that any decision on the cost-benefit analysis outweighs one another as a requirement for them to make a decision.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we must pass this bill, and we need to do it quickly because, in section 300 of this bill—I think it is section 323—we address a crucial issue. The European Union is eating our lunch. All across the world, we are losing our stature as the leading financial industry and system in the world. That affects every ounce of our security. We are number one in the world, and it is about time we stand up and ensure that by making sure that we address the European Union's harsh discrimination against our financial institutions abroad. This is particularly true when it comes to our clearinghouses, the standards that they are using.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yes, we are dealing with eight foreign countries, but they must have similar regimes, what we call equivalency. Now, why is that important, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. It is important because it is the CFTC that must determine if another nation, one of the eight top foreign nations, has an equivalency of a strong regulatory regime as does the United States, then certainly we can do business under their regime, but as long as we don't pass this legislation, the CFTC doesn't have that.

Finally, on all the cross-border situations, we need a definition of what a U.S. person is, and we need to give some backbone to our CFTC Commission to say: Look, why should the United States have to treat a foreign entity in a manner and with the respect that that foreign nation does not treat our industry?

Mr. Speaker, this country, the United States, is losing a tremendous amount of our prestige and our leadership on the world stage, and nowhere is that being pronounced more than in our financial system because for 3 years we have had this laid on the table. I urge a positive vote for this rule.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me the time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his many years of hard work on this very complicated issue. As you can see, he understands it well and understands the importance of passing this reauthorization legislation. I just want to thank him for his comments and hard work.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the esteemed former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the underlying bill, H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act. This bipartisan bill is the result of a series of hearings in which the Committee on Agriculture heard from stakeholders that do business with the CFTC as well as every CFTC Commissioner.

As chairman of the committee last year, I began the process of CFTC reauthorization, which resulted in the House-passed bipartisan bill, and I laud our committee chairman, Mr. CONAWAY, for his efforts in tackling the same subject and coming to the full House with another bipartisan CFTC reauthorization that passed the committee by a voice vote.

A chief selling point of this bill is its commitment to good governance reforms at the CFTC to increase transparency and efficiency. First, the bill closely follows an executive order by President Obama to improve the cost-benefit analysis performed by the Commission prior to promulgating rules. In addition, the bill would improve this oversight of Commissioners over activities which are outside the normal rulemaking process that still impact many futures market participants. Many of these activities, such as policy statements, guidance, and interpretation rules released by CFTC, would also be subject to public comment under the provisions of the bill when they have

the force of law. Furthermore, H.R. 2289 establishes an office of the chief economist at the CFTC to provide objective economic data and analysis.

The committee also heard from end users during this process and included several provisions to provide relief to those end users, such as a more workable definition of bona fide hedging and relief from burdensome recordkeeping rules for many businesses.

The CFTC has gone unauthorized since 2013, and it is time many CFTC activities were reformed by Congress. This rule will make possible the underlying bill that will improve the CFTC in many important ways. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to be clear on one thing. Yes, this is an authorization bill. It is not an appropriations bill. But the issue of funding for the CFTC is relevant in the discussion of this authorization bill because we are essentially proposing that we give additional responsibilities or require additional actions from the CFTC with no guarantee that we are going to provide the resources for them to do their job. We haven't provided them the adequate resources to do what they have been expected to do from the very beginning.

I also want to say that most end user relief in this bill is not objectionable, but the CFTC is already addressing them through rulemaking. A better way to address these concerns than in statute would be more flexibility for them to do rulemaking, which can be adjusted.

In addition to end user provisions, this bill also contains all the problems that we have already identified with regard to cost benefit and cross border. So there are some significant issues here.

The DelBene amendment was mentioned earlier. I want to make it clear that that does not prevent litigation. It just restates the standard of review from the Administrative Procedure Act abuse of discretion.

I will also point out to my colleagues that the cost-benefit analysis is mandated by section 202.

So, again, I would feel better about all of this if we addressed the funding shortfall in the CFTC. We are not doing that. And I don't expect that this majority is going to work with us on that.

I also will insert in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a letter that was sent to all Members of the House from Americans for Financial Reform strongly opposing H.R. 2289. Let me just read the opening paragraph:

''On behalf of Americans for Financial Reform, we are writing to express our opposition to H.R. 2289. . . . This legislation would have a severe negative impact on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and its ability to police commodity and derivatives markets. The new restrictions it places on the CFTC would require additional years of bureaucratic red tape prior to agency action, would enable numerous industry lawsuits against the agency, and would create inappropriate statutory restrictions on the agency's ability to properly oversee markets crucial to the financial system.''

AMERICANS FOR FINANCIAL REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Americans for Financial Reform, we are writing to express our opposition to HR 2289, ''The Commodity End User Relief Act.'' This legislation would have a severe negative impact on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and its ability to police commodity and derivatives markets. The new restrictions it places on the CFTC would require additional years of bureaucratic red tape prior to agency action, would enable numerous industry lawsuits against the agency, and would create inappropriate statutory restrictions on the agency's ability to properly oversee markets crucial to the financial system.

At the same time, this legislation includes no provisions that address the CFTC's most fundamental problem—the lack of resources to accomplish its mission. Due to the agency's massive new responsibilities under the Dodd-Frank Act for hundreds of trillions of dollars in previously unregulated derivatives markets, as well as the growth of traditional commodity markets, the size of CFTC-regulated markets has increased roughly 15-fold over the last decade. But the agency's funding lags far behind. As CFTC chair Tim Massad recently stated:

''The CFTC does not have the resources to fulfill our new responsibilities as well as all the responsibilities it had—and still has—prior to the passage of Dodd Frank in a way that most Americans would expect. Our staff, for example, is no larger than it was when Dodd-Frank was enacted in 2010. . . . Simply stated, without additional resources, our markets cannot be as well supervised; participants and their customers cannot be as well protected; market transparency and efficiency cannot be as fully achieved.''

While the CFTC's funding is appropriated, the agency authorization process is an appropriate mechanism for introducing mechanisms that would supplement appropriations with some form of agency self-funding. Such self-funding mechanisms are used by all other financial regulatory agencies and have been endorsed for the CFTC by every administration going back to the Reagan Administration, including the Bush and Obama Administrations.

Instead of addressing the pressing problem of funding, HR 2289 would instead load down the CFTC with additional mandates that would drain resources and act as a roadblock to necessary oversight and enforcement. Section 202 of HR 2289 would more than double the number of cost benefit analyses the agency must perform prior to taking any action. The CFTC already has a statutory requirement to consider the costs and benefits of its actions, and to evaluate these costs and benefits as applied to a number of significant considerations, including market efficiency, price discovery, and protection of the public.

However, Section 202 would massively expand this requirement. The section would enormously expand the number of different factors the CFTC must evaluate in any rulemaking, order, or guidance. It would also change the standard of evaluation from consideration of costs and benefits to a much more extensive and burdensome ''reasoned determination'' of costs and benefits. The section includes a particularly sweeping mandate that would require the agency to assess whether an action ''maximizes net benefits'' compared to all possible regulatory alternatives. This requirement alone, which seems to require comparison of any actual regulation to a potentially vast number of theoretical alternatives, could be read to require dozens of additional agency analyses.

Some of this language does replicate cost-benefit instructions from the Office of Management and Budget that already applies to agencies within the executive branch, although not to independent financial regulatory agencies like the CFTC. However, a crucial difference is that HR 2289 would add this language in statute, meaning that each and every additional instruction regarding cost-benefit analysis could become grounds for a Wall Street lawsuit against a CFTC rule. These extensive new cost-benefit requirements amount to a playbook for industry interests to tie up regulations in endless litigation, delays, and red tape. With critical rulemakings such as position limits to control commodity price manipulation still incomplete almost five years after they were passed, the addition of major new barriers to action would be dramatic movement in the wrong direction.

Section 314 of the legislation would also greatly weaken the authority of the CFTC to properly regulate derivatives transactions booked in foreign subsidiaries of U.S. banks, even when such transactions have a direct and significant connection to the U.S. economy. We need only look at the example of J.P. Morgan's ''London Whale'' transactions, or the London derivatives transactions of AIG Financial Products which resulted in the largest bailout in U.S. history, to see that derivatives transactions conducted through nominally overseas entities can have a profound impact on the U.S. economy. Over half of Wall Street derivatives transactions are currently booked in nominally foreign subsidiaries, and even more could be transacted in this way if there was an incentive to do so to avoid regulation.

Section 314 would force the CFTC to perform burdensome ''determinations'' in order to regulate foreign subsidiary transactions. Its discretion in performing these assessments would be limited in numerous ways by the legislation. To take just one example, the agency would be banned from considering the actual physical location of personnel doing swaps trading in determining whether a transaction was conducted inside the United States for the purposes of applying U.S. law. It defies common sense to impose such extraordinary restrictions on the discretion of a regulatory agency charged with oversight of the multi-trillion dollar derivatives market.

HR 2289 also includes many additional changes. Some of them, such as amendments to indemnification requirements for swaps data repositories, are reasonable. However, others create significant statutory loopholes that could permit evasion of derivatives regulations by large banks. For example, Section 301 of the legislation permits large financial institutions affiliated with commercial entities to take advantage of exemptions from key Dodd-Frank risk controls that were intended to apply only to commercial end users. The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service has stated that the language included in Section 301 ''could potentially allow large banks to trade swaps with other large banks and not be subject to the clearing or exchange trading requirements as long as one of the banks had a nonfinancial affiliate.''

Some of the other problematic parts of the bill expand the definition of ''commercial end user'' to include financial entities (Section 306), create sweeping exemptions from

CFTC oversight for broad classes of complex financial instruments (Section 309), weaken Commission authority to require swap dealers to raise equity capital to back up their trades (Section 311), permit marketing of complex institutional commodity pools to retail investors (Section 312), and weaken limits on commodity market speculation (Section 313). All of these sections appear significantly overbroad and could enable evasion of appropriate regulatory oversight.

In general, the ''end user'' changes in this bill fail to recognize the very substantial administrative exemptions provided to end users by the CFTC. The CFTC has already exempted end users from numerous Dodd-Frank regulations in areas targeted by this bill. By acting through administrative processes the agency has maintained appropriate safeguards as well as the ability to act if market participants use exemptions to evade important risk controls. In contrast, many of the provisions in HR 2289 would provide sweeping statutory exemptions that lack appropriate controls on risk and could easily become dangerous loopholes.

But even before considering these issues, the major new restrictions on the agency created by the cost-benefit and cross-border provisions of this bill create overwhelming reasons to reject this legislation as currently written. So long as those provisions are a part of this legislation, supporting appropriate derivatives regulation requires opposing this bill.

We urge you to vote against HR 2289 and preserve the CFTC's capacity to properly regulate crucial futures and derivatives markets. For more information please contact AFR's Policy Director, Marcus Stanley at marcus@ourfinancialsecurity.org.

Sincerely,

AMERICANS FOR FINANCIAL REFORM.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, I would urge all my colleagues to look in their mail for the letter from the Americans for Financial Reform strongly opposed to this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the good gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution and the underlying legislation, H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit, I want to thank our chairman, Mr. CONAWAY, for his strong leadership and for making this reauthorization process a productive one through the full Ag Committee.

I also want to thank my colleague from Georgia and the ranking member of the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee, Mr. DAVID SCOTT. He has been a tremendous partner throughout this effort, and we certainly continue to work well together. I thank him for that.

Derivatives markets exist to meet the risk management needs of farmers, ranchers, utilities, manufacturers, and other end users. To be clear, these hedging activities directly benefit the American citizen by helping to keep consumer costs low and reducing the risk of manufacturing in the United States.

The ability of producers and end users to use the derivatives markets to hedge risk has a direct impact on the cost of living in my district, Georgia's Eighth Congressional District, and every other district around the country. It is essential that we have strong markets that our farmers, ranchers, and end users can utilize to meet their needs effectively.

Earlier this year, our subcommittee held three very productive hearings that built upon the work done in the past two Congresses on this reauthorization effort. In many hours of testimony we heard diverse perspectives from end users, market participants, and regulators that were instrumental in drafting this legislation. Their testimony included outlooks on the unintentional impacts that the market reforms enacted following the 2008 financial crisis were having on the end user community.

Despite congressional attempts to exempt end users from some of the more costly and cumbersome mandates, end users continue to face unnecessary regulatory burdens and uncertainty. With this legislation we have the opportunity to erase that.

H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act, seeks to clarify congressional intent, minimize regulatory burdens, and most importantly, preserve the ability for those necessary risk management markets to serve those who need them.

I believe we have met these objectives of ensuring that our regulatory framework protects the integrity of our markets while not limiting the ability of end users to access these tools to conduct their business.

I am proud to support both this resolution and the underlying legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to join me in so doing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 2289 and just read a little bit of it so that my colleagues understand how strongly the administration is opposed to this:

''The administration strongly opposes the passage of H.R. 2289 because it undermines the efficient functioning of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission . . . by imposing a number of organizational and procedural changes that would undercut efforts taken by the CFTC over the last year to address end user concerns.

''H.R. 2289 also offers no solution to address the persistent inadequacy of the agency's funding. The CFTC is one of only two Federal financial regulators funded through annual discretionary appropriations, and the funding that Congress has provided for it over the past 5 years has failed to keep pace with the increasing complexity of the Nation's financial markets.

''The changes proposed in H.R. 2289 would hinder the ability of the CFTC to operate effectively, thereby threatening the financial security of the middle class by encouraging the same kind of risky, irresponsible behavior that led to the great recession.''

The statement concludes, Mr. Speaker:

''If the President were presented with H.R. 2289, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.''

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2289—COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

(Rep. Conaway, R–TX, June 2, 2015)

The Administration is firmly committed to strengthening the Nation's financial system through the implementation of key reforms to safeguard derivatives markets and ensure a stronger and fairer financial system for investors and consumers. The full benefit to the Nation's citizens and the economy cannot be realized unless the entities charged with establishing and enforcing the rules of the road have the resources to do so.

The Administration strongly opposes the passage of H.R. 2289 because it undermines the efficient functioning of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) by imposing a number of organizational and procedural changes and would undercut efforts taken by the CFTC over the last year to address end-user concerns. H.R. 2289 also offers no solution to address the persistent inadequacy of the agency's funding. The CFTC is one of only two Federal financial regulators funded through annual discretionary appropriations, and the funding the Congress has provided for it over the past five years has failed to keep pace with the increasing complexity of the Nation's financial markets. The changes proposed in H.R. 2289 would hinder the ability of the CFTC to operate effectively, thereby threatening the financial security of the middle class by encouraging the same kind of risky, irresponsible behavior that led to the great recession.

Prior to enactment of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, the derivatives markets were largely unregulated. Losses connected to derivatives rippled through that hidden network, playing a central role in the financial crisis. Wall Street Reform resulted in significant expansion of the CFTC's responsibilities, establishing a framework for standardized over-the-counter derivatives to be traded on regulated platforms and centrally cleared, and for data to be reported to repositories to increase transparency and price discovery. The changes proposed in H.R. 2289 would hinder the CFTC's progress in successfully implementing these critical responsibilities and would unnecessarily disrupt the effective management and operation of the agency without providing the more robust and reliable funding that the agency needs.

In order to respond quickly to market events and market participants, the CFTC needs funding commensurate with its evolving oversight framework. The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to authorize fee funding for the CFTC as proposed in the FY 2016 Budget request, a shift that would directly reduce the deficit. User fees were first proposed in the President's Budget by the Reagan Administration more than 30 years ago and have been supported by every Democratic and Republican Administration since that time. Fee funding would shift CFTC costs from the general taxpayer to the primary beneficiaries of the CFTC's oversight in a manner that maintains the efficiency, competitiveness, and financial integrity of the Nation's futures, options, and swaps markets, and supports market access for smaller market participants hedging or mitigating commercial or agricultural risk.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2289, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I think that basically says it all.

While I respect the intentions of my colleagues who drafted this bill, I think it is a deeply flawed bill, and it creates hurdles for the CFTC that will not be fully funded and will cause all kinds of problems.

I think we ought to make sure that the CFTC can do its job. I don't want a repeat of the financial crisis that resulted in the Great Recession. And I think the American people don't want a repeat of that.

I get very worried when I see this Congress chipping away at Dodd-Frank and the provisions in Dodd-Frank that get us back to what got us into this mess to begin with. I think we can do a lot better.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and vote ''no'' on the underlying bill.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me just say I appreciate the good discussion here today over the past hour. People on both side of the aisles have made very good comments, very good points.

As it relates to the last comment from Mr. MCGOVERN that talked about chipping away at Dodd-Frank, everything we're doing around here is fine-tuning and improving what has been passed in Congresses—legislation, laws on the books that need improvement—and I see that as what we are doing here today.

So I appreciate very much the comments. And although we may have some differences, I believe that this rule and the underlying bill are very strong measures that are important to the future of our country.

This rule provides for ample debate on the floor, the opportunity to debate and vote on the bill and numerous amendments, which I would note are divided evenly between Democratic and Republican Members of this Chamber. It reflects the balanced deliberation that this rule will provide. This rule will provide for a smooth and deliberative process for sending this bill over to the Senate for their consideration.

H.R. 2289 is a solid and substantial measure that will address several critical issues that the CFTC and end users are facing.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants to see the complete deregulation of our financial services industry and our commodities and derivative markets. And I appreciate the comments from the gentleman from Massachusetts. However, it is critical that the regulations put in place are appropriate for our economy and as well for the users.

These rules have to provide safeguards and prevent systemic risk but cannot catch our entire economy in a one-size-fits-all regulation.

As we have discussed here today, the current rules place enormous paperwork and financial burdens on small businesses. And that cannot go unstated. Our small businesses, ranchers, utilities, and manufacturers all face these financial burdens. They take these small, risk-averse entities and place them under the same regulatory scheme as large financial institutions and hedge funds. H.R. 2289 will differentiate and exempt the end users who are not a cause of systemic risk and should not have been lumped into these rules in the first place.

The underlying bill would also make much-needed reforms in the CFTC to strengthen their rulemaking process and add commonsense consumer protections.

Overall, this is a strong rule that provides for consideration of this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 288 and the underlying bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 182, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

YEAS—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—182

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Forbes
Jackson Lee
Kaptur
McMorris Rodgers
Roe (TN)

□ 1340

Messrs. FARENTHOLD, HANNA, McCLINTOCK, and WEBSTER of Florida changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2578.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1342

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. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. LOUDERMILK (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, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 98, line 20.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. PITTENGER of North Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment by Mr. FARR of California.

Amendment No. 1 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.

Amendment No. 9 by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. ROHRABACHER of California.

Amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. McCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PITTENGER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 263, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—163

Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Curbelo (FL)
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—263

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Ashford
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Kaptur
Roe (TN)
Smith (MO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1347

Ms. MOORE 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. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) 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 170, noes 256, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—170

Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—256

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Kaptur
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1351

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Vote No. 276 I am recorded as voting "no;" however, I intended to vote "yes."

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Chair, I was inadvertently absent in the House chamber for a vote on Wednesday, June 3, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 276 in support of the Nadler Amendment to remove language in the underlying bill to prohibit the use of funds to transfer or release detainees held at Guantanamo Bay.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) 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 153, noes 273, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—153

Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Yarmuth

NOES—273

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Grayson
Jackson Lee
Kaptur
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1355

Mr. CICILLINE changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 257, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—168

Allen
Amash
Babin
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—257

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz

Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Carson (IN)
Hinojosa
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1358

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 278, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) 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 195, noes 232, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—195

Aguilar
Amash
Barletta
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brat
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graham
Graves (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Harris
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
LaMalfa
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Takano
Tiberi
Torres
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yoho

NOES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buck
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carter (TX)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gibson
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hill
Hinojosa
Honda
Huelskamp
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCaul
McGovern
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Pingree
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Reed
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

Adams
Babin
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1403

Messrs. NORCROSS, SIRES, and CUMMINGS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) 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 282, noes 146, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—282

Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Barr
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graham
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce

Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—146

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barton
Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Buchanan
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cole
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Guinta
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Lucas
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder

NOT VOTING—4

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1407

Mr. REED changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) 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 184, noes 244, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—184

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—4

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1413

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) 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 27, noes 399, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—27

Aderholt
Brooks (AL)
Burgess
Carson (IN)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Gabbard
Gibson
Gohmert
Grayson
Issa
Jones
Katko
LaMalfa
Lofgren
McKinley
Mooney (WV)
Nolan
Perry
Posey
Rohrabacher
Russell
Sensenbrenner
Takai
Titus
Visclosky
Yoho

NOES—399

Abraham
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

DeFazio

NOT VOTING—5

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Conyers
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1416

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California 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. ROHRABACHER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 186, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—242

Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Graham
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack

Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—186

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—4

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1420

Messrs. RANGEL and TAKAI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) 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 245, noes 182, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

AYES—245

Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Graham
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harris
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—182

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Lance
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Hurt (VA)
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1424

Messrs. COLE and ASHFORD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 222, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

AYES—206

Aguilar
Amash
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tonko
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—4

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1429

Mr. LOEBSACK 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. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 297, noes 130, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—297

Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador

LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—130

Abraham
Aderholt
Amodei
Babin
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cleaver
Cole
Comstock
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
Knight
Lamborn
Latta
Lucas
Lynch
MacArthur
Marino
McCarthy
McHenry
McKinley
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Palazzo
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Rush
Russell
Salmon
Scalise
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Walberg
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

NOT VOTING—5

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1433

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 196, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—196

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Adams	Boyle, Brendan F.	Jackson Lee
		Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1438

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, I was unable to vote today because of the death of a close friend. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 274—"aye," rollcall No. 275—"aye," rollcall No. 276—"nay," rollcall No. 277—"nay," rollcall No. 278—"nay," rollcall No. 279—"nay," rollcall No. 280—"nay," rollcall No. 281—"nay," rollcall No. 282—"nay," rollcall No. 283—"nay," rollcall No. 284—"aye," rollcall No. 285—"nay," rollcall No. 286—"nay," rollcall No. 287—"aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 7606 (''Legitimacy of Industrial Hemp Research'') of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79) by the Department of Justice or the Drug Enforcement Administration.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 1445

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with four of my colleagues to offer a bipartisan amendment that simply requires the DEA to comply with Federal law.

The passage of our amendment to the 2014 farm bill legalized the cultivation of industrial hemp for research purposes and has allowed for the establishment of industrial hemp pilot programs in States across the country. In fact, in my home State of Kentucky alone, nearly 1,800 acres of hemp are projected to be grown this summer in these pilot programs.

However, despite the clear language of our farm bill amendment that specifically states that State agriculture agencies and universities will be growing the industrial hemp for research, the DEA has continuously ignored the plain text of the Federal statute.

The DEA continues to waste valuable time and taxpayer dollars by holding up non-psychoactive hemp seeds destined for legitimate hemp pilot programs.

Last year, officials from the State of Kentucky were forced to file a lawsuit in Federal court to compel the DEA to release industrial hemp seeds for university pilot programs. This year, participants in hemp pilot programs in Kentucky and other States did not receive their seeds until just a few weeks before the start of the growing season.

The language is clear: State authorities, not the DEA, shall register the sites where hemp will be grown. The DEA's deliberate refusal to allow this simple fact has resulted in a broken process where the DEA obfuscates and delays.

Mr. Chairman, States cannot launch industrial hemp pilot programs if the DEA continues to violate Federal law by seizing and delaying shipments of hemp seeds before they reach their destination.

I urge a ''yes'' vote note on our amendment to require the DEA to follow Federal law, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. In 2013, the Kentucky General Assembly passed Senate Bill 50, which exempted industrial hemp from the State's Controlled Substances Act but also mandated that Kentucky follow all Federal rules and regulations with respect to industrial hemp.

So, last year, I was proud to support an amendment to the 2014 farm bill, sponsored by my fellow Kentuckian, Congressman THOMAS MASSIE, which authorized State departments of agriculture in States where industrial hemp is legal to administer industrial hemp pilot programs for the purposes of research and development.

The Kentucky Department of Agriculture Industrial Hemp Pilot Research Program, in collaboration with my constituent, the University of Kentucky College of Agriculture, has since facilitated through permitted farmers the cultivation of nearly 2,000 acres of hemp this year alone in Kentucky.

Hemp is an important crop that holds tremendous commercial promise in Kentucky. In fact, former Speaker of the House Henry Clay was a large producer of industrial hemp. It can be used for food, horse bedding, animal feed, textiles, oils, lotions, cosmetics, rope, pharmaceuticals, et cetera.

Just last week, I met with a very sophisticated partnership of entrepreneurs, tobacco farmers, botanists, and even former law enforcement officials who have put up their own capital to invest in permanent industrial hemp projects, which they believe can spark a very profitable business.

This is about jobs.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, even though I am not actually in opposition.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I object. I rise to claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the job of the DEA is not simple. The job of the DEA is to stop drug use and drug abuse in the United States.

Sometimes the job isn't easy. When it comes to hemp, the job is not easy because, Mr. Chairman, hemp and marijuana are both cannabis, and you can't tell the seeds from one another. And it may be difficult for the DEA to determine because they are supposed to determine that the seeds used for hemp are below a certain level of THC—less than 0.3—and you can't tell by looking. You have to test and make certain that these seeds are in fact going to be used and qualify for the purposes of these pilot hemp programs.

The fact of the matter is there really is no evidence that the DEA does not comply with Federal law. They are fully complying with Federal law. The author of the amendment himself admitted that the seeds were there in time for planting. The fact of the matter is that this is not an easy job.

Under section 7606 of the 2014 farm bill, industrial hemp in pilot projects was authorized. Clearly, DEA licenses are not needed if they are granted through the State departments of agriculture or academic institutions. And the programs are proceeding.

The fact of the matter is that this amendment obfuscates the distinction between marijuana and hemp. It partially ties the hands of DEA to do what they need to do, which is to function as controllers of drugs in this country.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly agree with Dr. HARRIS. I rise also in opposition to this amendment.

Cultivation of cannabis for industrial purposes is governed by the Controlled Substances Act, and that includes hemp. It is permitted pursuant to the registration requirements found in title 21, United States Code.

In addition, the Agricultural Act of 2014 permits ''institutions of higher learning and State Departments of Agriculture to grow or cultivate industrial hemp.''

But let's make one thing clear. The DOJ says they have no intention at all of interfering with what has been provided for in this Department of Agriculture permit. But they still have control, they still have oversight responsibility, and as a result of that, they should do that.

Now, if there is any delay along the way, certainly we should help with that. We should facilitate administratively. But the potential for abuse here is very significant. The DEA and law enforcement must retain control and oversight of hemp, which is a cannabis, just like marijuana.

Mr. HARRIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. To my good friend from Maryland, Dr. HARRIS, just a quick response. We are talking about State-licensed programs where the law enforcement officials in Kentucky can identify permitted land where this hemp is grown. If it is on an unpermitted place, whether it is otherwise legal industrial hemp or marijuana, it would be illegal if it is not on a permitted piece of property. So there is no conflict with law enforcement.

But the fact of the matter is that last year the DEA delayed the seeds and delayed the planting of this legitimate, lawful, federally authorized industrial hemp project.

This is about jobs. This is not about marijuana. In fact, as my voting record just demonstrated in the last series of votes, I voted against every single amendment that would have decriminalized or facilitated marijuana. This is not about marijuana. This is about low-THC industrial hemp, and it is about jobs.

Mr. MASSIE. I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and I appreciate his leadership, focused like a laser on something that is not like marijuana.

For generations, Americans have used hemp. It has just been recently that it has been compromised. So we have to import hemp from overseas to make perfectly legal hemp products that you can buy in any American city.

This is an important step forward to be able to allow Kentucky and Oregon farmers to do something that they have done for generations. It is about economic development. It is about being rational. And it is about being able to focus on things that are important.

I deeply appreciate the gentleman's focus and patience keeping us on message here to be able to make sure that we are not having Federal interference for something that is State supervised and where States around the country want to allow this for their farmers and their ranchers.

I think it is an important step forward, and I appreciate his leadership in permitting me to speak on it.

Mr. MASSIE. I certainly thank the gentleman from Oregon, and I would just say that these hemp pilot programs have been tremendous in Kentucky. And they have answered all the questions, like the questions law enforcement had. They came and visited the fields. They said: ''You are right; there is no big deal here. This is okay.''

And so that is the important thing about these hemp programs, and we need to keep them going, and we need to take it to the level. We can't afford delays. You can't afford a delay when the weather is not always cooperating with you. A week, 2 weeks could ruin you.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment. It is just common sense. All we are asking is to follow the law. How hard is that?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. May I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, let's review what we have. What we have is a situation where last year it wasn't the DEA that held up the seeds; it was getting an import license. And then subsequent to that, obviously the DEA had to test those seeds.

The U.S. Congress has set out a very clear plan for how we are going to increase the use of industrial hemp in this country, and it involves, first, pilot programs in States where it is legal, like Kentucky, like Oregon, but subject to the oversight under the Controlled Substances Act of the DEA.

The DEA has to be certain, since all seeds are now imported. Eventually, under this plan, they won't be. Obviously, at some point we will progress to a point where our industrial hemp seeds are grown here in the United States, but they are not now.

Importing seeds and testing them is not a quick process, but it is a process that has to be done. The fact of the matter is hemp and marijuana are both cannabis. They are related. You can't tell the seeds apart. You have to test these seeds.

Our drug problem is serious. I am glad I don't have to do the job the DEA does dealing with controlling drugs that destroy lives in this country. Sure, is it a process that sometimes might take time? Yes. But that time is well worth taking.

Down the road, we are going to get to the proper industrial hemp production. It has got to be done under controlled processes. The DEA has these in place. The Department of Agriculture has these protocols in place. State departments of agriculture do.

This amendment is just unnecessary. And worse than that, it obscures the fact that it could tie DEA's hands from doing what it needs to do, which is controlling dangerous substances.

I urge the body to reject 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 Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

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

Mr. MASSIE. 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 Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to treat ammunition as armor piercing for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, except for ammunition designed and intended for use in a handgun (in accordance with 18 U.S.C. section 921(a)(17)).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, back in March, the ATF backed off on a controversial proposal to restrict the use of so-called ''green tip'' ammunition, some of the most popular ammunition in the country. In fact, it is used in the popular rifle, the AR–15.

The BATFE received over 80,000 comments, primarily from citizens who opposed the Bureau's attempt to restrict their Second Amendment rights. And so the ATF rescinded its proposal.

In my opinion, the proposed restriction was based on a flawed application of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code. If you go back and look at the debate that occurred in Congress, you will see that the legislation that was written was clearly meant to cover handgun ammunition. It was never meant to cover rifle ammunition.

In fact, there was a debate at the time whether they should limit so-called ''armor-piercing'' ammunition by its functionality—in other words, its efficacy—or whether they should limit it by its design. And they chose to limit it by its design. Because if you limit it by its functionality, what you will find out is darn near all rifle ammunition, unfortunately, will penetrate the common vest. In fact, the most lethal are deer rifles. And so a deer rifle is more lethal in terms of penetrating a vest than would be, say, a so-called assault rifle that shoots a much smaller caliber.

In any case, what happened is one pistol was made and came on the market—or a few pistols were made, handguns were made—that could be chambered with this round, but the round was designed and intended for use in a rifle, not in a handgun.

□ 1500

The clear text of the statute, in my opinion, excludes rifle rounds, but what has happened is recently, the ATF—now, this is only one example that I have recently—they proposed to ban the green tip ammunition, otherwise known as M855 or SS109. This is 223, also known as 556 ammunition. Well, there was a lot of public backlash, and so they backed off of that.

What a lot of people don't know is they already did ban some ammunition with this flawed interpretation. They banned the 7N6, which is a 5.45 by 39 round, and so it was a mistake that happened, and we need to correct this mistake.

We need to prevent future mistakes. The best way to do this is to withhold funding for flawed interpretations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. I was in support of the gentleman's first amendment; but, in this instance, we are at a different point of view.

I note that the majority has a lot of enthusiasm for gun amendments on this appropriations bill, and it is making it almost impossible for us to deal with the challenges for the subcommittee around spending when we keep getting mired down in this, these gun policy riders.

I would just say that it is obviously the majority's view that this somehow is an appropriate vehicle to express your love for guns of all types, ammunition of all types.

I think that my view would be we should make it permissible for any gun that you could bring into the Capitol, you should be able to bring into schools or colleges, or any ammunition you could bring into the Capitol, you could use in any weapon. That might be a way to proceed.

The majority doesn't have any enthusiasm for the Second Amendment when it comes to people coming into the United States Capitol because we know that guns can be dangerous. We know that people can be harmed.

We know, in fact, that there were Members, when an attack happened right here on this floor—that is why we have, on the back of these chairs, certain protections—who were shot from this balcony.

We know the dangers of guns and ammunition, and it is unfortunate that we would use an appropriations vehicle to move these policy matters, which are controversial.

You want to attach them to a must-pass appropriations bill, one that is about our economy and about innovation, and an appropriations bill that is dealing with a whole set of issues. You make it challenging for Members who have a different point of view on some of these controversial policy issues, like guns and the access to them.

Some might interpret the Second Amendment that says, if you want a bazooka or MX missile or whatever you want to have at your home, that somehow you have a right to have it.

There are others of us who think that reasonable regulation might be a better course of action, like the kind of reasonable regulation we have at the Capitol, which is that you can't bring a gun into this facility, unless you have some lawful reason to do so, and we regulate that very strictly.

I am in opposition to this amendment. I have nothing against my colleague, whom I enjoy working with on a whole range of issues. I agree with him on hemp, and I disagree with him on guns.

I hope that we can move this bill forward, as we have been trying to do since the chairman's mark in the subcommittee, and not get it mired down in unnecessary, controversial items that are not attached to how much money we are going to spend for these various accounts to move these agencies of our government forward.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania. I do, as he knows, support this amendment because it has become necessary to put restrictions like this on the bill because the ATF, under President Obama, did attempt to prohibit 223 ammunition, which is used in one of the most popular and widely available sporting rifles in the United States.

The new Director of the ATF, Tom Brandon, I want to thank him and professional law enforcement officers at the ATF. They came in to see me when I was the brand-new chairman of the subcommittee earlier this year.

We had a very good visit. We looked at the statute, and Director Brandon and his chief counsel understood that the guidelines that they had created went beyond the statute. They recognized that they were going to have a very difficult budget year if they persisted in this effort to interfere with American's lawful, constitutional Second Amendment rights.

I was very grateful that Director Brandon chose to drop their attempted prohibition on 223 ammunition after our meeting and in response to the 80,000 letters and all the requests from Members of Congress. The ATF did the right thing here by dropping their attempt to ban ammunition.

Mr. MASSIE's amendment is necessary because I think it is important to make it clear that we don't want the Obama administration coming back and attempting to ban ammunition again.

I remember, as a student of American history, that General Gage, in Boston, didn't go after the weapons first. They went after the powder and the ammunition, I believe, Mr. MASSIE, in Lexington and Concord.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time with just a question, Mr. Chairman, maybe you could inform me, but I believe that the restrictions on armor-piercing bullets predate the administration that you just named. Is that accurate?

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, but the ATF was attempting to use—the statute says you cannot use armor-piercing ammunition that includes depleted uranium, beryllium, and it has some very specific things.

As Mr. MASSIE said, the Congress was focused on the content of the bullet, rather than what type of weapon it could be used in. In the ATF's guideline, actually, the ATF created a legal framework for analysis, which is fairly standard for this administration.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. BLACK). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. I gladly yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Let me say that it is important to have Mr. MASSIE's language in this bill because the ATF, in this instance, just as in the EPA's attempt to regulate every square inch of the United States by saying navigable waters include any piece of ground on which the water drains off into a navigable stream, the EPA, the ATF, the Obama administration routinely uses what they call a legal framework for analysis to expand their executive authority far beyond what Congress intended.

In this instance, I was successful with the help of my colleagues. As the new chairman of the subcommittee, I was successful in persuading Director Brandon and the ATF to drop their attempt to ban 223 ammunition, and I will be monitoring them closely. I will be exercising very aggressive oversight over the ATF to ensure that they don't try it again.

I welcome Mr. MASSIE's amendment to help drive home the point that the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution is written in plain English, and it guarantees, absolutely, the right of Americans to keep and bear arms.

I welcome your amendment, Mr. MASSIE, and encourage Members to support it.

Mr. MASSIE. I appreciate that. I appreciate the effort that the chairman put in to making sure that our 556, 223 ammunition did not get banned. I appreciate my colleague from Pennsylvania's comments as well.

Let me say something. I am sympathetic to the ATF's job. We write some bad legislation here, okay. It is clear it has got gray areas. What I am trying to do is to clear up a gray area for them so that, when they go to work in the morning, they don't have to wonder should this apply to this or should this apply to this or not.

Even with the chairman's great efforts, the reason why this is necessary is because the same rationale that they were going to use to ban 556, they actually used a year or two ago to ban 5.45, which is a very similar round in composition and size and capacity. That is why this amendment is necessary.

My colleague from Pennsylvania is right. I do love guns; I have an enthusiasm, but the reason I am doing this is my respect for the Constitution. I understand you have respect for the Constitution as well; I do. We just interpret it a little bit differently.

This is not a bazooka amendment. This is just an ammunition amendment, and I am just trying to make sure this very popular caliber and other popular calibers are still able to be bought.

I appreciate the efforts that everybody puts in to making sure these laws are enforced. I just want to clear up this law. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I am going to yield to the gentleman from New York on this point. I just want to say something.

The point I made was that this restriction on armor-piercing bullets did not emanate with this administration, even though some might want to suggest somehow that this is President Obama's effort.

This dates back to a different period of time, when we had a Republican President, and it was put into place to protect law enforcement because the children who have been unfortunate victims of gunshots in their schools or in movie theaters and other circumstances where we have had these mass shootings, they haven't been wearing bulletproof vests.

Bulletproof vests are used by our law enforcement officials. There was a concern to make sure that they could be protected while they were out protecting us, right? I just want to be clear, as we go forward, what we are doing here and so that everybody who takes an action on this and, however they may vote, understands that they are voting to provide a circumstance in which there won't be any restriction on the piercing power of the projectile, right?

When it is pointed at a human being, it can be deadly, so I just want us to be clear.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), and I will keep track that he doesn't go over 2 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I must rise and oppose this amendment.

Earlier this year, ATF recognized the threat posed by armor-piercing handguns and tried to limit the sale of the green tip 556 round, which is the military-made armor-piercing round that fits into pistols. This would have made sense.

When ATF tried to make that change, the industry decried executive overreach and hidden administrative agendas and shouted down this commonsense proposal. I supported the ATF's proposal then, and I still believe that this and other commonsense regulations on armor-piercing handguns are sorely needed.

I introduced the APB Act to enact the ATF's proposed change into law because we have a responsibility to protect our police and our communities from these unreasonably dangerous weapons.

A hunter does not need a Sig Sauer P556 or an Extar EXP or any of the other pistols that can fire these armor-piercing rounds. These concealed weapons serve only one purpose: to kill human beings wearing body armor.

ATF needs the authority to monitor and regulate firearms and ammunition. When technology advances, like it did with the green tip, ATF needs to be able to act to protect our neighborhoods and our law enforcement. This amendment, I believe, would needlessly strip ATF's authority to regulate dangerous armor-piercing bullets and put cops, kids, and our communities at risk.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Text is most helpful when put in context. It is true that the Constitution says that it is a citizen's right to keep and bear arms, but it says that as part of a well-regulated militia.

When we want to focus in on the Second Amendment, it may be helpful for us to have a contextual framework in which the right is connected to responsible and regulated activity on behalf of our community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word for a very important clarification.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. My colleague, Mr. ENGEL, I think may not have the exact amendment in front of him because all Mr. MASSIE is attempting to do is enforce existing law and make it clear that the ATF has to enforce existing law, as written, and that armor-piercing ammunition cannot be used in handguns.

□ 1515

That is what the law says. The law says an armor-piercing round is one that uses depleted uranium or other materials and is used in a handgun. And that is all this amendment says.

So we, by accepting this amendment, are enforcing existing law, which is to prevent the use of armor-piercing ammunition in a handgun. So it is important that, I think, everyone understand that that is all this amendment is intended to do. And I will, as subcommittee chairman, make certain that the ATF does not interfere with Americans' Second Amendment rights under the Constitution and that the ATF is enforcing the law, as written by Congress, which is precisely what the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) is doing, and I urge Members to support his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MASSIE. 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 Kentucky be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk regarding the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

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. 543. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Institute of Standards and Technology to consult with the National Security Agency or the Central Intelligence Agency to alter cryptographic or computer standards, except to improve information security (in accordance with section 20(c)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3(c)(1)(A))).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, In December of 2013, news broke—and this was in a Reuters article—that, as a key part of a ''campaign to embed encryption software that it could crack into widely used computer products, the U.S. National Security Agency arranged a secret $10 million contract with'' a private company—in fact, ''one of the most influential firms in the computer security industry.''

It was further disclosed that ''an algorithm called Dual Elliptic Curve . . . was on the road to approval by the National Institute of Standards and Technology as one of four acceptable methods for generating random numbers.''

The company adopted this algorithm, knowing that it would be used as a standard, and it was, as expected, approved by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. But ''within a year, major questions were raised about Dual Elliptic Curve. Cryptography authority Bruce Schneier wrote that the weakness in the formula 'can only be described as a back door.' ''

This is just one example of the NSA exploiting its relationship with NIST to weaken encryption standards.

Look, NIST, we would like for them to set the highest standards for our country, particularly when it comes to encryption. Weakened encryption standards allow the NSA to snoop on Americans without a warrant.

So these back doors in encryption products are bad for privacy. It makes it just way too easy to violate our Fourth Amendment.

But back doors in encryption software are also bad for security. Think about this: Don't you want the best security available that the minds in this country can create, produce, to safeguard your health records, maybe to safeguard your gun records, maybe to safeguard your bank accounts and your credit cards.

We are more safe when we have better security and better encryption. So it makes no sense for the National Institute of Standards and Technology to work with the NSA to weaken our encryption software.

Finally, putting back doors in products is bad for business. It is bad for privacy. It is bad for security. And it is bad for business.

Why is it bad for business? Why would somebody buy a product made in America if it is known that the standards in America are weaker than the standards elsewhere? You know, if there are back doors in products, it is not just the government that can use them: hackers will find them. In fact, once the weakness was exposed in this Dual Elliptic Curve, it made it very easy for people to hack into that, and the company had to say, Quit using this software. We found a weakness in it.

So I would urge people to vote for this amendment. What it does is it prevents the spending of money at the National Institute of Standards and Technology to work with the NSA to weaken our encryption.

The amendment does nothing to keep them from making better encryption, but they cannot weaken it. They cannot compromise it. They can't spend your tax dollars making American products and our government standards worse.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, we accept the amendment, agree with the reasoning that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) has laid forth. I believe the amendment is acceptable to the minority as well. So the amendment is agreed to unanimously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. What is the balance of my time remaining, Madam Chair?

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

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I will just summarize why this is an important amendment.

We trust the National Institute of Standards and Technology to perform their constitutionally mandated responsibilities. That is one of the great things about NIST: its authorization is in the Constitution, to set the standards of weights and measures. So I appreciate the job they do. But we put a lot of trust into them when they set these standards. And a lot of people make business decisions. It is kind of like the Good Housekeeping seal of approval, if I may use that analogy.

So, when we stamp something as a government-approved standard, we want to know it is the best in the world, that the United States has the best encryption in their products, the best encryption. We want the products that our government buys to be safe. So it would be wrong for NIST to spend money working to put back doors in our products. That is why I urge our colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. POE), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chair, I would like to try to interpret what has been said in a simpler way.

Assume that the builders in the United States get together and they are given a new requirement: that when they build a new house, the Federal Government wants the option to have a master key to a back door—not only a back door but a secret back door so that at some time down the road, maybe the Federal Government would like to enter that secret back door for some purpose. And that is what this amendment is preventing.

Just like we wouldn't let the Federal Government have a key to our back door or require builders to put a master key in all of the new homes that they build in the country and give the key to the government, we would never allow that. That would certainly be in violation of the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution.

All this amendment does is it prevents technology—when technology is growing at a rapid rate—to prevent the Federal Government from requiring companies that make cell phones, for example, that there be an ability of the Federal Government to go in the cell phone and look around, even without the knowledge of the person who owns the cell phone. This is very similar to the bill that passed unanimously last night. So I urge the adoption to this amendment as well.

I thank the chairman for allowing me to speak on the gentleman from Kentucky's amendment, since he ran out of time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am glad to do so.

Madam Chair, again, the amendment is agreed to unanimously. I strongly support the gentleman from Kentucky's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MASSIE. 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 Kentucky 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. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives Special Advisory entitled ''Test, Examination and Classification of 7N6 5.45x39 Ammunition'', dated April 7, 2014. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise today to stand with my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and with sportsmen and law-abiding gun owners throughout the country.

Over the course of the last year, we have seen numerous misguided attempts by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to misclassify ammunition as ''armor-piercing'' and infringe on the Second Amendment rights of our citizens.

At a forum I held at the end of March in Prescott, Arizona, a large number of my constituents expressed their outrage about ATF reclassifying the imported 7N6, commonly known as the 5.45 x 39 ammunition, as ''armor-piercing,'' thus preventing this ammo from being imported.

7N6 ammo is very affordable and has been used for target practice by sportsmen for years. The administration—especially the ATF, as we have seen with Operation Fast and Furious and recent attempts to ban the green tip ammo—has a penchant for interpreting the law as it sees fit or as it is most convenient for them.

Fortunately, we have at least temporarily beaten back the attempt to ban the .223 green tip ammo after 230 different Members of this body, Chairman CULBERSON, and myself encouraged ATF to drop this misguided attempt. But the 7N6 ammunition ban is yet another example of Federal overreach on the part of the administration.

After years of having a sportsmen exemption, 7N6 was reclassified after ATF found an extremely rare and obscure Polish-made pistol that could supposedly use and shoot the 7N6 cartridge.

I strongly applaud the committee for including four other commonsense provisions in this bill that protect the Second Amendment.

I ask that this body stand with sportsmen throughout this country. I ask that my colleagues support this additional, commonsense provision to protect the Second Amendment and allow the 7N6 ammo to be used for target practice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I guess redundancy has some utility here because we have been around the rosie a number of times on this same issue, both late last night and now early this afternoon, one amendment after another amendment after another amendment, trying to make sure that our fascination with armor-piercing bullets doesn't escape this debate.

□ 1530

So here we have another one, and maybe there is something different about this one than the one before, but I am not able to discern what it is. I am opposed to it.

I think that people have a right to weapons under our Constitution. I think common sense suggests people should have a right to weapons, long guns, rifles, for both sports activities and for their own protection. I also think that it is a responsible thing for those who are governing our country to put in place reasonable regulations and restrictions just like the regulations and restrictions that we have here on the Capitol campus.

Not only do we spend hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money for our own police force to protect us, we also say that you can't bring a firearm into the buildings that we work in each and every day.

Now, we do this even though we come to the floor and profess our undying love for the unfettered notion of the Second Amendment as interpreted by some that you can have a gun anywhere, in a bar, in a park, in a school, in a daycare center, and at church. Take your gun and ride off into the wind with it. But we won't allow it here.

I am just waiting for a Member of the majority, since we have multiple amendments, to come to the floor and to say that people should be able to exercise their Second Amendment here when they visit the people's House, when they visit their elected Representatives, that somehow we want to welcome them and their guns with their armor-piercing bullets, and then I would know that you truly love the Second Amendment and that you see it as an unfettered right anywhere, anytime, and under any circumstances.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I strongly support the gentleman's amendment, and it is necessary because the ATF, once again, here attempted to ban ammunition that could be used in a handgun that is otherwise commonly available for rifles. In the statute, the Congress intended to prohibit the use of armor-piercing ammunition for handguns. So the gentleman's amendment is necessary, and I strongly support the amendment as, again, additional protection for Americans' constitutional Second Amendment rights to keep and bear arms.

I would point out to my good friend from Pennsylvania that at the Texas Capitol, concealed-carry permit holders are actually given a separate line so they can get into the capitol even more rapidly because law enforcement officers in Texas recognize that a concealed-carry permit holder is their best backup because they have had a background check and they are trained in the use of the weapon.

I coauthored the legislation in Texas in the 1990s to allow Texans to get a concealed-carry permit, and we have prevented a lot of crimes and saved a lot of lives. I don't think there has even been a fistfight among concealed-carry permit holders in Texas in all these years. They are given expedited access to the Texas Capitol because law enforcement recognizes an honest, law-abiding American with a concealed-carry permit is their best friend.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I urge its passage.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my friend.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Arizona's leadership on this issue, and my profound gratitude and immense respect to Chairman CULBERSON for making sure that this interpretation that was applied to 5.45 ammunition was not applied to 5.56. He has the gratitude of millions of gun owners in this country—law-abiding gun owners, I should say.

This travesty of justice still applies to this other caliber, using the same reasoning. I won't impugn the motives of the ATF. I won't do that. I think they are just trying to enforce the law. There is a gray area here, and I think this bill clears up that gray area for the benefit of millions of gun owners—law-abiding gun owners—in this country, and I thank Representative GOSAR for leading on this.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, what I would like to do is highlight that only an obscure pistol could use this 7N6 ammunition. So I was going out of the way for a very popular round that is used for target practice all over this country. So I would ask for support for my amendment.

I thank the gentleman for helping me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to operate or disseminate a cell-site simulator or IMSI catcher in the United States except pursuant to a court order that identifies an individual, account, address, or personal device

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer this amendment, and it becomes necessary because selective spying by using these devices commonly called StingRays or cell site simulators or IMSI catchers has become a reality.

These sophisticated, affordable mobile devices in fact spoof or convince your phone that they are a valid cell tower and allow for the gathering of communications content, including texts and emails.

What is disturbing is that Federal dollars may be being used to capture tens of thousands of Americans' information without a warrant. The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Post, the Associated Press, and more have, in fact, uncovered cases of nationwide use by the FBI and other agencies working to cover up StingRay use in instances in which they have, among other things, dropped criminal cases to avoid having to disclose their use of them. Additionally, they have entered into nondisclosure agreements at times in order to not do so.

Just a month ago, this House—and the Senate, a few days ago—passed, overwhelmingly, a new authorization of the PATRIOT Act. We did so with a careful balance between what our government can do to us and what protections we have, and particularly the Fourth Amendment.

This is a narrowly crafted amendment. It in no way stops the use of these devices when a Federal court has ordered and allowed the use, either a FISA court or a common warrant issued by a judge.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I concur with the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. At this time, Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, I rise in support of our amendment today that I am working on with Mr. ISSA.

Madam Chair, the Associated Press reported yesterday that they confirmed reports that the FBI is flying surveillance cameras in aircraft over the U.S. with these devices. They are operated sometimes through shell companies that use video and StingRay technology to capture data on Americans

in bulk both visually and from our cell phones.

This flies in the face of every concept of liberty and privacy that we cherish in this country. Our Founding Fathers would be sickened if they found out how far we have slipped. As much as I have been encouraged by the fact that both Houses of Congress have passed the USA FREEDOM Act to end bulk surveillance under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, reports like this show me we still have a long way to go.

This secretive FBI program to hack into our cellphones seems far from appropriate and constitutional, and it must be curtailed. This amendment would ensure that any usage of this program would only happen through a court order targeting a specific individual and never as a dragnet for bulk surveillance.

I am happy to hear that there is very little opposition to this, and I look forward to working to continue to regain our liberty from mass and unconstitutional surveillance.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers. I urge passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. 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 further implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I rise to assert a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FATTAH. 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 Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, this amendment does not change existing law. It just removes the funding for an unconstitutional, unstatutory action by the President.

□ 1545

Madam Chair, it seems like I have caused some excitement with the Parliamentarian this afternoon, so why don't I do this.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and go to the second Flores amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Executive Order 13547 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes), including the National Ocean Policy developed under such Executive Order.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer a simple amendment to address an ongoing overreach by the executive branch of our government.

My amendment bans the use of Federal funds for the implementation of Executive Order 13547. That executive order, which was signed in 2010, requires that 60-plus bureaucracies, as shown on this chart, essentially zone the oceans and the sources thereof.

This amendment addresses a critical executive branch encroachment into the powers of Congress as set forth in our Constitution. The activities being conducted by Executive Order 13547 have not been authorized by Congress, nor have appropriations been made by Congress to fund those activities.

Madam Chair, since 2010, this body has voted six times in support of this amendment in a bipartisan manner. This language was also included in the base text of the fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. Today, I am offering my amendment again because concerns have been raised that the effects of the National Ocean Policy extend well beyond restricting ocean activities and encroach into inland activities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I visited Chicago a few years back for the coastal zone conference to talk about how important it was that this administration has finally put forward, and we support, an ocean policy. There have been since 2012 over 15 different amendments seeking to undermine responsible ecosystem-based management of our oceans.

As appropriators, we have not been willing to accept these efforts to undermine this. We understand we have a responsibility as stewards. In fact, as a Nation we have more responsibility for the world's oceans than any other Nation in terms of territorially in the world.

We have some challenging circumstances. It is good that we now have a policy going forward. I would ask that the House oppose this amendment.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the former mayor and a great Congressman.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Flores amendment, which would prohibit the implementation of the National Ocean Policy, which permits better coordination among Federal agencies responsible for coastal planning.

This amendment, in particular, would undermine NOAA's participation in planning, it would hurt States and communities, businesses, and would impede States like Rhode Island from managing their own resources in a way that best fits their needs and priorities.

This administration has made it clear that the National Ocean Policy does not create new regulations, supersede current regulations, or modify any agency's established mission, jurisdiction, or authority. Rather, it helps coordinate the implementation of existing regulations by Federal agencies to establish a more efficient and effective decisionmaking process.

In the Northeast, our regional ocean council has allowed our State to pool resources and businesses to have a voice in decisionmaking and has coordinated with Federal partners to ensure all stakeholders have a voice in the process.

It is astounding to me that since 2012, 15 riders undermining ocean planning have been introduced to House bills, including riders on two previous CJS appropriations bills.

Allowing Federal agencies to coordinate implementation of over 100 ocean laws and giving States and local governments a voice in the ocean planning process is smart public policy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided amendment and to understand and accept our responsibility to be good stewards of our oceans. That is what the administration's policy does. This is allowing agencies to coordinate that work in a thoughtful, strategic, and smart way.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I again reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, first of all, I think it is important to set the record straight. The issue here is not whether or not we want to take care of our oceans. All of us want to take care of our oceans. All of us believe in managing the ocean economy, the ocean

ecology. We also believe in trying to make sure that we have a government that adheres to this Constitution. Under article I of that Constitution, all legislative powers are reserved to this body, to this Congress, not to the President. That is the issue at stake here. The President has overstepped his constitutional statutory bounds.

Now, in the year 2000, Congress did pass something during the 106th Congress to create an ocean commission to review and make recommendations. Since then, the 108th, 109th, 110th, and 111th Congresses each looked at those recommendations and decided to take no legislative action.

That is what caused the President to move forward with his executive order to try to go around Congress. There are no appropriations. We have asked the Department for this function specifically. We have asked the Department of Interior specifically to provide their statutory support for the President's actions. They have provided none. So the President has gone around Congress by signing these executive orders.

There are 67 groups that include fishing, agricultural, farming, energy, and other industries that are concerned about the impact of this Federal overreach—and again, I would say an unconstitutional Federal overreach.

Again, this is a simple amendment that just stands up for the constitutional rights of this Congress to create the statutes under which this activity can be conducted and to transparently appropriate the funds for this activity should it so choose.

We are not against ocean planning, as I said at the outset of this. What we are for, though, is for the Constitution and to stand up for our congressional rights to enact the statutes related to this activity and for the appropriators to be able to transparently appropriate the money.

Again, this amendment has been adopted with bipartisan support six times over the last 4½ years and is already included in the base text of the fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

I want to thank Chairman CULBERSON for considering this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, can I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What selective memory you have. You say that the President is abusing his authority. Do you know who first asked for this? President Bush. He is the one that created the Commission and asked for those recommendations.

And guess what? Five Republicans authored that bill—Republicans Greenwood, Bilbray, Gilchrest, Horn, and Franks. That was in 2000 and 2004 they introduced it. The bill went to committee, and the committee never heard the bill. So don't say that Congress never had a chance to enact this thing. Congress refused, just like Congress refuses to respond to the President's ask that we ought to decide whether we ought to go to war in the Middle East.

You are very selective. You say, Don't let the President make these executive orders, and then when he does you want to sue him because it is about immigration or issues like that. You criticize this President because Congress fails to take action, even after Presidents—Republican and Democratic Presidents—have asked Congress to take action, and we refused. And now you get up and say, Well, because we refused, you took executive action, therefore, we ought to not allow it to be implemented.

The Acting CHAIR. Members will address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Madam Chair. I am referring the remarks to the Madam Chair.

Look, deleting this ability for the National Ocean Policy—by the way, we haven't appropriated money. No money is being spent on it. But we are smart about getting 70 or 80 Federal agencies together to have one stop to figure out how we can get all these permits. That is why the fishermen support it.

I live in a coastal community. The author of this does not. We make our living off the ocean. And, by God, we want all the regulatory agencies to be in sync. And one of the policies here is, let's have a healthy ocean. What is wrong with that?

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, if the oceans die, it is impossible for us to live.

The Pew Foundation in Philadelphia has put hundreds of millions of dollars behind efforts around ocean science. My friend, Gerry Lenfest, has put a lot of his own fortune behind this effort. When I first got to the Congress, I was chair of the Friends of the Caribbean Caucus. We should do better by our oceans.

I ask that we oppose this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. 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 prosecute or hold liable any person or corporation for a violation of section 2(a) of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703(a)).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, the question we should ask ourselves is, should green energy companies be held liable for incidental deaths of birds of prey or migratory birds as a result of them flying into wind turbines or onto solar arrays.

As you may know, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, while well-intentioned, are significantly outdated.

Under current law, the accidental death of a protected bird is punishable as a misdemeanor; a second offense can be charged as a felony. This includes accidental deaths caused by wind turbines and solar panels.

The MBTA covers over 1,000 different species of birds. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act were written to target the intentional killing of migratory birds and birds of prey. I don't think anybody believes that accidental deaths as a result of solar panels or wind energy production warrants felony prosecution.

Every year, cars, trucks, skyscrapers, windmills, oil platforms, airplanes, and houses with big windows cause the deaths of hundreds of thousands of these protected birds, doing things that are otherwise well within the law but that make drivers, pilots, property owners, and green energy companies potential felons under a strict interpretation of an outdated law.

As you can imagine, the enforcement of this law is pretty spotty, with bureaucrats selectively enforcing these regulations, creating uncertainty in the green energy marketplace.

President Obama's Fish and Wildlife Service recently announced plans to study the possibility of creating a permitting regime under the MBTA, which would allow for incidental and accidental take without criminal penalty, and they have suspended prosecutions until this is worked out. I agree with this approach. That is consistent with a bill I introduced—my CLEAN Energy Producers Act, H.R. 493.

My amendment today to the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill will suspend further prosecutions for incidental avian deaths under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act until this incidental take permitting regime is implemented.

I believe this is the right step as we move toward permanent reforms of the MBTA and the BGEPA as a part of the

national all-of-the-above energy independence strategy.

I would urge a ''yes'' vote on this important issue, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, what is broken that needs fixing? These are laws that have been in place for 100 years. In fact, they are laws that have been implemented because the United States has signed treaties with other countries that share our migratory fowl, countries like Canada, Mexico, Japan, and Russia. These are treaties that require that we be responsible for the wildlife that flies over our air space and lands in our soil.

Migratory birds are integrated into a healthy, natural system. In many ways, they affect the predators, the prey, the seed dispensers, and the pollinators. They are really actively appreciated by millions of people. We have a society in America called the National Audubon Society. We make an awful lot of money in my district off watchable wildlife.

Why would we want to stop the laws that protect that wildlife? I think this is all about responsible management; but to have an amendment that says that none of the funds may be available to prosecute or hold liable any persons who have violated the law, you are dismantling law enforcement's ability to enforce the law where people have violated it—violated it.

I think the public of this country does appreciate their watchable wildlife, whether they are hunting it or whether they are viewing it, and a lot of people make money off of it. I don't think this amendment is at all constructive. You are upsetting 100 years of law and international responsibility that we have as a country in this hemisphere.

I oppose the amendment and ask people to vote against it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I am in full support of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. I am an avid water fowler; I am an avid hunter, and I see how the Migratory Bird Treaty Act has benefited the species from the heyday of the market hunting and what we saw in the early 1900s.

I believe that the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act were designed to talk about the intentional killing or overharvesting of migratory birds and potential killing of birds of prey.

Even the Obama administration recognizes that there is something wrong with how we prosecute these cases of incidental and accidental deaths. This simply takes what they are already doing and says let's just have a pause until we can work this out in permanent law. That is all my amendment does.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Well, with all due respect, that is not what your law says. It says:

> None of the funds made available by this act may be used to prosecute or hold liable any person or corporation for a violation of the provision of law found in section 703(a) of title 16 of the United States Code.

There is no language in here about working anything out. There is no language about being responsible managers of the land or flyways.

Yes, we have a lot of new equipment up in our energy business, our wind energy and our solar energy. Those things, obviously way before you build them, you are supposed to take into account whether they are being built right in a flyway.

We have condors in our area that we have obviously spent a lot of money trying to revive. People actually spend money to come to very expensive hotels so that they can come see a condor. These are things that you want to protect.

To say that none of the funds can be made available to hold liable people that are violating the law seems to me just a reckless act to upset 100 years of wildlife management.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if somebody has intentionally violated law, absolutely, they ought to be prosecuted. This amendment is in order because we are dealing with justice and how this is prosecuted. We are saying that the Justice Department can't expend any money to prosecute these incidental accidental deaths.

We need an interpretation of law. There is no doubt in my mind that we ought to revisit the MBTA and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, and we will. I am on the Natural Resources Committee. I promise you, this issue will come up; but I think it is appropriate to say we are going to hold off on expending any money by prosecuting these accidental incidental deaths.

I would urge my colleagues to vote for this. I think it is the right place and the right time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, in closing, to say that the law says that those who are in violation of law—I mean, how many golden eagles do you have to kill and tell the law enforcement you can't do anything about it? This isn't about accidental death. This is people violating the law with an intent. You have to have an intent to do wrong.

I think this is a reckless amendment. I hope we defeat it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
>
> SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to collect information about individuals attending gun shows, by means of an automatic license plate reader, or to retain any information so collected.

Mr. FARR. I reserve a point of order on this issue.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, an email uncovered by the ACLU revealed that the Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, or ATF, collaborated on a plan to use automatic license plate readers to monitor and collect information about law-abiding citizens attending gun shows.

Under this program, mere attendance at a gun show would have been enough to have one's attendance recorded in a massive DEA database. As if that weren't bad enough, the primary purpose of this database is asset forfeiture, a controversial practice of seizing motorists' possessions if police suspect they are criminal proceeds.

In response to inquiries about the uncovered document, the DEA has said that the proposal was rejected by superiors and never implemented. Keep in mind that this was taking place in Phoenix in 2009 at about the time of Fast and Furious, and there were, I believe, rogue projects going on in that part of the country at the time.

We have litigated that as a House against the Department of Justice, and they have not supplied the documents that they were supposed to have supplied to Congress.

We also held former Attorney General Eric Holder in contempt of Congress for not providing those documents. This was at a time when, perhaps, rogue projects were actually going on in Phoenix. I believe that they were, and I believe that this is one of those.

However, the DEA never supplied any documents saying that they rejected this project. They blamed it on an underling, and they said it was never implemented. While this assurance is welcome, the fact that such a proposal was even considered raises very serious privacy concerns.

My amendment would prohibit any funds from being used to collect or retain information about individuals attending gun shows by means of an automatic license plate reader. This

amendment is supported by the NRA, the National Rifle Association; the Gun Owners of America; and the ACLU.

Automatic license plate readers should not be used to target law-abiding citizens who are engaged in their constitutionally protected rights. Without strong regulations and greater transparency, this new technology would only increase the threat of illegitimate government surveillance.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment in order to rein in the illegal surveillance of Americans and to send a clear message to agencies like the DEA and the ATF that automatic license plate readers must not be used to collect information during constitutionally protected activities.

This includes Second Amendment activities, like attending gun shows.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FARR. 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.

That rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law''

One of the provisions is that it ''requires a new determination.''

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, let me respond to that by saying that The Wall Street Journal published an article on January 27 of this year which quotes what the ACLU uncovered through a Freedom of Information Act request to the Department of Justice.

In pertinent part, this revelation that was obtained by the ACLU reads:

> The DEA Phoenix Division Office is working closely with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives on attacking the guns going to ''blank''—that is redacted—and the gun shows to include programs-operations with license plate readers at the gun shows.

At least some agent or agents within the DEA's Phoenix region believed that they had the authority to go to gun shows and use automatic license plate recognition technology to, basically, throw out a dragnet and take in the identities of everyone who was attending a constitutionally protected activity.

That is what this amendment attacks. At least some elements within the DEA thought that they had this authority. They thought they had this power.

I don't think this is creating any new legislation, because it is going after a power they believed they already had and believed that they had the ability to exercise.

So the withdrawal of funding to something they thought they had the power to do is not creating a new oversight or provision. I forget the word the gentleman used. It is not legislating in the sense of giving them a power they didn't already have. They thought they had this power. This amendment would withdraw the funding for that.

I would urge the Chair to reject the point of order raised by the opposition.

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 includes language requiring a new determination by the relevant Federal officials of whether an individual is attending a gun show. The gentleman from Colorado has not proven that this determination is required by 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

Mr. SANFORD. 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. ____. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 2.48 percent.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple and straightforward amendment, as has been laid out, which is to, in essence, make an across-the-board cut of this particular appropriation by 2.48 percent.

I think it is important to do so simply for this reason. I was in a Budget hearing this morning, and the new Director of the Congressional Budget Office came by.

In his testimony, what he talked about was the way in which the American civilization and the Federal budget was nearing a tipping point beyond which there would be substantial consequence to that which we can budget here at the Federal level; to the value of the dollar; to future interest rates; and, ultimately, to the American way of life.

□ 1615

I think what is interesting is that, indeed, Admiral Mike Mullen, a military man, observed the same, because when he was asked what is the biggest threat to the American way of life and to American security, his answer was the American debt.

You can look at a long list of different authors who have talked about this theme in different ways. You know, Reinhart and Rogoff talked about it in their book entitled, ''This Time is Different,'' wherein, again, you look at economies that get to around 90 percent debt to GDP and, frankly, the wheels start to come off. Bad things begin to happen both to the economy and to the government's ability to perpetuate funding for programs that are important.

We have gone through a long list of well-discussed programs within this particular appropriation bill that are important, but for our government's ability to sustain those programs, we need to look beyond 10 or 15 years out. We need to look at the long run, and ultimately that is what this bill is about.

I think it is interesting from a nonpartisan standpoint that Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson said, if you look at our financial picture, it is the most predictable financial collapse or calamity in the history of man. I could go through a lot of other reasons numerically as to why I think it is important, but the short answer is we are nearing that tipping point that was talked about in the Budget hearing this morning.

I see my colleague standing, so I will reserve the balance of my time and come back to a few other points in a moment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to across-the-board cuts.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's presentation, but I think we ought to put it in full context. We do have an across-the-board cut. It is a huge cut. It is called sequestration. Although Admiral Mullen did admonish the Congress for the fact that we were running a deficit and it was a threat to our national security, he also opposed sequestration, across-the-board cuts.

I think the problem is—and this bill certainly is an across-the-board cut from what we used to spend, with the exception of the protection of one program, but I oppose this. We are on the Committee on Appropriations. We try to go through these things with a fine-tooth comb to figure out how to adjust the spending of the United States of America. The worst thing you can do is just do an across-the-board cut because that harms good programs, and you aren't necessarily cutting enough to really make a big dent in the national debt.

Frankly, the spending of America has come down quite dramatically, and the economy has improved, and our national debt is, in the recent years, at an all-time low. I think, frankly, we in Congress talk about this debt but don't put it into context.

I like to put it in the context that I talk to my constituents about that what we have at the national level, just like you have at the local level and your own personal life, you have

sort of two debts. You have a short-term debt, which is that credit card, you spent too much that one month, so you are going to pay it slowly off in the next couple months. That is the annual deficit.

The long-term debt is that big mortgage that we have on our houses. We don't panic because of a mortgage. We made an agreement over a period of time—15, 30 years—that we are going to pay off this mortgage, and we know what those payments will be.

Wall Street doesn't worry about a deficit when we have a plan to pay it off. Wall Street worries about when we take a meat-ax approach to not running the government efficiently, not having enough people to process people when they need permits and they need access to licenses and things like that.

So I wish Congress would get off this sort of let's just use a meat-ax approach to solving these problems because we won't spend the time to get into the weeds. And although I respect the gentleman and his approach, I just don't think this is the proper way to do it, and I would oppose the across-the-board cut.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join in opposition to this amendment. I share my colleague's concern about government spending, but two-thirds of the problem is in Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid, and in ObamaCare, the national debt, the interest on the debt. That is what is drowning us.

We, in the appropriations process, handle about a third of Federal spending, and we have cut spending here in this bill. We have limited resources; and as chairman of the subcommittee, we have prioritized that money to go, first and foremost, to law enforcement.

The gentleman's amendment would cut $683 million out of Federal law enforcement, which is something I just simply cannot support. The gentleman's amendment would cut $212 million out of the FBI and just eviscerate their ability to deal with cyber espionage and to deal with terrorism. The gentleman's amendment would cut $450 million from NASA, essentially crippling our efforts to get Americans back into space on an American-made rocket, something we simply have to do as quickly as possible.

We have in our bill prioritized the limited, very precious, and scarce, hard-earned tax dollars that our constituents have entrusted us with and made sure that Federal law enforcement is taken care of, scientific research is protected, NASA is protected. But first and foremost, we protected public safety with the way we have prioritized our spending.

I have to urge Members to oppose this amendment because we have already followed the Dave Ramsey approach in spending money where it is most needed. We have got to focus on the two-thirds of the problem that is drowning us: the mandatory, automatic spending programs—Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid—that are drowning this economy. That is where the deficit and the debt is coming from. While we continue to do our part in Appropriations on the one-third that we have got control over, we are continuing to cut and prioritize, let's focus on the two-thirds that is actually hurting the American economy. I would urge Members to oppose this amendment and defeat it.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. It is good to see my good friend on the floor. I, unfortunately, can't support his amendment, but I appreciate his work here in the Congress.

In the past, unlike those rhetorically who offer notions of support for Simpson-Bowles, I actually supported it and voted for it. I am the only Member of the House that has offered a bill to get rid of the income tax and pay our debts.

I wanted to set up a consumption tax, which 150 other countries in the world use. We have got a consumption-based economy. It might be a good notion to find our revenues where the action is.

I don't take a backseat to anyone when it comes to fiscal responsibility, but unless we have a global budget deal, it is going to be impossible for us to manage the accounts of what you agree are very important Federal agencies that have very important responsibilities.

We are running the most important, the most powerful country in the world. We can't do it on the cheap and be number one. China builds 100 science-only universities in 5 years. It would take us 20 years to build one. We don't have the same kind of decision-making process, obviously, and it takes us a while to formulate our decision package; but even when we get there, we have this debate about whether or not we are going to stand up and be the leading country in the world, whether in space exploration or in any of the areas of scientific enterprise in which we have always had the absolute lead. Now we have only a relative lead.

There are those who are working in ways that are adverse to insisting on America being number one. Those are people who want to tell the American public that we can continue to have the best military in the world and not pay for it or the best education system and not pay for it. Or you look at our national laboratories, and I have visited Oak Ridge, I have visited Los Alamos and Sandia and Fermi and Argonne. You look at these laboratories. These were major investments. Now, some might call it spending, but it helped America win wars, but also win the economic fight against our competitors by making these investments.

I just think that it is not a matter of what we can cut. It is where does our country want to end up. Do we want to be something less than number one in the world? Is that the legacy we want to leave our children and grandchildren? Or are we going to make the decisions that others before us have made, which is that we have to make tough decisions, and we are going to have to carry our own pail of water up the hill, and we are going to have to pay for all that we get. It was Abraham Lincoln who said you may not get all that you pay for, but you will pay for all that you get.

So this notion that somehow America can be number one on the cheap, I am not buying it. The world's not going to buy it. We are competing with countries that have a billion-plus population. They are making investments, and they want to eat our lunch, economically. There may be challenges in other ways for our country down the road, and we have to be prepared as leaders to make some tough decisions and to tell the American public that, in order to retain our position, we might have to actually stand up to the bar and pay our fair share.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I admire the earnestness of my colleagues who, in good faith, are pressing forward in terms of trying to protect a whole host of programs that I think we all recognize are of great importance to the American people.

Churchill once observed that the beauty of the American political system was that it always did the right thing—after it had exhausted every other possible remedy. My fear in this is, if we wait late in the game, and this is exactly what the Budget Director was talking about this morning, if we wait, the consequences to waiting, in numerical terms, become horrific. We are dealing with a math trap that compounds with time. Einstein, in fact, was once asked what is the most powerful force in the universe, and his reply was compound interest. The numbers become, I think, absolutely compelling.

So I would agree with my colleagues that across-the-board cuts are absolutely not the best way to go. When I was involved in State politics, I worked earnestly against across-the-board cuts. It is only out of desperation that I offer a proposal that entails across-the-board cuts because, again, if we wait, what the Budget Director this morning says was that there will be real consequences.

I would make four additional points:

One, if we are serious about addressing the entitlement problem, then we shouldn't be borrowing from entitlement spending to fund mandatory spending, and that is exactly what this particular appropriation bill does to the tune of about $10 billion. So I think

that if we are really going to get earnest about entitlement spending, this would be a place to start, which is part of the reason as to why we focused on this particular appropriation bill.

Two, my colleague from California mentioned national debt is at an all-time low. That is incorrect. In fact, we are at an all-time high if you look at the numbers. Roughly, it took us 200 years to get to $5 trillion in debt. Over the Bush administration, we went from 5 to 10. It doubled. And now, during the Obama administration, it is going to double again from roughly 10 to 20. It is at an all-time high.

I think the key to a mortgage is your ability to pay it off. It is not, again, is there a mortgage or isn't there. It is can you pay it off. If you look at the numbers—and increasingly rating agencies around the world have suggested that when you get up around that 90 percent number, there is less and less probability that you will be able to perpetuate that spending, which goes to the heart of can we perpetuate our ability to fund these worthwhile programs, which is what this amendment is about.

Lastly, I would say Admiral Mullen, when he spoke against the sequester, he did so, in large measure, because what he recognized was the way in which sequester disproportionately impacted the military.

For a host of reasons, again, I would ask support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

Mr. CULBERSON. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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 with respect to the case State of Texas, et al. v. United States of America, et al. (No. B-14-254 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas and No. 15-40238 in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

□ 1630

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an amendment, in short form, that says that none of the funds made available by this act may be used with respect to the case State of Texas, et al. v. United States of America.

I point out to the body, Mr. Chairman, that that is the case that was filed by then-Attorney General of Texas Greg Abbott, now Governor of Texas, to protect the interest of Texans. It has been signed on to now by 25 States, I believe. And this is in reference to the President's November 20 DAPA policy, his executive amnesty policy.

We have watched as this Congress has three times voted to reject the President's initiative, and the debate has been centered on constitutional grounds. The position of this Congress has three times been that the President of the United States is the leader of the executive branch of this government, and the legislative powers are all vested here in the United States Congress, in a House and in a Senate. That is article 1 of the Constitution.

That is what the President taught through his 10 years as an adjunct professor of constitutional law at the University of Chicago, and that is what he also uttered at least 22 times as President of the United States—that he didn't have the authority to establish in advance an executive amnesty that would waive the application of the law for some 5 million people.

Not only does this Congress agree with the President's 22 statements that he has since changed his position on—by the way, the President has a 33-page Office of Legal Counsel opinion that is written, I think, very loosely—and I read every word of that—but the President's convictions, I believe, were reflected prior to this political decision.

And so my amendment prohibits any of the funds from being used to further defend this unconstitutional executive amnesty position.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that not only has Congress voted three times but also the President's 22 statements, as I said, and then it is backed up by Federal Judge Hanen, who ruled on the side of the Constitution and the rule of law and the separation of powers. And on the administration's appeal, a three-judge panel in the Fifth Circuit also ruled and indicated that the State of Texas and the other coplaintiffs were likely to prevail, and granted standing to the State of Texas.

And now we have an administration that appears to be willing to continue this debate further and go with an appeal to the Circuit Court again. They actually have the opportunity to go directly to the Supreme Court.

So, Mr. Chairman, I go through this long list of things that have happened because a lot of money has been spent and wasted in an attempt to, let's say—the gracious way to say it would be to stretch the Constitution beyond any bounds that it had been stretched before.

This amendment simply directs that none of the funds made available shall be used to continue that endeavor.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FATTAH. So when the gentleman references the Congress acting three times, when you say ''the Congress,'' do you mean both Houses of the Congress? Or, are you referring to one House?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would have to go back and look at the record in the Senate to give you an accurate count. I can tell you that it is an accurate count for the House. It may not be a full three times in the Senate.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman, and if he would continue to yield, we can continue for one second. Because I know that you appreciate the construction of our government and the way the Constitution framed it. It is not the law of the land that one House acts on something. We need the House to act, the Senate to act, and then we need a Presidential signature or an override by a Presidential veto.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his insight, Mr. Chairman, I would state that the Constitution is very clear. It was very clear to the President of the United States for 10 years while he taught it, and it was very clear when he made his statements 22 times.

So this is the Congress reasserting itself. Our Founding Fathers expected we would do that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time in that colloquy. I look forward to being able to do the same in return, but I do appreciate the opportunity to communicate with my colleague, because I don't want anyone to misinterpret the facts here.

Every single President has acted in this area. And these actions by this President are no different than the actions by previous Presidents in this trade space around providing amnesty.

And what the gentleman strenuously and sincerely objects to is that this has benefited a large number of people whom the President has a different view of, in terms of their circumstances, because they were brought here as young children. And the President says, well, they are here, they went to school here, and this is the only country they know, and they have abided by our laws, and he is granting them this ability to stay. And the gentleman objects.

But I don't want anyone to think that the Congress has taken some different view, because the Congress is

two Houses—the House and the Senate—and even if both Houses were to act, the way our laws are structured, you need a Presidential signature.

So, in fact, one House may have a difference of opinion. When Ronald Reagan was President, the Democrats had a difference of opinion. It didn't change the law so that we voted in some particular way.

I don't want anyone to misinterpret the comments of my colleague as he has articulated his sincere objections to these issues.

And then to get to the point of his amendment, what he is saying is that it is wonderful that the judiciary is responding, they are interpreting the law the way he thinks it should be interpreted, but here what he wants to do is to deny the executive branch appropriate resources to pursue its policy objectives by saying that none of the funds here can be used by DOJ in furtherance of their position.

So I think it is fair for the House to have a view. The House is even suing the President about his point of view on some things. But it is unfair for us to deny the executive branch an opportunity to put forth its arguments in court on any of these matters so that we can get a proper ruling from the third branch of our government.

And even though there have been rulings in the gentleman's favor, he and I both know that we are not at the final rendezvous here, and that the wheels of justice grind slowly, but there will be a final decision probably by the highest court in the land. But we should not deny the DOJ an opportunity to go into court and argue the administration's position. I think that would be unfair.

Therefore, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of the amendment. I strongly support Mr. KING's amendment because what the President has done is clearly illegal.

The President does not have the ability to change the law by himself. As my good friend from Philadelphia points out, one House of Congress cannot change the law all by itself. And similarly, the Chief Executive cannot change the law enacted by Congress and signed by the President all by himself.

The law is very clear that people who are in the country illegally, who have violated the immigration laws of the United States, need to be deported. And the President by this illegal executive action has attempted to override the Federal law enacted by Congress and signed by previous Presidents.

The District Court agreed that President Obama's action is illegal and that an injunction lies against it. The District Court suspended the President's executive order because it was illegal. The Federal Court of Appeals in New Orleans suspended the President's executive order because it was illegal. We expect the full Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals to suspend the President's executive order because it is illegal. We expect the Supreme Court to suspend the President's order because it is illegal, because the Constitution clearly says that as chief executive you have an obligation to faithfully execute the laws of the United States.

You cannot make a law all by yourself with the stroke of a pen. And that is exactly what President Obama has done. In addition, it has placed an incredibly unaffordable financial burden on the people of Texas, the people of Tennessee, and the people of all the States of the Union that would have to deal with these folks that are here illegally.

All that we ask is that the law be enforced. All that we ask is that the law be respected, because, as our Founding Fathers understood, the law is the foundation of all of our liberty. Without law enforcement, there can be no liberty. Because there is just simply anarchy. If you look at northern Mexico today, it is in a complete state of anarchy. Mexico is essentially a failed state because they have no law enforcement.

In the United States of America we cannot expect to preserve this great Republic handed down to us by our Founders without enforcing the law. The fundamental question that this lawsuit, Texas v. United States, is pursuing—and winning—is respect for the rule of law as the foundation for all our liberties.

So I strongly support Mr. KING's amendment as an important tool in the ongoing effort to overturn the President's illegal executive amnesty. We expect the Supreme Court will stand behind the State of Texas and agree that the President's order must be suspended because it is illegal, because without law enforcement, without respect for the law, there can be no liberty. That is the issue here.

I strongly support the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would just reiterate that the President of the United States has signed a document. It is a November 20 document that says that he is going to impose executive amnesty. This House disagrees. Many in the Senate also disagree.

They have been chasing down an expensive rabbit trail to advance an operation of imposing amnesty in the United States of America, in contravention of our laws.

This Congress is reserved the right by the Constitution to write immigration law, and our Founding Fathers imagined we would jealously guard that power. That is what this amendment is about.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I think that we are at a point where it is difficult to reconcile what we are trying to do here—that is, in an appropriations bill—with these policy riders.

Now, I have heard my chairman claim that the President of the United States has done things that are illegal three or four times. I think that that kind of language is not useful in the debate, nor is it factual, because I think that the President has been acting well in concert with the precedents of former Presidents who have provided clemency and amnesty.

And I have heard Members like Mr. KING criticize those other Presidents who have provided amnesty, like Ronald Reagan and others, and I have never heard anyone claim that President Reagan acted illegally in those matters. So I find it unusual that we would be in this type of circumstance.

I heard the chairman run through a litany in which he also has the Supreme Court finally make some decision, which they have obviously not done yet.

So I would like to try to get back on the tracks of moving an appropriations bill. And the point that we have to understand here is that, if we are a coequal branch of the government—that is, the President is coequal to us, but we are one-half of the Congress—then the idea that what the House says goes is nonsensical.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just make the point that this Congress passed an amnesty act in 1986, and Ronald Reagan signed that. It was an act of Congress that brought amnesty in 1986. I think it was a mistake, but I believe it was constitutional.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's point.

Like I was saying, it is nonsensical to assume that whatever the unfettered action of the House is, that it, number one, represents the action of the Congress, because it doesn't. We have two Houses. We have a Senate and a House. And then we are coequal to the President, but the President has certain rights provided to him under the Constitution.

If you find no exception in the actions of other Presidents, it is unusual that we would have such enthusiastic language in condemnation of this President's very similar actions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

□ 1645

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to negotiate or finalize a trade agreement that includes provisions relating to visas issued under section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)). The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses the circumstances around the trade promotion authority and later on, perhaps, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, but it also addresses any of our trade negotiations that might take place that would be funded under this bill.

The rationale is that there has been much concern about the negotiations with regard to trade promotion authority in particular, enabling the discussion about immigration visas as being part of the trade negotiations.

It is a longstanding pattern and practice of this Congress to assert our constitutional authority over immigration visas. When our U.S. Trade Representative or other negotiators bring in negotiations that have to do with visas, it complicates our trade negotiations and puts us in a place where, when we see a trade agreement come before us, perhaps it is under a trade promotion authority that would be negotiated and this House votes on it, then it may well have within it visa agreements that have been negotiated with the multiple countries and taking out of the hands of Congress the ability to directly establish, although there is an indirect inference, but directly establish our immigration policy.

A lot of the opposition to the trade negotiations that have been taking place in the Trans-Pacific Partnership have been about concerns of news reports that have come from places likes Australia that have pointed out that there are negotiations going on that have to do with visas.

There was a circumstance several years ago, under a previous administration, where they had negotiated immigration provisions in a trade agreement, and even though it was a nonamendable trade agreement, we went before the Judiciary Committee and had a full hearing. I offered two amendments that passed, and ultimately, there were changes made in that agreement. There is a long history on this with me.

It has been an important issue to maintain the separation of immigration policy and the Congress from the executive branch negotiations in trade. That is what this amendment does. It says no immigrant visas will be negotiated in trade agreements. That means all of them.

Again, the Constitution enumerates this power to the Congress, not the executive branch. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. I think that the hopes of having some bipartisan support for this bill is waning. I think it is very unfortunate that we are now at a point where we are trying to intrude in an entirely different area of the President's prerogatives. He can negotiate all he wants.

Now, I may not support what he negotiates, but to say you can't even discuss something in a negotiation, I think, is unfortunate.

I am in opposition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would reiterate this point, that this Congress and a lot of the American people lack confidence in the negotiations of our President. A lot of this angst has flowed forth from the Iranian negotiations and their march towards a nuclear capability that has undermined his credibility and made it significantly more difficult for a Congress that is in favor of trade, especially on my side of the aisle.

I am a natural-born free trader. I have always believed that I can compete with anybody in the world, and I think America and American companies can compete with anyone in the world. I think that we need to have a level playing field.

What is happening is that lack of confidence in the President's negotiations and the willingness to, I believe, give away some of the positions that would better enhance our national security with regard to Iran, in particular, has made it far more difficult for those like me, who are pro-free trade, pro-smart trade, and because of that and the discussions about immigration visas being part of the negotiations and the indications from other countries that that is taking place, the secrecy around these negotiations is another component of it.

When we have to go into a secure room and give up our iPhone and leave our notes there in order to be able to see what the administration will present us as far as these negotiations are concerned, it is hard to have confidence that we are getting all of the straight story.

This is a way to put some containment around the negotiations. If the administration says there are no visas being negotiated, there should be no reason to oppose this amendment. That is really the bottom line.

If the administration opposes my amendment, that is a strong indication that they are not giving us the full story, but we are getting more of the full story from places like Australia.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining, please?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time here and reiterate that this amendment addresses a lack of trust that these trade negotiations are focused on the things that trades are supposed to be discussed about.

I have a strong suspicion that they have included immigration visas in their trade agreements. This amendment is drafted consistent with the position of this Congress that immigration should not be part of trade negotiations.

If the administration says that it is not part of trade negotiations, they should say, Fine, I am happy to support the King amendment; and they will be happy to prove it in that fashion.

Meanwhile, a lot of us are not going to a secure room to see if there is anything in there, and we won't know what is presented to the this Congress until it is too late to resist.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the House I have no intention of taking 4½ minutes to make the comments that I intend to make.

I was at SelectUSA, which is a gathering of people that the administration has brought together from around the world who were businesspeople and about investments in America. I was there with a number of Members of the U.S. Senate, Senator NELSON and others.

I got a chance at the lunch to sit next to a gentleman who has businesses in the United States—manufacturing businesses—and in South Africa and his home country in Asia and a number of other places.

He was saying that, when he travels to America, even though he has got 3,000 employees here, it is almost impossible for him to get the kind of visas and to get back and forth post-9/11 that can make it an efficient business trip for him. It requires such advance planning and so on.

I could imagine, in a negotiation, that there could be some consideration when there is a person who has got a multinational business and is employing Americans in Iowa or some other

State about their entry and exit from our country. In fact, he indicated that, in these other countries, he has such arrangements, just not in our own. I think that America has got to think about where it is on these issues.

This is not the appropriate bill for this. This is a bill to determine the appropriation levels that we are going to fund in certain accounts. We are well off the tracks, and I hope that we vote this amendment down. I am opposed to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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 under the heading ''Department of Justice—Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'' may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates the funding that might be used in contravention of section 642(a) that is designated in the amendment.

642(a) is the section in the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, as I know it, that prohibits the political subdivisions in America from establishing sanctuary policies we often refer to as sanctuary cities. These are the political subdivisions that establish a policy that prohibit their law enforcement officers and their other agents from cooperating with Federal immigration officials.

It seems illogical to me to think that any local government would want to prohibit their law enforcement officers from assisting in, cooperating with, and transferring information to the Federal law enforcement officers who are enforcing immigration law.

That section, it reads, in part, but with the thought being contained here: ''Notwithstanding,'' the language says, ''the political subdivisions may not prohibit, or in any way restrict any government entity or official from sending to or receiving from the INS''—at the time, that is ICE today—''information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.''

Mr. Chairman, I grew up in a law enforcement family. I looked at the men around me as a little boy, and I just thought that all adult men put on a uniform of some kind or another. I was steeped in respect for the supreme law of the land—the Constitution—and the rule of law.

When there was an issue that came forward, whether it was a bank robbery or some tragedy that took place, all levels of law enforcement cooperated with all other levels of law enforcement. No one that was a member of the city police said: I am not going to be serving papers here because that is the county's job.

No county deputy decided that he wouldn't pull somebody over for speeding because that was the city speed limit on a city street. No highway patrol officer decided that he wouldn't enforce local law.

No one that came in from the Division of Criminal Investigation or the FBI decided that it was their bailiwick, that it was exclusively their law to enforce and that no one should help them with that.

Law enforcement, to be effective, has to be a cooperation from all levels; and, of course, the public has to respect the rule of law; and they have to respect those who are there to protect and serve and to also enforce that law.

For me, I cannot understand how or why a city would establish these policies, but they are doing so. In the process of that, they are undermining the rule of law and eroding the respect for the rule of law and leaving their citizens vulnerable, when we could be helping them with Federal officers who need to get this information.

This is an amendment that has been offered in multiple years. It has passed this House multiple times. The number that I saw last year with the identical language passed the House by a vote of 214–94.

We have been consistent in defending the rule of law. This amendment says that no funds shall go to these political subdivisions from this bill, if they establish sanctuary city policies, to put it in short summation.

I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, the description of the amendment, as we understand it, prohibits the use of these funds that contravene section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

The facts are that the States and localities around the country that have adopted laws and policies to limit immigration enforcement by law enforcement are focused on protecting public safety. We have this in California. We have it in many border States. There is a level of cooperation that does take place between local law enforcement agencies as well as our Federal enforcement officers.

Surely, we don't believe it is good public policy to force an unwanted role upon police through the threat of sanctions, which is what this amendment does, or withholding police funding. Frankly, if you believe in Federalism and if you believe in that relationship between local, State, and Federal Government, this is really top-down and I think runs contrary to the notion that law enforcement agencies at all levels collaborate and cooperate.

Holding this sort of a sword of Damocles, so to speak, over the head of local law enforcement agencies simply, I think, is not good public policy.

In an op-ed piece that was published in Roll Call last year, the police chief of Dayton, Ohio, explained why his department instructs its officers not to check the immigration status of witnesses and victims or to question their status in minor traffic stops.

He says:

These policies allow us to focus our limited resources on our primary mission, which is crime solving and community safety.

We know that local law enforcement agencies are clearly stretched very thin across the country. They also said victims of crimes should never be afraid to reach out for help due to the fear of immigration consequences because, notwithstanding the fact of their status, crimes are perpetrated upon these people as well.

Since Dayton adopted these policies and innovative ways of addressing crime problems, their crime rates have significantly declined; and, in the past 3 years, serious crime has declined nearly 22 percent, while serious property crime has gone down 15 percent. It is simply, we believe, perverse to punish communities that want to prioritize because they know best what their challenges are within their communities to protect the public against crime and to enact community-based policing activities. To deny them this funding through this threat of the SCAAP funds simply is, we believe, inappropriate.

Finally, I think that this amendment focuses on a problem that doesn't exist.

With those statements, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to speak in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the objection of the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) to this amendment is that he does not believe current Federal law is good public policy. As a Member of Congress, he has the privilege of filing amendments and filing

legislation to change current Federal legislation, but we cannot, as lawmakers, encourage law breaking.

All the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) says is that if a local or State government expects to receive Federal money, they should comply with Federal law. It is really that simple.

Mr. KING's amendment simply says that, if you expect to receive funding from the Department of Justice, if you expect to receive funding under the SCAAP program—the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program—to compensate local jurisdictions for housing illegal aliens who have broken State law and are housed in a State or local jail at local taxpayer expense, if you want to be compensated for that and if you want to apply for grant funding from the Department of Justice, all Mr. KING's amendment says is follow Federal law. If you want Federal money, follow Federal law.

The Federal law is very clear. The law Mr. KING is referencing here is very simple. It simply says that a State or local government may not prohibit or in any way restrict a government entity or official from sending or receiving any information regarding the citizenship or immigration status of any individual to the Immigration Services. That is all this law says.

It is a very important piece of law because, as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) quite correctly points out, we expect all our local and State and Federal law enforcement officials to work together seamlessly.

Because we are a Nation of laws, we understand that all our liberty depends on the enforcement of the law, with equal protection and due process for everyone. All our liberties depend on local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers using their good hearts, their good sense, and their ability, as law enforcement officers, to recognize when and where they need to cooperate and communicate with the State law enforcement officials, with Federal law enforcement officials to protect the life and liberty of the people of the United States. That is what is really at stake here.

That is the objection that we have had to the President's unlawful actions. That is the concern and the objection we have in the State of Texas to the uncontrolled flow of people and drugs and guns and illegal material across the border. Our concern is not with the lawful free flow of people back and forth over the Rio Grande River. Our concern is with the illegal, criminal conduct.

We recognize in Texas the importance of free trade with Mexico and with Canada, but you cannot have free trade and a strong economy without safe streets, and you cannot have safe streets until the law is enforced. We in Texas, first and foremost, recognize that, in order to have that good relationship with Mexico, the law has got to be enforced.

We need workers from Mexico to come here lawfully. We need our laws to be respected so that we can ensure the economy stays strong, so that our liberty is protected. Our liberty can only be safe when the law is enforced.

All Mr. KING's amendment says is, if you expect to receive Federal money, follow Federal law. It is not complicated. That is very, very simple. Under the law that has been on the books since 1996, a State or local unit of government cannot restrict in any way the ability of a government official to either send information to Immigration Services or receive information from Federal immigration regarding the citizenship or unlawful status of any individual.

If my colleague from California (Mr. COSTA) objects to that law, it is his privilege, as a Member of Congress, to file an amendment or file legislation to amend it or change it. In the meantime, our responsibility as lawmakers and my responsibility as chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee is to ensure that the law is enforced.

If agencies of the Federal Government or State or local governments expect to receive Federal money, if they expect to have the privilege of spending our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars, they should expect to follow the law.

If you want Federal money, follow Federal law. It is that simple. That is all Mr. KING's amendment does, and I urge Members to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate the positions that were taken by the gentleman from Texas. We have political subdivisions, primarily, as sanctuary cities that are violating Federal law, and all we are saying is follow the law.

The point hasn't been made here that the Department of Justice could enforce this law, but they choose not to, and that empowers the political subdivisions, particularly the cities that continue to advance these sanctuary policies.

Can you imagine being a police officer and being told that, if you pick up people who are unlawfully present in America, that you can't tell the INS—even if you are having coffee with them—that you have got a jail full of people who are unlawfully present in America that are required by law to be placed into removal proceedings? That is just illogical.

I would point out that, if you disagree with this section of the code, you are here in this Congress, bring a bill to try to change it.

In the meanwhile, I am for full funding of the SCAAP funding. I think that, when we have people in the country and we are not enforcing immigration law, we should make sure that local jails are funded when they are picking up people that are unlawfully present in America.

I support the Byrne JAG grants. I want to give that to them, but we cannot do that under provisions if the local subdivisions are violating law.

Then with regard to the statement that this is a problem that doesn't exist—no, it is a problem that exists all over this country. It is growing. It is replete in city after city. We need to restore respect for the rule of law. That is what this amendment does. I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. 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 in this Act may be used to carry out the program known as ''Operation Choke Point''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, question: How does the Federal Government get rid of an industry it doesn't like?

Answer: Simple, it cuts off that industry from the financial services sector.

Sounds impossible, doesn't it? However, that is exactly what the Department of Justice is doing in conjunction with the FDIC right now. Their name for this action is called Operation Choke Point. It is designed to force legally operating entities out of business by choking them off from the financial services they need to operate their businesses.

What started with nondepository lenders has spread to other industries, including pawn shops, tobacco retailers, and the firearms and ammunition industries, to name just a few, as well as the businesses that provide services and products to these industries.

This amendment would ensure that Operation Choke Point is ended and that the DOJ returns to their proper job, targeting companies based on fraudulent actions, not entire industries based on political motive. An identical amendment was offered by a bipartisan group of lawmakers during fiscal year 2015 debate, and it was passed by voice vote.

This isn't a partisan issue. This is an issue of DOJ abusing its authorities. I urge support for this amendment.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chair, soon, we will vote to end funding for a government program that is, at best, unethical and, at worst, illegal. The program known as Operation Choke Point forces banks to discriminate against legitimate, legal businesses.

Today, we know that banks are closing their customers' accounts under a directive by the U.S. Department of Justice. There is no appeals process.

That is right; the enforcer of the law of the land is backing this potentially unlawful program. Hard-working American businessowners are having their livelihoods ripped out from under them by a law established by this administration, not by Congress.

Operation Choke Point is another example of how the Obama administration has gone around Congress to create laws, rather than do their job to enforce the laws we already have on the books.

As a businessowner myself, Operation Choke Point worries me greatly. Operation Choke Point is un-American. It is deceiving and simply wrong. It is time this Congress uses its power of the purse to rein in government overreach and restore government accountability.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to defund Operation Choke Point.

In God we trust.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

□ 1715

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, now I think that there may be some mutuality of interest if what the gentleman says is true about what is at stake here. However, this is not a process in which we can discern all of that at this moment. This is an appropriations bill. I think that this is probably an area where the Congress should hold some hearings and look into it, take some testimony and figure out exactly what is going on before we would shut down what might be a very important program.

It may be, as the gentleman describes, that is something where DOJ is just moving in ways that make little or no sense. But I think that to come at the final point in the bill and seek to restrict DOJ in this way, I would be reluctant to support it, and therefore, I stand in opposition to it.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank my friend, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and I thank the chairman. What we are up here talking about is a program where the government is trying to put legal businesses out of business—that is what Operation Choke Point is—legal businesses that some people don't like especially within the administration, pawnshops, payday lenders, ammunition manufacturers, gun shops, but legal businesses.

With all due respect to my friend from Pennsylvania, we have had hearings on this. In fact, the Department of Justice has claimed they have stopped this program. They have agreed with us that they shouldn't be doing this. Now, we don't believe they are actually doing that. We have indications from what is happening back in our districts that even though the Department of Justice says they have stopped Operation Choke Point, that it is still going on.

So here is my question, Mr. Chairman: Who supports this program? The Department of Justice says it is wrong. The Department of Justice says it is not even doing it. So who would get up here on this floor and say: ''I think Operation Choke Point is a great idea. I think we should go ahead and continue to use means within the Department of Justice to drive legal businesses out of business''? I'm not really sure how you defend that position.

This is real for me in my district, Mr. Chairman. I have a woman-owned business in my home county who cannot get money to expand her pawnshop. I have businesses elsewhere in South Carolina that have a little tiny piece of their large financial services business in payday lending. They have been cut off from their financial relationships of 25 years. They can't get banking services. That is why the DOJ said they were going to stop. We just don't happen to believe them.

Mr. Chairman, we should support this amendment because it is the appropriate thing to do, to my good friend from Pennsylvania, because that is how we work. We defund programs that we don't like. And if the DOJ says they are not doing it anyway, what is the harm in voting for the amendment?

So I would ask again, who could possibly be against the amendment? Who could possibly be for Operation Choke Point?

I hope we have overwhelming and broad support for Mr. LUETKEMEYER's amendment later on this evening.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) for purposes of a colloquy.

Since the Republicans are in the majority, you have held hearings on this. Is there legislation that is coming forward to end these practices?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Yes. There have been hearings in the Financial Services Committee. There also have been hearings in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. In fact, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has an extensive report on both the DOJ and FDIC activities that include emails and internal memos from those agencies indicating these activities. They can't be denied. They admit this in discussions with the FDIC. In a follow-up hearing to the report, they admit doing this. They have put in place a number of provisions of a bill that I am offering.

Mr. FATTAH. Let me restate my question.

Is there legislation coming forward that would end the practice?

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. That is what I was getting to.

As a result of these reports, we have come up with a bill. I have a bill filed. It will be coming up later on this month for a hearing in committee.

The FDIC has put in place many of the same provisions of the bill already as protocols for their operations on how they handle situations like this. I think we are making progress.

The problem is that DOJ has flipped the model of using FIRREA, which is a bank law that banks use to protect themselves against fraud, to now use that law against them. As a result, we need to stop that. That is part of the bill as well.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate your answering my question.

So what I hear is that you held some hearings, that you have legislation, that you are making progress, and that the administration has already curtailed some of these practices that you are concerned about. However, you would still like to proceed with this prohibition of funds which might be entirely appropriate.

I don't have enough information, standing here today, to agree with you that that is the right thing to do, so I stand in opposition to the amendment even though I may not be, in spirit, in opposition to what it is that you are attempting to do. I just don't have enough information to join you in this effort as robustly as you are engaged in it.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that I think my two other spokespeople here, with regards to this, have expressed concern.

There are businesses across this country that are being choked off from financial services, and as a result, they are doing legal business but yet not being able to do that business because of the actions of the FDIC and the DOJ, which the OGR report indicates that they are doing. They admit this wrongdoing in different committee hearings as well as meetings on campus here. What we are trying to do is protect legal businesses to be able to continue to do a legal business

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to implement in the California Central Valley Recovery Domain any existing recovery plan for salmon and steelhead populations listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) as threatened species or endangered species if that recovery plan does not address predation by non-native species.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will help protect native salmon and steelhead species in California. My amendment would increase the effectiveness of recovery plans for species of salmon and steelhead listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 by ensuring an appropriate focus on predation control efforts.

Predation has long been recognized as a source of significant mortality for endangered and threatened species. In fact, according to NOAA, nonnative species are cited as a cause of endangerment for 48 percent of the species listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. This is especially true for marine species, and along the Pacific coast salmon and steelhead juveniles.

Recently, the National Marine Fisheries Service found protection of salmon and steelhead required ''significantly reducing the nonnative predatory fishes,'' and that reducing the number of nonnative predatory fishes was necessary to ''prevent extinction or to prevent the species from declining irreversibly.''

In my own State, as far back as 1995, the State Water Resources Control Board recommended in its water quality control plan for the Bay Delta that the State and Federal fish agencies pursue programs to determine the impacts of predation by nonnative fish on salmon and steelhead. Unfortunately, despite such recognition, nothing has been done, and there are currently no programs in California to remove these nonnative predator fish.

Today in California, species such as the nonnative striped bass, introduced into California from New Jersey, consume up to 95 percent of the salmon and steelhead juveniles along the Sacramento and San Joaquin River System. These bass are not suppressed but, rather, managed by local State officials for abundance and sport fishing.

Mr. Chairman, predator control efforts can and do work. Currently, control of predator fish is being successfully used in a number of locations in North America. In the Great Lakes, control efforts of sea lamprey have reduced predation on lake trout, whitefish, salmon, rainbow trout, and others. In the Wood River System of Alaska, control of the arctic char reduced predation on sockeye salmon. In the Columbia and Snake Rivers, control of pike minnow reduced predation on salmon. In Cultus Lake, British Columbia, sockeye salmon increased after an eradication program focusing on pike minnow.

Recovering threatened and endangered salmon and steelhead populations has been a critical priority for Congress for years. This amendment simply ensures that controlling nonnative predators is a top priority for NOAA and all other stakeholders interested in maintaining healthy and sustainable salmon and steelhead populations.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment even though my opposition is not as apparent as it might otherwise be.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), my great colleague here.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlemen from California and from Pennsylvania for allowing me this time, and the gentleman from California for offering this important amendment.

Let me give a little perspective here. Clearly, everyone is aware of the disastrous drought that is having catastrophic impacts in California, not only in the San Joaquin Valley but throughout the State. There are a number of factors that have caused the challenges that we face with a lack of water in California. Obviously, it hasn't rained very much or snowed very much in the mountains for 4 years.

In addition to that, we have a broken water system in the sense that, designed in the fifties and the sixties, both the Federal and State water projects, for a State of 20 million people, today we have 38 million people, and we have a lot of demands not only for the use of agriculture, but for people in our cities and for the environment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to our requirements under the law to protect the environment, those endangered species, salmonoid and steelhead that are native to California.

What happened is some 100 years ago, before we had a better understanding and before California was a much bigger State, there was the introduction of striped bass from the East Coast, bound from the Gulf of Saint Lawrence Seaway all the way down to Alabama. These are native fish on the East Coast, but they were not native to California. They were introduced in a small number but became very successful in propagation, so much so that in the early 1900s, after 10 years of introduction, over 1 million pounds a year was being harvested of these nonnative striped bass fish in the San Francisco Bay-San Joaquin-Sacramento-Delta River systems.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the State has changed a great deal to present day. The current water system is unable to meet the demands under the current restrictions that are required under the Endangered Species Act to maintain and to try to increase the population of salmonoid and steelhead.

We have determined, as my colleague and friend from California stated, that these fish, these predator fish, are responsible for a large amount of the takings of both the native California salmon and steelhead, and yet we have no program to balance this.

What this amendment would do is it simply requires that for a recovery plan to be effective, it must incorporate and address all factors involved in species recovery, those of particularly high concern.

Some of the studies have indicated on the Sacramento River over 95 percent of the juvenile salmon and steelhead are eaten by these predator striped bass, these nonnative fish and other invasive species. This amendment ensures that the recovery plan for endangered salmon and steelhead takes these factors into account, including the predation by the nonnative species such as striped bass.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from California.

□ 1730

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out one thing. Turlock Irrigation District, which is in my district, was forced to do a federally ordered study which actually showed, on the lower Tuolumne, 42,000 snook were killed by nonnative fish. This nearly eliminated the entire population. This is a federally ordered study.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for offering this very important amendment.

When you look at what is going on in Central Valley, my hometown, and you hear stories—and I see for myself because I was there this past week—cities, houses, running out of water, wells

going dry. There was a news article a couple of days ago about a city in my district named Lemoore where wells are going dry that supply homes there the south side of town. That is a frustrating situation.

We fought for the last couple of years to bring legislation to the floor. We delivered it to the Senate a few times to help resolve this.

What makes this more frustrating than anything is we have got a situation here where we could actually make a difference. There are studies here that prove that 95 percent of the fish that we are trying to protect are being eaten by species that we are doing nothing about. The tools are there.

This is a simple amendment that actually helps deliver and force these agencies which should be looking out for the best interests of the people of the United States, it forces them to actually use every single tool in their toolbox to actually address the situation instead of wasting water.

When I saw the story not too long ago about water being diverted or released in these pulse flows to trick some of our species to try to protect instead of actually doing something to make a difference, it is a waste of water that could have made a real difference for the people in my district, people who are unemployed. We are starting to see unemployment numbers again upwards of 50 percent in some of these communities, houses where they are actually delivering water by truck so they can bathe. This is a real dire situation.

This amendment is a step in the right direction that actually allows these government agencies which, again, are supposed to take the interests of the American people at heart first to use all the tools in their toolbox.

This is a good idea, this is a good amendment, and this really truly makes a difference.

Again, thank you for this amendment, and I urge support.

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

Mr. FATTAH. 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. FATTAH. 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.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, an amendment was passed, King No. 077, and passed by a voice vote. I requested a recorded vote. I ask unanimous consent that my request for a recorded vote on the amendment that it be withdrawn and allow the voice vote on which it passed to be the fact.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. We have arrived at our final moment in this bill where my colleague from New York, who is an extraordinary Member, has a very important amendment to offer.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the monitoring or review of electronic communications between an inmate and attorney or attorney's agents who are traditionally covered by attorney client privilege except as provided in 28 CFR 501.3(d).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member from Pennsylvania, for his leadership.

This amendment would prohibit the use of funds in connection with the monitoring or review of electronic communications between an inmate detainee and his or her attorney or attorney's agents who are traditionally covered by the attorney-client privilege, except in circumstances where reasonable suspicion exists that a particular inmate's communications with attorneys or their agents may be designed to further or facilitate acts of terrorism.

This amendment is designed to protect the legally sacrosanct attorney-client privilege. It would protect the Sixth Amendment right to counsel of individuals who are using electronic communications to share privileged information with their designated court advocate.

The attorney-client privilege is one of the oldest recognized privileges in American jurisprudence. It is intended to encourage the full and frank communication between attorneys and their clients and thereby promote the broader public interests in the observance of the law and the administration of justice. It, of course, is anchored in the Sixth Amendment.

Currently, in-person attorney visitations in facilities that are run by the Bureau of Prisons can take place in attorney-client rooms which provide the privacy to share information necessary for a lawyer to adequately defend his or her client in court.

However, this is not the case for correspondence collected through electronic means. Waiver notices in Federal prisons vary from facility to facility, with some having clearly posted notices which state that by using the Trust Fund Limited Inmate Computer System, otherwise known as TRULINCS, inmates are waiving their privilege rights. Other facilities, however, provide no indication on the level of privacy that a detained individual can expect when using electronic prison resources.

The TRULINCS system also does not provide an option for a detained individual who hasn't been convicted to contact his or her attorney without subjecting electronic communications to external review.

The reading and collecting of privileged information in instances where clients are having electronic exchanges with their attorneys is a clear invasion of the traditional attorney-client privilege.

In this great country, there is a presumption of innocence, as one of our Founding Fathers, John Adams, has eloquently set forth. It is a foundational principle of our democracy.

It seems unreasonable to require in the 21st century that protection of the attorney-client privilege at a detention center only occurs through in-person visitation. These correctional facilities are often located in distant locations that cannot be easily accessed. We live in an era of modern technology and communication. The technology is available in these facilities, and our laws should reflect and adapt to the modern age.

This amendment would prohibit the prison system from compromising the attorney-client privilege, as anchored in the Sixth Amendment constitutional right to assistance of counsel.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is prepared to withdraw the amendment. We will work together to resolve this problem, so I do claim the time in opposition.

I think the gentleman from New York has raised a very valid concern. Certainly we do not want to see any exception to the attorney-client privilege. It can't be limited to just those circumstances where an attorney is actually present with the individual

interviewing him at the facility. I think the gentleman has identified a legitimate problem that we need to address.

As I discussed with Mr. JEFFRIES earlier, we got the language very late, and I want to be certain that we are not creating any unanticipated problems. Mr. JEFFRIES wants to be sure to exclude the very reasonable exception in current law that if a court order, on a finding of a judge, sees that there is potential or reasonable cause for concern that there may be furtherance of a terrorist plot in the course of those communications between an attorney and a client, the Department of Justice would have the right under that court order to listen to that conversation.

We want to make sure that we protect that exception but make sure we take care of the one he has identified, so if I could, with my colleague from Philadelphia Mr. JEFFRIES' help, we appreciate, as we just discussed earlier, if he would withdraw this amendment. I will work with my colleague Ranking Member FATTAH from Philadelphia to help address the concern you have got when we move to conference. I think it is a valid concern and one that we will work closely with you, sir, to resolve.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to concur with the chair's every utterance on this amendment that we will work together and help facilitate what I think is a very righteous effort on behalf of Congressman JEFFRIES to protect the rights of all Americans to have privileged conversations and interactions with their attorneys so that their rights can be fully protected.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to hear from my colleague from New York for the purpose of completing the discussion.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for their willingness to work together on this very important issue in terms of the preservation of the attorney-client privilege in the detainee context and look forward to working with the two of them and Members of this august body to resolve this issue.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment by Mr. FLORES of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. SANFORD of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment by Mr. DENHAM of California.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 289, noes 132, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

AYES—289

Aguilar
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—132

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Babin
Barletta
Barton
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cole
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Denham
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Guinta
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Lynch
MacArthur
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Pelosi
Peters
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Ruiz
Rush
Russell
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder

NOT VOTING—11

Adams
Bilirakis
Cartwright
Fattah
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Nugent
Roe (TN)
Sinema
Stewart
Stivers

□ 1812

Messrs. FORBES, CALVERT, LYNCH, SESSIONS, KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. ROBY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. DEUTCH, HASTINGS, ISRAEL, DANNY DAVIS of Illinois, GUTIÉRREZ, CLYBURN, ELLISON, HUFFMAN, Mses. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, MAXINE WATERS of California, and WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SIMMS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 288 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, During rollcall vote No. 288 on H.R. 2578, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "nay" when I should have voted "aye."

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chair, I rise for the purpose of making an announcement.

Members are advised that no more votes are expected in the House tonight.

The House will begin debate on the fiscal year 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill immediately following this vote series. Debate will continue late tonight, so any Member wishing to offer an amendment should be prepared to do so at the appropriate point in the bill.

Our next votes are expected at approximately 11 a.m. tomorrow.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). 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 Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 171, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—250

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—171

Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (NY)
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Adams
Bilirakis
Capps
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Conyers
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1818

Mr. PITTENGER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 289, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 383, noes 43, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—383

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—43

Brady (PA)
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cooper
Delaney
Donovan
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Harper
Keating
Kennedy
Kind
King (NY)
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
MacArthur
Meeks
Moulton
Pascrell
Payne
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schiff
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1825

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Messrs. CLYBURN, SWALWELL of California, BUTTERFIELD, LOEBSACK, CÁRDENAS, RUSH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. GUTIÉRREZ, and HINOJOSA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. LANGEVIN changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair announces to all Members that 2-minute voting will be strictly enforced.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 190, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—190

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer

Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1828

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 290, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—134

Allen
Amash
Babin
Barton
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harris
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Olson
Palmer
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Stutzman
Tiberi
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoho
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—290

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Adams
Bera
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1831

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 204, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—204

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1835

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 198, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—227

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—198

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart
Vela

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1838

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 181, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—245

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—181

Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1841

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016''.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. 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. REED) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, 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. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2578 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 23, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,000,000)''.

In the ''Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs'' account, on page 38, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

In the ''Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs'' account, on page 39, line 22, after the dollar amount relating to sexual assault victims assistance, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

In the ''Juvenile Justice Programs'' account, on page 47, line 10, after the dollar amount relating to missing and exploited children programs, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California (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 California?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 2578, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment would provide an additional $3 million for Violence Against Women prevention and prosecution programs, increasing resources for sexual assault victims' assistance. My amendment would also provide an additional $3 million for Juvenile Justice programs, directed to the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force program.

Mr. Speaker, there is more than ample room within the budget cap for this bill to do more to help sexual assault victims and prevent the exploitation of children. I hope we can all agree that these critical programs are worthy of added resources.

The Sexual Assault Services Program was authorized through the Violence Against Women Act and was the first Federal program dedicated to the provision of direct services to victims of sexual violence.

Across the country, the Sexual Assault Services Program supports critical, lifesaving, safety net services. Support services are offered to both adult and minor survivors of sexual assault and to family members who are helping them cope with the mental health issues and physical trauma of sexual assault.

The program also funds intervention and advocacy services, providing survivors with the help that they need to navigate through the medical and criminal justice systems.

For many survivors of sexual assault, this program is a critical and necessary source of support at the most vulnerable time in their lives. We must support these lifesaving programs and stand up for survivors of sexual assault.

Additionally, we must do more to protect vulnerable children from predators who despicably exploit children on the Internet. That is why my amendment will provide a much-needed increase for the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force program, which funds State and local law enforcement who investigate online child exploitation.

The program also provides forensic, prevention, and investigative assistance to law enforcement, educators, prosecutors, and families. The program also ensures law enforcement officers are trained to deal with online child pornography and child enticement so that these cases will be fully investigated and prosecuted.

In 2014 alone, 7,800 individuals were arrested, and the task forces around the country conducted over 60,000 forensic investigations. Clearly there is an urgent and compelling moral need to address these heinous crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit, to vote ''yes'' to protect women and girls from sexual assault and violence, to vote ''yes'' to protect children from online predators.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), my friend who is a champion in protecting children.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's motion to recommit because there are children out there who need to be saved. They are waiting to be saved.

This motion provides additional funding for the Internet Crimes Against Children program, a national network of 61 coordinated law enforcement task forces investigating and prosecuting those who sexually exploit our most vulnerable constituents, our children.

With the proliferation of the Internet and wireless technology, online child pornography has become an epidemic. And let's not forget that these are not just heinous images. They are crime scene photos. The ICAC needs resources to go after these criminals now.

According to estimates, half of these arrests lead us to the door of a hands-on offender, and that is a child waiting to be rescued. Yet in one recent year, the ICAC only had the resources to investigate a mere 2 percent of all leads.

Previous increases in Federal funding have directly resulted in thousands more arrests, contributing to many more thousands of children who are outright rescued or who will be spared contact with an abuser.

Let's take this opportunity to help the ICAC rescue more children. Please, think about these precious babies being victimized. Let's rescue as many of them as possible. If you are a parent, God forbid it was your own child.

I urge Members' support for the motion to recommit, and I thank the gentlewoman for her commitment to making sure that we can rescue America's victimized children.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, before I begin—and I will be very brief—I want to make sure to thank the majority staff who have worked so hard on this bill. I want to thank our chief clerk, John Martens; Leslie Albright; Jeff Ashford; Taylor Kelly; Colin Samples; and Aschley Schiller for their tireless work drafting this bill, along with Bob Bonner and Matt Smith on the minority's staff and Corey Inglee and Megan Olmstead in my personal office. And a personal thank you to my good friend, the Congressman from Philadelphia, who has done such a great job. We have worked together arm in arm on this bill.

Starting at about 2 o'clock yesterday afternoon, we have worked through over 80 amendments. All the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) would have had to do was to show up here. During the course of that debate, any Member could have offered an amendment, and that is one of the great things about this process.

I want to thank our majority leader and our Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER, for opening up the legislative process. Unlike in the past, any Member of this Congress could stand up and represent their 700,000 constituents. You could take a Big Chief notepad and a pencil and just write out an amendment and walk right down there and give it to the Clerk.

All the gentlewoman from California had to do was just write the amendment up and present it to the Clerk. Why, we would have even accepted it. But instead, she offers it up here today as a procedural trick to confuse and confound.

We produced a great bill. The ranking member and I have worked together arm in arm to produce a good

bill that protects this Nation's investment in space exploration and scientific research but, above all, invests in the good people of the law enforcement community.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I am the whip. I wanted to make that perfectly clear.

The fact of the matter is, did the gentleman just say if this amendment had been offered previously that you would have accepted it?

Mr. CULBERSON. Absolutely, because it would have been done properly.

Mr. HOYER. But you are now urging——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has the time.

Mr. CULBERSON. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is exactly right. We would have accepted this amendment earlier in the process because it is an open process. Anyone has a chance to come down here and offer an amendment in an open and free House of Representatives. That is why this amendment should be defeated.

We have got a good bill. I urge Members to vote ''no'' against this motion to recommit.

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.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were 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 the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 240, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

YEAS—184

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Adams
Comstock
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Rush
Stewart

□ 1859

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk

Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—183

Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Buck
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fleming
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Comstock
Jackson Lee
Keating
Nugent
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1905

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1908

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I would also like to thank, in particular, Chairman ROGERS and also Ranking Member LOWEY plus the members of the committee, and yes, I must say, especially the members of the subcommittee for the hours and hours spent in hearings, markups, and meetings, working together in a cooperative effort to bring this bill to the floor and eventually signed into law. Finally, as we can never do enough, I want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for their incredible hard work.

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

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

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses	105,000	113,657	105,000	---	-8,657
Immediate Office of the Secretary	(2,696)	---	(2,734)	(+38)	(+2,734)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	(1,011)	---	(1,025)	(+14)	(+1,025)
Office of the General Counsel	(19,900)	---	(20,066)	(+166)	(+20,066)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	(9,800)	---	(9,310)	(-490)	(+9,310)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	(12,500)	---	(12,808)	(+308)	(+12,808)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	(2,500)	---	(2,500)	---	(+2,500)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	(25,365)	---	(26,029)	(+664)	(+26,029)
Office of Public Affairs	(2,000)	---	(2,029)	(+29)	(+2,029)
Office of the Executive Secretariat	(1,714)	---	(1,769)	(+55)	(+1,769)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	(1,414)	---	---	(-1,414)	---
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response	(10,600)	---	(10,793)	(+193)	(+10,793)
Office of the Chief Information Officer	(15,500)	---	(15,937)	(+437)	(+15,937)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Innovative Finance	---	---	---	---	---
Research and Technology	13,000	14,582	11,386	-1,614	-3,196
National Infrastructure Investments	500,000	1,250,000	100,000	-400,000	-1,150,000
Infrastructure Permitting Center	---	4,000	---	---	-4,000
Financial Management Capital	5,000	5,000	1,000	-4,000	-4,000
Cyber Security Initiatives	5,000	8,000	7,000	+2,000	-1,000
DATA Act Compliance	---	3,000	---	---	-3,000
U.S. Digital Services	---	9,000	---	---	-9,000
Office of Civil Rights	9,600	9,678	9,600	---	-78
Transportation Planning, Research, and Development	6,000	10,019	5,976	-24	-4,043
Working Capital Fund	(181,500)	---	(181,500)	---	(+181,500)
Minority Business Resource Center Program	925	933	933	+8	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,367)	---	(18,367)	---	(+18,367)
Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilizaton and Outreach (Minority Business Outreach)	3,099	4,518	4,518	+1,419	---
Safe Transport of Oil	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	155,000	175,000	155,000	---	-20,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	802,624	1,612,387	400,413	-402,211	-1,211,974
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations	9,740,700	9,915,000	9,847,700	+107,000	-67,300
Air traffic organization	(7,396,654)	(7,505,293)	(7,505,293)	(+108,639)	---
Aviation safety	(1,218,458)	(1,258,411)	(1,258,411)	(+39,953)	---
Commercial space transportation	(16,605)	(18,114)	(16,605)	---	(-1,509)
Finance and management	(756,047)	(764,621)	(725,000)	(-31,047)	(-39,621)
NextGen	(60,089)	(60,582)	(60,089)	---	(-493)
Staff offices	(292,847)	(207,099)	(282,302)	(-10,545)	(+75,203)
Security and Hazardous Materials Safety	---	(100,880)	---	---	(-100,880)
Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,600,000	2,855,000	2,500,000	-100,000	-355,000
Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund	156,750	166,000	156,750	---	-9,250
Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(3,200,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,600,000)	(+400,000)	(+100,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(3,350,000)	(2,900,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+450,000)
Administration	(107,100)	(107,100)	(107,100)	---	---
Airport cooperative research program	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	---	---
Airport technology research	(29,750)	(31,000)	(31,000)	(+1,250)	---
Small community air service development program	(5,500)	---	---	(-5,500)	---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Youth Build (rescission)	-460	---	---	+460	---
Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108):					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(-200,000)	---
Rescission	---	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000
HOME Investment Partnerships Program	900,000	1,060,000	767,000	-133,000	-293,000
Transfer from Housing Trust Fund	---	---	133,000	+133,000	+133,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-8,000)	---	---	(+8,000)
Subtotal	900,000	1,060,000	900,000	---	-160,000
Housing Trust Fund (transfer out)	---	---	-133,000	-133,000	-133,000
Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
Homeless Assistance Grants	2,135,000	2,480,000	2,185,000	+50,000	-295,000
Brownfields (rescission)	-2,913	---	---	+2,913	---
Total, Community Planning and Development	6,477,627	6,752,000	6,392,000	-85,627	-360,000
Housing Programs					
Project-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals	9,520,000	10,545,000	10,504,000	+984,000	-41,000
Contract administrators	210,000	215,000	150,000	-60,000	-65,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-20,000)	---	---	(+20,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year)	9,730,000	10,760,000	10,654,000	+924,000	-106,000
Advance appropriations	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000	---	---
Total, Project-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill	9,730,000	10,760,000	10,654,000	+924,000	-106,000
Housing for the Elderly	420,000	455,000	414,000	-6,000	-41,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-3,000)	---	---	(+3,000)
Housing for Persons with Disabilities	135,000	177,000	152,000	+17,000	-25,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Housing Counseling Assistance	47,000	60,000	47,000	---	-13,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Rental Housing Assistance	18,000	30,000	30,000	+12,000	---
Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund	10,000	11,000	11,000	+1,000	---
Offsetting collections	-10,000	-11,000	-11,000	-1,000	---
Total, Housing Programs	10,350,000	11,482,000	11,297,000	+947,000	-185,000
Federal Housing Administration					
Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(-15,000)	---
Offsetting receipts	-7,951,000	-7,003,000	-7,003,000	+948,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM)	-36,000	-97,000	-97,000	-61,000	---
Additional offsetting receipts (Pres. Sec. 244)	---	-29,000	---	---	+29,000
Administrative contract expenses	130,000	174,000	130,000	---	-44,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
General and Special Risk Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(-15,000)	---
Offsetting receipts	-876,000	-657,000	-657,000	+219,000	---
Rescission	-10,000	---	---	+10,000	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration	-8,743,000	-7,612,000	-7,627,000	+1,116,000	-15,000

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1915

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

In transportation, the bill levies deep cuts to capital programs. As we learned from the Amtrak derailment last month in Philadelphia, these cuts can have clear, direct consequences for the safety of our transportation system. The bill before us cuts Amtrak by 18 percent—18 percent—below last year. There is no funding for the expansion of safety mechanisms, including Positive Train Control, which regulates the excessive speeds that caused the Philadelphia derailment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Even though the bill was considered in full committee the morning after last month's tragic Amtrak crash in Philadelphia, the majority voted down amendments to increase funds for Amtrak capital investments and positive train control, which the NTSB has said would have prevented the derailment. Yet it does not receive any funding in the bill.

□ 1930

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There are really three great reasons to support this bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

It works to eliminate the number of trucks that are on the road. This bill's actually extending the trailer length will eliminate 6.6 million truck trips; it will save 1.3 billion miles driven; it will reduce carbon emissions by 4.4 billion pounds annually, and it will eliminate the need for every ninth truck in our economy. Truck tonnage is projected to grow by 23 percent over the next 12 years, so it makes sense to move freight in fewer trucks.

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

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

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

Let's go down the list.

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

The Coast Guard is spread so thin it can't meet its own criteria for search and rescue, but they are $17 million below what the President proposed, and there is no money in here for a new Coast Guard icebreaker. We are a great maritime nation. We are down to one 50-year-old, decrepit icebreaker. That is not going to serve our country too well.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ROUZER. I thank the chairman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MAY 6, 2015.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

Safety is an absolute priority for their industry. Trucking companies know that, without good safety records, they will not be the carriers of choice for businesses that need to move freight.

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

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1945

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thousands of housing units identified as containing lead paint hazards will not be made safe for the children who live there. Thousands of children will be needlessly subjected to decreased IQ and cognitive function across their entire lifespan, developmental delays, behavior problems, learning disabilities, seizures, coma, and even death. Lead poisoning impacts the decision making center of the brain. Children with lead poisoning are 7 times more likely to drop out of school, more likely to engage in risk-taking behaviors, and more likely to engage in criminal activity.

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

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2577

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

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, $105,000,000, of which not to exceed $2,734,000 shall be available for the immediate Office of the Secretary; not to exceed $1,025,000 shall be available for the immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary; not to exceed $20,066,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; not to exceed $9,310,000 shall be available for the Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy; not to exceed $12,808,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs; not to exceed $2,500,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs; not to exceed $26,029,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration; not to exceed $2,029,000 shall be available for the Office of Public Affairs; not to exceed $1,769,000 shall be available for the Office of the Executive Secretariat; not to exceed $10,793,000 shall be available for the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response; and not to exceed $15,937,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any office of the Office of the Secretary to any other office of the Office of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no appropriation for any office shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent by all such transfers: *Provided further*, That notice of any change in funding greater than 5 percent shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $60,000 shall be for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, excluding fees authorized in Public Law 107–71, there may be credited to this appropriation up to $2,500,000 in funds received in user fees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for the position of Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

I understand the problems of Amtrak, and I know that it needs funding, but I am just asking the majority to please look at the budget you have offered. Your offsets in the case of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation are truly unacceptable, and in doing so, the seaway will be harmed. It will harm ports like Erie, Pennsylvania; Massena, New York; Duluth, Minnesota; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Gary, Indiana; Toledo, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan. The list is a very, very long list.

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

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

□ 2000

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BUSTOS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

We have benefited here across the United States in recent times with a boom in energy and moving towards energy self-sufficiency. Much of this has been due to the ability to take advantage of our natural resources, including crude oil, which is increasingly being developed from the Western parts of our country. In fact, more than 33 million barrels of crude oil are shipped by rail each month in the United States, and that is a fifty-fold increase from more than 5 years ago.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert ''($4,000,000)''.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

During yesterday's hearing, one of the themes we heard repeatedly from Administrator Rosekind was that NHTSA would have been better able to identify and mandate recalls had they had more resources. It is a refrain we are used to hearing here in Congress. His argument was that with more money, the agency could save more lives. I will take him at his word on that.

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

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

□ 2015

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

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

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For capital investments in surface transportation infrastructure, $100,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation shall distribute funds provided under this heading as discretionary grants to be awarded to a State, local government, transit agency, or a collaboration among such entities on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant impact on the Nation, a metropolitan area, or a region: *Provided further*, That projects eligible for funding provided under this heading shall include, but not be limited to, highway or bridge projects eligible under title 23, United States Code; public transportation projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code; passenger and freight rail transportation projects; and port infrastructure investments (including inland port infrastructure and land ports of entry): *Provided further*, That the Secretary may use up to 20 percent of the funds made available under this heading for the purpose of paying the subsidy and administrative costs of projects eligible for Federal credit assistance under chapter 6 of title 23, United States Code, if the Secretary finds that such use of the funds would advance the purposes of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That in distributing funds provided under this heading, the Secretary shall take such measures so as to ensure an equitable geographic distribution of funds, an appropriate balance in addressing the needs of urban and rural areas, and the investment in a variety of transportation modes: *Provided further*, That a grant funded under this heading shall be not less than $2,000,000 and not greater than $15,000,000: *Provided further*, That not more than 20 percent of the funds made available under this heading may be awarded to projects in a single State: *Provided further*, That the Federal share of the costs for which an expenditure is made under this heading shall be, at the option of the recipient, up to 50 percent: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall give priority to projects that require a contribution of Federal funds in order to complete an overall financing package: *Provided further*, That not less than 10 percent of the funds provided under this heading shall be for projects located in rural areas: *Provided further*, That for projects located in rural areas, the minimum grant size shall be $1,000,000 and the Secretary may increase the Federal share of costs above 80 percent: *Provided further*, That projects conducted using funds provided under this heading must comply with the requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall conduct a new competition to select the grants and credit assistance awarded under this heading: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may retain up to $5,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading, and may transfer portions of those funds to the Administrators of the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration and the Maritime Administration, to fund the award and oversight of grants and credit assistance made under the National Infrastructure Investments program.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I am looking at the figures for this year. There is a $500 million appropriation for that program in the current year. Is the gentlewoman aware that the Department of Transportation has already received 950 preapplications, totaling $14.5 billion? That is 29 times the amount available.

What does that suggest about the need for this program?

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

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

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

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

I thank the gentlewoman.

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

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

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

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

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

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

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

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

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

□ 2030

Madam Chair, my district is heavily reliant on all forms of transportation. The Chicagoland area is the hub for the Nation's transportation network. Over 925 million tons of freight move in and out of Chicago each and every year, and each workday, tens of thousands of citizens of the 10th Congressional District use commuter rail.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Madam Chair, I take second place to no one in this body as the champion of the TIGER program, as I hope was evident in my support for the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) amendments just now; but we are underscoring in this amendment, while it is worthy in its intent—and I would love to be able to add a lot more money than this to the TIGER program—its offset is very worrisome and one that I think should lead us to oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. DOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CAPITAL

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

CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVES

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

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

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

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

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

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Working Capital Fund, not to exceed $181,500,000 shall be paid from appropriations made available to the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That such services shall be provided on a competitive basis to entities within the Department of Transportation: *Provided further*, That the above limitation on operating expenses shall not apply to non-DOT entities: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated in this Act to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without majority approval of the Working Capital Fund Steering Committee and approval of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

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

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

SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION AND OUTREACH

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

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, this amendment eliminates the $155 million of discretionary spending that is wasted on one of the least essential programs in the entire United States Government, the so-called Essential Air Service. That is the program that subsidizes empty and near-empty planes to fly from small airports to regional hubs just a few hours or less away by car.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the same principle holds true of governments.

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 2045

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

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, this is the kindest cut of all. It is a temporary program that was established 37 years ago and has become a poster child for wasteful Federal spending, and I believe the authorization ran out years ago. Our national debt has doubled in 8 years. American taxpayers pay $230 billion a year just in interest costs on that debt. That means if you are an average family paying average taxes, $2,000 of those taxes did nothing more than rent the money that we have already spent.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike lines 1 through 3.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

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

Thanks in part to the leadership of Mr. SENSENBRENNER in 1998, Congress passed similar antilobbying language to prohibit the Department of Transportation from lobbying State and local elected officials.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, administrative expenses for research and development, establishment of air navigation facilities, the operation (including leasing) and maintenance of aircraft, subsidizing the cost of aeronautical charts and maps sold to the public, lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, in addition to amounts made available by Public Law 112–95, $9,847,700,000 of which $8,831,250,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which not to exceed $7,505,293,000 shall be available for air traffic organization activities; not to exceed $1,258,411,000 shall be available for aviation safety activities; not to exceed $16,605,000 shall be available for commercial space transportation activities; not to exceed $725,000,000 shall be available for finance and management activities; not to exceed $60,089,000 shall be available for NextGen and operations planning activities; and not to exceed $282,302,000 shall be available for staff offices: *Provided*, That not to exceed 2 percent of any budget activity, except for aviation safety budget activity, may be transferred to any budget activity under this heading: *Provided further*, That no transfer may increase or decrease any appropriation by more than 2 percent: *Provided further*, That any transfer in excess of 2 percent shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 405 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall transmit to Congress an annual update to the report submitted to Congress in December 2004 pursuant to section 221 of Public Law 108–176: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by $100,000 for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to the Congress: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress a companion report that describes a comprehensive strategy for staffing, hiring, and training flight standards and aircraft certification staff in a format similar to the one utilized for the controller staffing plan, including stated attrition estimates and numerical hiring goals by fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by $100,000 per day for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to Congress: *Provided further*, That funds may be used to enter into a grant agreement with a nonprofit standard-setting organization to assist in the development of aviation safety standards: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for new applicants for the second career training program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Federal Aviation Administration to finalize or implement any regulation that would promulgate new aviation user fees not specifically authorized by law after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections funds received from States, counties, municipalities, foreign authorities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred in the provision of agency services, including receipts for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities, and for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station certificates, or for tests related thereto, or for processing major repair or alteration forms: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $154,400,000 shall be for the contract tower program, including the contract tower cost share program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act for aeronautical charting and cartography are available for activities conducted by, or coordinated through, the Working Capital Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2100

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

What this amendment would do is remove $25 million from the FAA budget and transfer it to rail. The reason for that is because the FAA has steadfastly refused to do part of their job in my district. I have tried to get them to come to the town of Milton, Massachusetts, to address the overflights in that area. The new NextGen RNAV system concentrates flight after flight, thousands of flights a month, over the town of Milton, Massachusetts.

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

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

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

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

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

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

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

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

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

□ 2115

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, technical support services, improvement by contract or purchase, and hire of national airspace systems and experimental facilities and equipment, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; engineering and service testing, including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available; and the purchase, lease, or transfer of aircraft from funds available under this heading, including aircraft for aviation regulation and certification; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, $2,500,000,000, of which $460,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, and $2,040,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment, improvement, and modernization of national airspace systems: *Provided further*, That upon initial submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2017 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a comprehensive capital investment plan for the Federal Aviation Administration which includes funding for each budget line item for fiscal years 2017 through 2021, with total funding for each year of the plan constrained to the funding targets for those years as estimated and approved by the Office of Management and Budget: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by $100,000 per day for each day after the initial submission of the fiscal year 2017 President's budget that such report has not been submitted to Congress.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

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

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

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

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 120. Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) determine the proportion that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(e) REDISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 125. Section 31111(b)(1)(A) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or of less than 28 feet on a semitrailer or trailer operating in a truck tractor-semitrailer-trailer combination,'' and inserting ''or, notwithstanding section 31112, of less than 33 feet on a semitrailer or trailer operating in a truck tractor-semitrailer-trailer combination,''.

SEC. 126. EXEMPTION.—

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 31112(c)(5) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''Nebraska may'' and inserting ''Nebraska and Kansas may''; and

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

(b) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 31112(c) of such title is amended—

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

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

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

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

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

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

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

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2130

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 134.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 135. None of the funds made available by this Act or previous appropriations Acts under the heading ''Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs'' shall be used to pay for costs associated with design, development, testing, or implementation of a wireless roadside inspection program until 180 days after the Secretary of Transportation certifies to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that such program does not conflict with existing non-Federal electronic screening systems, create capabilities already available, or require additional statutory authority to incorporate generated inspection data into safety determinations or databases, and has restrictions to specifically address privacy concerns of affected motor carriers and operators: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the Department's ongoing research efforts in this area.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary, with respect to traffic and highway safety authorized under chapter 301 and part C of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, $150,000,000, of which $20,000,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2017.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 12, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $1,200,000)''.

Page 142, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 2145

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which seeks to bolster funds for the inspector general of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, or Amtrak.

I am a strong proponent of government oversight, and I believe the revelatory work of the inspector general should be staunchly supported within each agency of the Federal Government.

Today, given the dismal financial record of Amtrak through its history, compounded with recent safety failures, it is clear that the scrupulous, objective oversight of the inspector general is needed for this agency now more than ever.

This amendment redirects $500,000 to the Amtrak Office of the Inspector General salaries and expenses account to bring it up to the budget request level.

Since the Inspector General Act was passed into law, the IG community has saved taxpayers billions of dollars and has uncovered countless examples of wrongdoing in the Federal Government. The inspector general community does good work. Let's give them the resources they need.

The committee has noted the good work of the Amtrak OIG in the committee report, stating: ''The OIG's efforts have resulted in valuable studies and recommendations for this committee and for the Corporation that have yielded cost savings and management improvements. These studies have been in a number of areas, including food and beverage service, capital planning, overtime, and fraud.''

I commend the committee for the work they have done to support efficient and effective government.

This amendment is directly in line with the high value the committee places on the thorough work of the OIG and will ensure additional transparency and accountability within Amtrak.

There is a wide agreement about the need to reform, streamline, and improve Amtrak. A valuable first step in that reform is supporting the objective, rigorous auditing information which the OIG is uniquely qualified to produce.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of government accountability by giving the Amtrak OIG the resources they need to identify the waste, fraud, and abuse within a government agency that is in desperate need of reform.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, $125,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2016, are in excess of $125,000,000, of which $120,000,000 shall be for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 403 and $5,000,000 shall be for the National Driver Register authorized under chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That within the $120,000,000 obligation limitation for operations and research, $20,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017, and shall be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for future years: *Provided further*, That $6,500,000 of the total obligation limitation for operations and research in fiscal year 2016 shall be applied toward unobligated balances of contract authority provided in prior Acts for carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent on the enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109–59, as amended by Public Law 112–141, and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112–141, to remain available until expended, $561,500,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account): *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2016, are in excess of $561,500,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109–59, as amended by Public Law 112–141, and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112–141, of which $235,000,000 shall be for ''Highway Safety Programs'' under 23 U.S.C. 402; $272,000,000 shall be for ''National Priority Safety Programs'' under 23 U.S.C. 405; $29,000,000 shall be for the ''High Visibility Enforcement Program'' under section 2009 of Public Law 109–59, as amended by Public Law 112–141; $25,500,000 shall be for ''Administrative Expenses'' under section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112–141: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for construction, rehabilitation, or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local or private buildings or structures: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 of the funds made available for ''National Priority Safety Programs'' under 23 U.S.C. 405 for ''Impaired Driving Countermeasures'' (as described in subsection (d) of that section) shall be available for technical assistance to the States: *Provided further*, That with respect to the ''Transfers'' provision under 23 U.S.C. 405(a)(1)(G), any amounts transferred to increase the amounts made available under section 402 shall include the obligation authority for such amounts: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of any exercise of the authority granted under the previous proviso or under 23 U.S.C. 405(a)(1)(G) within 60 days.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 140. An additional $130,000 shall be made available to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, out of the amount limited for section 402 of title 23, United States Code, to pay for travel and related expenses for State management reviews and to pay for core competency development training and related expenses for highway safety staff.

SEC. 141. The limitations on obligations for the programs of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration set in this Act shall not apply to obligations for which obligation authority was made available in previous public laws but only to the extent that the obligation authority has not lapsed or been used.

SEC. 142. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to implement section 404 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 143. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to obligate or award funds for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's National Roadside Survey.

SEC. 144. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to mandate global positioning system (GPS) tracking in private passenger motor vehicles without providing full and appropriate consideration of privacy concerns under 5 U.S.C. chapter 5, subchapter II.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SAFETY AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, $186,870,000, of which $15,400,000 shall remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $16,930,000)''.

Page 52, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $83,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that will bolster our Nation's rail safety and operations.

First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for his dedication and important work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the number of train derailments and accidents in our local communities is a growing concern among my constituents and Americans all across the country.

In the first 2 months of 2015, there were 18 Amtrak accidents, as well as recent oil train derailments in West Virginia and in North Dakota. Most recently, Mr. Chairman, an Amtrak train crash in Philadelphia killed eight people and injured dozens more.

In New Jersey alone, there are 2,400 miles of freight lines and over 1,000 passenger rail miles, and we must ensure, Mr. Chairman, that these existing lines are operating safely.

So what do we have here? My amendment fully funds the Federal Railroad Administration's safety and operations account without increasing spending in the underlying bill. The FRA's safety and operations account provides funding for the FRA's safety program activities related to passenger and freight railroads.

So how do we do this? By reallocating a mere 4 percent of funding from capital investment grants, we can fund the safe operation of our Nation's trains at the President's requested levels.

Mr. Chairman, we do not build a new section onto our house if our roof is caving in. So we should not be adding on to these systems if they are caving in or failing.

So why are we funding new projects before we ensure that our current rail lines have enough dollars, enough funding for their safety?

My amendment would simply prioritize safety and maintenance of our existing infrastructure over the ribbon-cutting ceremonies associated with system expansion.

In light of the recent upsurge in deadly rail accidents, now is the time to adequately fund the safety and operations of our trains. Additionally, with our rising national debt, it is very important that we remain fiscally responsible and prioritize how we spend our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars.

That is why, in conclusion, my amendment does not increase spending, but only prioritizes a commonsense directive. And so I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to fund train safety, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, while I know and I am absolutely certain that the gentleman from New Jersey's heart is in the right place, unfortunately, I cannot support the offset.

The committee carefully calculated the New Start numbers to be able to accommodate the signed FFGAs and Small Starts Grant Agreements at the beginning of the fiscal year, and I am a firm believer that once you sign a grant, once you make that commitment, we should honor it. This reduction would impact those signed agreements, so I reluctantly oppose this amendment.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to echo his opposition to this amendment, although I do commend Mr. GARRETT for his focus on safety and operations. I, too, would like to raise that appropriation to the request level. That is a good objective.

There are a couple of problems here, though. One, is that because of differences in outlay rates, to pick up $17 million on the safety and operations side you have to cut $83 million from the transit New Starts. That has to do with differences in outlay rates. But the fact is, it is a substantial cut. And these New Starts in the bill, I remind colleagues, are already $1.3 billion below the President's request. They are $198 million below what we have this year.

These are badly underfunded items. So we simply, again, are robbing Peter to pay Paul. But because of the disproportionate impact here, and the fact that New Starts are already so underresourced, I reluctantly oppose this amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, two points. The first is, I understand the gentleman's opposition on procedural grounds as far as the differences in outlays and what have you. But when you go back home and talk to your district and say you are trying to do something for safety, as we are in this case, and you say: Well, the reason we can't do this is the procedural aspect of outlays versus the actual amount of money going in and the amount of money being cut, and so on and so forth, and you go through all the rubric and the matrix that we use around here and all the buzz words on the floor to try to explain things, the eyes of the people back home glaze over, rightfully so, because they say: Those are your rules, not ours. Why don't you just get something done.

What they are asking to get done is rail safety. And that is what this amendment does.

I just want to end with one quote. Back in 2010, the head of the FTA—at that time, the administrator was Peter Rogoff—chastised local transit agencies for promoting rail construction for so many new rail lines. He said on one hand, agencies were unable to maintain the rail lines they already had. The FTA had recently at that point estimated that rail transit systems suffered from close to a $60 billion maintenance backlog—and the backlog was growing even then.

And he said this: ''If you can't afford to operate the systems you have,'' he asked the agencies, ''why does it make sense for us to partner with you in new expansions?''

That is a great question. If they can't fix up what is already out there and all the problems on the rail lines out there on important things like safety, then why on Earth are we spending all these tens of millions of dollars on brand new programs that we know that they are not going to be able to maintain as well? Let's do first things first.

As I said in my little example before, if your roof is collapsing on your house, you don't add a new deck, you don't put in a new pool, you don't put in a paved new driveway, you don't do anything else. You repair the roof, first and foremost, and then everything else comes after that.

And that is really all I am asking. Let's maintain the safety, first and foremost, so that everyone riding on the rails can feel confident that they are operating right. Then, after that, let's come back here to the floor and fix up the other funding mechanism for new programs and what have you, and go forward.

Right now, let's make sure that our constituents back home can feel confident every time they ride on a transit system, be it a bus or train or something else, that they know that it is adequately funded and taken care of and maintained.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, $39,100,000, to remain available until expended.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT FINANCING PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue direct loans and loan guarantees pursuant to sections 501 through 504 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–210), as amended, such authority to exist as long as any such direct loan or loan guarantee is outstanding. *Provided*, That pursuant to section 502 of such Act, as amended, no new direct loans or loan guarantee commitments shall be made using Federal funds for the credit risk premium during fiscal year 2016.

OPERATING GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make quarterly grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, in amounts based on the Secretary's assessment of the Corporation's seasonal cash flow requirements, for the operation of intercity passenger rail, as authorized by section 101 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–432), $288,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amounts available under this paragraph shall be available for the Secretary to approve funding to cover operating losses for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific train route: *Provided further*, That each such grant request shall be accompanied by a detailed financial analysis, revenue projection, and capital expenditure projection justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Corporation shall transmit, in electronic format, to the Secretary and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations the annual budget, business plan, the 5-Year Financial Plan for fiscal year 2016 required under section 204 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 and the comprehensive fleet plan for all Amtrak rolling stock: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall include annual information on the maintenance, refurbishment, replacement, and expansion for all Amtrak rolling stock consistent with the comprehensive fleet plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall provide monthly performance reports in an electronic format which shall describe the work completed to date, any changes to the business plan, and the reasons for such changes as well as progress against the milestones and target dates of the 2012 performance improvement plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation's budget, business plan, 5-Year Financial Plan, semiannual reports, monthly reports, comprehensive fleet plan and all supplemental reports or plans comply with requirements in Public Law 112–55: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to support any route on which Amtrak offers a discounted fare of more than 50 percent off the normal peak fare: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso does not apply to routes where the operating loss as a result of the discount is covered by a State and the State participates in the setting of fares.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

□ 2200

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with this very simple amendment. It is one that is meant to shed light on inadequate investments that are being made in our Nation's passenger rail service.

The bill before us appropriates nearly $16 billion for aviation, over $40 billion for our roads, over $10 billion for public transit, but just $1.1 billion for our Nation's passenger rail service.

I represent Las Vegas, where we import everything from tourists to lobsters, so we certainly understand the importance of transportation mobility.

It is interesting, many international and domestic travelers alike are shocked to learn, when they are coming to Las Vegas, that a major metropolitan city, home to more than 2 million residents and playground and boardroom to over 42 million visitors a year, we just don't have access to passenger rail service.

Visitors from Europe or Asia are accustomed to taking trains from one city to another, and they face a sad reality when traveling to Las Vegas from other Southwestern tourist destinations.

From Los Angeles, for example, you would have to take a 7-hour train ride that drops you off in Kingman, Arizona, at 1:30 in the morning. There, you would have to find the bus station, which is 4 miles away, get on a bus at 4 in the morning to travel another 3 hours to downtown Las Vegas. That is just crazy.

The last Amtrak train on the Desert Wind line departed the back of the Plaza Hotel in May of 1997, bound for Los Angeles.

Well, a lot has changed since the late 1990s. Over the last 17 years, southern Nevada's population has grown by a million new residents, and 10 million more visitors travel to southern Nevada annually, putting enormous strain on our area's highways and the airport, which is among the top 10 busiest airports in the country.

More than 42,000 vehicles also cross the I–15 border between California and Nevada daily. If you have traveled along that busy stretch of road, you know the kind of traffic nightmares that you might encounter.

In fact, I recently spoke with an airline pilot who frequently makes the short flight between Los Angeles and Las Vegas, and he remarked that you can't get lost. All you have to do is follow the red brake lights on I–15 all the way to McCarran.

We can and we must do better; but this isn't just about Las Vegas. Cities like Phoenix, Arizona; Nashville, Tennessee; Columbus, Ohio; Louisville, Kentucky; and Boise, Idaho, don't have passenger rail service either.

In addition, there is no direct rail service between major metropolitan areas like Houston and Dallas, Atlanta and Orlando, and Kansas City and Oklahoma City. I believe that expanding rail service to unserved communities like those in southern Nevada should be a priority, but, unfortunately, this legislation before us does not really get us there.

At the end of April, I organized a roundtable back in my district to discuss the need to restore passenger service to Las Vegas, and I was really surprised by the high level of interest from local stakeholders.

We had participants from our State and local transportation authorities, the gaming and hotel industries, the chamber of commerce, labor unions and economic development organizations, all in agreement that southern Nevada should have passenger rail service as part of our long-term economic viability plans. This type of development is a regional and should be a national priority.

Now, a lot of attention has been paid to the Northeast corridor, where travelers frequent Amtrak service along the East Coast, but we should not forget that it was the railroad that built the West and still, today, remains a critical piece of our transportation network.

China is investing $128 million in rail in 2015 alone and India, $137 billion over the next 5 years; yet we are investing only $1.1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, since this amendment really has no monetary impact, I would respectfully ask that you accept it. It is my hope that we recognize this mode of transportation that is so tied to our Nation's history and that we can continue to work together to see that it gets the attention and support that it deserves.

Thank you very much for your time and your consideration. I hope that, together, we can work to be sure that passenger rail service is expanded throughout the country and especially in the Southwest.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, strike line 6 and all that follows through page 47, line 3.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, America recently suffered four straight trillion dollar deficits. In the past few months, America's debt blew through the $18 trillion mark.

America pays over $200 billion per year in debt service, which is more than four times what the Federal Government spends on highways, bridges, and interstates each year. America's Comptroller General warns that America's deficits and debt paths are unsustainable.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office warns that our debt service cost is on a path to increase by another $600 billion within a decade, to more than $800 billion per year. That is more than America spends each year on national defense. The CBO also warns that, within a decade, if current trends continue, America will face yearly trillion dollar deficits in perpetuity.

Per then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen's testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, debt is America's ''greatest threat to our national security.''

As a result of America's debt, in a few short years, America's uniformed military personnel numbers will be our smallest since before World War II, America's Navy will have the smallest number of operational naval vessels since World War I, and America's Air Force will have its smallest number of operational aircraft in its history. Debt, not our enemies, is slowly but surely stripping America of its ability to defend itself.

In sum, Washington's financial irresponsibility, this House of Representatives' financial irresponsibility, is pushing America into a debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy that will destroy the American Dream for our children and grandchildren.

It is in this setting that I beseech this House of Representatives to be financially responsible by supporting my amendment that eliminates Federal Government operating subsidies of Amtrak, thus forcing Amtrak to operate in the black.

How bad is the Amtrak subsidy problem? The Congressional Research Service reports that, from 1971 to 2015, Federal Amtrak subsidies totaled $78 billion in constant 2015 dollars. In fiscal year 2014, Amtrak had a net loss of $1.1 billion. Who paid for that loss? America's children and grandchildren, that is who.

How so? It is because America does not have the money and had to borrow every penny of that $1.1 billion, thus burdening Americans for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, a business that relies on subsidies and tax dollars to cover losses has little incentive to operate efficiently or effectively or, for that matter, as safely as it should.

It is appalling that the Federal Government undermines and threatens the future of America's children and grandchildren in order to subsidize Amtrak passenger service that would be self-sufficient if Amtrak riders stopped mooching off of hard-working American taxpayers and, instead, simply paid for the actual cost of their rides.

Amtrak supporters often claim that Amtrak will go out of business if it is not subsidized by American taxpayers. That is bunk unsupported by facts.

This same ''woe is me'' argument was made about freight train subsidies; yet, when freight rail subsidies ended and freight rail was sold to private investors in the 1980s, freight rail did not go out of business and still operates today.

Similarly, the Federal Government does not operate or subsidize national airlines or national bus services; yet airlines and buses operate profitably in the private sector, despite Federal Government subsidies for Amtrak, their competitor.

Just as airlines, bus services, and freight rail operate without government subsidies, Amtrak will do the same if this House of Representatives has the courage to wean Amtrak from the taxpayer nipple.

Mr. Chairman, after more than 40 years, it is time to stop the runaway Amtrak train. It is time to force Amtrak riders to pay their own way by ending their subsidized rides on the backs of American taxpayers.

I urge adoption of my amendment to do just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which, purely and simply, would end intercity passenger rail for our Nation.

I remind colleagues, there is not a single mode of transportation in this country that is not subsidized, contrary to what we have just heard.

To make the case further, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), a distinguished member of the authorizing committee.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, when I was coming up, I used to like this television show, ''Robin Hood.'' My colleagues practice what I call reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the working people and the poor people and the transit people to give tax breaks to the rich.

Just a few weeks ago, the House Republicans passed a bill cutting taxes by $269 billion—I guess that didn't affect the deficit—for their wealthiest friends, but can't find the $2 billion that we need for Amtrak—shameful.

The funding cuts proposed in this amendment would simply force Amtrak to shut down, strand millions of rail passengers, disrupt commuter operations, add to our already congested roads and airports, eliminate over 20,000 jobs nationwide, and jeopardize local economies and businesses that depend on Amtrak's service.

Amtrak provides the majority of all intercity passenger rail service in the United States, with more States and localities across America turning to passenger rail to meet the transportation needs of our citizens.

Amtrak has done an excellent job, based on the fact that 9/11, when we were attacked, Amtrak was the only means that you could move away.

When we had Hurricane Katrina, Amtrak is the only way that we could move people out of harm's way by evacuating and delivering food and water and supplies.

Amtrak has made significant improvement in its system over the last several years, has steady increase in ridership numbers, played a vital role in disaster recovery, and has an ambitious agenda for future growth.

I encourage all Members to vote against this ill-willed and ill-thought-out amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would respond that there is no factual basis for the gentlewoman's comments that have just been made.

Socialism does not work. We need to get Amtrak passengers off the backs of all taxpayers, including those that are poor, that can't afford the taxes that they are already having to pay to benefit those Amtrak riders. Let's set them free.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Let me thank the ranking member.

The fact of the matter is, notwithstanding what was offered to the House as the picture of America, we actually live in the greatest country in the world. We have the strongest economy. We are the wealthiest country. There is no country, based on the IMF, that would want to trade our position vis-a-vis debt-to-wealth ratio.

I hear the gentleman saying, Woe is America, and we can't afford to subsidize rail. I think the ranking member makes it clear that there is no form of transportation that is not subsidized.

I heard this utterance that we don't subsidize airplane travel. This is nonsensical. Just the facts of this bill itself outline some of our country's subsidies for our airline industry.

□ 2215

But I want to talk about Amtrak.

When it is said that there is a $1 billion subsidy and that somehow we can't afford that from last year, I want

to remind this House that for each and every month we have been in Afghanistan, we have been spending $2 billion a week for well over a decade, as a Nation. The idea that we can't afford to have a first-rate passenger rail system defies logic. It is just a matter of political will.

We need to make a decision about America's place in the world, and our economy is dependent on our ability to transport not just freight but human beings, and Amtrak is critical to that.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me time.

I hope this House will reconsider this thrust of the majority to move away from passenger rail. I heard some talk from the gentleman that we have got to stop this runaway train, but we tried to stop a train in Philadelphia, and if we had made the investments, there would be people who would be alive today.

We need to make these investments, and we need to move our country forward. It is not about political philosophy. It is about practicality.

Our economic competitors are subsidizing rail. And if we want to make our economy work, we are going to have to make Amtrak work. And we can do that through some of the efforts on this bill today.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for his wise words and join him in wholeheartedly opposing this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CAPITAL AND DEBT SERVICE GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for capital investments as authorized by sections 101(c), 102, and 219(b) of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–432), $850,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $160,200,000 shall be for debt service obligations as authorized by section 102 of such Act: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, not less than $50,000,000 shall be made available to bring Amtrak-served facilities and stations into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act: *Provided further*, That after an initial distribution of up to $200,000,000, which shall be used by the Corporation as a working capital account, all remaining funds shall be provided to the Corporation only on a reimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, up to $20,000,000 may be used by the Secretary to subsidize operating losses of the Corporation should the funds provided under the heading ''Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation'' be insufficient to meet operational costs for fiscal year 2016: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may retain up to one-half of 1 percent of the funds provided under this heading to fund the costs of project management and oversight of activities authorized by subsections 101(a) and 101(c) of division B of Public Law 110–432: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall approve funding for capital expenditures, including advance purchase orders of materials, for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific capital project justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That except as otherwise provided herein, none of the funds under this heading may be used to subsidize operating losses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be used for capital projects not approved by the Secretary of Transportation or on the Corporation's fiscal year 2016 business plan: *Provided further*, That in addition to the project management oversight funds authorized under section 101(d) of division B of Public Law 110–432, the Secretary may retain up to an additional $3,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading to fund expenses associated with implementing section 212 of division B of Public Law 110–432, including the amendments made by section 212 to section 24905 of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall conduct a business case analysis on capital investments that exceed $10,000,000 in life-cycle costs: *Provided further*, That each contract for a capital acquisition that exceeds $10,000,000 in life cycle costs shall state that funding is subject to the availability of appropriated funds provided by an appropriations Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $861,500,000)''.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases capital grants to Amtrak by $861 million. This will bring the total funding for Amtrak in the bill to $2 billion, equal to Amtrak's fiscal year 2016 budget request to Congress.

This bill, as if it wasn't bad enough, cut $290 million from Amtrak's capital program, which is used to repair and replace aging infrastructure on the Northeast corridor, including 140-year-old bridges and tunnels, and implement positive train control, a system that, according to the National Transportation Safety Board, would have prevented the recent Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia.

According to the April 2015 report to Congress, ''At the current rate of available funding, it would take over 300 years to replace all of the bridges on the Northeast corridor, well beyond the timeframe in which assets would simply be shut down.''

The list of critical needs extends far beyond just bridges and tunnels. Major portions of Amtrak's electrical power supply system date back to 1930.

According to the commission, in total, $21.1 billion is needed to achieve a state of good repair on the corridor, $8.7 billion of which is needed to address critical infrastructure needs over the next 5 years.

We cannot point to the recent Amtrak derailment and say that it was directly caused by a lack of investment. That is true. But we do know from the NTSB that it was preventable had positive train control been installed on that section of track.

Amtrak included $36.4 million in their $2 billion fiscal year 2016 budget request to Congress. Amtrak testified at a hearing in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee yesterday that had they been provided adequate funding from the get-go, they would have been able to implement positive train control sooner.

The impact of this tragic accident could also have been lessened had the Republican-controlled Congress not denied Amtrak's request for funding to replace passenger cars that date back to 1975 with newer cars.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I think it is critically important that we understand that the President requested an increase in capital allotments for Amtrak. Not only was that not honored, but we actually went with the wisdom of the majority: we actually cut last year's number by over $250-plus million.

This is a move in the wrong direction for our country, and I hope that through the gentlewoman's amendment, we can reverse that. So I stand in support of it, and I hope that the majority would allow us to proceed to a vote.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5 of the 114th Congress, which states the following:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, just a few short weeks ago, House Republicans passed a bill cutting taxes by $269 billion for their wealthiest friends, yet we can't find $2 billion for Amtrak to make it safe?

My friend from Florida, this is unacceptable; shame.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman needs to confine her remarks to the point of order.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thought I was speaking to the point of order, sir.

That is my point. We cut $269 billion, and we can't find $2 billion to make Amtrak safe? That is the point.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budgetary authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, strike line 4 and all that follows through page 49, line 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, my first amendment, Brooks No. 19, strikes $288.5 million in operating subsidies for Amtrak. This second amendment, which is Brooks No. 21, strikes capital and debt service subsidies that total $850 million per year to get to the point where we can strike all taxpayer subsidies for Amtrak.

I would rely on the arguments previously made with respect to my first amendment to support this second amendment.

I would add, however, that I have heard some comments about the safety associated with Amtrak. I would emphasize at this point that if you want safety with rail service, probably the best thing to do is to put it in the private sector and eliminate Amtrak altogether.

Look at airlines, air carriers; they are private sector and are much safer than Amtrak. Look at buses; they are private sector and are safer than Amtrak. And I would submit that if lives are what concern the opponents to these amendments that they would propose putting Amtrak into private hands in order to have the same kind of safety record that we have with buses, air carriers, and other modes of private transportation.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I very strongly oppose this amendment which, like the gentleman's previous amendment, would essentially end passenger rail service in this country. It is just that drastic. It is also targeting passenger rail in a way that obscures the fact that every mode of transportation in this country is subsidized. It is in the public interest to maintain diverse modes of transportation that serve our various transportation needs and our various population centers.

Amtrak provides an invaluable service to this country: 500 destinations in 46 States, connecting small communities that don't have access to air service.

Amtrak is popular with the American people. It is increasingly being taken advantage of. In the last 11 years, 10 consecutive years of record ridership, serving nearly 32 million passengers last year.

Without Amtrak's service in the Northeast corridor, where would we be? There would be virtual gridlock in New York's airports, but it is not just the Northeast corridor. I come from a State that had the insight years ago to invest in State Amtrak service, and now Amtrak is the preferred mode of transportation for thousands of people between Raleigh and Charlotte, with three full routes a day in each direction.

This is an irresponsible amendment. It will eliminate thousands of jobs. It will harm local economies. And it will violate labor agreements. There is so much wrong with this.

I urge its rejection and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the argument that this would end rail service is absolutely false and is not supported by history. Nothing in history supports the gentleman's argument. However well-intentioned, the evidence is clear.

Freight rail, the same kind of argument was made. Subsidies were ended. It went into the private sector. It survives and thrives today.

There is an argument that buses and air carriers are somehow or another subsidized. I would submit that what we are talking about, there are user fees and there are gasoline taxes and diesel taxes that pay for those roads that buses use, and there are air passenger charges that pay for the cost of those airports that air carriers use.

So with that as a backdrop, I would submit that it is time for Amtrak passengers to pay their own way. It is time for Amtrak passengers to quit riding on the backs of other taxpayers. They have the ability to pay their own way. The rest of the country is expected to pay their own way when they travel. As such, I would ask this body to adopt my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 150. The Secretary of Transportation may receive and expend cash, or receive and utilize spare parts and similar items, from non-United States Government sources to repair damages to or replace United States Government owned automated track inspection cars and equipment as a result of third-party liability for such damages, and any amounts collected under this section shall be credited directly to the Safety and Operations account of the Federal Railroad Administration, and shall remain available until expended for the repair, operation and maintenance of automated track inspection cars and equipment in connection with the automated track inspection program.

SEC. 151. None of the funds provided to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation may be used to fund any overtime costs in excess of $35,000 for any individual employee: *Provided*, That the President of Amtrak may waive the cap set in the previous proviso for specific employees when the President of Amtrak determines such a cap poses a risk to the safety and operational efficiency of the system: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations each quarter of the calendar year on waivers granted to employees and amounts paid above the cap for each month within such quarter and delineate the reasons each waiver was granted: *Provided further*, That the President of Amtrak shall report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by March 1, 2016, a summary of all overtime payments incurred by the Corporation for 2015 and the three prior calendar years: *Provided further*, That such summary shall include the total number of employees that received waivers and the total overtime payments the Corporation paid to those employees receiving waivers for each month for 2015 and for the three prior calendar years.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal Transit Administration's programs authorized by chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, $102,933,000, of which not more than $4,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5329 and not less than $750,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5326: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided or limited in this Act may be used to create a permanent office of transit security under this heading: *Provided further*, That upon submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2017 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to Congress the annual report on New Starts, including proposed allocations for fiscal year 2017.

□ 2230

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 52, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Rhode Island and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today with my good friends Congressmen QUIGLEY and BUTTERFIELD will return funding for FTA Technical Assistance and Training back to its 2014 level. Older adults and individuals with disabilities disproportionately rely on public transit to live, learn, get to work and access recreation in their communities. The Technical Assistance and Training dollars made available by this amendment will help increase mobility for people with disabilities and older adults. By providing this assistance to our transit systems and services, we can ensure that they become more accessible for those who rely on them the most.

Mr. Chairman, FTA has a long history of working with Easter Seals, the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, and others to provide training, technical assistance, and other problem-solving support to the transit industry, people with disabilities, and older adults; and it is imperative that this work continue as more people age and more people with disabilities seek to live as independently as possible.

Now, in order to realize this goal, FTA needs adequate resources to support these technical assistance activities. To that end, my amendment will increase funding by $2 million for FTA Technical Assistance and Training and reduce, by an equivalent amount, funding for FTA administrative expenses.

Mr. Chairman, the House adopted this exact amendment last year to restore FTA Technical Assistance and Training to $5 million. Unfortunately, it was cut to $3 million in this bill. My amendment will simply restore the funds back to the fiscal year '15 House-adopted level of $5 million.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues support this amendment, which will provide a world of benefit to all those that it serves.

I thank my colleagues today for their consideration.

Again, I urge passage of the amendment, and with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

Clerk read as follows:

TRANSIT FORMULA GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in the Federal Public Transportation Assistance Program in this account, and for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112–141, and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112–141, $9,500,000,000, to be derived from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or execution of programs authorized under 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112–141, and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112–141, shall not exceed total obligations of $8,595,000,000 in fiscal year 2016.

TRANSIT RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5312, $26,000,000.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5314 $3,000,000.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5309, $1,921,395,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $230,000,000)''.

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $230,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, as you know, we are very in debt in this country. This budget is on path to balance the budget eventually years down the road, but, really, we should be looking to cut spending right now.

You look at things the Federal Government is paying for that should be done locally, and one of those things is these new capital improvements on mass transit projects. I think normally these things do not get the ridership that justifies these projects, and we would not be doing these projects, local governments would not be applying for these projects or building these projects if they had to pay their money themselves. The only reason these things go ahead is the Federal Government is paying for them, and the Federal Government has no money.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal will bring back down the funding on this line to what the Appropriations Committee wanted only 2 years ago, and for whatever reason, apparently in negotiations, this amount went up last year. But I don't think it is too much to ask that this House not zero out this line—and we could argue that we shouldn't be doing this at all—but at least go back to the levels of 2013, especially given the huge amount of debt that is being piled up at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the committee carefully calculated the New Start number to be able to accommodate the signed FFGAs and Small Starts Grant Agreements at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Again, as I submitted before, I am a firm believer that once you sign a grant agreement, then we should, frankly, honor that. This reduction would impact those signed agreements, and I reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment. I know the passion that he has for this, but I again have to reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's yielding. I would like to echo his opposition to this amendment.

I have just retrieved here a list of New Start projects that, under the present funding levels of the bill, probably aren't going to be able to be addressed. We are talking about the Westside project in Los Angeles. We are talking about San Diego, Denver, Baltimore, the Washington, D.C. area, the Maryland National Capital Purple Line, Minneapolis, Fort Worth. These are ready to go. These are ready to go with strong support in their communities, a strong impact on moving people and providing jobs. It is just unthinkable that we would cut this further.

Transit is an extremely important mode of transportation in many of our cities and suburban areas too, and the bill is inadequate. We need to find ways to make it more adequate going forward.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would move exactly in the wrong direction, so I urge its defeat.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is all fine and good to move forward, but we are going to borrow about 14 percent of this budget, and we have got to stop saying whenever we see a spending item it is time to move forward. I think what we have to do here is—I can certainly understand if we made commitments today, I can understand how people of goodwill would not want this amendment. But if this amendment doesn't pass, then I think we have to make doubly certain that a year from now we have a dramatic reduction here.

If there are any of these projects that are that important, the local unit of government can fund it. There is no surer way to overspend than have the Federal Government give grants to local units of government that they would never dream of spending themselves.

That is what is going on here, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS TO THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

For grants to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority as authorized under section 601 of division B of Public Law 110–432, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall approve grants for capital and preventive maintenance expenditures for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority only after receiving and reviewing a request for each specific project: *Provided further*, That prior to approving such grants, the Secretary shall certify that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority is making significant progress in eliminating the material weaknesses, significant deficiencies, and minor control deficiencies identified in the most recent Financial Management Oversight Review: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall determine that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority has placed the highest priority on those investments that will improve the safety of the system before approving such grants: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, in order to ensure safety throughout the rail system, may waive the requirements of section 601(e)(1) of title VI of Public Law 110–432 (112 Stat. 4968).

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MICA

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 53, line 11, strike the colon and all that follows through line 15 and insert a period.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. My colleagues, at this late hour, this is a simple amendment. It strikes a waiver that was granted to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and it is a waiver that has been in place for several years. It waives the requirements for them to complete installation of cellular service in the tunnels of the Metro system in Washington, D.C. That waiver allows them to continue to receive Federal funds but not have made the installation.

It is funny because congressional staffers said: Well, Mr. MICA, why are you doing this? I am doing this because, as the chairman of a subcommittee on transportation oversight, I had to conduct a hearing after the January 12 deadly incident in the Washington area Metro. You may recall at L'Enfant Plaza, on the Yellow Line, there was an incident in which smoke filled the tunnel. A passenger train was left outside of the station.

I might say that, back in 2008, we set up a requirement that we have at the stations, within 1 year, Metro cellular service, and then by 4 years later, the entire system. So they were given from 2008 to 2012 to complete the system. They never completed the system. One individual died, others were injured, and we disrupted service. It was a day from hell in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, they never completed the job. They said they were going to complete the job right after 2012. They did not complete the job. They said it would be done in 2015. The last time I checked, it is 2015. It won't be done in 2015. They will not even sit down with the carriers who will install this equipment, and it is really at no cost to Metro.

I have talked to Mr. CONNOLLY, the gentleman from Virginia; I have talked to Mrs. COMSTOCK, the gentlewoman from Virginia; I have talked to Mr. HOYER, the gentleman from Maryland; and others. We have all had it with Metro not complying with us.

This waiver was put in to give them the opportunity to comply, and they haven't complied. Now it is in here again, and I am offering, in this amendment, to take it out.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), the chairman, for comment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Florida is talking about this issue, I think all of us should be very, very concerned. I will tell you I think that the gentleman from Florida has been beyond reasonable, has tried to get folks to do what they were, again, supposed to do, and they have not done it.

So I just want to let the gentleman from Florida know that I am looking forward, and I am committed to making sure that this issue is solved one way or another. I am hoping that it is solved in a nice, positive way. But otherwise, I want to let the gentleman from Florida know that I will be working with him to make sure that we hold folks accountable.

Mr. MICA. Again, Mr. Chairman, I am willing to work with everyone. Again, I have had to conduct oversight over a tragedy that could have and should have been prevented.

Here is the latest headline: ''Can You Hear Me Now? In Metro Tunnels, Answer Is 'Not Yet.' ''

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize deeply with the concerns expressed by my friend and colleague from Florida (Mr. MICA), and I know Metro is committed to working with the wireless carriers to ensure seamless coverage throughout the rail system. I appreciate his willingness ultimately to withdraw the amendment so as not to jeopardize other vital safety improvements underway at Metro by conditioning the Federal commitment, which has already been reduced and which is matched by our State and local partners, on completion of this wireless upgrade.

Without question, the January arcing incident at L'Enfant Plaza underscored the urgent need for having working communications in Metro's underground stations and tunnels. While faulty electrical wiring was to blame for the fire and hazardous smoke, a breakdown in communications, as Mr. MICA has indicated, led to passengers being stranded in dangerous conditions aboard that Yellow Line train for an extended period of time. It wasn't just public safety personnel who experienced problems communicating. Stranded riders also reported having spotty or no cellular service in the tunnel.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), our colleague, so he can complete his statement.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from North Carolina, the distinguished ranking member.

Tragically, one rider—Carol Glover of Virginia, my home State—died as a result of smoke inhalation, and dozens of others required medical treatment and/or hospitalization.

□ 2245

This was, and remains, an unacceptable situation, and I and all of the members of the national capital region delegation are committed to working with the NSTB, FTA, Metro, and our

regional partners to ensure corrective actions are taken to restore public confidence.

I would note for my colleagues, the current Federal law already includes language requiring Metro riders to have underground access to wireless telecommunications services if the service providers work with Metro to install such services. Unfortunately, they have lagged behind again, as my friend from Florida has indicated.

Congress approved that requirement as part of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008. One year later, as required by the law, the wireless providers did successfully establish service in the 20 busiest underground rail stations. However, Congress has granted an extension on the timeline to install wireless service to the tunnels and the rest of the system because Metro and the wireless providers have run into delays with scheduling work while Metro trains are not running, performing higher priority safety improvements as directed by the NTSB, and other factors. However, they continue to work toward meeting this requirement, albeit at a very slow and glacial pace.

Metro is particularly motivated to complete this work as it also involves a parallel upgrade of its own underground radio communications services. Metro is an essential component of this region's transportation network, moving hundreds of thousands of commuters every day, including a significant portion of Federal employees. It also serves as America's subway, transporting 12 million visitors from across the country to the Nation's Capital each year.

It is critical that we maintain this bipartisan commitment to match local and State funding so that Metro can continue working with the NTSB and FTA on its critical safety upgrades.

Mr. MICA is right, and all of us from the national capital region agree with him. I pledge upon withdrawal of this amendment we will work with Mr. MICA to ensure that Metro meets deadlines at a much more expeditious pace than has been the case in the past.

Again, I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding, and I thank Mr. MICA for his leadership.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I just want to conclude. I want to thank Mr. CONNOLLY. I want to thank Mrs. COMSTOCK, and the chairman particularly, for working on this.

I think we have gotten the attention of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. We have an agreement to bring the parties together as a result of this pending amendment. That is set. If it does not go through, I can assure you we will find a way to put this waiver in.

At this time, though, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. I will bring the parties together and hopefully common sense and good faith will prevail.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair.

I rise to offer an amendment with my colleagues in the national capital region that would restore full funding of the Federal commitment for vital rider safety improvements to ''America's Subway,'' the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, or Metro.

Let me remind my colleagues, this is not like the traditional transit or capital funding under the Department of Transportation. The Passenger Rail Investment Improvement Act of 2008 specifically authorized a $150 million annual Federal commitment for 10 years, and Congress has worked in bipartisan fashion the past 6 years to fulfill that. It was a Republican initiative initiated and authored by my predecessor, Republican member Tom Davis of Virginia.

As required by law, the Federal funding is matched dollar for dollar, with $150 million coming from Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

I appreciate the efforts of my fellow Virginian, Mr. RIGELL, and the subcommittee chairman, my friend, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, to try to work with us to restore some of the funding at full committee markup. But reducing any of this funding would renege on the Federal commitment and jeopardize the successful local-State-Federal partnership we have worked so hard to create.

It would also open the door for our partners to pull back on their commitments commensurately, which would only exacerbate Metro's challenge in upgrading its aging infrastructure.

This partnership is funding critical safety improvements throughout the system identified by Metro itself, the National Transportation Safety Board, and the Federal Transit Administration following the tragic 2009 Red Line accident and the recent tragedy on the Yellow Line this past January. The most visible improvement is the purchase of 7000-series new rail cars with advanced crash-resilient technology and extra capacity to replace the oldest and original cars in the fleet.

Congress and the Federal Government have a responsibility in the operation and safety of Metro. Half of all Metro stations are located on Federal property, and approximately 40 percent of rush-hour riders on Metro are, in fact, Federal employees, including many Members of Congress and their staffs.

It is critical we maintain this bipartisan commitment to match local and State funding so that Metro can continue making these safety upgrades.

I want to thank Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BEYER, and my friend Mrs. COMSTOCK for working with us on this regional priority.

I now yield the balance of my time to the distinguished delegate from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding and as a cosponsor of this amendment, which has profound safety implications for America's subway. I think it is so urgent that a member of the Appropriations Committee has already restored $25 million.

This was a partnership, a partnership between the Federal Government and Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. It became real after there was a crash that took the lives of nine District of Columbia residents in 2009.

This is a unique transit agency. This is where staff of this body, this is where visitors from all over the world ride. If this funding is delayed, it will delay the crashworthy 7000-series trains. It is in trains that were not crashworthy that we lost lives. We beg that this funding be restored.

The District, Maryland, and Virginia are each fulfilling their part of the partnership. It is up to the Federal Government to do our part and fulfill our part. Don't break the partnership open now.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, and I continue to reserve my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), who, obviously, is very passionate about this issue.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise as a cosponsor of the amendment in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as been pointed out by my colleagues, Congress did make a 10-year statutory commitment as a Federal partner, a 50–50 partner, to provide capital grant money to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. This funding has been used for vital

capital and safety improvements on the Metro system that so many of our constituents and our staff and tourists, people from all over the world, travel on every day.

As part of that agreement, matching grant money from the Commonwealth of Virginia, the District of Columbia, and the State of Maryland have all supplemented this in a full 50–50 match. This is truly a good partnership that has worked well since the bill was passed in 2008, and we should continue to fulfill that commitment.

This amendment would restore the already obligated funding to the bill and keep the promise that we have already made. Metro needs these important funds for capital improvements that will address important safety concerns.

I appreciate the opportunity to join my colleagues in the national capital area in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, which states the following:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I respectfully ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the invocation of the point of order.

This is a provision that has been in law for the past 6 years, and I believe that it ought to be enshrined in law for a 7th. We represent the entire National Capital Region. This is a unique region. This is the Nation's Capital. And we ought not to be reneging on a deal that was worked out with great effort 6 years ago based on a point of order.

With that, I oppose the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 160. The limitations on obligations for the programs of the Federal Transit Administration shall not apply to any authority under 49 U.S.C. 5338, previously made available for obligation, or to any other authority previously made available for obligation.

SEC. 161. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or limited by this Act under the heading Fixed Guideway Capital Investment of the Federal Transit Administration for projects specified in this Act or identified in reports accompanying this Act not obligated by September 30, 2020, and other recoveries, shall be directed to projects eligible to use the funds for the purposes for which they were originally provided.

SEC. 162. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated before October 1, 2015, under any section of chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, that remain available for expenditure, may be transferred to and administered under the most recent appropriation heading for any such section.

SEC. 163. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to enter into a full funding grant agreement for a project with a New Starts share greater than 50 percent.

SEC. 164. (a) LOSS OF ELIGIBILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds in this or any other Act may be available to advance in any way a new light or heavy rail project towards a full funding grant agreement as defined by 49 U.S.C. 5309 for the Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County, Texas if the proposed capital project is constructed on or planned to be constructed on Richmond Avenue west of South Shepherd Drive or on Post Oak Boulevard north of Richmond Avenue in Houston, Texas.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR A NEW ELECTION.—The Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County, Texas, may attempt to construct or construct a new fixed guideway capital project, including light rail, in the locations referred to in subsection (a) if—

(1) voters in the jurisdiction that includes such locations approve a ballot proposition that specifies routes on Richmond Avenue west of South Shepherd Drive or on Post Oak Boulevard north of Richmond Avenue in Houston, Texas; and

(2) the proposed construction of such routes is part of a comprehensive, multimodal, service-area wide transportation plan that includes multiple additional segments of fixed guideway capital projects, including light rail for the jurisdiction set forth in the ballot proposition. The ballot language shall include reasonable cost estimates, sources of revenue to be used and the total amount of bonded indebtedness to be incurred as well as a description of each route and the beginning and end point of each proposed transit project.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to the Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Corporation's budget for the current fiscal year.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses to conduct the operations, maintenance, and capital asset renewal activities of those portions of the Saint Lawrence Seaway owned, operated, and maintained by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, $32,042,000, to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99–662.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, $186,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses of operations and training activities authorized by law, $164,158,000, of which $22,000,000 shall remain available until expended for maintenance and repair of training ships at State Maritime Academies, and of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for National Security Multi-Mission Vessel design for State Maritime Academies and National Security, and of which $2,400,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2017, for the Student Incentive Program at State Maritime Academies, and of which $1,200,000 shall remain available until expended for training ship fuel assistance payments, and of which $19,700,000 shall remain available until expended for facilities maintenance and repair, equipment, and capital improvements at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and of which $3,000,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2017, for Maritime Environment and Technology Assistance grants, contracts, and cooperative agreement: *Provided*, That amounts apportioned for the United States Merchant Marine Academy shall be available only upon allotments made personally by the Secretary of Transportation or the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs: *Provided further*, That the Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent and the Director of the Office of Resource Management of the United States Merchant Marine Academy may not be allotment holders for the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and the Administrator of the Maritime Administration shall hold all allotments made by the Secretary of Transportation or the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That 50 percent of the funding made available for the United States Merchant Marine Academy under this heading shall be available only after the Secretary, in consultation with the Superintendent and the Maritime Administrator, completes a plan detailing by program or activity how such funding will be expended at the Academy, and this plan is submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SHIP DISPOSAL

For necessary expenses related to the disposal of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet of the Maritime Administration, $4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI) PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative expenses of the maritime guaranteed loan program, $3,135,000 shall be paid to the appropriations for ''Maritime Administration—Operations and Training''.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 170. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in addition to any existing authority, the Maritime Administration is authorized to furnish utilities and services and make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under control of the Maritime Administration: *Provided*, That payments received therefor shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the cost thereof and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That rental payments under any such lease, contract, or occupancy for items other than such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 171. None of the funds available or appropriated in this Act shall be used by the United States Department of Transportation or the United States Maritime Administration to negotiate or otherwise execute, enter into, facilitate or perform fee-for-service contracts for vessel disposal, scrapping or recycling, unless there is no qualified domestic ship recycler that will pay any sum of money to purchase and scrap or recycle a vessel owned, operated or managed by the Maritime Administration or that is part of the National Defense Reserve Fleet: *Provided*, That such sales offers must be consistent with the solicitation and provide that the work will be performed in a timely manner at a facility qualified within the meaning of section 3502 of Public Law 106–398: *Provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall affect the Maritime Administration's authority to award contracts at least cost to the Federal Government and consistent with the requirements of 54 U.S.C. 308704, section 3502, or otherwise authorized under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONAL EXPENSES

For necessary operational expenses of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, $20,725,000.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

For expenses necessary to discharge the hazardous materials safety functions of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, $60,500,000, of which $7,570,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That up to $800,000 in fees collected under 49 U.S.C. 5108(g) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, for reports publication and dissemination, and for travel expenses incurred in performance of hazardous materials exemptions and approvals functions.

PIPELINE SAFETY

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

(OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)

For expenses necessary to conduct the functions of the pipeline safety program, for grants-in-aid to carry out a pipeline safety program, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 60107, and to discharge the pipeline program responsibilities of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $145,870,000, of which $19,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and shall remain available until September 30, 2018; and of which $124,500,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which $66,309,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That not less than $1,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading shall be for the One-Call state grant program.

□ 2300

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 22, strike the period at the end insert the following: '': *Provided further*, That not less than $1,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading shall be for the finalization and implementation of rules required under section 60102(n) of title 49, United States Code, and section 8(b)(3) of the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (49 U.S.C. 60108 note; 125 Stat. 1911).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that will take a modest step forward to improve pipeline safety. This issue is of particular importance to me and to my constituents.

Two weeks ago, more than 100,000 gallons of crude oil spilled from the ruptured Plains All American Pipeline along the treasured Gaviota Coast, in my district, just north of Santa Barbara. The oil quickly flowed under the highway, onto the beach, and into the ocean where the oil slick spread south for miles along the coastline, affecting pristine environmental habitats, recreational interests, and commercial fishing operations.

While the exact causes of this spill are still being investigated, it is already clear that woefully inadequate Federal pipeline safety standards played a significant role, but it didn't have to be this way.

In 2011, the House worked in a bipartisan way to pass the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act. This law, which passed the House unanimously, directed the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or PHMSA, to update and strengthen key pipeline safety standards.

The law called on PHMSA to issue a rule requiring automatic shutoff valves on new pipelines and to strengthen requirements for the inclusion of leak detection technologies on pipelines.

The law required these rules to be finalized by January of last year; yet, here today, we are still waiting. PHMSA has not even issued a proposed rule on these commonsense regulations, which passed the House unanimously. PHMSA continues to drag its feet, and communities like mine continue to pay the price. It is time for PHMSA to follow the law and the bipartisan will of Congress.

My amendment is simple. It would set aside $1 million of PHMSA's own budget for the finalization and implementation of these overdue pipeline safety and spill mitigation rules.

My amendment would simply help ensure that section 4 and section 8 of the bipartisan 2011 pipeline safety law are finally implemented so that our Federal regulations are in line with today's reality.

My amendment does not cost a dime, and it does not authorize any new programs. Section 4 requires new pipelines to install automatic shutoff valves, and section 8 requires pipeline operators to use the latest leak detection technologies. Both of these provisions were enacted unanimously by this House in 2011.

The pipeline that burst in my district did not have an automatic shutoff valve despite the fact that other comparable pipelines in the area do use this technology. An automatic shutoff valve would not have prevented the spill necessarily, but it certainly would have minimized it. It took over 2 hours for the pipeline operator to even identify where the pipeline had ruptured, let alone to actually stop the flow of crude oil.

That is unacceptable. If the standards required under section 4 and section 8 had been required of the Plains pipeline in my district, the spill likely would have been much less severe. My amendment would take a small, yet important step forward to address these troubling issues by pushing PHMSA to get its act together and finalize these rules.

Mr. Chairman, oil and gas development, by its nature, is a dangerous and dirty business. The mere fact that the Plains and other companies have oil spill contingency funds shows that there is no such thing as a safe pipeline. Spills do happen, and they will continue to happen as long as we depend on fossil fuels for our energy needs. We have a responsibility, therefore, to do all we can to make these pipelines as safe as possible.

Congress has repeatedly directed PHMSA to strengthen its standards; yet this agency has done little. My amendment would help hold their feet to the fire and get commonsense safety standards finalized and implemented. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $27,604,000)''.

Page 61, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $27,604,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that Federal pipeline safety standards are in serious need of improvement. Despite repeated bipartisan efforts to strengthen these standards, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA, has dragged its feet on implementing the new rules.

Not only has this agency failed to keep up with new statutory requirements, they struggle to even enforce the rules they already have on the books. There are several reasons for this, including rapid growth in the miles of new pipelines to inspect and the need to compete with the private sector for the best talent while using limited resources.

PHMSA's preliminary estimate of serious incidents on pipelines showed an increase in 2014; and, with the miles of pipelines only multiplying, these numbers will surely grow. That is why my amendment would increase funding for PHMSA's pipeline safety program by $27 million, to simply match the President's own fiscal year 2016 budget request. While this would not solve the multitude of problems facing the agency, it would certainly make a big difference in two key areas.

First, it would help PHMSA retain and recruit the best inspectors and staff. Last year, Congress provided funding for 100 additional full-time employees to help PHMSA adjust to the increasing demand; and, as part of its fiscal year 2016 request, PHMSA requested $15 million to fully fund and annualize these employees. The current bill only provides enough funding for 1 year of salaries for these new employees.

How is the agency supposed to attract the best talent when they can't count on paying their new employees for more than a year at a time?

Second, my amendment would also provide requested funding for the national pipeline information exchange. This information exchange would be a comprehensive database of integrated pipeline safety information from PHMSA, from State regulators, industry, and other Federal resources.

Of the 2.6 million miles of pipeline in the United States, PHMSA inspects only 20 percent, while States monitor the remaining 80 percent. However, the information the States gather through inspections is neither shared among the States, nor with PHMSA. That is kind of unbelievable. It makes no sense. We should be doing everything we can to analyze and understand this data.

My amendment would fund this exchange to help regulators be more effective and to better protect communities like mine from future spills. There are currently pilot information exchange programs in 7 States, and the funding provided by my amendment would allow PHMSA to expand these information exchanges to 25 States.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment costs absolutely nothing from the American taxpayers, not one dime. The increased funding would come from a modest increase in user fees paid into the pipeline safety fund. These user fees are paid for by the oil companies that profit enormously from the oil and gas flowing through the pipelines that PHMSA oversees.

Oil companies are seeing record profits from a booming oil and gas development industry. This is leading to more miles of pipeline and more risks for local communities like mine. The least they can do is ensure that the Federal oversight of the industry is keeping pace with the growth because, when pipelines fail, it is our local communities and our constituents, not the oil companies, who suffer the most.

My amendment takes a small step forward to help strengthen the pipeline safety and oversight, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I commend my colleague for offering this amendment, and I want to offer my strong support.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking here about annualizing the funding—in other words, bringing these people on board permanently—for pipeline safety inspectors who were hired in fiscal year 2015. We are also talking about the better coordination of enforcement activities between Federal, State, and local officials.

I would like to remind my colleagues we have 2.6 million miles of pipeline across this country. I think the number is maybe 548 personnel in the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.

This is an enormous task. The gentlewoman's amendment would greatly improve our capacity to address this challenge, and I urge its adoption.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. The authorization for this program expires this year, Mr. Chairman. Frankly, there are many questions, and it is not really clear whether or not the next authorization would accommodate this funding fee level. I understand the gentlewoman's passion, but I must respectfully urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, again, I urge the adoption of this amendment. I have a classic example of why it is needed, and I ask for your consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS
(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5128(b), $188,000, to be derived from the Emergency Preparedness Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the fiscal year limitation specified in 49 U.S.C. 5116, not more than $28,318,000 shall be made available for obligation in fiscal year 2016 from amounts made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i), and 5128(b) and (c): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 5116(i)(4), not more than 4 percent of the amounts made available from this account shall be available to pay administrative costs: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i), 5128(b), or 5128(c) shall be made available for obligation by individuals other than the Secretary of Transportation, or his or her designee.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $86,223,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the Department: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this heading may be used to investigate, pursuant to section 41712 of title 49, United States Code: (1) unfair or deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition by domestic and foreign air carriers and ticket agents; and (2) the compliance of domestic and foreign air carriers with respect to item (1) of this proviso: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds transferred to the Office of the Inspector General through forfeiture proceedings or from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund or the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund, as a participating agency, as an equitable share from the forfeiture of property in investigations in which the Office of Inspector General participates, or through the granting of a Petition for Remission or Mitigation, shall be deposited to the credit of this account for law enforcement activities authorized under the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, to remain available until expended.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Surface Transportation Board, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $31,375,000: *Provided*,

That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $1,250,000 from fees established by the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and used for necessary and authorized expenses under this heading: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2016, to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at no more than $30,125,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 180. During the current fiscal year, applicable appropriations to the Department of Transportation shall be available for maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of liability insurance for motor vehicles operating in foreign countries on official department business; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 181. Appropriations contained in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for an Executive Level IV.

SEC. 182. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than 110 political and Presidential appointees in the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That none of the personnel covered by this provision may be assigned on temporary detail outside the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 183. (a) No recipient of funds made available in this Act shall disseminate personal information (as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(3)) obtained by a State department of motor vehicles in connection with a motor vehicle record as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(1), except as provided in 18 U.S.C. 2721 for a use permitted under 18 U.S.C. 2721.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall not withhold funds provided in this Act for any grantee if a State is in noncompliance with this provision.

SEC. 184. Funds received by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Railroad Administration from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training may be credited respectively to the Federal Highway Administration's ''Federal-Aid Highways'' account, the Federal Transit Administration's ''Technical Assistance and Training'' account, and to the Federal Railroad Administration's ''Safety and Operations'' account, except for State rail safety inspectors participating in training pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 20105.

SEC. 185. None of the funds in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be used to make a loan, loan guarantee, line of credit, or grant unless the Secretary of Transportation notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 3 full business days before any project competitively selected to receive a discretionary grant award, any discretionary grant award, letter of intent, loan commitment, loan guarantee commitment, line of credit commitment, or full funding grant agreement totaling $750,000 or more is announced by the department or its modal administrations from:

(1) any discretionary grant or federal credit program of the Federal Highway Administration including the emergency relief program;

(2) the airport improvement program of the Federal Aviation Administration;

(3) any program of the Federal Railroad Administration;

(4) any program of the Federal Transit Administration other than the formula grants and fixed guideway modernization programs;

(5) any program of the Maritime Administration; or

(6) any funding provided under the headings ''National Infrastructure Investments'' in this Act:

Provided, That the Secretary gives concurrent notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for any ''quick release'' of funds from the emergency relief program: *Provided further*, That no notification shall involve funds that are not available for obligation.

SEC. 186. Rebates, refunds, incentive payments, minor fees and other funds received by the Department of Transportation from travel management centers, charge card programs, the subleasing of building space, and miscellaneous sources are to be credited to appropriations of the Department of Transportation and allocated to elements of the Department of Transportation using fair and equitable criteria and such funds shall be available until expended.

SEC. 187. Amounts made available in this or any other Act that the Secretary determines represent improper payments by the Department of Transportation to a third-party contractor under a financial assistance award, which are recovered pursuant to law, shall be available—

(1) to reimburse the actual expenses incurred by the Department of Transportation in recovering improper payments; and

(2) to pay contractors for services provided in recovering improper payments or contractor support in the implementation of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002: *Provided*, That amounts in excess of that required for paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(A) shall be credited to and merged with the appropriation from which the improper payments were made, and shall be available for the purposes and period for which such appropriations are available: *Provided further*, That where specific project or accounting information associated with the improper payment or payments is not readily available, the Secretary may credit an appropriate account, which shall be available for the purposes and period associated with the account so credited; or

(B) if no such appropriation remains available, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That prior to the transfer of any such recovery to an appropriations account, the Secretary shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of the amount and reasons for such transfer: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section, the term ''improper payments'' has the same meaning as that provided in section 2(d)(2) of Public Law 107–300.

SEC. 188. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if any funds provided in or limited by this Act are subject to a reprogramming action that requires notice to be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, transmission of said reprogramming notice shall be provided solely to the Committees on Appropriations, and said reprogramming action shall be approved or denied solely by the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide notice to other congressional committees of the action of the Committees on Appropriations on such reprogramming but not sooner than 30 days following the date on which the reprogramming action has been approved or denied by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 189. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used by the Surface Transportation Board of the Department of Transportation to charge or collect any filing fee for rate or practice complaints filed with the Board in an amount in excess of the amount authorized for district court civil suit filing fees under section 1914 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 190. Funds appropriated in this Act to the modal administrations may be obligated for the Office of the Secretary for the costs related to assessments or reimbursable agreements only when such amounts are for the costs of goods and services that are purchased to provide a direct benefit to the applicable modal administration or administrations.

SEC. 191. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to carry out a program that establishes uniform standards for developing and supporting agency transit pass and transit benefits authorized under section 7905 of title 5, United States Code, including distribution of transit benefits by various paper and electronic media.

SEC. 192. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Surface Transportation Board to take any actions with respect to the construction of a high speed rail project in California unless the permit is issued by the Board with respect to the project in its entirety.

SEC. 193. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to facilitate new scheduled air transportation originating from the United States if such flights would land on, or pass through, property confiscated by the Cuban Government, including property in which a minority interest was confiscated, as the terms confiscated, Cuban Government, and property are defined in paragraphs (4), (5), and (12)(A), respectively, of section 4 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6023 (4), (5), and (12)(A)): *Provided*, That for this section, new scheduled air transportation shall include any flights not already regularly scheduled prior to March 31, 2015.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 2016''.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

For necessary salaries and expenses for Executive Offices, which shall be comprised of the offices of the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Adjudicatory Services, Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Public Affairs, Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, and the Center for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, $14,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,000 of the amount made available under this heading shall be available to the Secretary for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OFFICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary salaries and expenses for Administrative Support Offices, $547,000,000, of which $45,600,000, to remain available until expended, in addition to amounts made available under this heading for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer and the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer, shall be for funding shared service agreements between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of the Treasury; $39,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer; $93,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; $199,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Administration; $40,000,000 shall be

available for the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer; $49,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Field Policy and Management; $16,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Procurement Officer; $3,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity; $4,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Strategic Planning and Management; $44,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer; and of which the remaining amount shall be available through September 30, 2017, for transfer to the appropriations for offices specified under this heading or the heading ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'' in this title: *Provided*, That funds provided under this heading may be used for necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under this heading may be used for advertising and promotional activities that directly support program activities funded in this title: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide the Committees on Appropriations quarterly written notification regarding the status of pending congressional reports: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide in electronic form all signed reports required by Congress.

PROGRAM OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Public and Indian Housing, $203,000,000.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development, $102,000,000.

HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Housing, $372,000,000.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Policy Development and Research, $22,700,000.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, $73,000,000.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL AND HEALTHY HOMES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes, $6,700,000.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING PROGRAMS

TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) (''the Act'' herein), not otherwise provided for, $15,918,643,000 to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be available on October 1, 2015 (in addition to the $4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available on October 1, 2015), and $4,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019, shall be available on October 1, 2016: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading are provided as follows:

(1) $18,151,000,000 shall be available for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts (including renewals of enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act) and including renewal of other special purpose *or* incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, from amounts provided under this paragraph and any carryover, the Secretary for the calendar year 2016 funding cycle shall provide renewal funding for each public housing agency based on validated voucher management system (VMS) leasing and cost data for the prior calendar year and by applying an inflation factor as established by the Secretary, by notice published in the Federal Register, and by making any necessary adjustments for the costs associated with the first-time renewal of vouchers under this paragraph including tenant protection, HOPE VI, and Choice Neighborhoods vouchers: *Provided further*, That in determining calendar year 2016 funding allocations under this heading for public housing agencies, including agencies participating in the Moving To Work (MTW) demonstration, the Secretary may take into account the anticipated impact of changes in targeting and utility allowances, on public housing agencies' contract renewal needs: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this paragraph may be used to fund a total number of unit months under lease which exceeds a public housing agency's authorized level of units under contract, except for public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration, which are instead governed by the terms and conditions of their MTW agreements: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the extent necessary to stay within the amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this paragraph), prorate each public housing agency's allocation otherwise established pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That except as provided in the following provisos, the entire amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this paragraph) shall be obligated to the public housing agencies based on the allocation and pro rata method described above, and the Secretary shall notify public housing agencies of their annual budget by the latter of 60 days after enactment of this Act or March 1, 2016: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the notification period with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements and shall be subject to the same pro rata adjustments under the previous provisos: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may offset public housing agencies' calendar year 2016 allocations based on the excess amounts of public housing agencies' net restricted assets accounts, including HUD held programmatic reserves (in accordance with VMS data in calendar year 2015 that is verifiable and complete), as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall also be subject to the offset, as determined by the Secretary, excluding amounts subject to the single fund budget authority provisions of their MTW agreements, from the agencies' calendar year 2016 MTW funding allocation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall use any offset referred to in the previous two provisos throughout the calendar year to prevent the termination of rental assistance for families as the result of insufficient funding, as determined by the Secretary, and to avoid or reduce the proration of renewal funding allocations: *Provided further*, That up to $75,000,000 shall be available only: (1) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies, after application for an adjustment by a public housing agency that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs of vouchers resulting from unforeseen circumstances or from portability under section 8(r) of the Act; (2) for vouchers that were not in use during the 12-month period in order to be available to meet a commitment pursuant to section 8(o)(13) of the Act; (3) for adjustments for costs associated with HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD–VASH) vouchers; (4) for adjustments for public housing agencies with voucher leasing rates at the end of the calendar year that exceed the average leasing for the 12-month period used to establish the allocation, and for additional leasing of vouchers that were issued but not leased prior to the end of such calendar year; (5) for public housing agencies that despite taking reasonable cost savings measures, as determined by the Secretary, would otherwise be required to terminate rental assistance for families as a result of insufficient funding; and (6) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs as a result of participation in the Small Area Fair Market Rent demonstration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall allocate amounts under the previous proviso based on need, as determined by the Secretary;

(2) $130,000,000 shall be for section 8 rental assistance for relocation and replacement of housing units that are demolished or disposed of pursuant to section 18 of the Act, conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8, the family unification program under section 8(x) of the Act, relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency, enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act, HOPE VI and Choice Neighborhood vouchers, mandatory and voluntary conversions, and tenant protection assistance including replacement and relocation assistance or for project-based assistance to prevent the displacement of unassisted elderly tenants currently residing in section 202 properties financed between 1959 and 1974 that are refinanced pursuant to Public Law 106–569, as amended, or under the authority as provided under this Act: *Provided*, That when a public housing development is submitted for demolition or disposition under section 18 of the Act, the Secretary may provide section 8 rental assistance when the units pose an imminent health and safety risk to residents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may only provide replacement vouchers for units that were occupied within the previous 24 months that cease to be available as assisted housing, subject only to the availability of funds: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this paragraph, $5,000,000 may be available to provide tenant protection assistance, not otherwise provided under this paragraph, to residents residing in low vacancy areas and who may have to pay rents greater than 30 percent of household income, as the result of (1) the maturity of a HUD-insured, HUD-held or section 202 loan that requires the permission of the Secretary prior to loan prepayment; (2) the expiration of a rental assistance contract for which the tenants are not eligible for enhanced voucher or tenant protection assistance under existing law; or (3) the expiration of affordability restrictions accompanying a mortgage or preservation program administered by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such tenant protection assistance made available under the previous proviso may be provided under the authority of section 8(t) or section 8(o)(13) of the

United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(t)): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement the previous provisos, including, but not limited to, requirements for defining eligible at-risk households within 120 days of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That any tenant protection voucher made available from amounts under this paragraph shall not be reissued by any public housing agency, except the replacement vouchers as defined by the Secretary by notice, when the initial family that received any such voucher no longer receives such voucher, and the authority for any public housing agency to issue any such voucher shall cease to exist: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, for the purpose under this paragraph, may use unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from amounts appropriated in prior fiscal years under this heading for voucher assistance for nonelderly disabled families and for disaster assistance made available under Public Law 110–329;

(3) $1,530,000,000 shall be for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program, of which up to $10,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary to allocate to public housing agencies that need additional funds to administer their section 8 programs, including fees associated with section 8 tenant protection rental assistance, the administration of disaster related vouchers, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers, and other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That no less than $1,520,000,000 of the amount provided in this paragraph shall be allocated to public housing agencies for the calendar year 2016 funding cycle based on section 8(q) of the Act (and related Appropriation Act provisions) as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–276): *Provided further*, That if the amounts made available under this paragraph are insufficient to pay the amounts determined under the previous proviso, the Secretary may decrease the amounts allocated to agencies by a uniform percentage applicable to all agencies receiving funding under this paragraph or may, to the extent necessary to provide full payment of amounts determined under the previous proviso, utilize unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading from prior fiscal years, excluding special purpose vouchers, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That all public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements, and shall be subject to the same uniform percentage decrease as under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That amounts provided under this paragraph shall be only for activities related to the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under section 8, including related development activities;

(4) $107,643,210 for the renewal of tenant-based assistance contracts under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), including necessary administrative expenses: *Provided*, That administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the special purpose vouchers in this paragraph shall be funded under the same terms and be subject to the same pro rata reduction as the percent decrease for administrative and other expenses to public housing agencies under paragraph (3) of this heading;

(5) The Secretary shall separately track all special purpose vouchers funded under this heading.

□ 2315

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 78, line 9, before the semicolon insert the following: '', except that of the amount made available by this proviso, $75,000,000 shall be used only for the purpose under this clause''.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in support of the people who make it possible for us to be here. Of course, I speak of those persons who go to distant places, those persons who serve us in our military who don't always return the same way they left.

I rise tonight because we have had a successful program. The HUD VASH program has been successful, and it has contributed to the decline in homelessness among those persons who make it possible for us to be here, who make real the great and noble American ideals: liberty and justice for all; government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Mr. Chairman, homelessness has declined 33 percent among our veteran population since 2010, and this is because the President made it a priority. President Obama indicated that he would reduce homelessness among veterans, and he had 2015 as a targeted date.

I am proud to say that in my city of Houston, Texas, our mayor, Annise Parker, had an event just recently with three HUD Secretaries, and it was announced at that event that in Houston, Texas, the resources were available to accommodate a veteran in need of a place to call home.

Tonight, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that would accord $75 million to the HUD VASH program. This $75 million would be used to make sure that what we have done we will not only continue to do, but we can do even better.

I believe that the people who have served us and who find themselves now living on the streets of life should have a better quality of life. For this reason, I will promote this amendment tonight, understanding that a point of order has been made, but also understanding that it is necessary for us to continue to remind ourselves that we have people who are willing to make the sacrifice and that we should make sacrifices for them.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I want to thank the gentleman, again, for his passion for this issue and for talking to me about this issue, and I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman.

Obviously, all of us know that there is never anything, there is never enough that we could ever do for our veterans. So again, I thank the gentleman, and I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman.

I thank you for yielding your time.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and I thank the Congress of the United States of America because Congress has appropriated money for these VASH vouchers, this program. I have always tried to get more because I think our veterans deserve as much as we can give them, but I am appreciative for what Congress has done, and I am appreciative for what the chairman has done.

So tonight I will withdraw my amendment, Mr. Chairman, but I do so with the understanding that as we move forward, knowing that we have done a great job, the President has done well, that the cities and municipalities have worked well with the President, this has been an integrated system, holistic approach to ending homelessness among our veterans, but I still believe that we cannot allow ourselves to relax. We must never assume that we have done enough for those who are willing to do all for us.

With that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $512,000,000)''.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $512,000,000)''.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 2577, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, that would fully fund the existing Housing Choice Vouchers and replenish the 67,000 vouchers lost to the fiscal year 2013 sequestration.

It is difficult, Mr. Chair, to think of a more urgent issue confronting the American people. Affordable housing has reached zero in many communities of our country. It is estimated that 2.1 million low-income families utilize the Housing Choice Voucher program. These are the most vulnerable among us, including children, senior citizens, veterans, and persons with disabilities who rely on this important program to keep their families from becoming homeless.

Most families must make roughly $18.92 per hour to afford a two-bedroom apartment, which is more than 2½ times the Federal minimum wage. In the District of Columbia, where affordable housing has virtually disappeared, families must make $28.25 per hour to afford a two-bedroom apartment, making the Nation's Capital one of the most expensive housing markets in the Nation.

The District mirrors cities and suburbs throughout the country, however. For over a decade, District residents have faced increasing rents, stagnant incomes, and the disappearance of affordable rental units. As a result, the city has had to close—actually close altogether—its housing waiting list, which includes vouchers, leaving more than 72,000 people waiting to be placed and thousands more waiting for a chance even to get on the list.

My amendment would fund President Obama's budget request to restore 67,000 vouchers lost during the fiscal year 2013 sequestration, bringing urgently needed relief to struggling families across the country. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. What is Congress here for if not to bring some relief to millions of families across the country, those who are most in need?

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida may state his point of order.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5 of the 114th Congress which states the following:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, but for sequestration probably most of these housing vouchers would have gone through. They are already cut. These are cuts that were never anticipated. These were sequestration cuts. The Congress cannot ignore forever the neediest people for housing as homelessness increases and as there is no relief whatsoever.

I understand the point of order. I can't agree with it. I think at some point this Congress must face what it must do for people who but for sequestration, something none of us wanted, none of us anticipated, would at least among them have some who would have these housing vouchers.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,204,853,210)''.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $182,816,000)''.

Page 79, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 81, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $490,037,000)''.

Page 83, after line 10, insert the following:

(5) $277,000,000 shall be for incremental rental voucher assistance under section 8(o) of the Act to be distributed based on relative need, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall make such funding available, notwithstanding section 204 (competition provision) of this title;

(6) $177,500,000 shall be used for incremental rental voucher assistance for use by families, veterans, and tribal families who are experiencing homelessness, as well as victims of domestic and dating violence: *Provided*, That eligibility for veterans is made without regard to discharge status: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make such funding available through a competitive process to public housing agencies that partner with eligible Continuums of Care, as identified by the Secretary and to recipients eligible to receive block grants under the Native American Housing Assistance and Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.): *Provided further*, That assistance provided to recipients eligible under NAHASDA shall be subject to requirements of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive, or specify alternative requirements for any provision or statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the use of funds made available under this paragraph upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective delivery and administration of such voucher assistance: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement the previous proviso;

(7) $37,500,000 shall be made available to provide incremental rental voucher assistance for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, as defined by the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–4), who require an emergency transfer: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement this paragraph;

(8) $20,000,000 shall be made available for new incremental voucher assistance through the Family Unification Program: *Provided*, That the assistance made available under this paragraph shall continue to remain available for family unification upon turnover: *Provided further*, That the amounts made available under this paragraph shall be used only in connection with tenant-based assistance on behalf of—

(A) any family—

(i) who is otherwise eligible for such assistance; and

(ii) who the public child welfare agency for the jurisdiction has certified is a family for whom the lack of adequate housing is a primary factor in the imminent placement of the family's child or children in out-of-home care; and

(B) for a period not to exceed 60 months, otherwise eligible youths who have attained at least 18 years of age and not more than 21 years of age and who have left foster care at age 16 or older.

Page 83, line 11, strike ''(5)'' and insert ''(9)''

Mr. NADLER (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the funding levels provided in this bill are unrealistic and unsustainable and clearly demonstrate that our current budget process has failed. This bill reveals where the majority's priorities lie, and they clearly do not lie in serving the most basic function of government: to provide for the safety and well-being of its citizens.

This bill makes major cuts to critical HUD programs. The public housing

capital fund is slashed by $200 million, barely reaching its 1989 level, almost 30 years ago. This will cover less than half of the basic maintenance needs and does nothing to address the $25 billion in deferred projects.

For the first time since 2007, this body will provide no new funding to provide housing and support to homeless veterans. The Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control program is cut by 32 percent, even as The Washington Post reported 2 months ago that in low-income West Baltimore neighborhoods, more than 3 percent of children under the age of 6 had dangerously high levels of lead in their blood, which we know leads to learning disabilities and can lead to lifelong dependency, not to mention lifelong dependency on the taxpayers.

But perhaps most startling is the bill's failure to provide low-income seniors and hard-working families adequate access to affordable housing through HUD's Section 8 program. Rental assistance helps 2.1 million very-low-income households to rent modest homes in the private market at affordable costs. Households that use vouchers have an average income of $13,000 per year, well below the Federal poverty line, and nearly all include children, seniors, or people with disabilities. Only about one in four eligible low-income families receives Federal rental assistance. Long waiting lists remain in nearly every community, and these long waits are exacerbated by a lack of administrative funding for public housing agencies.

Sequestration has only made this situation worse. As of June of last year, an estimated 100,000 fewer families were receiving assistance from Section 8 due to the sequestration cuts; 100,000 families cut off. These cuts have had a severe impact on communities at a time when the number of very-low-income renters with worst case housing needs remains 30 percent higher than it was before the Great Recession.

Through the fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015 appropriations bills, Congress began the work of reversing the deep cuts in assistance caused by sequestration, but nearly 67,000 vouchers have yet to be restored. My amendment would finally restore those lost vouchers by providing an additional $512 million to the voucher renewal account. This amendment mirrors the President's request and targets 30,000 vouchers to those families and individuals most in need of housing assistance: homeless families; veterans, including those not covered by the VASH program; victims of domestic violence; and Native Americans.

□ 2330

The bill does include important and helpful language directing HUD to target vouchers to the vulnerable populations as they become available but provides no funds for HUD to do so.

My amendment sets aside specific funding for these targeted vouchers to make sure the most vulnerable populations have access to safe, affordable housing.

This additional funding will go a long way toward ensuring that every family that qualifies for rental assistance finds a home. However, at the funding levels for administrative fees in this legislation, it would be impossible for public housing agencies to hire and maintain enough staff to process and renew vouchers.

We cannot continue to undermine our hard-working public housing agencies by failing to provide them enough money to function. My amendment would finally address the undercutting of public housing agencies by providing an additional $490 million to match the President's request.

Mr. Chairman, this is the minimum we can do to meet the vital needs of our lowest-income citizens and of our veterans. I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, which states:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, we can all agree that this amendment is necessary. We are talking about denying tens of thousands of families and seniors access to an efficient, cost-effective program that keeps families together and lowers the government's costs over the long term. Without this amendment, we will see a spike in homelessness, a spike in medical costs, and a spike in hungry children.

I understand the point of order. I understand that the rules demand an offset for any funding increase in the bill. I also appreciate the chairman's efforts to support Section 8 and public housing. However, when funding levels are as restrictive as this bill provides across the board, it is impossible to offset such drastic underfunding without hurting other people in need.

When faced with a funding bill——

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from New York wish to speak to the point of order?

The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. NADLER. When faced with a funding bill that fails to provide any new funding to support homeless veterans and is leaving victims of domestic violence and homeless families with no access to secure housing, we need to take action to support the most vulnerable among us.

I hope that as we go forward, we can find a way to provide these funds so that kids, working families, and seniors are not out on the street.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that this moment not pass without us expressing appreciation to Mr. NADLER and to Ms. NORTON for these amendments they have offered, because they are addressing a critical issue, a critical deficiency in this bill. And believe me, Mr. Chairman, this is just the tip of the iceberg.

The President proposed in his budget to provide additional rental vouchers to compensate for those lost earlier to sequestration. He also proposed funding for 30,000 new targeted vouchers, as Mr. NADLER was indicating: homeless families, veterans, Native Americans, victims of domestic violence and stalking, reuniting families.

Because of this budget policy that has us so hamstrung, we are simply not addressing in this bill any of these desperate needs. I invite colleagues to talk to their local housing authorities, if they haven't already. Ask how many are on the waiting list. Ask how many people are desperate for decent housing. There is nothing more basic to our communities' well-being than decent housing.

I don't know of a single housing program that isn't underresourced, and all this because of a budget policy that really isn't working as fiscal policy. That is what it is supposed to be doing, but it is decimating these investments that our country needs to be making.

I said the tip of the iceberg. Here is what I mean. The Choice Neighborhoods initiative is the successor to HOPE VI. That has been an enormously successful program in my area of Raleigh-Durham in North Carolina. That is $20 million. That is a token amount. I hope we will revisit that amount later.

Public housing capital fund, $1.68 billion. That is $194 million cut from last year. That goes back to where we were 26 years ago. And then we have a $25 billion backlog—not even beginning to address that.

Mr. Chairman, my district displays rental housing for the elderly, housing for the disabled. Local congregations have taken on these projects. We have group homes for the disabled that have done a wonderful job. This budget simply turns them into rental renewal programs. No capital funding, no increase in the supply. And so it goes.

So Mr. NADLER and Ms. NORTON have done us a great service tonight in pressing the case for tenant-based rental assistance—for these vouchers—and for addressing some of these very needy categories of our fellow citizens. But it is the tip of the iceberg. It is only one of an array of programs that we very much need to address.

I am hopeful that the inadequacy of this bill tonight, and the kind of debate we are having tonight, the kind of sharp relief that these needs are being put into, will motivate us very strongly sooner rather than later.

Let's not wait for a Presidential veto. Let's not wait for some kind of governmental shutdown. Let's show that we can govern. Let's show that we can take hold of our situation, invest the way a great country should invest, and do a budget agreement that secures our fiscal future but also makes room for the kind of investments that we should make.

So I thank my colleagues for bringing up these critical housing needs. We simply must address them in the weeks ahead.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $614,000,000)''.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $434,000,000)''.

Page 81, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $180,000,000)''.

Page 81, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $180,000,000)''.

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $614,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be here. It shows different people look at this budget and see different things.

I look at this budget and see a $614 million increase in Section 8 housing, and I look at the huge debt we have, and I say: Why are we spending more? Other people apparently look at the $614 million increase and say: Why, that is just a pittance.

Obviously, a 3 percent increase in any program at a time we are in the huge debt we are should be viewed skeptically. I have an amendment here to get rid of the $614 million increase.

Now, as I understand, the reason there is an increase is because we are getting in less receipts on the Section 8 housing and, therefore, we feel that the citizens of this country have to make up the difference.

My opinion is they have done nothing that we have to take more out of their pocket, either in taxes or by way of inflation, and we should not be increasing this funding by $614 million.

In the debate over the last amendment it was said that there is a waiting list on a lot of these programs. That doesn't mean we have to spend more money on the programs. If we are giving away something for free, there is always going to be a waiting list. If you go out in society, if a store says, we are going to give away something for free, you have a waiting list, right?

This is a flawed program for a couple of reasons. I don't object to using it for disabled people. I don't object to using it for elderly people. But like many welfare-related programs, two things help you in eligibility for this program.

First of all, you are required not to work very hard. And the gentleman made a point that the income level of a lot of these people in the projects isn't that high. That is because if they made more money, they wouldn't be eligible for the generous subsidies. So, of course they are not making a lot of money. It is wrong to set up a program that discourages industry.

The second thing wrong with this program is it discourages marriage. A lot of these housing things are set up such that if somebody marries the mother or father of their children who is working harder, you lose the subsidy. I can't imagine anything more foolish than setting up a program that says we will give you an apartment if you raise a child out of wedlock, but if you get married, we will take away your apartment.

The last time we really looked at this program was 1994. It is time we look at it again. And the idea of pouring another $614 million into this program is out of line.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition with considerable enthusiasm.

It is as though what I said 5 minutes ago about the deficiencies of this bill—this whole budget strategy that has left us so unable to address our needs—it is as though the gentleman took that and went in exactly the opposite direction.

His amendment reduced an allocation that is already far too low, and it takes these rental assistance programs and reduces them further. Not only does it not meet the need that we are seeing but actually reduces what we are already doing. This means evictions. I promise you, it means large-scale evictions. It means a cutting back in communities across this country of the housing alternatives that people have.

I have always thought, Mr. Chairman, that rental assistance—Section 8—should be a housing program that conservatives should love because it is market-based. It is not, contrary to what the gentleman says, a total free ride. As a matter of fact, people pay a third of their income in rent. What Section 8 provides is a modest boost so that these housing developments and these apartment buildings can work. People can live there. They put their own money in, and they get a boost. They are able to move toward self-sufficiency.

So it is not public housing. It is housing for people who are able to do more for themselves and who are receiving support as they do that. This would be unconscionable to cut this program further.

With great conviction I believe this would be a mistaken amendment, a hard-hearted amendment, and one that this body should reject.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

Unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading, the heading ''Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing'' and the heading ''Project-Based Rental Assistance'', for fiscal year 2016 and prior years may be used for renewal of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts and for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were appropriated: *Provided*, That any obligated balances of contract authority from fiscal year 1974 and prior that have been terminated shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That amounts heretofore recaptured, or recaptured during the current fiscal year, from section 8 project-based contracts from source years fiscal year 1975 through fiscal year 1987 are hereby rescinded, and an amount of additional new budget authority, equivalent to the amount rescinded is hereby appropriated, to remain available until expended, for the purposes set forth under this heading, in addition to amounts otherwise available.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) (''the Act''), $1,681,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2016 the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian

Housing any authority under paragraph (2) of section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section: *Provided further*, That for purposes of such section 9(j), the term ''obligate'' means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays, immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That up to $3,000,000 shall be to support ongoing Public Housing Financial and Physical Assessment activities: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to make grants, notwithstanding section 204 of this Act, to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs including safety and security measures necessary to address crime and drug-related activity as well as needs resulting from unforeseen or unpreventable emergencies and natural disasters excluding Presidentially declared emergencies and natural disasters under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) occurring in fiscal year 2016: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading $30,000,000 shall be for supportive services, service coordinator and congregate services as authorized by section 34 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437z-6) and the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.): *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, up to $15,000,000 may be used for a Jobs-Plus initiative modeled after the Jobs-Plus demonstration: *Provided further*, That the funding provided under the previous proviso shall provide competitive grants to partnerships between public housing authorities, local workforce investment boards established under section 117 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, and other agencies and organizations that provide support to help public housing residents obtain employment and increase earnings: *Provided further*, That applicants must demonstrate the ability to provide services to residents, partner with workforce investment boards, and leverage service dollars: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may set aside a portion of the funds provided for the Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency program to support the services element of the Jobs-Plus Pilot initiative: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may allow PHAs to request exemptions from rent and income limitation requirements under sections 3 and 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 as necessary to implement the Jobs-Plus program, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may approve upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective implementation of the Jobs-Plus initiative as a voluntary program for residents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register any waivers or alternative requirements pursuant to the preceding proviso no later than 10 days before the effective date of such notice: *Provided further*, That for funds provided under this heading, the limitation in section 9(g)(1) of the Act shall be 25 percent: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the limitation in the previous proviso to allow public housing agencies to fund activities authorized under section 9(e)(1)(C) of the Act: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary shall provide bonus awards in fiscal year 2016 to public housing agencies that are designated high performers: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify public housing agencies of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For 2016 payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), $4,440,000,000.

CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS INITIATIVE

For competitive grants under the Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (subject to section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v), unless otherwise specified under this heading), for transformation, rehabilitation, and replacement housing needs of both public and HUD-assisted housing and to transform neighborhoods of poverty into functioning, sustainable mixed income neighborhoods with appropriate services, schools, public assets, transportation and access to jobs, $20,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That grant funds may be used for resident and community services, community development, and affordable housing needs in the community, and for conversion of vacant or foreclosed properties to affordable housing: *Provided further*, That the use of funds made available under this heading shall not be deemed to be public housing notwithstanding section 3(b)(1) of such Act: *Provided further*, That grantees shall commit to an additional period of affordability determined by the Secretary of not fewer than 20 years: *Provided further*, That grantees shall undertake comprehensive local planning with input from residents and the community, and that grantees shall provide a match in State, local, other Federal or private funds: *Provided further*, That grantees may include local governments, tribal entities, public housing authorities, and nonprofits: *Provided further*, That for-profit developers may apply jointly with a public entity: *Provided further*, That for purposes of environmental review, a grantee shall be treated as a public housing agency under section 26 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437x), and grants under this heading shall be subject to the regulations issued by the Secretary to implement such section: *Provided further*, That such grantees shall create partnerships with other local organizations including assisted housing owners, service agencies, and resident organizations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall consult with the Secretaries of Education, Labor, Transportation, Health and Human Services, Agriculture, and Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to coordinate and leverage other appropriate Federal resources: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances, including recaptures, remaining from funds appropriated under the heading ''Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)'' in fiscal year 2011 and prior fiscal years may be used for purposes under this heading, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY

For the Family Self-Sufficiency program to support family self-sufficiency coordinators under section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate the use of assistance under sections 8 and 9 of such Act with public and private resources, and enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, $75,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, by Federal Register notice, waive or specify alternative requirements under sections b(3), b(4), b(5), or c(1) of section 23 of such Act in order to facilitate the operation of a unified self-sufficiency program for individuals receiving assistance under different provisions of the Act, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That owners of multifamily properties with project-based subsidy contracts under section 8 may compete for funding under this heading and/or voluntarily make a Family Self-Sufficiency program available to the assisted tenants of such property in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such procedures established pursuant to the previous proviso shall permit participating tenants to accrue escrow funds in accordance with section 23(d)(2) and shall allow owners to use funding from residual receipt accounts to hire coordinators for their own Family Self-Sufficiency program.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq.), $650,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to determine the amount of the allocation under title I of such Act for each Indian tribe, the Secretary shall apply the formula under section 302 of such Act with the need component based on single-race census data and with the need component based on multi-race census data, and the amount of the allocation for each Indian tribe shall be the greater of the two resulting allocation amounts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, $3,500,000 shall be contracted for assistance for national or regional organizations representing Native American housing interests for providing training and technical assistance to Indian housing authorities and tribally designated housing entities as authorized under NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under the previous proviso, not less than $2,000,000 shall be made available for a national organization as authorized under section 703 of NAHASDA (25 U.S.C. 4212): *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, $2,000,000 shall be to support the inspection of Indian housing units, contract expertise, training, and technical assistance in the training, oversight, and management of such Indian housing and tenant-based assistance, including up to $300,000 for related travel: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $2,000,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $17,452,007: *Provided further*, That the Department will notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, notwithstanding section 302(d) of NAHASDA, if on January 1, 2016, a recipient's total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department's line of credit control system is greater than three times the formula allocation it would otherwise receive under this heading, the Secretary shall adjust that recipient's formula allocation down by the difference between its total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department's line of credit control system on January 1, 2016, and three times the formula allocation it would otherwise receive: *Provided further*, That grant amounts not allocated to a recipient pursuant to the previous proviso shall be allocated under the need component of the formula proportionately among all other Indian tribes not subject to an adjustment: *Provided further*, That the two previous

provisos shall not apply to any Indian tribe that would otherwise receive a formula allocation of less than $5,000,000: *Provided further*, That to take effect, the three previous provisos do not require the issuance of any regulation.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), $8,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, up to $1,269,841,270, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That up to $750,000 of this amount may be for administrative contract expenses including management processes and systems to carry out the loan guarantee program.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.), $332,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, except that amounts allocated pursuant to section 854(c)(3) of such Act shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall renew all expiring contracts for permanent supportive housing that initially were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act from funds made available under this heading in fiscal year 2010 and prior fiscal years that meet all program requirements before awarding funds for new contracts under such section: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

□ 2345

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 94, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 116, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Mr. NADLER (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, since 1992, the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS has provided a vital safety net. In the United States, 50,000 people become infected with HIV every year, and 1.2 million people are living with HIV/AIDS. More than 500,000 of these individuals will need some form of housing assistance during the course of their illness, but 145,000 individuals have unmet housing needs.

HOPWA combines housing support with additional services to help people living with HIV/AIDS and their families stay in stable, safe housing; manage their illness; and remain active in their communities. Housing interventions are critical in our continued fight against HIV/AIDS, and research clearly shows that stable housing leads to better health outcomes.

Providing stable housing to people living with HIV/AIDS reduces the risk of transmission to a partner by 96 percent; it reduces emergency room visits and expense to the public by 36 percent and hospitalizations by 57 percent. In other words, investing a modest amount in HOPWA today saves us millions, if not billions of Federal taxpayer dollars in the future.

HOPWA is the only Federal housing program to provide cities and States with dedicated resources to address the housing crisis facing people living with HIV/AIDS, and the program traditionally enjoys strong bipartisan support.

Congressional support for HOPWA is clear in this legislation. While nearly every other program in the bill has been slashed by millions of dollars and often funded at levels below the point of actually functioning, HOPWA saw a slight increase in funding during the committee's consideration of the bill.

Some hail the bill's slim $332 million for HOPWA as a victory. I also applaud any additional funding for HOPWA, but I cannot call it a victory to fund this program below its 2010 funding level when wait lists for HOPWA services continue to grow and thousands of Americans die on the streets and in shelters because we refuse to provide a few extra million dollars to provide them with the care they need.

I will not claim that my amendment completely solves that problem. The National AIDS Housing Coalition estimates that, in FY16, they will need $364 million to provide HOPWA services to those who need them and to fund vital administrative support to improve the program.

To reach that goal, we would need to find $32 million somewhere in this bill to transfer to HOPWA, but the funding levels we are considering today are so abysmally low, it is nearly impossible to move that much money without gutting other important programs.

What we do, at the very least, is pass my amendment to restore HOPWA to its FY10 funding level of $335 million, a scant $3 million increase. That funding level makes only a small dent in HOPWA's real need, but it will give hundreds more people and families access to lifesaving services. It is a very small step, but it is in the right direction, and I believe if we have the chance to save even one life, let alone hundreds, we have a duty to act.

To protect those living with HIV/AIDS and to stay within the House rules, my amendment offsets this additional funding to cuts to HUD's information technology fund.

I recognize the importance of providing HUD with phones and computers and understand the chairman and ranking member's concerns about additional cuts to this account, but nothing is more important than, quite simply, saving lives.

We must pass this amendment and give those families battling HIV/AIDS a fighting chance. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, let me inquire of the chairman, does he plan to claim the time in opposition?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I will not be claiming the time in opposition.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, although, as a formality, I will then claim that time, although I am not opposed; I am enthusiastically in support of Mr. NADLER's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I do want to take a little extra time to mention some things connected to this that I think need to come to our colleagues' attention.

First of all, this is not an ideal offset that Mr. NADLER has chosen. This is simply an example of the problem we have had all evening. Any funding amendment will fill only one hole by digging another, and so that is just the reality we are dealing with.

I do support this amendment. It runs the risk of further delaying HUD's acquisition of improved IT systems. We are going to need to attend to that. In this bill, HUD's IT account is already $150 million below the fiscal year '15 level and $234 million below the President's request. This is not an account that has a lot to spare, so I hope we can revisit that.

It may be relatively easy to target this funding line. We have got to provide HUD with the tools it needs to properly administer HOPWA and other programs.

We need, of course, eventually, a bipartisan budget agreement that will allow for a more credible bill that will adequately fund HOPWA and HUD's IT account both, both of those.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, I, in addition, hope that the chairman and other longtime supporters of HOPWA are

going to be able to work—we are all going to be able to work together moving forward to get this HOPWA formula updated once and for all.

The formula hasn't been updated for the distribution of funds, the allocation of funds, that formula hasn't been updated since the inception of program in the early nineties. Without an update, many Americans who are living with HIV in areas of the country with the fastest growing infection rates—namely, the South and rural America—are not getting the housing support they desperately need.

As a Member from a State with an AIDS death rate higher than the national average, this issue, getting this formula right, is a matter of life and death for many of my constituents.

As we work on this bill in the months to come, try to get the funding levels where they need to be, we also very much need to address that formula issue, and I pledge my readiness to work with colleagues to have an equitable funding formula.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. I won't use it.

I simply want to express my appreciation first to the ranking member for supporting the amendment, despite the very painful offset which he will have to deal with, which I won't have to deal with, except as a single Member of the House.

I want to thank the chairman for not opposing this amendment. This amendment is a matter of life or death for a large number of people, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, $3,060,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, unless otherwise specified: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided, $3,000,000,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (''the Act'' herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.): *Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading, not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended for planning and management development and administration: *Provided further*, That a metropolitan city, urban county, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe, or insular area that directly or indirectly receives funds under this heading may not sell, trade, or otherwise transfer all or any portion of such funds to another such entity in exchange for any other funds, credits or non-Federal considerations, but must use such funds for activities eligible under title I of the Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 105(e)(1) of the Act, no funds provided under this heading may be provided to a for-profit entity for an economic development project under section 105(a)(17) unless such project has been evaluated and selected in accordance with guidelines required under subparagraph (e)(2): *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for grants for the Economic Development Initiative (''EDI'') or Neighborhood Initiatives activities, Rural Innovation Fund, or for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5307): *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading $60,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, of which, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 204 of this Act), up to $3,960,000 may be used for emergencies that constitute imminent threats to health and safety.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during fiscal year 2016, commitments to guarantee loans under section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5308), any part of which is guaranteed, shall not exceed a total principal amount of $300,000,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in subsection (k) of such section 108: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall collect fees from borrowers, notwithstanding subsection (m) of such section 108, to result in a credit subsidy cost of zero for guaranteeing such loans, and any such fees shall be collected in accordance with section 502(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That all unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading are hereby permanently rescinded.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, $767,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the amount made available under this heading, the threshold reduction requirements in sections 216(10) and 217(b)(4) of such Act shall not apply to allocations of such amount: *Provided further*, That the requirements under provisos 2 through 6 under this heading for fiscal year 2012 and such requirements applicable pursuant to the ''Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013'', shall not apply to any project to which funds were committed on or after August 23, 2013, but such projects shall instead be governed by the Final Rule titled ''Home Investment Partnerships Program; Improving Performance and Accountability; Updating Property Standards'' which became effective on such date: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding paragraphs (1)(B)(i) or (2)(B)(i) of section 1337(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4567(a)), amounts allocated under such paragraphs shall be credited to, made available, and merged with this account: *Provided further*, That no amounts made available by any provision of law may be transferred, reprogrammed, or credited to the Housing Trust Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the ''Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—HOME Investment Partnerships Program'' account, after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(increased by $293,000,000)''.

In the ''Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—HOME Investment Partnerships Program'' account, strike the last two provisos.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me please start by acknowledging the Honorable MAXINE WATERS. What I present tonight is an amendment that she actually authored, and I would like to present it. In so doing, I want to remind us that this amendment deals with two programs that are near and dear to my heart, the affordable housing trust fund and the HOME program.

These programs are near and dear to my heart because the greatness of a nation will not be measured by how we treat people who live in the suites of life, how we treat the well off, the well heeled, and the well to do.

The greatness of a nation is often measured by how we treat people who live in the streets of life, those who are too often among the least, the last, and the lost.

This amendment seeks to provide aid and comfort for those who, but for the grace of God, could be you or me, but those who find themselves living in the streets of life. This amendment, in dealing with the affordable housing trust fund, will restore it.

The current bill would actually eliminate the affordable housing trust fund. This amendment provides some degree of aid and comfort for those who are living at 30 percent of the area median income, wherever they happen to live.

In Ms. MAXINE WATERS' district, this would mean an annual income of $20,200 for a family of four. I would dare say that there are few among us who

would dare attempt to live off of $20,200 as an individual. This helps a family of four with $20,200. This is what the affordable housing trust fund does. It helps people who are extremely low of income.

My hope is that we will be able to prevent this elimination of the affordable housing trust fund, and this amendment does it.

This amendment also will help those who can benefit from the HOME program. The HOME program can serve a family of four that earns up to $53,900 per year. This program is a partnership, if you will, between State, municipal, and Federal Government.

It has been a program that has been of great benefit across the length and breadth of this country. There is not a State in the country, I would dare say, that has not benefited from the HOME program.

It is my hope that we can meet the President's request for the HOME program. Right now, it is about $293 million short of the President's request. This amendment would add that $293 million that the President has requested.

I started by indicating that these are two programs that are near and dear to me. Mr. Chairman, I believe that Ruth Meltzer was right when she indicated that some measure their lives by days and years, others by heartthrobs, passions, and tears; but the surest measure under God's sun is what for others in your lifetime have you done.

These programs afford us an opportunity to do for others, to be a blessing to those that have not been as blessed as we. My hope is that we will find a way to salvage both of these programs, restore the HOME program to what the President has requested, and prevent the affordable housing trust fund from finding its way to the ash heap of history.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)3 of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, which states the following:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. If I may, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, understanding the rules, I still would beseech us, Mr. Chairman, to give some consideration to the salvation of these programs.

Perhaps I will be able to work with the chairman and in some way help those who are not in a position to help themselves.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

□ 0000

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program, as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended, $50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be made available to the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $35,000,000 shall be made available for the second, third, and fourth capacity building activities authorized under section 4(a) of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note), of which not less than $5,000,000 shall be made available for rural capacity building activities: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity building by national rural housing organizations with experience assessing national rural conditions and providing financing, training, technical assistance, information, and research to local nonprofits, local governments and Indian Tribes serving high need rural communities.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency solutions grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended; the continuum of care program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; and the rural housing stability assistance program as authorized under subtitle D of title IV of such Act, $2,185,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That any rental assistance amounts that are recaptured under such continuum of care program shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That not less than $250,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such emergency solutions grants program: *Provided further*, That not less than $1,905,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such continuum of care and rural housing stability assistance programs: *Provided further*, That up to $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the national homeless data analysis project: *Provided further*, That all funds awarded for supportive services under the continuum of care program and the rural housing stability assistance program shall be matched by not less than 25 percent in cash or in kind by each grantee: *Provided further*, That for all match requirements applicable to funds made available under this heading for this fiscal year and prior years, a grantee may use (or could have used) as a source of match funds other funds administered by the Secretary and other Federal agencies unless there is (or was) a specific statutory prohibition on any such use of any such funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall establish minimum project performance thresholds for each grantee under the continuum of care program based on program performance data: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be available to renew any expiring contract or amendment to a contract funded under the continuum of care program unless the Secretary determines that the expiring contract or amendment to a contract is needed under the applicable continuum of care and meets appropriate program requirements, financial standards, and performance measures, including the minimum performance thresholds established in the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall prioritize funding under the continuum of care program to grant applications that demonstrate a capacity to reallocate funding from lower performing projects to higher performing projects: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible: *Provided further*, That with respect to funds provided under this heading for the continuum of care program for fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 provision of permanent housing rental assistance may be administered by private nonprofit organizations: *Provided further*, That any unobligated amounts remaining from funds appropriated under this heading in fiscal year 2012 and prior years for project-based rental assistance for rehabilitation projects with 10-year grant terms may be used for purposes under this heading, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were appropriated: *Provided further*, That all balances for Shelter Plus Care renewals previously funded from the Shelter Plus Care Renewal account and transferred to this account shall be available, if recaptured, for continuum of care renewals in fiscal year 2016: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation from amounts allocated (which may represent initial or final amounts allocated) for the emergency solutions grant program within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of project-based subsidy contracts under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) (''the Act''), not otherwise provided for, $10,254,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2015 (in addition to the

$400,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available October 1, 2015), and $400,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2016: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading shall be available for expiring or terminating section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for amendments to section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), for renewal of section 8 contracts for units in projects that are subject to approved plans of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, and for administrative and other expenses associated with project-based activities and assistance funded under this paragraph: *Provided further*, That of the total amounts provided under this heading, not to exceed $150,000,000 shall be available for performance-based contract administrators for section 8 project-based assistance, for carrying out 42 U.S.C. 1437(f): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may also use such amounts in the previous proviso for performance-based contract administrators for the administration of: interest reduction payments pursuant to section 236(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(a)); rent supplement payments pursuant to section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s); section 236(f)(2) rental assistance payments (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(f)(2)); project rental assistance contracts for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q); project rental assistance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(d)(2)); project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667); and loans under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667): *Provided further*, That amounts recaptured under this heading, the heading ''Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing'', or the heading ''Housing Certificate Fund'', may be used for renewals of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts or for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 8 project-based Housing Assistance Payments contract that authorizes HUD or a Housing Finance Agency to require that surplus project funds be deposited in an interest-bearing residual receipts account and that are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary, shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amount otherwise provided by this heading for uses authorized under this heading.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

For amendments to capital advance contracts for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for senior preservation rental assistance contracts, including renewals, as authorized by section 811(e) of the American Housing and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000, as amended, and for supportive services associated with the housing, $414,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, up to $77,000,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects: *Provided further*, That amounts under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 202 projects: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of section 202 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed 5 years in duration: *Provided further*, That upon request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 202 project rental assistance contract, and that upon termination of such contract are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary, shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until September 30, 2019, for purposes under this heading, and shall be in addition to the amounts otherwise provided under this heading for such purposes: *Provided further*, That in addition, of the prior year unobligated balances of funds, including recaptures and carryover, made available under this heading, $47,000,000 shall be used for an additional amount for the purposes provided under this heading, notwithstanding any purpose for which originally appropriated.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 105, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 113, line 6, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to increase the housing for the elderly account in this bill by $2.5 million and decrease the policy development and research account within the Department of Housing and Urban Development by an equal amount.

I hope my good friend from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) across the aisle agrees with me on this one. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

For amendments to capital advance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of such Act and for project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, for project rental assistance to State housing finance agencies and other appropriate entities as authorized under section 811(b)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Housing Act, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811(b)(1) of such Act, $152,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 811 projects: *Provided further*, That, in this fiscal year, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 811 project rental assistance contract and that upon termination of such contract are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until September 30, 2019: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited in this account pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amounts otherwise provided by this heading for the purposes authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds transferred to or appropriated under this heading may be used for the current purposes authorized under this heading notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds originally were appropriated.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance excluding loans, as authorized under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, $47,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, including up to $4,500,000 for administrative contract services: *Provided*, That grants made available from amounts provided under this heading shall be awarded within 180 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That funds shall be used for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners, both current and prospective, with respect to property maintenance, financial management/literacy, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions, meeting their financial needs, and fulfilling the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership; for program administration; and for housing counselor training: *Provided further*, That for purposes of providing such grants from amounts provided under this heading, the Secretary may enter into multiyear agreements as is appropriate, subject to the availability of annual appropriations.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

For amendments to contracts under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s) and section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1) in State-aided, noninsured rental housing projects, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount, together with unobligated balances from recaptured amounts appropriated prior to fiscal year 2006 from terminated contracts under such sections of law, and any unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated

under this heading after fiscal year 2005, shall also be available for extensions of up to one year for expiring contracts under such sections of law.

PAYMENT TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), up to $11,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $11,000,000 is to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at zero, and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation: *Provided further*, That for the dispute resolution and installation programs, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may assess and collect fees from any program participant: *Provided further*, That such collections shall be deposited into the Fund, and the Secretary, as provided herein, may use such collections, as well as fees collected under section 620, for necessary expenses of such Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the requirements of section 620 of such Act, the Secretary may carry out responsibilities of the Secretary under such Act through the use of approved service providers that are paid directly by the recipients of their services.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee single family loans insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund shall not exceed $400,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2016, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed $5,000,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing amount in the previous proviso shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund: *Provided Further*, That for administrative contract expenses of the Federal Housing Administration, $130,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee loans insured under the General and Special Risk Insurance Funds, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3 and 1735c), shall not exceed $30,000,000,000 in total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2016, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(l), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed $5,000,000, which shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed $500,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That $23,000,000 shall be available for necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Government National Mortgage Association: *Provided further*, That receipts from Commitment and Multiclass fees collected pursuant to title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, $52,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That with respect to amounts made available under this heading, notwithstanding section 204 of this title, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements funded with philanthropic entities, other Federal agencies, or State or local governments and their agencies for research projects: *Provided further*, That with respect to the previous proviso, such partners to the cooperative agreements must contribute at least a 50 percent match toward the cost of the project: *Provided further*, That for non-competitive agreements entered into in accordance with the previous two provisos, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall comply with section 2(b) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–282, 31 U.S.C. note) in lieu of compliance with section 102(a)(4)(C) with respect to documentation of award decisions: *Provided further*, That prior to obligation of technical assistance funding, the Secretary shall submit a plan, for approval, to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on how it will allocate funding for this activity.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, $65,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary may assess and collect fees to cover the costs of the Fair Housing Training Academy, and may use such funds to provide such training: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant, or loan: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $300,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the creation and promotion of translated materials and other programs that support the assistance of persons with limited English proficiency in utilizing the services provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 114, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $28,375,000) (increased by $28,375,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART as well as Ranking Member PRICE for their hard work on this bill and for preparing a bill that is the best we can do.

I do rise in support of an amendment that seeks to curb lawsuit abuse and help fund our local governments. This creates congressional intent to redirect funds away from the private enforcement account to the administrative enforcement account.

My amendment would decrease by $28.375 million the Private Enforcement Initiative and redirect those resources to the Administrative Enforcement Initiative in the Fair Housing Initiatives Program.

I believe that the most efficient and effective way to protect Fair Housing is through the Administrative Enforcement Initiative of the Fair Housing Initiatives Program, which helps State and local governments who administer laws that include rights and remedies every day. They act to help Fair Housing. They know their communities, and they can enforce in their communities best.

My amendment would help protect more consumers. In fact, I believe administrative enforcement is less expensive to taxpayers. It is more certain. It has faster resolution. It has less conflicts of interest than some of these nonprofit proxy agencies that use the Private Enforcement Initiative.

In fact, there is a 1997 GAO study, Mr. Chairman, that revealed that more than half of the Private Enforcement Initiative dollars were concentrated in just 6 of the 27 awardees. I have asked the GAO to update that study and to look at private enforcement as far as its effectiveness because, as I said, it is slower and more expensive than administrative enforcement.

Therefore, I would ask my colleagues to support my congressional intent amendment to redirect these resources to our State and local governments who can more effectively administer justice. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. We have only recently received it, and I haven't fully analyzed

it; but, on the face of it, it does appear to be shifting the support among private enforcement and public enforcement, the kind of private enforcement that involves community-based groups, that involves often more flexible ways of resolving conflicts and issues.

I simply think it is ill advised here tonight to undertake that kind of internal shifting of funds and would suggest that we reject this, understanding that we can return to it and examine this more fully to see exactly what is implied by this kind of internal shifting of funds within Fair Housing accounts.

I suggest that we reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to my colleague from North Carolina that administrative enforcement is more effective, it is more efficient. That is why we should redirect these resources internally inside Fair Housing. It doesn't change Fair Housing dollars one penny.

It redirects the resources to more efficient and effective means of enforcement, from folks who enforce these laws every day and can do it faster and more effectively, to make sure the people that might be discriminated against get their redress sooner.

I am excited about this amendment. I think it will lead to much more effective enforcement. It does so without the conflict of interest of these private organizations that can have conflicts of interest, and that has been another issue that I have asked the GAO to look at in my letter to them today.

I apologize that the minority is just seeing this for the first time. I did talk about it at the Rules Committee the other day. It is something I have been working on just for a couple of days since that Rules Committee meeting when it came up. I apologized for not giving the gentleman from North Carolina more notice.

I would urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 114, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $150,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to raise the cap on funding for the Limited English Proficiency Initiative under the Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity section of the bill by 50 percent.

I want to highlight that we are not taking away anything from other programs. We are simply lifting the cap on this particular initiative. This amendment has passed by voice vote for the last 2 years, and it is my hope that it will do so again.

There are more than 40 million Americans who do not speak English as their first language. This tiny, but vital program demonstrates to the American people that we have equal protection under the law, regardless of what language we speak.

I hope to once again have the support of my friend from Florida and from the House as a whole.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL AND HEALTHY HOMES

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by section 1011 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, $75,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That up to $15,000,000 of that amount shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related diseases and hazards: *Provided further*, That for purposes of environmental review, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other provisions of the law that further the purposes of such Act, a grant under the Healthy Homes Initiative, or the Lead Technical Studies program under this heading or under prior appropriations Acts for such purposes under this heading, shall be considered to be funds for a special project for purposes of section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading in this or prior appropriations Acts, and that still remain available, may be used for any purpose under this heading notwithstanding the purpose for which such amounts were appropriated if a program competition is undersubscribed and there are other program competitions under this heading that are oversubscribed.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FUND

For the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide and program-specific information technology systems, for the continuing operation and maintenance of both Department-wide and program-specific information systems, and for program-related maintenance activities, $100,000,000: *Provided*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund under this Act shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund from amounts appropriated by previously enacted appropriations Acts may be used for the purposes specified under this Fund, in addition to any other information technology purposes for which such amounts were appropriated.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $126,000,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within this office.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 201. Eighty five percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 85 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be rescinded or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate. Any amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded, returned to the Treasury, or otherwise awarded by September 30, 2016 shall be rescinded or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2016 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a nonfrivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. Sections 203 and 209 of division C of Public Law 112–55 (125 Stat. 693–694) shall apply during fiscal year 2016 as if such sections were included in this title, except that during such fiscal year such sections shall be applied by substituting ''fiscal year 2016'' for ''fiscal year 2011'' and for ''fiscal year 2012'' each place such terms appear, and shall be amended to reflect revised delineations of statistical areas established by the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3504(e)(3), 31 U.S.C. 1104(d), and Executive Order No. 10253.

SEC. 204. Except as explicitly provided in law, any grant, cooperative agreement or other assistance made pursuant to title II of this Act shall be made on a competitive basis and in accordance with section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545).

SEC. 205. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for the services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-11).

SEC. 206. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or through a reprogramming of funds, no part of any appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available for any program, project or activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted to Congress.

SEC. 207. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the

limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2016 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 208. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations regarding all uncommitted, unobligated, recaptured and excess funds in each program and activity within the jurisdiction of the Department and shall submit additional, updated budget information to these Committees upon request.

SEC. 209. The President's formal budget request for fiscal year 2017, as well as the Department of Housing and Urban Development's congressional budget justifications to be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall use the identical account and sub-account structure provided under this Act.

SEC. 210. A public housing agency or such other entity that administers Federal housing assistance for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California, and the States of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi shall not be required to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of assistance provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 on the board of directors or a similar governing board of such agency or entity as required under section (2)(b) of such Act. Each public housing agency or other entity that administers Federal housing assistance under section 8 for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California and the States of Alaska, Iowa and Mississippi that chooses not to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of section 8 assistance on the board of directors or a similar governing board shall establish an advisory board of not less than six residents of public housing or recipients of section 8 assistance to provide advice and comment to the public housing agency or other administering entity on issues related to public housing and section 8. Such advisory board shall meet not less than quarterly.

SEC. 211. No funds provided under this title may be used for an audit of the Government National Mortgage Association that makes applicable requirements under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.).

SEC. 212. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to the conditions listed under this section, for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may authorize the transfer of some or all project-based assistance, debt held or insured by the Secretary and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions if any, associated with one or more multifamily housing project or projects to another multifamily housing project or projects.

(b) Transfers of project-based assistance under this section may be done in phases to accommodate the financing and other requirements related to rehabilitating or constructing the project or projects to which the assistance is transferred, to ensure that such project or projects meet the standards under subsection (c).

(c) The transfer authorized in subsection (a) is subject to the following conditions:

(1) Number and bedroom size of units.—

(A) For occupied units in the transferring project: the number of low-income and very low-income units and the configuration (i.e., bedroom size) provided by the transferring project shall be no less than when transferred to the receiving project or projects and the net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided to the transferring project shall remain the same in the receiving project or projects.

(B) For unoccupied units in the transferring project: the Secretary may authorize a reduction in the number of dwelling units in the receiving project or projects to allow for a reconfiguration of bedroom sizes to meet current market demands, as determined by the Secretary and provided there is no increase in the project-based assistance budget authority.

(2) The transferring project shall, as determined by the Secretary, be either physically obsolete or economically nonviable.

(3) The receiving project or projects shall meet or exceed applicable physical standards established by the Secretary.

(4) The owner or mortgagor of the transferring project shall notify and consult with the tenants residing in the transferring project and provide a certification of approval by all appropriate local governmental officials.

(5) The tenants of the transferring project who remain eligible for assistance to be provided by the receiving project or projects shall not be required to vacate their units in the transferring project or projects until new units in the receiving project are available for occupancy.

(6) The Secretary determines that this transfer is in the best interest of the tenants.

(7) If either the transferring project or the receiving project or projects meets the condition specified in subsection (d)(2)(A), any lien on the receiving project resulting from additional financing obtained by the owner shall be subordinate to any FHA-insured mortgage lien transferred to, or placed on, such project by the Secretary, except that the Secretary may waive this requirement upon determination that such a waiver is necessary to facilitate the financing of acquisition, construction, and/or rehabilitation of the receiving project or projects.

(8) If the transferring project meets the requirements of subsection (d)(2), the owner or mortgagor of the receiving project or projects shall execute and record either a continuation of the existing use agreement or a new use agreement for the project where, in either case, any use restrictions in such agreement are of no lesser duration than the existing use restrictions.

(9) The transfer does not increase the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended) of any FHA-insured mortgage, except to the extent that appropriations are provided in advance for the amount of any such increased cost.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms ''low-income'' and ''very low-income'' shall have the meanings provided by the statute and/or regulations governing the program under which the project is insured or assisted;

(2) the term ''multifamily housing project'' means housing that meets one of the following conditions—

(A) housing that is subject to a mortgage insured under the National Housing Act;

(B) housing that has project-based assistance attached to the structure including projects undergoing mark to market debt restructuring under the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Housing Act;

(C) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(D) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as such section existed before the enactment of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(E) housing that is assisted under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act; or

(F) housing or vacant land that is subject to a use agreement;

(3) the term ''project-based assistance'' means—

(A) assistance provided under section 8(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937;

(B) assistance for housing constructed or substantially rehabilitated pursuant to assistance provided under section 8(b)(2) of such Act (as such section existed immediately before October 1, 1983);

(C) rent supplement payments under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

(D) interest reduction payments under section 236 and/or additional assistance payments under section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act;

(E) assistance payments made under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959; and

(F) assistance payments made under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act;

(4) the term ''receiving project or projects'' means the multifamily housing project or projects to which some or all of the project-based assistance, debt, and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions are to be transferred;

(5) the term ''transferring project'' means the multifamily housing project which is transferring some or all of the project-based assistance, debt, and the statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions to the receiving project or projects; and

(6) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(e) PUBLIC NOTICE AND RESEARCH REPORT.—

(1) The Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register the terms and conditions, including criteria for HUD approval, of transfers pursuant to this section no later than 30 days before the effective date of such notice.

(2) The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the transfer authority under this section, including the effect of such transfers on the operational efficiency, contract rents, physical and financial conditions, and long-term preservation of the affected properties.

SEC. 213. (a) No assistance shall be provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to any individual who—

(1) is enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education (as defined under section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002));

(2) is under 24 years of age;

(3) is not a veteran;

(4) is unmarried;

(5) does not have a dependent child;

(6) is not a person with disabilities, as such term is defined in section 3(b)(3)(E) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(3)(E)) and was not receiving assistance under such section 8 as of November 30, 2005; and

(7) is not otherwise individually eligible, or has parents who, individually or jointly, are

not eligible, to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(b) For purposes of determining the eligibility of a person to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), any financial assistance (in excess of amounts received for tuition and any other required fees and charges) that an individual receives under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), from private sources, or an institution of higher education (as defined under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall be considered income to that individual, except for a person over the age of 23 with dependent children.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 156, line 8 be considered read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill through page 156, line 8, is as follows:

SEC. 214. The funds made available for Native Alaskans under the heading ''Native American Housing Block Grants'' in title II of this Act shall be allocated to the same Native Alaskan housing block grant recipients that received funds in fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 215. Notwithstanding the limitation in the first sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20(g)), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may, until September 30, 2016, insure and enter into commitments to insure mortgages under such section 255.

SEC. 216. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 2016, in managing and disposing of any multifamily property that is owned or has a mortgage held by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and during the process of foreclosure on any property with a contract for rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or other Federal programs, the Secretary shall maintain any rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and other programs that are attached to any dwelling units in the property. To the extent the Secretary determines, in consultation with the tenants and the local government, that such a multifamily property owned or held by the Secretary is not feasible for continued rental assistance payments under such section 8 or other programs, based on consideration of (1) the costs of rehabilitating and operating the property and all available Federal, State, and local resources, including rent adjustments under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (''MAHRAA'') and (2) environmental conditions that cannot be remedied in a cost-effective fashion, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance. The Secretary shall also take appropriate steps to ensure that project-based contracts remain in effect prior to foreclosure, subject to the exercise of contractual abatement remedies to assist relocation of tenants for imminent major threats to health and safety after written notice to and informed consent of the affected tenants and use of other available remedies, such as partial abatements or receivership. After disposition of any multifamily property described under this section, the contract and allowable rent levels on such properties shall be subject to the requirements under section 524 of MAHRAA.

SEC. 217. The commitment authority funded by fees as provided under the heading ''Community Development Loan Guarantees Program Account'' may be used to guarantee, or make commitments to guarantee, notes or other obligations issued by any State on behalf of non-entitlement communities in the State in accordance with the requirements of section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided*, That any State receiving such a guarantee or commitment shall distribute all funds subject to such guarantee to the units of general local government in non-entitlement areas that received the commitment.

SEC. 218. Public housing agencies that own and operate 400 or fewer public housing units may elect to be exempt from any asset management requirement imposed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the operating fund rule: *Provided*, That an agency seeking a discontinuance of a reduction of subsidy under the operating fund formula shall not be exempt from asset management requirements.

SEC. 219. With respect to the use of amounts provided in this Act and in future Acts for the operation, capital improvement and management of public housing as authorized by sections 9(d) and 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(d) and (e)), the Secretary shall not impose any requirement or guideline relating to asset management that restricts or limits in any way the use of capital funds for central office costs pursuant to section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(g)(1), (2)): *Provided*, That a public housing agency may not use capital funds authorized under section 9(d) for activities that are eligible under section 9(e) for assistance with amounts from the operating fund in excess of the amounts permitted under section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2).

SEC. 220. No official or employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be designated as an allotment holder unless the Office of the Chief Financial Officer has determined that such allotment holder has implemented an adequate system of funds control and has received training in funds control procedures and directives. The Chief Financial Officer shall ensure that there is a trained allotment holder for each HUD sub-office under the accounts ''Executive Offices'' and ''Administrative Support Offices'', as well as each account receiving appropriations for ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'', ''Government National Mortgage Association—Guarantees of Mortgage-Backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account'', and ''Office of Inspector General'' within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 221. The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall, for fiscal year 2016, notify the public through the Federal Register and other means, as determined appropriate, of the issuance of a notice of the availability of assistance or notice of funding availability (NOFA) for any program or discretionary fund administered by the Secretary that is to be competitively awarded. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2016, the Secretary may make the NOFA available only on the Internet at the appropriate Government web site or through other electronic media, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 222. Payment of attorney fees in program-related litigation must be paid from the individual program office and Office of General Counsel personnel funding. The annual budget submissions for program offices and Office of General Counsel personnel funding must include program-related litigation costs for attorney fees as a separate line item request.

SEC. 223. The Disaster Housing Assistance Programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, shall be considered a ''program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development'' under section 904 of the McKinney Act for the purpose of income verifications and matching.

SEC. 224. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall take the required actions under subsection (b) when a multifamily housing project with a section 8 contract or contract for similar project-based assistance:

(1) receives a Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC) score of 30 or less; or

(2) receives a REAC score between 31 and 59 and:

(A) fails to certify in writing to HUD within 60 days that all deficiencies have been corrected; or

(B) receives consecutive scores of less than 60 on REAC inspections.

Such requirements shall apply to insured and noninsured projects with assistance attached to the units under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), but do not apply to such units assisted under section 8(o)(13) (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(13)) or to public housing units assisted with capital or operating funds under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g).

(b) The Secretary shall take the following required actions as authorized under subsection (a)—

(1) The Secretary shall notify the owner and provide an opportunity for response within 30 days. If the violations remain, the Secretary shall develop a Compliance, Disposition and Enforcement Plan within 60 days, with a specified timetable for correcting all deficiencies. The Secretary shall provide notice of the Plan to the owner, tenants, the local government, any mortgagees, and any contract administrator.

(2) At the end of the term of the Compliance, Disposition and Enforcement Plan, if the owner fails to fully comply with such plan, the Secretary may require immediate replacement of project management with a management agent approved by the Secretary, and shall take one or more of the following actions, and provide additional notice of those actions to the owner and the parties specified above:

(A) impose civil money penalties;

(B) abate the section 8 contract, including partial abatement, as determined by the Secretary, until all deficiencies have been corrected;

(C) pursue transfer of the project to an owner, approved by the Secretary under established procedures, which will be obligated to promptly make all required repairs and to accept renewal of the assistance contract as long as such renewal is offered; or

(D) seek judicial appointment of a receiver to manage the property and cure all project deficiencies or seek a judicial order of specific performance requiring the owner to cure all project deficiencies.

(c) The Secretary shall also take appropriate steps to ensure that project-based contracts remain in effect, subject to the exercise of contractual abatement remedies to assist relocation of tenants for imminent major threats to health and safety after written notice to and informed consent of the affected tenants and use of other remedies set forth above. To the extent the Secretary determines, in consultation with the tenants and the local government, that the property is not feasible for continued rental

assistance payments under such section 8 or other programs, based on consideration of (1) the costs of rehabilitating and operating the property and all available Federal, State, and local resources, including rent adjustments under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (''MAHRAA'') and (2) environmental conditions that cannot be remedied in a cost-effective fashion, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance. The Secretary shall report semi-annually on all properties covered by this section that are assessed through the Real Estate Assessment Center and have physical inspection scores of less than 30 or have consecutive physical inspection scores of less than 60. The report shall include:

(1) The enforcement actions being taken to address such conditions, including imposition of civil money penalties and termination of subsidies, and identify properties that have such conditions multiple times; and

(2) Actions that the Department of Housing and Urban Development is taking to protect tenants of such identified properties.

SEC. 225. None of the funds made available by this Act, or any other Act, for purposes authorized under section 8 (only with respect to the tenant-based rental assistance program) and section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.), may be used by any public housing agency for any amount of salary, including bonuses, for the chief executive officer of which, or any other official or employee of which, that exceeds the annual rate of basic pay payable for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule at any time during any public housing agency fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 226. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the doctoral dissertation research grant program at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 227. None of the funds in this Act provided to the Department of Housing and Urban Development may be used to make a grant award unless the Secretary notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 3 full business days before any project, State, locality, housing authority, tribe, nonprofit organization, or other entity selected to receive a grant award is announced by the Department or its offices.

SEC. 228. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require or enforce the Physical Needs Assessment (PNA).

SEC. 229. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used by the Federal Housing Administration, the Government National Mortgage Administration, or the Department of Housing and Urban Development to insure, securitize, or establish a Federal guarantee of any mortgage or mortgage backed security that refinances or otherwise replaces a mortgage that has been subject to eminent domain condemnation or seizure, by a state, municipality, or any other political subdivision of a state.

SEC. 230. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to terminate the status of a unit of general local government as a metropolitan city (as defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302)) with respect to grants under section 106 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 5306).

SEC. 231. Amounts made available under this Act which are either appropriated, allocated, advanced on a reimbursable basis, or transferred to the Office of Policy Development and Research in the Department of Housing and Urban Development and functions thereof, for research, evaluation, or statistical purposes, and which are unexpended at the time of completion of a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, may be deobligated and shall immediately become available and may be reobligated in that fiscal year or the subsequent fiscal year for the research, evaluation, or statistical purposes for which the amounts are made available to that Office subject to reprogramming requirements in Section 405 of this Act.

SEC. 232. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to require a recipient or sub-recipient of funding for the purpose of land acquisition, affordable housing construction, or affordable housing rehabilitation to meet Energy Star standards or any other energy efficiency standards that exceed the requirements of applicable State and local building codes.

SEC. 233. Of the unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated in section 1497(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111–203; 42 U.S.C. 5301 note) and section 2301(a) of title III of division B of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–289; 42 U.S.C. 5301 note), $7,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

SEC. 234. (a) All unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the heading ''Rural Housing and Economic Development'' are hereby rescinded.

(b) Effective October 1, 2015, all unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for accounts under the headings ''Management and Administration'' and ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'' in division K of Public Law 113–235 are rescinded.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2016''.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

ACCESS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Access Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, $7,548,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation funds received for publications and training expenses.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 307), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902, $25,660,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $23,999,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern the obtaining of such services within the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may select, appoint, and employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Office of Inspector General, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern such selections, appointments, and employment within Amtrak: *Provided further*, That concurrent with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2017, the Inspector General shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2017 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS–15; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902), $103,981,000, of which not to exceed $2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses. The amounts made available to the National Transportation Safety Board in this Act include amounts necessary to make lease payments on an obligation incurred in fiscal year 2001 for a capital lease.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101–8107), $135,000,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be for a multi-family rental housing program: *Provided*, That in addition, $42,000,000 shall be made available until expended to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for mortgage foreclosure mitigation activities, under the following terms and conditions:

(1) The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NRC) shall make grants to counseling intermediaries approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (with match to be determined by NRC based on affordability and the economic conditions of an area; a match also may be waived by NRC based on the aforementioned conditions) to provide mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance primarily to States and areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures to help eliminate the default and foreclosure of mortgages of owner-occupied single-family homes that are at risk of such foreclosure. Other than areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures, grants may also be provided to approved counseling intermediaries based on a geographic analysis of the Nation by NRC which determines where there is a prevalence of mortgages that are risky and likely to fail, including any trends for mortgages that are likely to default and face foreclosure. A State Housing Finance Agency may also be eligible where the State Housing Finance Agency meets all the requirements under this paragraph. A

HUD-approved counseling intermediary shall meet certain mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance counseling requirements, as determined by NRC, and shall be approved by HUD or NRC as meeting these requirements.

(2) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance shall only be made available to homeowners of owner-occupied homes with mortgages in default or in danger of default. These mortgages shall likely be subject to a foreclosure action and homeowners will be provided such assistance that shall consist of activities that are likely to prevent foreclosures and result in the long-term affordability of the mortgage retained pursuant to such activity or another positive outcome for the homeowner. No funds made available under this paragraph may be provided directly to lenders or homeowners to discharge outstanding mortgage balances or for any other direct debt reduction payments.

(3) The use of mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance by approved counseling intermediaries and State Housing Finance Agencies shall involve a reasonable analysis of the borrower's financial situation, an evaluation of the current value of the property that is subject to the mortgage, counseling regarding the assumption of the mortgage by another non-Federal party, counseling regarding the possible purchase of the mortgage by a non-Federal third party, counseling and advice of all likely restructuring and refinancing strategies or the approval of a work-out strategy by all interested parties.

(4) NRC may provide up to 15 percent of the total funds under this paragraph to its own charter members with expertise in foreclosure prevention counseling, subject to a certification by NRC that the procedures for selection do not consist of any procedures or activities that could be construed as a conflict of interest or have the appearance of impropriety.

(5) HUD-approved counseling entities and State Housing Finance Agencies receiving funds under this paragraph shall have demonstrated experience in successfully working with financial institutions as well as borrowers facing default, delinquency and foreclosure as well as documented counseling capacity, outreach capacity, past successful performance and positive outcomes with documented counseling plans (including post mortgage foreclosure mitigation counseling), loan workout agreements and loan modification agreements. NRC may use other criteria to demonstrate capacity in underserved areas.

(6) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to $2,000,000 may be made available to build the mortgage foreclosure and default mitigation counseling capacity of counseling intermediaries through NRC training courses with HUD-approved counseling intermediaries and their partners, except that private financial institutions that participate in NRC training shall pay market rates for such training.

(7) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to 5 percent may be used for associated administrative expenses for NRC to carry out activities provided under this section.

(8) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance grants may include a budget for outreach and advertising, and training, as determined by NRC.

(9) NRC shall continue to report bi-annually to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as well as the Senate Banking Committee and House Financial Services Committee on its efforts to mitigate mortgage default.

UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness in carrying out the functions pursuant to title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, $3,530,000.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 401. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 402. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 403. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through a procurement contract pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 404. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or ''new age'' belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N–915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 405. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2016, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

(1) creates a new program;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

(4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either the House or Senate Committees on Appropriations for a different purpose;

(5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less;

(6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or

(7) creates, reorganizes, or restructures a branch, division, office, bureau, board, commission, agency, administration, or department different from the budget justifications submitted to the Committees on Appropriations or the table accompanying the explanatory statement accompanying this Act, whichever is more detailed, unless prior approval is received from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the report shall include:

(A) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the prior year enacted level, the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(B) a delineation in the table for each appropriation and its respective prior year enacted level by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation; and

(C) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

SEC. 406. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2016 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2016 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2017, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines under section 405 of this Act.

SEC. 407. No funds in this Act may be used to support any Federal, State, or local projects that seek to use the power of eminent domain, unless eminent domain is employed only for a public use: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities: *Provided further*, That any use of funds for mass transit, railroad, airport, seaport or highway projects, as well as utility projects which benefit or serve the general public (including energy-related, communication-related, water-related and wastewater-related infrastructure), other structures designated for use by the general public or which have other common-carrier or public-utility functions that serve the general public and are subject to regulation and oversight by the government, and projects for the removal of an immediate threat to public health and safety or brownfields as defined in the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Public Law 107–118) shall be considered a public use for purposes of eminent domain.

SEC. 408. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly

held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his or her period of active military or naval service, and has within 90 days after his or her release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year, made application for restoration to his or her former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his or her former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 410. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. 411. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c).

SEC. 412. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class airline accommodations in contravention of sections 301–10.122 and 301–10.123 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 413. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to approve a new foreign air carrier permit under sections 41301 through 41305 of title 49, United States Code, or exemption application under section 40109 of that title of an air carrier already holding an air operators certificate issued by a country that is party to the U.S.-E.U.-Iceland-Norway Air Transport Agreement where such approval would contravene United States law or Article 17 bis of the U.S.-E.U.-Iceland-Norway Air Transport Agreement.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict or otherwise preclude the Secretary of Transportation from granting a foreign air carrier permit or an exemption to such an air carrier where such authorization is consistent with the U.S.-E.U.-Iceland-Norway Air Transport Agreement and United States law.

SEC. 414. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Maritime Commission or the Administrator of the Maritime Administration to issue a license or certificate for a commercial vessel that docked or anchored within the previous 180 days within 7 miles of a port on property that was confiscated, in whole or in part, by the Cuban Government, as the terms confiscated, Cuban Government, and property are defined in paragraphs (4), (5), and (12)(A), respectively, of section 4 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6023).

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that portion of the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 415. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under Section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Private Enforcement Initiative of the Fair Housing Initiatives Program under section 561(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3616a(b)) and section 125.401 of the regulations of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (24 C.F.R. 125.401).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I will be fairly brief.

This is a followup amendment. We have already accepted the congressional intent that we will have a preference toward administrative enforcement. This is a followup limitation amendment that basically says we will not, for this calendar year, use the Private Enforcement Initiative.

As the gentleman from North Carolina said, we can always come back; but I think we need to have time for this GAO study that I have requested to come back because I would assert that administrative enforcement is less expensive to taxpayers than private enforcement.

It creates more certainty. It happens faster. It has less conflict of interest than the Private Enforcement Initiative. I would ask that my colleagues support this limitation amendment on the Private Enforcement Initiative for this year period.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0015

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Again, Mr. Chairman, let me say how unfortunate I believe it is that we are dealing with this kind of amendment in this setting here tonight without really having much notice, much ability to understand the full implications.

I do think that we need to appreciate the role of what the gentleman calls private organizations. We are really talking here about nonprofits, about mediators, about the kind of working out of complaints, working out of problems, informal work with landlords, the kind of thing that actually helps avoid legal action and avoid litigation. There is a lot that can be mediated, a lot of things can be worked out in the fair housing arena. There are many nonprofit groups that do a good job of doing that.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman apparently has lots of complaints about this, and there have been a couple of prominent cases. I am aware of that. But the notion that we would come in here tonight and make a change of this magnitude, of this importance, I simply don't think is responsible.

So I will speak for myself. I am perfectly willing to look at this matter down the road. I understand there may be some issues here, but this is a pretty drastic amendment, and you are taking a whole area here of mediation and informal conciliation, things that actually keep things out of the courts, keep things out of the legal system and out of litigation. I don't know why we would want to do that. It seems reckless to me.

I recommend that we reject this amendment and, at the same time, pledge to look at this carefully and work on it later.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Chair, does recognize that there are problems in the private enforcement initiative. He just admitted that. There is a lot of lawsuit abuse. In fact, many of these organizations sue first and ask questions later. They don't do their due diligence. They send interns in to actually look at these places and file lawsuits before they get the facts.

The gentleman asserted that we shouldn't make these kind of changes. That is why the people sent us here, to make things better. We are supposed to do it every day, and when we see problems, we need to fix them. This is a temporary, 1-year halt of the private enforcement initiative with the GAO study that is not directed in this bill, but I asked for by letter through the GAO, and they are always good about doing those when you ask them to. They haven't looked at this program since 1997.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to look at this program in detail. I would assert that our local and State governments can also do the mediation that the gentleman from North Carolina talked about, Mr. Chairman, and they can do it better, more efficiently, and without the conflicts of interest that some of these private organizations have done.

So I think we ought to give it a try. That is the great thing about an annual appropriations bill. Guess what; we get to do it again next year. I am certainly willing to admit if I am wrong and we find out through a GAO study that the private enforcement has worked well. But there have been articles in the paper about some of the lawsuit abuse that we have seen all across the country, and I think we should just take a strategic pause here and give the money to our State and local governments who can better enforce our laws. They do it every day, and they can do it through the mediation and things that the gentleman asserts that these private enforcement initiatives can do so well.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I think it will help make our fair housing laws better, and it will protect more consumers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be waived.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill considered under an open rule during the 113th and 114th Congresses.

My amendment would expand the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of that contractor. It is my hope that this amendment will be noncontroversial, as it always has been, and again passed unanimously by the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 121.584 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will ensure that the FAA is doing everything that it can to certify that our aircraft are protected during a moment that pilots, flight attendants, and Federal law enforcement officers have all said that the aircraft is vulnerable to terror hijackings. Despite the effort to safeguard the cockpit after the 9/11 terror attacks, today, operational experience has highlighted that a critical vulnerability remains when a pilot must open the hardened, reinforced cockpit doors to eat, rest, or use the bathroom during long flights. Even the FAA recognizes that, ''During this door transition, the flight deck is vulnerable.''

Current FAA regulations require that the area outside the flight deck be secure before the reinforced cockpit door is opened. Currently, some airlines are using human shields or, in some cases, drink carts to try to block entry to the cockpit and claim it ''secure.'' But only one method has been thoroughly studied and proven to beat the threat of a trained hijacker exploiting this particular vulnerability, and that is an installed physical secondary barrier door. These barriers are light, inexpensive wire gates that are able to protect the flight deck long enough for the pilot to shut the reinforced door.

This double door security procedure is something that Israeli airlines have been using for over a decade. They understand the risk and how to mitigate it. A Cato study has shown these secondary barrier doors to be the most cost-effective way to protect the cockpit door when the reinforced door is opened.

This is not some hypothetical threat. We know for a fact that terrorists maintain their desire to exploit vulnerabilities in our aircraft safety protocols to bring down an airliner just like they did on September 11, 2001. A recent USA Today headline read, ''ISIS' Next Test Could Be a 9/11–Style Attack.'' In 2013, outgoing FBI Director Robert Mueller said that the terror scenario he fears most remains an attack with the use of an aircraft.

Perhaps no one knows the consequences of terrorists hijacking our aircraft more so than my constituent, Ellen Saracini. The terror hijackings of September 11 took the life of her husband, Victor Saracini, Captain of United Flight 175, which was hijacked and flown into the South Tower of the World Trade Center by al Qaeda terrorists.

Inspired by Ellen and the pilots and flight attendants that stand with her, I have been working with a bipartisan, bicameral group of lawmakers to have these commonsense, cost-effective security features installed on every single large passenger aircraft in the United States through my bill, H.R. 911, the Saracini Aviation Safety Act.

Some have pointed to the ''layered security'' approach to aircraft security as proof that we don't need secondary barriers, but one only need to read current headlines to see the huge gaps in our layered security. As we recently learned, undercover agents, we saw, this week, were able to get weapons past the TSA 95 percent of the time.

Mr. Chairman, a recent Advisory Circular issued by the FAA highlights the risk to the cockpit during door transition and calls for the use of effective protection measures. Support for this amendment today would build on this positive step used by the FAA by showing that Congress is serious about this issue and that installed physical secondary barriers are the only way that we can guarantee, as FAA regulations do require, that the flight deck be secure prior to that reinforced door being opened.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make incentive payments pursuant to 48 CFR 16.4 to contractors for contracts that are behind schedule under the terms of the contract as prescribed by 48 CFR 52.211 or over the contract amount indicated in Standard Form 33, box 20.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be waived.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a good government amendment the House passed by voice vote last year. It simply states that bonus payments should not be paid to contractors whose projects are behind schedule or over budget.

I urge support for this amendment that combats waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TODAY

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 2, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2048. To reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, June 4, 2015, at 9 a.m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2623. A bill to reduce prescription drug costs by allowing the importation and reimportation of certain drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 2624. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow for fair application of the exceptions process for drugs in tiers in formularies in prescription drug plans under Medicare part D, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 2625. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to reform the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit Indian tribal governments to be shareholders of S corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2627. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to expand the use of salad bars in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2628. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2629. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the approval of certain antibacterial and antifungal drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOLLY (for himself and Ms. GRAHAM):

H.R. 2630. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to extend the moratorium on oil and gas leasing and related activities in certain areas of the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 2631. A bill to require notice and comment for certain interpretive rules; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2632. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and update the National Child Traumatic Stress Initiative for grants to address the problems of individuals who experience trauma and violence related stress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2633. A bill to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2634. A bill to provide for temporary emergency impact aid for local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 2635. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2636. A bill to require a study on the public health and environmental impacts of the production, transportation, storage, and use of petroleum coke, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 2637. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the regulation of emissions of carbon dioxide from new or existing power plants under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2638. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reform and modernize the Universal Service Fund Lifeline Assistance Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GIBSON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2639. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for additional qualification requirements for individuals appointed to marriage and family therapist positions in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2640. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for discharge of consumer indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2641. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 2642. A bill to provide sensible relief to community financial institutions, to protect consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. FINCHER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 2643. A bill to direct the Attorney General to provide State officials with access to criminal history information with respect to certain financial service providers

required to undergo State criminal background checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 2644. A bill to expedite certain forest management activities on National Forest System lands derived from the public domain when the activities are developed through a collaborative process of interested parties. to require the posting of a bond in initiating a legal challenge to certain forest management activities, to modify the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, to authorize additional funding sources for forest management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H. Res. 292. A resolution permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H. Res. 293. A resolution expressing concern over anti-Israel and anti-Semitic incitement within the Palestinian Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself and Mr. POCAN):

H. Res. 294. A resolution expressing support for the continuation of the Perkins Loan Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. YODER):

H. Res. 295. A resolution supporting local law enforcement agencies in their continued work to serve our communities, and supporting their use of body worn cameras to promote transparency to protect both citizens and officers alike; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 296. A resolution calling for Sickle Cell Trait research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LEE, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H. Res. 297. A resolution expressing support for designation of the first full week of May as ''National Mental Health No Stigma Week''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof''

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 2624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which sets forth the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 2625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes); Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 (To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures); Article I, Section 8, Clause 6 (To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department thereof).

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 2626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 2628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XVI

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 2630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 2631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 provides Congress the power to ''make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.'' This legislation provides for appropriate execution of rulemaking authority by agencies throughout the federal government.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 2635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 1 (''The Congress shall have Power To . . . [enact legislation that] provide[s] for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States[.]'') (this bill would require several federal agencies, in consultation with other issue area experts, to conduct a study on the public and ecological health consequences of the storage and transportation of petroleum coke, and promulgate rules based off of the study's findings—improving public and ecological health, and in turn, improving the nation's ''general Welfare.'').

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution:

[The Congress shall have Power] To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 2638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, . . .

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I—Section 8—Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes'')

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 2644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 136: Mr. PETERS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HAHN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 223: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 235: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 266: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 282: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 314: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 356: Ms. TITUS and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 363: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 378: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 379: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 387: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 425: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 499: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 510: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 511: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 540: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 542: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 546: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 556: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 572: Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 602: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 605: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 628: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 653: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 662: Ms. TITUS and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 702: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 707: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 766: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 767: Mr. BEYER, Mr. TROTT, Mr. VELA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 784: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 812: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 815: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 838: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 845: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 850: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 868: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 911: Mr. GRAYSON and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 920: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 980: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 985: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1089: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1095: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1114: Mr. HARDY and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1117: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1141: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1179: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1190: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 1197: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1211: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1221: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1233: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1301: Mr. REED and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1309: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 1310: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1312: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1321: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1338: Mr. WALZ, Mr. LATTA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1344: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1369: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1371: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1387: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1388: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1401: Mr. TONKO, Ms. ESTY, Ms. ADAMS, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1413: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1415: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1427: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1439: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1462: Mr. LEVIN and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1475: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1552: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1574: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1598: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1599: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. BARR, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1603: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1608: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1610: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1655: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1660: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1664: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1665: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1671: Mr. HILL and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1674: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1684: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1692: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1695: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1718: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1725: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1734: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1769: Ms. SINEMA, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1801: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1830: Mr. BABIN and Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 1843: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1848: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1854: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1856: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1857: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 1861: Mrs. NOEM and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1886: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1902: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1908: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 1919: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1964: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1986: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1988: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1994: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 2005: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2016: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2017: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2032: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 2044: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2061: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2076: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2126: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 2150: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2156: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 2170: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2207: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2215: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 2216: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2218: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2228: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2233: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 2247: Mr. BABIN and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 2248: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2255: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2300: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 2302: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2315: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 2355: Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2400: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2404: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2405: Mr. RENACCI and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2406: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2410: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2412: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KIND, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2431: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 2459: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2490: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2497: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2509: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 2510: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 2516: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2521: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2522: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2523: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2526: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2531: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2540: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MEADOWS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2545: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2570: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2579: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2612: Mr. HIMES, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.J. Res. 30: Mr. TAKANO.
H.J. Res. 32: Mr. NUGENT.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. REED.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. LABRADOR.
H. Res. 12: Mr. KIND and Mr. DOGGETT.
H. Res. 54: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H. Res. 207: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H. Res. 209: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. MESSER.
H. Res. 233: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H. Res. 240: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 259: Mr. YODER, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 281: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H. Res. 284: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 7: 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.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. COLLINS OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 4, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000)''

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide financial assistance in violation of section 214(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 1436a(d)).

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 78, line 9, before the semicolon insert the following: '', except that of the amount made available by this proviso, $75,000,000 shall be used only for the purpose under this clause''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. DENT

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $9,000,000)''.

Page 50, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 56, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 114, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $150,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 13: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make incentive payments pursuant to 48 CFR 16.4 to contractors for contracts that are behind schedule under the terms of the contract as prescribed by 48 CFR 52.211 or over the contract amount indicated in Standard Form 33, box 20.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Page 9, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $155,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 16: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 5309 of title 49, United States Code.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 113, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 18: Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 19: Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 115, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 20: Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 108, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)'',

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 114, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 22: Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)'',

Page 77, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 23: Beginning on page 54, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 55, line 21.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 105, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 113, line 6, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.