



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2016

No. 19

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, 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.

ENDING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 515, and I commend Congressman SMITH for his continued leadership efforts to combat human trafficking. It is an issue many of us take very, very seriously.

This Congress, the House has passed several commonsense, bipartisan pieces of legislation to end human trafficking, and we remain dedicated to finding solutions to prevent this criminal activity, to protect victims, and to prosecute those individuals who seek to exploit innocent children.

One year ago today, I spoke on this critical piece of legislation when it first came to the House floor. I am glad the Senate has finally considered it, and I am proud to be standing here again today as this legislation will finally make its way to the President's desk for his signature following the legislation's passage here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is not a distant concept. It exists in communities across America. An estimated

300,000 young Americans are in danger of becoming victims of sex trafficking. The average age, believe it or not, is 12 to 14 years old for girls. Last year alone, my home State of Pennsylvania had a total of 106 reported cases of human trafficking and 514 calls of human trafficking violations. In fact, Pennsylvania has stepped up the fight by enacting stricter human trafficking laws, and it was named one of the top five "most improved" States by the Polaris Project.

The legislation we have passed here in the House is another step in the right direction. We have made progress, but there is more that we can and must do. I look forward to working with my colleagues to continue the fight against human trafficking.

BARCLAY GROUNDS

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I also rise to highlight the success of a local land preservation effort in West Chester Borough, Chester County, Pennsylvania.

The Barclay Grounds, located in West Chester Borough, is a beautiful property. The land has a rich history dating back to William Penn's charter from the King. Over the years, it has served as an orchard and has been utilized for agricultural purposes as well as for passive recreation activities. For over 2 years, local officials and grassroots volunteers have worked on a common mission: to preserve the Barclay Grounds for future generations.

I can recall, when I was a county commissioner, when a gentleman by the name of John Cottage, who founded the Barclay Grounds Preservation Alliance, came in to see us, and I and my then-colleagues on the Board of County Commissioners, Terence Farrell and Kathi Cozzone, decided that this was a worthwhile endeavor. We provided the seed funding, if you will, to help kickstart the grant application process for several funding streams to make sure that we would be able to preserve the Barclay Grounds.

I am pleased to stand before this country today and say that a group of local officials and local volunteers did something great in a local community that is going to preserve for future generations a really historic, cultural, and environmental gem.

I commend the dedicated officials in the West Chester community, including the West Chester Borough Council, a lot of people involved in the preservation movement, including the grant writing teams at the Natural Lands Trust, as well as the Brandywine Conservancy and many others, for their efforts to preserve this passive park.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of mercy, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

With exciting news for some, disappointing for others, and remarkable for our Nation, the Members of this assembly gather to address the work that is theirs to perform.

May each Member be reminded of the responsibility before them and, amidst the heightened emotions of this day, properly and accurately discern substance from distraction.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H435

We thank You for the incredible gift of our representative democracy still being forged in the river of time that is American history. May the work done in the people's House through these days prove to be historically fruitful and edifying for generations of Americans to come.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING FLONNIE ANDERSON

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Flonnie Anderson of Winston-Salem, North Carolina. This remarkable and talented woman has spent her life accomplishing things ahead of her time, from majoring in theater during the 1940s to helping desegregate a community, to starting her own theater group.

As a teacher at Parkland High School in 1970, Mrs. Anderson directed a play that starred both African American and Caucasian students, a first in the history of Forsyth County schools. As a director, she also helped integrate the theater department at Wake Forest University.

She was the first African American actress to perform with the Little Theatre of Winston-Salem. From that point on, the Little Theatre became known as a place where the African American community could be treated equally.

In recognition of her 34 years as an educator, Parkland High School in Winston-Salem has named their auditorium for Mrs. Anderson. This honor is well deserved and pays tribute to her lasting impact in the local community.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN MADAYA, SYRIAN

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to bring attention to the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Madaya, Syria.

The inhabitants of Madaya are unable to leave and are threatened daily by regime snipers and antipersonnel mines that surround their city. Over 40,000 civilians have been kept from receiving vital humanitarian aid. And, yes, this has resulted in mass starvation.

Sadly, Madaya is not unique in its suffering. There are Madayas all over Syria—cities under siege—caught in the middle of this vicious fighting, cities with inhabitants in dire need of food, water, and medical attention.

I urge Congress, the President, and the international community to do more in response to the humanitarian crisis that is going on in Syria. Enough is enough. We have to stop these tragedies from happening. It is our collective responsibility to do everything in our power; so let's do it.

IRANIAN NUCLEAR DEAL SUPPORTS TERRORISM

(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, the fantasy Iranian nuclear deal went into effect on January 16, giving the Iranian regime billions of dollars to support terrorism, expand its ballistic missile program, and threaten American families with attacks.

Just 2 weeks ago Secretary of State John Kerry admitted that some of the funds would go to terrorist groups. What is worse, the Secretary believes there is no way to prevent the funds from supporting terrorist activity to kill American families. We must and should be clear that the United States has zero tolerance for terrorism or regimes that support terrorism.

I am grateful to cosponsor the bipartisan Zero Tolerance for Terror Act. This critical legislation gives Congress the ability to act quickly and effectively when Iran violates the existing restrictions. We should take every effort to protect American families and our Persian Gulf allies from an irrational regime that promotes "death to America, death to Israel."

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

GREENSBORO FOUR SIT-INS

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the anniversary of the Greensboro Four sit-ins.

Fifty-six years ago four North Carolina A&T freshmen decided to peacefully challenge racial segregation in my hometown of Greensboro and the community I'm proud to serve in Congress.

Joseph McNeil, Jibreel Khazan, Franklin McCain, and David Richmond sat at a whites-only lunch counter inside a Greensboro Woolworth store. These young men sparked a wave of peaceful protests that spanned the State and Nation, helping to put an end to racial segregation.

I remember traveling through North Carolina as a young girl and going to the back door of restaurants because I couldn't sit inside. Because of the Greensboro Four, my children, my grandchildren, and future generations won't have to share in my experience.

My bipartisan resolution, H. Res. 128, honors these four courageous men and recognizes their impact. It has the support of 62 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle.

Today I am calling on my colleagues to support and pass this resolution in honor of the Greensboro Four and all of the students who stood up for equality by sitting down to end racial segregation.

ROADBLOCK HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak up on behalf of the millions of people across the world who suffer under the injustice of modern-day slavery.

Last month the House observed Human Trafficking Awareness Month to shine light on this horrific crime. The injustice of human trafficking knows no political party or geographical boundary. It happens right in our backyards.

Yesterday the House took important steps in passing two bills to strengthen our response to trafficking. I have also recently introduced H.R. 4406, the Enhancing Detection of Human Trafficking Act, legislation which ensures the Department of Labor effectively trains its employees to recognize and respond to the illegal trade of people for exploitation or commercial gain.

It will take close coordination from stakeholders at every level to eradicate this unthinkable crime. Together, our voices and actions can help bring freedom to the oppressed.

FIGHT TO CURE CANCER

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago President Obama in this very Chamber called for a national moonshot initiative to fight cancer. Yesterday the White House proposed to allocate \$1 billion over the next 2 years to

supplement cancer research efforts that are underway.

The President said cancer research is at an inflection point, and he is right. One need only to look at the groundbreaking work on immunotherapy underway at the Roswell Park Cancer Institute in Buffalo to see how far the science has come.

Last year Congress came together to increase funding to the National Institutes of Health by \$2 billion, including a 5 percent increase to the National Cancer Institute. Now is not the time to let up. It is time to accelerate and expand our Nation's cancer fight.

Next month the House will consider a budget resolution. I call on House leaders to stand behind our scientists to support Americans living with cancer and to include robust funding for cancer research.

SHAKESPEARE'S FIRST FOLIOS

(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, just across the street is the world's largest Shakespeare collection. The Folger Shakespeare Library is home to more Shakespeare "First Folios" than anywhere else in the world.

Published in 1623, the "First Folio" is the first printed collection of Shakespeare's plays. Without it, 18 plays, including "Macbeth," "Julius Caesar," and "The Tempest," could have been lost.

This year, as part of a national celebration marking the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's death, the Folger Shakespeare Library is touring a "First Folio" around the country. Schoolchildren, theater lovers, and Shakespeare enthusiasts alike will witness with their own eyes the book that gave us Shakespeare.

During the month of February, the 10th District of Illinois is hosting the "First Folio." The Lake County Forest Preserve District's Lake County Discovery Museum has the honor to present the exhibition "First Folio! The Book That Gave Us Shakespeare."

This will offer the public a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to see this influential and treasured book and experience the powerful words of William Shakespeare.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone who is able to take advantage of this amazing opportunity.

MOURNING THE HONORABLE GILBERT KAHELE

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, this morning in Hawaii, in just a couple of hours, the people of the Aloha State are gathering at the Hawaii State Capitol to perform the Kanikau, a morning

chant, as they bid farewell and celebrate the life of a great man and dedicated public servant who passed away suddenly last week.

The Honorable Gilbert Kahele was born in a small fishing village in Milolii on May 15, 1942. He is a native Hawaiian, a very talented musician, and a community activist who selflessly served our country as a U.S. marine, served Hawaii as a State senator, and served his community of Hawaii as a fierce advocate.

I saw Gil recently here in Washington, D.C., just a few months ago, where, as always, he was ready with a smile, a hug, and warm aloha.

My heart is with the Kahele 'ohana and all of Hawaii island as today we celebrate Gil's life of service and the positive impact he made on countless lives.

Gil, mahalo nui loa for dedicating your life to serving others and for demonstrating how much we can achieve when we work together in the spirit of aloha.

PUNXSUTAWNEY PHIL PREDICTS EARLY SPRING

(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, I rise today with good news. Early this morning in Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania, located in the Commonwealth's Fifth Congressional District, Punxsutawney Phil predicted an early spring.

In the 130 years Phil has predicted the weather on February 2, this is only the 18th time that he has called for an early spring. Now, I know that I join many of my colleagues from across the Nation in a bipartisan fashion in hoping that this prediction comes true.

Groundhog Day means so much to Punxsutawney and the communities which surround it. This tradition has its roots which go back centuries, but the celebration in Punxsutawney got a start in 1886, one year before the first trek to the celebration's official home of Gobbler's Knob.

Since the start of the celebration, Phil has been joined on February 2 by movie stars such as Bill Murray and several Governors of Pennsylvania. And, yes, I have attended the festivities a few times. Phil even visited President Ronald Reagan at the White House.

It is wonderful to see such dedication from the people of Punxsutawney to this great tradition, which brings in visitors from across the world to Pennsylvania.

□ 1215

LET'S MAKE 2016 A YEAR OF ACTION

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, our economy has made solid gains since 2009. We have added millions of jobs. Businesses are hiring. Our economy is growing.

In the Second District, we are seeing signs of recovery through small business growth and new startups like The New Look Restaurant and Bar owned by Nate and Cleo Pendleton.

But the fact remains that the American Dream still remains out of reach for far too many families. Today 8 million Americans are searching for well-paying jobs 7 years after the end of the recession.

Each year at my annual jobs fair, I meet hundreds of these qualified Americans who are tired of searching for good jobs. They are single mothers in night school. They are fathers working two part-time jobs to keep a roof over their family's heads. They are veterans who survived the fight abroad only to fight for employment at home. They are seniors who have to reenter the workforce after their retirement savings were wiped out.

These Americans deserve a government that will pass impactful jobs legislation. Let's make 2016 a year of action and economic prosperity.

COMMEMORATING 25 YEARS OF SERVICE FOR TRINITY BAPTIST COMMUNITY CHURCH INTER- NATIONAL

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate 25 years of faithful service carried out by members at Trinity Baptist Community Church International in Crystal Lake, Illinois.

Founded in 1991 by Senior Pastor Bishop Dr. Michael J. Love, the church has been a light to the surrounding community and to people around the world, demonstrating in word and deed Christ's command to love one's neighbor as oneself.

Through a myriad of initiatives, members have provided job skills training to struggling workers and relief to the impoverished.

Bishop Love's prison outreach ministry is well known to McHenry County and is a respected partner to the McHenry County Correctional Facility. Their diligence demonstrates the integral role faith plays in our local communities by bringing people together, united by common beliefs to help each other.

Like the Good Samaritan, they understand that "neighbor" sometimes includes those outside of their communities. That is why they have been involved with over 100 ministries across the globe, sharing the gospel and serving the people of Haiti, India, and the Dominican Republic, among others.

May God bless Trinity Baptist in its next 25 years of service.

**AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IS
HELPING PEOPLE**

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Affordable Care Act and to urge this House to sustain President Obama's veto of the legislation to repeal it.

During our last recess, I visited St. John's Well Child and Family Center, an anchor in the south Los Angeles community that provides quality health care for the community regardless of the patient's ability to pay.

The Affordable Care Act has enabled St. John's to expand and improve its facilities and increase its services, including updating and modernizing its children's dental services. This is an example of the dental clinic.

Because California embraced the law, St. John's is now able to serve over 53,000 new patients. Repealing the law would be detrimental. As St. John's Executive Director Jim Mangia told me: Repealing the Affordable Care Act would strip away health insurance from 26,000 of St. John's patients. That is 26,000 patients from that one clinic alone.

Our primary goal in Congress should be helping people, not voting away their health insurance.

**REMEMBERING DONALD "BUDDY"
WRAY**

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of one of Arkansas' most treasured business leaders, Donald "Buddy" Wray.

Mr. Wray, the former president of Tyson Foods, in Springdale, died late last month at the age of 78. Buddy spent more than 40 years with Tyson Foods, growing and supporting good jobs in Arkansas.

Buddy was an avid hunter, an outdoorsman, and a proud fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks. He spent much of his time helping our local communities. In particular, he was an avid member of the Kiwanis Club in Springdale.

Buddy's work and legacy has been recognized by numerous organizations, and he was inducted into both the Arkansas Agriculture Hall of Fame and the Business Hall of Fame. He has left a lasting impact on our State and will be greatly missed by all of us.

I extend my respect, affection, and prayers to his many friends, family, and loved ones.

SECURE OUR SKIES ACT

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, human trafficking, which affects more than 21

million people worldwide, is an insidious crime that we must rout out wherever it exists. That is why today I am joining with my Republican colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA COMSTOCK, to introduce the Secure Our Skies Act, a bipartisan bill that will give our airline employees the tools that they need to combat human trafficking and close off the airways to perpetrators of this heinous crime.

The Secure Our Skies, or SOS, Act ensures that all airlines develop training for their frontline employees on the best ways to recognize and report the often subtle signs of human trafficking. This legislation builds on the work of the Blue Lightning campaign, a voluntary program developed by the Departments of Homeland Security and Transportation with the assistance of the Association of Flight Attendants, who are real champions for this training.

Sadly, reported cases of human trafficking are growing here at home and around the globe. We all have to play a role in stopping human trafficking, and this legislation will ensure our airline personnel can spot the signs and stop the crimes.

KEEP POUNDING

(Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, "Keep Pounding" is the motto of my Carolina Panthers and one that transcends the football field.

Even when Sam Mills was diagnosed with colon cancer—Sam was one of the team's coaches and a former player—he kept fighting. He was undergoing radiation and chemotherapy treatments but kept pounding.

Now this phrase is used to inspire players and to remind the team to keep fighting, even when they are feeling weak or run down.

Mr. Speaker, just as the Panthers keep pounding all the way to the Super Bowl, the Committee on Energy and Commerce keeps pounding in a bipartisan manner to discover cures and fund research for many of the rare cancers and diseases that exist today.

The 21st Century Cures initiative, which passed the House last July, will allow us to develop cures for cancer, like the one that took Sam Mills from this world and the one that affects our young superfan, Braylin Beam, who courageously battles each day.

During this year's Super Bowl, I encourage fans everywhere to remember those who have been the inspiration behind our motto, "Keep Pounding."

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, Spring, Texas, July 9, 2014:

Stephen Robert Stay, 39 years old.
Katie Stay, 33 years old.
Brian Stay, 13.
Emily Stay, 9.
Rebecca Stay, 7.
Zachary Stay 4.
Pendleton, South Carolina, November 1, 2015:
Violet Taylor, 82 years old.
Barbara Scott, 80 years old.
Kathy Scott, 60.
Michael Scott, 59.
Rockford, Illinois, December 20, 2014:
Demontae Rhodes, 24 years old.
Martia Flint, 24.
Tyrone Smith, 6 years old.
Tobias Smith, 4 years old.
Topeka, Kansas, December 1, 2013:
Marvin Lewis Woods, 56 years old.
Carla Jean Avery, 45.
Eric Christopher Avery, 43.
Tamesha Lee, 34.
Dallas, Texas, August 7, 2013:
Zina Bowser, 47.
Toya Smith, 43 years old.
Neima Williams, 28.
Tasmia Allen, 27.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

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

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of American Heart Month and to remind Members of this week's National Wear Red Day.

Each February here in Congress and in communities around this country, we join together to raise awareness of heart disease, the number one cause of death for women. In fact, every minute heart disease kills another woman.

As co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Heart and Stroke Coalition, I urge you to join us as we honor these women and those who will be affected in the future by participating in the National Wear Red Day campaign on Friday, February 5. By wearing red, we will unite with women from around the country to raise awareness of heart disease.

We can and we must continue to work together on behalf of our loved ones, our friends, our neighbors, and everyone affected by heart disease. We must reduce these numbers.

**RECOGNIZING THE FIFTH
ANNIVERSARY OF TERRY'S HOUSE**

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the fifth anniversary of Terry's House, a home that provides families with a place to stay when their loved ones are in critical care units at Fresno's Community Regional Medical Center.

The inspiration for the home came from Terry Richards, who suffered a serious head trauma when he was a child, and his mother had to travel over 80 miles a day to be with him.

Now, thanks to Terry's House, over 3,600 families from 42 States and 23 countries, who would otherwise have found themselves in similar circumstances, have been provided with an affordable, comfortable place to stay across the street from the hospital where their loved ones are.

Terry's House is dependent on generous supporters. I would like to thank them and their staff for all that they do for a positive difference for the families who are going through this very, very difficult time.

We cannot say thank you enough to my friend, Tom Richards, and his mother, Marie. Their efforts have made this important home a reality for all as a living memory for Terry, who is no longer with us. Thank God for them and thank God for Terry's House.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3700, HOUSING OPPORTUNITY THROUGH MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 594 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 594

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. 3700) to provide housing opportunities in the United States through modernization of various housing programs, 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services 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 114-42. 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.

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1230

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule for H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015. House Resolution 594 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3700.

The resolution provides 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. Additionally, the resolution provides for consideration of 14 amendments offered to H.R. 3700. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides a motion to recommit for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution and the underlying legislation. H.R. 3700 is a package of several bipartisan provisions that have been voted on by the House Financial Services Committee and received bipartisan support multiple times since 2006 in both Republican and Democratic Congresses.

H.R. 3700 cuts down on inefficient and duplicative regulations. The bill employs a commonsense approach to mitigating the overlapping and redundant procedures that have made rental assistance programs unnecessarily burdensome for some tenants as well as private owners and investors in affordable housing.

The portions of H.R. 3700 that are particularly important to me and many of the large metropolitan housing authorities around the country create positive changes based on project-based vouchers.

The Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority, in my hometown, does a lot of vouchers. They have a strong record of converting slums into mixed-income neighborhoods. They help make sure that the needs of those who live there come first and that we help build strong communities around them.

An integral part of this approach is often project-based vouchers that can be provided to encourage the development of mixed-income housing facilities. However, because the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority is approaching its cap for project-based vouchers, as many metropolitan housing authorities around the country are, their capacity to build new mixed-income communities that are thriving and strong is at risk.

This bill authorizes public housing authorities to project-base up to 20 percent of its authorized voucher allocation rather than 20 percent of its voucher funding. This change ensures that the unauthorized number of vouchers is more stable. It will help make it easier for housing authorities to plan their future investments in the communities they serve.

Knowing Charles Hillman and the great people at the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority and the great work they do, I would sure hate to see them taken off the front lines in our war against poverty. We need to make this change. It is just one example of something that is really good in this bill.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill is projected to actually save \$311 billion in discretionary spending over just the next 5 years. The savings associated with the flexibilities and regulatory burden relief provided to local housing authorities will result in substantial improvement in the return on investment for taxpayers and help make sure that the affordable housing programs we have are sustainable.

Mr. Speaker, the bill passed the Financial Services Committee, which I serve on, with a vote of 44-10—a strong bipartisan vote.

It is my understanding that the sponsor of this legislation has worked over the past few weeks with the ranking member of the committee, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, to address an amendment that she offered—which has been made in order under the rule—which will alleviate the concerns of some Members about this legislation.

So, even though it only passed 44-10—which is pretty good—I think we can actually see a bigger improvement when it hits the floor, because I think the sponsor has worked with the ranking member, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, to alleviate some of those concerns.

I look forward to debating this bill with our House colleagues, and I urge support for both the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity

Through Modernization Act of 2015. This bill includes modifications and updates to several existing laws pertaining to housing—and low-income housing, in particular.

Many of these changes clarify and improve specific regulations for the benefit of those providing low-income housing and those benefiting from the availability of low-income housing. In fact, this bill improves access to affordable housing for the most vulnerable, such as low-income families and veterans.

It is apparent that much work has been involved in finding a balance, and the authors and committee members of both parties are to be commended for their efforts. With that being said, it is important to note that a provision of this bill will effectively raise rents for thousands of families with children and, ultimately, make it more difficult for some low-income parents to maintain employment.

The deduction provisions in this bill, as it is currently worded, raise rents for some of the lowest income families in the country. A quarter of households facing rent increases of \$25 or more a month are families with children whose childcare deduction would be reduced.

I hope that this important issue of childcare deductions will be addressed. My colleague from Ohio just spoke about the work that our colleagues, the chair of this committee and the ranking member, have done to perhaps cause this measure to go forward and not be derailed because of the measure of reducing the childcare deduction for families.

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

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

I want to quickly address the issue raised by the gentleman. I alluded to it, but I didn't speak to it maybe as clearly as I should have.

I believe that there is an agreement between the chairman of the subcommittee as well as the ranking member of the full committee on an amendment that Ms. WATERS is offering with regard to the provision that you refer to. I will tell you, I am going to be voting for that amendment, and I would urge you to vote for it. I believe it is going to pass. It may just be a voice vote. If you are here, vote on it by voice.

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

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

This is an example, in my view, of what can happen here when parties work together. Obviously, on this issue, the Financial Services Committee has done a tremendous job.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to pivot for a moment and offer an amendment to the rule to bring up a bill to help prevent mass shootings by promoting research into the causes of gun violence, making it easier to identify and treat those prone to committing these acts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, this morning at 9, I held a gun violence roundtable. We had extraordinary presenters from those who are gathering information and disseminating that information around the country to address this subject.

What the Gun Violence Research Act would do is give the Centers for Disease Control the authority to research the causes, mechanisms, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of injuries with respect to gun violence. It would also encourage the improvement and expansion of the National Violent Death Reporting Systems and empower healthcare providers by not inhibiting a physician or other healthcare provider from asking a patient about the possession of a firearm and speaking to a patient about gun safety or reporting to authorities a patient's threat of violence.

If there is anyone in the House of Representatives who does not believe that we have a gun violence epidemic in our society, then I would ask him or her if they would speak with me and other Members of Congress that have been about the business of trying to cause there to be a reduction.

This actually does fit into the circumstances that we are addressing in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Many of the violent acts that take place—not just mass shootings, but on a day-to-day basis—regrettably, take place in some of the low-income areas, where we have inadequate housing, inadequate education, and inadequate educational opportunity.

I hope at least the research can be done that may give us the data for this Congress to have the courage to tell the American people that, yes, we have a gun violence epidemic, and, yes, we are going to do something about it.

The bill underlying this rule would enact several incremental reforms to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Section 8 tenant- and project-based rental assistance and other public housing programs. Many of these reforms have been around for several years and have, as my colleague from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) has pointed out, broad support from a wide range of stakeholders as well as both parties in Congress.

However, returning again to the subject of the matter of deductions for child care, it is an important issue that needs to be addressed. Representative WATERS has an amendment that was made in order yesterday by the Rules Committee to resolve this issue. Like my colleague from Ohio, I plan to vote for that amendment, and I would urge Members to recognize that this makes

a good bill better, and I would urge my colleagues to support Ms. WATERS' amendment.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Florida said, this is a good bill. It is a commonsense bill. It reforms our housing programs so they make sense for people. It makes them more efficient. It saves \$300 billion. It is a no-brainer.

I hope that we can pass the previous question so that we can actually move to passing this bill and doing important reforms that will make government more efficient and help people in the war against poverty.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule, support the previous question, and support the resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 594 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 3926) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for better understanding of the epidemic of gun violence, 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill 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. 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. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3926.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To

defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1245

RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTH-CARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 25, 2016, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of January 8, 2016, at page H210.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the veto message of the President of the United States to the bill, H.R. 3762.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day. It is not often that the House has the opportunity to so clearly fight to defend the will of the people. This is a day that embraces our Constitution and one of its fundamental tenets, our system of checks and balances.

This issue, the issue of health care, is vital to every single American. Health care is so very personal. The American people are offended by a Federal Government that says that they know best, that they know and should dictate to folks what kind of health care we should have, who should be treating us, where we should be treated, and on and on and on.

The American people have always opposed the current law. From the very day it was passed and was signed into law, a majority of the citizens of this country opposed this law.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, more people oppose the law now than they did when the bill was passed. This is truly remarkable. More people oppose it now than did when it was passed, which is why we have worked and fought so very hard to represent them, to represent our constituents, and to carry out our

solemn responsibility as their Representatives.

The House and the Senate voted to veto this destructive law, a law that is not only destructive to the health and well-being of our citizens, but destructive to the health of our economy, taking jobs away, forcing people into part-time work, forcing businesses to downsize or limit who they hire. It is remarkably destructive.

In fact, the House voted to repeal it by larger numbers than it voted to pass it originally. However, the President vetoed our repeal.

The President is the only person standing in the way of what the American people want. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. The President is the only person standing in the way of what the American people want.

So our job now is to stand up for them, to demonstrate for them who is on their side, and who is standing in the way of positive, patient-centered reform.

We favor a healthcare system where patients and families and doctors are making medical decisions, not Washington, D.C. We favor a healthcare system that gets everyone covered with policies that they want for themselves and for their families, not that the government forces them to buy.

We favor a healthcare system that embraces the principles of health care, accessibility, affordability, quality, responsiveness, innovation, and choice, principles that are all violated by the current law.

So today, Mr. Speaker, we stand with the American people. We will vote to override the veto of the President, an action that runs absolutely counter to the will of the majority of our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this veto override vote and stand with positive solutions based on the principles of health care that we all embrace.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The only thing historic about this vote today is it probably breaks the record for the number of times a Congress has voted to try to overturn existing law that has been twice upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, here we go again and again and again. How fitting it is that we are here, on Groundhog Day, for the 63rd vote in the House of Representatives to overturn the Affordable Care Act.

And make no mistake. The Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan entity that analyzes bills, has told us and told the American people that, in overturning the Affordable Care Act, you will eliminate affordable health care for 22 million Americans.

So this is a historically callous action that, in 1 day, our colleagues are proposing that we would deny affordable health care to 22 million Americans. It is also the 12th vote this House

has taken to attack women's health care and defund Planned Parenthood.

You know, the American people have got to be scratching their heads. They were told that, with a new Speaker, in the new year, 2016, we would actually begin to address the real challenges facing this country and do some serious work.

Yet, the very first action taken here on this House floor in 2016 with the new Speaker was to again try to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. And, yes, that legislation went through the Senate and the House. It went to the President's desk, and the President vetoed it.

Make no mistake. We will not overturn the President's veto today. This is a futile gesture. It is part of an obsession to try to undo affordable care for 22 million Americans, and it is not going to happen.

Now, what has happened since the last vote we had here to attack women's health programs and defund Planned Parenthood?

We have had a decision by a court in Texas. Here were the headlines that came out of that court decision: "Vindication for Planned Parenthood" and "Texas grand jury clears Planned Parenthood, indicts its accusers."

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, our colleagues have a lot of gall to bring this to the floor after that Texas court decision.

You know, they went into that Texas court decision, and the Harris County District Attorney said at the outset of their investigation into Planned Parenthood: We must go where the evidence leads us.

It began as an investigation into Planned Parenthood, just as we have had a series of witch-hunt investigations here in the House, where the chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee said months ago that there was no evidence that Planned Parenthood had committed any wrongdoing. Now we have a Texas court not only vindicating Planned Parenthood, but indicting their accusers.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you, this does take a lot of gall to come back here after that and go after women's health programs not for the first time, not for the second time. This is now the 11th time.

This will be the 11th time this House has wasted taxpayer time and money trying to overturn women's health programs and the 63rd time it has wasted taxpayer time and money trying to strip away affordable health care to 22 million Americans by undoing the Affordable Care Act.

So, yes, this is a shamefully historic day. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I think it probably breaks all the records in wasting taxpayer time and money where, in a really cruel way, if we actually did overturn the President's veto, 22 million Americans would be denied access to health care.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto. Don't

take away health care to 22 million Americans, and don't continue this attack on women's health.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that what we are interested in is expanding health care for the American people that actually responds to their needs.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a fellow physician who is the chair of the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to vote to override President Obama's veto of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act.

I practiced medicine in rural Tennessee for over 30 years, where I didn't just talk about health care; I actually provided it for patients. The problems that I saw in the system were a major reason why I ran for Congress.

The premise of the Affordable Care Act was to increase access and decrease costs. Everyone in this room agrees with that. Unfortunately, the President's healthcare proposal was a 2,500-page bill that defined what kind of health insurance coverage you bought and then fined you when you didn't buy it, even if you couldn't afford it.

Access might be up because Americans are forced to buy into the President's healthcare law, but so are costs. I hear from east Tennesseans almost every day who are worse off—not better off—under ObamaCare.

The President was wrong to veto this legislation, just like he is wrong when he says Republicans have no ideas for healthcare reform.

Republicans have many ideas and have introduced numerous pieces of legislation to put patients and doctors in charge of their healthcare decisions, not the government and not insurance companies.

I know I have a comprehensive bill, and so does Dr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, as many of my colleagues do in the Doctors Caucus. It is time to repeal this flawed law and give the American people the viable healthcare options they deserve.

I encourage my colleagues to support overriding this veto.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), who is on the Republican committee designed to roll back protections to women's health care.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this frivolous and wasteful exercise, which will be our sixth vote to defund the Nation's leading provider of reproductive health care.

That is right. House Republicans have now voted six times to defund an organization that 2.7 million Americans rely on, even though four different Congressional committees tried and

have failed to uncover any evidence of illegal activity, even though a grand jury last week cleared Planned Parenthood of all wrongdoing and, instead, indicted their anti-choice accusers, even though Republicans' taxpayer-funded Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives, which they created nearly 4 months ago, hasn't held a single meeting.

□ 1300

Yet here we are on Groundhog Day, no less, voting for the sixth time to prevent women from choosing their own healthcare provider. It might be funny if it weren't so outrageous. Women deserve better. They deserve leaders who actually care about the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no"

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a fellow member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office just announced for the first time in our history that Federal healthcare payments now exceed Social Security benefits. Not coincidentally, it also warned that our deficit is again ballooning out of control.

ObamaCare forced millions of Americans out of their low-cost catastrophic coverage and basic employee plans and into Medicaid—the dysfunctional government poverty program. The result is skyrocketing costs in that program in which surgical patients are 13 percent more likely to die than those with no health insurance at all, according to a recent University of Virginia study.

Mr. Obama promised, if we liked our plans and our doctors, we could keep them, and that ObamaCare would save an average family \$2,500 a year. In fact, millions lost their doctors and their plans while premiums have increased an average of more than \$3,500 per family.

This ain't working, and it is time to move on to something that does.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this measure does absolutely nothing for the American people. Meanwhile, we have a terribly flawed campaign finance system, an unfair justice system, and a broken immigration system. There are so many things we could be doing, rather than passing another messaging bill just to make the opponents of ObamaCare feel good.

This won't make the American people feel good. As a matter of fact, CBO said that by repealing the Affordable Care Act, we will not only add to the deficit, but we will have a demonstrably healthier population.

We have to remember, this is not just about the 22 million who will lose their insurance. This is about the tens of millions of people, hundreds of millions of people who will lose the protections that are part of this act: the ability to put their children on their policies until they are 26 years old, an end to lifetime caps, and an end to annual caps. There are so many things that we would be damaging without an alternative if we pass this measure today.

Finally, the only reason that the Republicans are putting this up is because they know it can't pass because, if it passes, it will wreak havoc on the United States of America and the American citizens, and it will do nothing to help them. There is no alternative, and the Republicans know it.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a fellow physician.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in support of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

Before I came to Congress, I spent my career taking care of patients. As a physician, I want every American to have access to quality, affordable care. The legislation before us today marks the next step toward that goal.

Last month, for the first time, we put a bill to dismantle ObamaCare on the President's desk. It is no surprise that he vetoed it.

Now, with this veto override vote, we are exercising our constitutional power to the fullest extent and bypassing the President to do what is right for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill to show the American people that the House of Representatives is doing everything in our power to stop this disastrous law and replace it with a patient-centered healthcare plan.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who is the ranking member of the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives that Republicans set up to take away reproductive healthcare access from women.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, how appropriate that the House Republican leadership decided to vote again on repealing the Affordable Care Act and defunding Planned Parenthood on Groundhog Day. In the movie Groundhog Day, Bill Murray's character relived the same day over and over again, and we are doing the same thing right here.

This is the 63rd vote to undermine or repeal the Affordable Care Act. This is the 12th Republican attack on women's health in this Congress. While House Republicans have already passed 11 anti-women health measures and are now voting on their 12th, they have not passed one single measure that helps women get the health care that they need.

So here we are—on only the 12th business day of the session—facing the same Republican attacks on women's access to health care. Republicans have said this bill will show the American people the difference between the political parties in this election year. You bet it will. The difference is clear. My Republican colleagues remain willing to play partisan politics at the expense of women's health and access to affordable, quality health care. Women of America are watching, and they don't like what they see.

Never mind the fact that three House committees have already investigated Planned Parenthood following the release of the selectively edited videos, and never mind that a grand jury in Harris County cleared Planned Parenthood and, instead, indicted the two individuals who made the doctored videos.

Facts matter. The truth matters. Despite my objection to the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives, as its ranking member, I will continue to fight to protect women's health. That is the promise of all Democrats. We will, once again, reject this legislation. This attempt to override is going nowhere, and it shouldn't.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), a fellow member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the veto override.

James Madison wrote in Federalist Paper 51: "It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part."

As expected, President Obama vetoed a reconciliation bill that would repeal the misnamed Affordable Care Act. This was within his constitutional authority. However, our Founders created a balance of powers within the three branches to prevent tyranny by one. With two-thirds, we have the opportunity to override a veto that doesn't correlate with the views of the American public. We have the opportunity to listen to the American people and put healthcare decisions back in their hands.

With this override, we have the opportunity to begin the process of real healthcare reform that provides the American people with healthcare choices, choices they can afford, choices that allow people to keep their doctors, choices that provide a safety net rather than a net that entraps people into a government program, and choices that allow people to keep their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this veto override and put the power to legislate back in the hands of the legislators.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, since the passage of the Affordable Care Act in 2010, the House of Representatives has attempted to dismantle the law 62 times. Today is number 63, to repeal a major portion of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, since the Affordable Care Act passed, people with pre-existing conditions can now get health insurance. The cost of health insurance has been increasing at the lowest rate since they started keeping records about a half a century ago. Those young people under 26 can stay on their parents' policies. Women are no longer paying more for insurance than men. We are closing the prescription drug doughnut hole. While thousands of people were losing their insurance every day when we passed the bill, more than 17 million people have insurance today.

If we vote "yes" on this motion, we will cancel all of that progress and at the same time just add to the deficit. Mr. Speaker, we should reject this motion, just as we have 62 previous times.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the chair of the Oversight Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I just want to recap quickly how we got here.

ObamaCare was passed on a partisan basis through the House and the Senate, signed into law, and then it went forward. It created a false premise, and the false promise that didn't come to fruition was that people were going to be able to keep their physicians, that premiums were going to go down, and it wasn't going to add to the deficit. We all know now that was nonsense.

So what did the American public do? They said, "We are going to change the House of Representatives." So they elected a Republican majority in the House to take out ObamaCare. What did they do next when they found an obstacle in the United States Senate? They changed the disposition of the United States Senate.

Now, there are some people that say today, "Oh, this is a complete waste of time." No, it is not, Mr. Speaker. This is not a waste of time.

This is a demonstration to the American public that there is now one office that stands between them and the repeal of ObamaCare. There is one office that stands between them and the continued shameful subsidy of Planned Parenthood. We have got an opportunity to change that office in November.

Mr. Speaker, I urge us to continue that momentum and to vote with Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia on this bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said that if you actually override this veto, 22 million Americans would lose access to affordable health care.

Under the Affordable Care Act, the number of uninsured Americans has dropped significantly. It is a sad day that some people don't see that as a good thing, just like the same people apparently want to deny women access to reproductive health care.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, last month I said that my Republican colleagues had declared their verdict against Planned Parenthood without ever holding a trial. Now it is even worse. A grand jury in Texas has not only refused to indict Planned Parenthood, but instead indicted two individuals who made this series of blatantly manipulated, false videos on which the Republicans base their attack.

Despite this unequivocal finding by a grand jury, not to mention by several congressional committees that Planned Parenthood has violated no laws and done nothing wrong, the Republicans are forging ahead in this ludicrous effort to cut off all Federal funding.

If we override this veto today, we will pass legislation that targets one organization and cuts it off from all Federal funding, including reimbursement for services provided, for no justifiable legislative reason beyond punishment for offering a constitutionally protected medical procedure.

This is a clearly unconstitutional bill of attainder. The prohibition on bills of attainder exist to ensure that Congress may not usurp the powers of the courts by using legislation to punish an organization or individual that a majority in Congress doesn't like. The Constitution is clear. Congress cannot be judge, jury, and executioner.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, it is not our role to declare an organization guilty and to impose a punishment. That is for a court. Not only is this bill an unconstitutional bill of attainder, it is a travesty and is seeking to punish one of the best, most praiseworthy organizations in the country, and punish it for what? For enabling women to exercise their constitutional rights. This is really not only an unconstitutional act, but it is part of the war on women.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding, for his leadership, and for bringing this important bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day. This is the first time that the House of Representatives has had a vote to override President Obama's veto. If you look at what the veto is about and

what the legislation that was vetoed is about, it is about letting the American people actually determine their own healthcare destiny. It is about stopping taxpayer money from going to abortion providers like Planned Parenthood.

What this bill does is something very historic by gutting ObamaCare and returning that power back to families.

I see in my district, and my colleagues share the same stories, all across the country, millions of Americans have lost the good health care that they had. They were promised by this President "if you like what you have, you can keep it." Everybody knows that that is a promise that was broken by this President in his own healthcare law. We restore that ability back to the American people with this bill.

With this bill, we also say that abortion providers like Planned Parenthood should not be able to get taxpayer money. We completely defund Planned Parenthood in this bill. If this is something that is so vital, look at what the bill does. It actually transfers the money to federally approved health centers all across the country—many more, by the way, than Planned Parenthood facilities that exist. These are facilities that actually provide services for women that don't include abortion. So if you look at what this bill is doing, it shows very clearly to the country what is at stake this November.

We sent a bill to President Obama's desk that guts ObamaCare and that defunds Planned Parenthood, and he vetoed it. We are going to have the override today.

□ 1315

If it is not successful in the vote today with a two-thirds vote, it makes clear what is at stake this November. Just by changing the President, by having a President who shares our values, Mr. Speaker, who wants to gut this law that is failing Americans, who wants to defund Planned Parenthood, by having a President with those values, we can accomplish those important objectives.

I urge everyone to vote "yes."

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I really urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to read the letter from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. This is the agency that we all turn to for unbiased, nonpartisan advice. On page 9, you will read that their estimate is that, by overturning the President's veto and enacting the underlying bill, H.R. 3762, we would increase the number of people without health insurance coverage by about 22 million people in most years after 2017.

When my colleagues say this is a historic moment, it is true. Never before would this Congress have voted on a veto override that would immediately deny access to affordable health care for 22 million people.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON

COLEMAN), a terrific member of the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I had no idea that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were such great fans of the movie "Groundhog Day." If I had a little more time right now, I would give the exact same speech I gave just 1 month ago, because nothing has changed.

The facts remain that Planned Parenthood is a health organization serving 3 million Americans each year; that one in five Americans will receive care from Planned Parenthood; that despite arguments to the contrary, there are simply not enough health centers to fill the gap; that defunding Planned Parenthood snatches care away from millions of families; and that today's bill says to women once again how and when they get health care is not their choice.

Like then, this has no chance of becoming law; and, like then, I urge my colleagues to abandon the merry-go-round of attacks on women and families. Enough attacks on health care, enough attacks on women, and enough attacks on families.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I rise today in support of a vote to override the President's veto of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act.

With his veto, the President sent Congress and the American people a disappointing—but unsurprising—message. Protecting the rights of patients, families, the unborn, and American taxpayers is clearly not a priority for this administration.

It is, however, a priority for me and for Congress. We worked to pass this legislation with bicameral support. We worked to help reduce government spending and reduce the burdens of the President's healthcare law on patients and families. We worked together to prevent taxpayer dollars from funding organizations practicing, in my opinion, shameful and unethical activities.

We must now work together to override the President's veto and give the power of healthcare decisions back to the people.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to see how giving power to the people is stripping 22 million Americans of their affordable health care.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. SPEIER), a member of the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Are we able to distinguish the plot of "Home Alone" from congressional proceedings? Today, I am not so sure. I find myself comparing the bumbling criminals trying to break into a house

to the misleading criminals and bumblng legislators who seem to have broken this House. But while “Home Alone” is a comedy, the consequences of today’s votes attacking women’s health and the health care of hard-working Americans is a tragedy.

In each case, we have people who do the same thing over and over but only succeed in hurting themselves. In Home Alone, the criminals are tricked with booby traps and misdirection; but in real life, Republicans are stumbling into their 63rd vote to undermine the Affordable Care Act and the 12th vote to attack women’s health by filmmakers who have been indicted for their illegal activities.

I am pleased to see that the Texas grand jury exonerated Planned Parenthood and indicted the real criminals—the video creators. If there were an Oscar for the most fraudulent film, the so-called Center for American Progress would be thanking the Academy.

I urge my Republican colleagues to kick these criminals out of our House, disband the taxpayer funded Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives, and get back to the business of governing.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a fellow healthcare professional and a member of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, minority leader NANCY PELOSI famously called ObamaCare a jobs bill, yet the Congressional Budget Office says it will cost our economy the equivalent of 2 million jobs. The President himself promised that ObamaCare would save families an average of \$2,500 in healthcare costs per year, yet the largest insurer in my State just upped premiums by 36 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this law was built on a grand deception. Nearly 6 years later, the lofty promises have faded, and what is left behind are real stories and real people whose lives and livelihoods are impacted by the government-knows-best law they continue to reject.

The President’s veto of our reconciliation bill to repeal ObamaCare may be what is in his best interest for his political legacy, but my constituents have told me loud and clear it is not what is best for them.

Today, let’s call his bluff, and let’s override this veto.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, facts are stubborn things. Since the Affordable Care Act was passed, which our Republican colleagues said would be a jobs killer, we have actually seen millions and millions of jobs added in the economy, and the unemployment rate has come way down. The notion that the Affordable Care Act was going to wreck the economy is just blatantly false for everybody to see. Just look at the statistics around the country.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), someone who cares about the facts, the distin-

guished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority, the gentleman who has worked so hard on budgets, for yielding.

The majority whip referred to November. We are serving notice in this discussion: We are proud to defend healthcare reform and will do so between now, as we did before, and November.

Since health care began, the uninsured rate has declined from 20.3 to 11.4, nearly 18 million people now covered who were before uninsured.

Now this has also happened: 137 million Americans have free preventive services.

The ACA ends lifetime and annual limits on coverage for 105 million Americans.

Also what it does—let me just emphasize this—129 million Americans with preexisting health conditions no longer have to worry about being denied care.

I met, last weekend, a woman who had breast cancer. She lost her job and lost health insurance. Because of healthcare reform, she received health insurance. Her breast cancer came back. She looked at us and said to us squarely, one on one, each of us: “I wouldn’t be here except for healthcare reform.”

That is what this is all about. This veto will be sustained. It will be sustained because healthcare reform responded to the needs of millions of Americans. We in the Democratic Party are proud of that and will, from now until November, say so with immense ardor.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a pro-life champion in our Nation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in the age of ultrasound imaging and benign life enhancing healthcare interventions for the baby in the womb, how is it that Planned Parenthood first dehumanizes and then massively kills unborn children—more than 7 million since 1973—and then demands that taxpayers subsidize the organization to the tune of about \$500 million?

Caught on numerous videos, Planned Parenthood abortionists describe how they dig with knives and cut out the inner organs of babies all while altering pain-filled dismemberment procedures so as to preserve intact baby hearts, lungs, and livers for a price.

This isn’t the first time Planned Parenthood has been caught red-handed. In 2011, videos by Live Action exposed several Planned Parenthood clinics eager to facilitate secret abortions for undercover pimps for child sex trafficking. In 2012, more videos by Live Action ex-

posed Planned Parenthood advising undercover investigators how to procure sex selection abortions for little girls.

Have we lost our capacity to be shocked? Can we not empathize with the child victim?

Support the override.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage everybody to read the results of the Texas grand jury proceeding. Here are some headlines from what happened: “Vindication for Planned Parenthood,” and “Texas Grand Jury Clears Planned Parenthood, Indicts Its Accusers.”

It is a charade that we are back on the floor after that grand jury decision. It is rare, my colleagues, to see a grand jury investigate one entity—in this case, Planned Parenthood—and turn around and indict its accusers. Despite that, we are back here in this evidence-free zone.

I yield 1 minute to gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a distinguished member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today, we find ourselves rereading the same chapter from a Republican extremist book that seems to have no end. Today’s vote represents the 63rd time the GOP has tried to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act and the 12th time the GOP has voted to attack women’s health care in the 114th Congress alone.

Partisan games and divisions are transgressions on our communities. We must work together to seize the opportunity that exists in our great Nation. We can’t do that by wasting time and energy on radical agendas.

Attacking Planned Parenthood is part of a ploy to roll back women’s rights. No one should control a woman’s right to make decisions about her own body. I won’t stop advocating for women’s comprehensive health care or a woman’s right to control her own body.

This war on women must stop.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), a champion of patient-centered healthcare reform, the Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the chairman for his work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, today the House is keeping its promise to the American people. We showed we can defund abortion providers like Planned Parenthood and increase funding for thousands of women health centers across the country, and we showed we can send a bill repealing ObamaCare to the President’s desk even when Democrats are trying to stop us.

Now, this is big. That means that when a Republican President takes office next year, we know we can get this passed. We don’t have to worry about the filibuster. We don’t have to worry

about a veto. With simple majorities and the stroke of a pen, ObamaCare can be gone once and for all.

Democrats see that. They know that ObamaCare, in particular, is hanging by a thread. And do you know what? They are terrified.

You are going to hear a lot of mocking on the other side of the aisle today. Mr. Speaker, they are saying that Republicans are at it again trying to repeal ObamaCare. They are trying to make it seem like this vote doesn't matter.

They tried to stop us at first with arguments and debate, but they have lost that debate.

□ 1330

The people aren't happy with what the Democrats sold them, as few are enrolling, premiums are skyrocketing, and deductibles are so high it can make insurance practically worthless.

So, the Democrats, they have given up on debate. They have seen that they have lost, and they have tried their next tactic. They have tried to tell us that there is nothing we can do, that ObamaCare is the law of the land, and that we had better just give up.

But then they realized we didn't give up. Year after year, we listened to the American people, and the people voted for Representatives to repeal ObamaCare; and year after year, the American people saw the healthcare promises that Democrats in Congress and President Obama made were just exactly what they were—empty: you can keep your doctor; you can keep your plan; your premiums will drop. Nobody—not even the President—believes that anymore.

So we didn't give up. We fought for the American people, and we put a bill repealing this law on the President's desk.

Now the Democrats have no more defenses. Their law is failing. The people aren't on their side. The end of ObamaCare is coming, and, in its place, we can create something that delivers so much more than just broken promises.

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

The Republican leader said we don't have to worry about the veto. The reality is the President's veto will be sustained today. Apparently, our Republican colleagues are not worried about the 22 million Americans who will lose access to affordable health care. I don't know what the Republican leader's definition of "mockery" is, but if anybody is mocking the Republican bill here, it is the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which wrote to each and every Member of Congress that, if you actually overrode the President's veto and enacted this legislation—and I am sorry to repeat it again, but it is here in black and white from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—you would increase the number of people who are without health insurance

coverage by 22 million people. That is what our Republican colleagues are talking about here.

So, no, we don't want to do that, and the President doesn't want to do that, and that is not going to happen here today, but it certainly does indicate the stakes in the 2016 elections, because, on the one hand, you have a Republican-controlled Congress that would, at the snap of a finger, like to get rid of affordable health care for 22 million people, and, apparently, it wants to ignore the facts that we learned from the Texas grand jury that vindicated Planned Parenthood and said that their accusers, instead, should be indicted.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the chair of the Health Subcommittee of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PITTS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the millions of families across the country who have had their health insurance disrupted by the President's health law and in support of the millions more Americans who don't want the government giving their tax money to abortion providers.

Some 6 million households across the country have lost the health plans they liked or have lost their doctors even though President Obama promised 37 different times that this would not happen. Hundreds of my constituents have contacted me to tell me about higher premiums, higher deductibles, and coverage lost outright:

Michael Cain of Lancaster contacted me recently to tell me that his premiums have nearly doubled just in the 2 years since the implementation of the President's health law;

Jennifer Hoy of Ephrata wrote to me that her family lost three out of four of her children's doctors. Imagine the stress of a mother in that situation;

Deborah Kennedy of Columbia contacted me to tell me that, in November, she spent countless hours trying to operate the broken healthcare.gov Web site. She lost her insurance and had to buy insurance nearly 50 percent more expensive while she lives on a fixed income.

These are hardworking Pennsylvania families who have done nothing wrong but who have been victimized by the arrogance of a Federal Government that thinks it knows better than the people and that tries to bully hardworking American families.

The legislation we are considering today saves taxpayers money and treats them with respect. Mr. Speaker, 84 percent of this country supports restrictions on abortions. However, this administration is giving their tax dollars to organizations that kill innocent babies. Today's legislation channels taxpayer money away from organizations that provide abortion and toward something that all Americans can sup-

port—federally qualified health centers. These centers are focused on caring for the poorest in our communities, and they actually care for women's health. Unlike Planned Parenthood, they actually do mammograms.

A vote for this bill is a vote for the millions like Deborah Kennedy, Jennifer Hoy, and Michael Cain, who have borne the consequences of an out-of-control Federal Government. Vote to override the President's veto.

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

I heard the word "bullying" used. It is ironic that that word would be used in a vote that would deny 22 million Americans access to affordable health care.

Again, I want to underscore for our colleagues, some of whom may not have read the Congressional Budget Office's report, that this comes from the nonpartisan entity that advises both parties in Congress. In fact, the head of the Congressional Budget Office was appointed by our Republican colleagues. It is they who are telling us that, with this vote, 22 million Americans would be denied access to affordable health care. That seems to qualify as bullying if anything does.

Mr. Speaker, let's review the situation with respect to Planned Parenthood.

This Republican-controlled House had its standing committees investigate Planned Parenthood, including the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. They had hearings, and they hauled up the head of Planned Parenthood to some of these hearings. At the end of those hearings, the Republican chairman of that committee concluded that Planned Parenthood had engaged in no wrongdoing. He said that on national television. Despite that finding, back in January, our Republican colleagues went ahead and launched this attack on women's reproductive health and defund Planned Parenthood.

That was bad enough.

Since that time, we have had even more evidence. We have had the grand jury proceeding in Texas that exonerated Planned Parenthood. They began the investigation against Planned Parenthood, and they said they would go where the evidence led them. At the end of that evidence-seeking effort, they exonerated and vindicated Planned Parenthood and called for the indictment of the people who had wrongly accused them. That was the result.

Yet here we are on this House floor today as if nothing had happened—ignoring the evidence that the grand jury heard and continuing on this witch hunt of the special committee's against Planned Parenthood.

So, yes, maybe this day is making history. It is probably one of the saddest examples of a Congress run amuck, when, for the 62nd or 63rd time now, we are trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare—and,

for the 12th time, trying to launch this attack on women's reproductive health and on Planned Parenthood despite all of the intervening and previously existing evidence.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest days that the American people remember on the floor of this House was a day in March of 2010. It was when this House voted in a hyperpartisan way to pass a healthcare bill that took away patient-centered health care and put Washington in charge of health care across this country.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans have endured skyrocketing premiums, higher deductibles, limited networks, failing co-ops, and dropped coverage because of the Affordable Care Act, like the mom in my district who now has to pay \$400 for her son's lifesaving peanut allergy medication when it used to cost her \$10 under the plan that the President promised she could keep.

While some have gained coverage under this failing law, it has been at the expense of far too many others. Just last Monday, the Congressional Budget Office announced that 40 percent fewer Americans signed up for health coverage this year than was predicted. In fact, many Americans are choosing to pay a penalty instead of signing up for the so-called affordable healthcare coverage mandated by this law. We need to empower all patients with more choice while offering solutions for the uninsured and those with preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, if we vote to override, contrary to what has been suggested, the insurance doesn't end tomorrow. We have provisions in this legislation that would extend credits through the end of 2017, giving us the opportunity to do proper healthcare reform that does empower patients and not bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this veto override.

Listen, I understand people's objections and concerns about the healthcare reform that we have embarked upon as a nation, but, clearly, now is not the time to take us back to the status quo, which was going to leave us in a very bad place in this Nation.

Before the Affordable Care Act was passed, the numbers of uninsured were going up. The expense for individuals and businesses was going up. Healthcare costs, budgetwise, were going up. Too many people were being denied coverage based on preexisting

conditions. Young people—younger than 26—were being dropped from health insurance plans.

All of that now is being corrected. Not that this is a perfect response to the complexity of the healthcare system, but there is a lot of good that is being done, including in two areas. One is delivery system reform so that we move to a more integrated, coordinated, patient-centered healthcare delivery system based on models that do work. Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, we are changing, under the Affordable Care Act, how we pay for health care so that it is based on the quality or on the outcome or on the value of care that is given and no longer on the numbers of procedures and how much is done to us rather than how well it's done.

We are demanding better quality at a better price, and the numbers are showing that we are heading in this direction. I say we stay the course in continuing to benefit by extending affordable healthcare coverage to more Americans and in finally getting a grip on these rising healthcare costs. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this veto override.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA), a champion of patient-centered health care.

Mr. GUINTA. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3762 and in support of overriding the President's veto of this very important bill.

The Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act repeals some of the most egregious and harmful aspects of ObamaCare: the individual mandate, the employer mandate, the medical device tax, and especially the Cadillac tax—a 40 percent excise tax on certain employer health benefits.

In the coming years, the Cadillac tax will be responsible for employees from local governments, small businesses and large, nonprofits, and colleges-universities losing their access to high-quality, affordable health care. This is unacceptable for my home State of New Hampshire—people who want patient-centered health care and options for themselves, their families, not higher premiums, higher deductibles, and fewer doctors.

That is why it is so important to override this veto today. The House and Senate have worked hard in giving American families and small-business owners better care, better options, and greater affordability. We need to continue that approach and ensure that patient-centered health care is at the center of what America stands for.

As a new member of the Budget Committee, I thank my chairman for giving me the opportunity to speak today, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1345

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

Not having access to any affordable health care certainly doesn't meet anyone's definition of patient-centered healthcare.

Our Republican colleagues, when they first launched the attacks on the Affordable Care Act and ObamaCare, said: We are going to repeal this, and we are going to replace it.

Well, we have voted, as of today, 63 times to dismantle it. How many times have we voted to replace it? Zero. Zero times to replace it.

My colleague, Mr. KIND from Wisconsin, raised an important point. The way our healthcare insurance system was working back in the early 2000s, millions of Americans were denied access to health care because of a pre-existing condition, because their kid had diabetes or asthma. Premiums were going through the roof and skyrocketing.

The Affordable Care Act has now provided affordable health care to millions more Americans and, as we have heard from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, passing this bill would actually take it away for 22 million Americans.

Despite all that, despite the 63rd attempt to get rid of it and deny that access to health care, not once have we heard the replaced part of that Republican agenda.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day when you want to take away access to affordable health care from 22 million Americans and don't have a single alternative to put on the floor of this House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chair of the Ways and Means Committee, a gentleman who has dedicated so much time and effort to responsible, appropriate health care for the American people.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PRICE for his leadership during this historic effort to dismantle the President's burdensome healthcare law and stand for the rights of the unborn. I am pleased to support this veto override. It couldn't come at a more critical time in our history.

The rights of the innocent unborn is the great human rights issue of our time. This President has chosen to stand on the wrong side of history. By vetoing this bill, he continues to funnel taxpayer dollars to subsidize the gruesome practices at Planned Parenthood.

This country has lost 58 million children to abortion since 1973. That means there are more American deaths from this practice each year that are nearly equal to all of the American casualties from all our wars combined. This government-financed war on the innocent unborn has to stop.

This House has already spoken. Whether you are pro-life or pro-choice,

we have always agreed you don't use taxpayer dollars for the controversial practice of abortion.

It is up to us to continue to stand with those we represent who don't believe their dollars should go to this. We are going to stand with our constituents against this terrible healthcare law because they have been hurt by higher prices, fewer doctors, and less affordable medicine. Frankly, this healthcare law has hurt too many Americans.

We know now the path to repeal. We know how to remove the law's mandates, tax hikes, and slush funds. Now we just need a new President.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am embarking on completing my fourth year here in the United States House of Representatives. Four years ago I ran for the Congress, in part, to support the Affordable Care Act.

There is a group of beneficiaries of the ACA that is often not discussed, and it is hospitals. I come from a part of northeastern Pennsylvania where the hospitals bore the brunt—and this is true all over America—bore the brunt of having to treat uninsured patients. People would show up on the doorsteps of the hospital and have to be treated. Well, the hospital has to absorb that when they treat uninsured patients.

So what we saw over and over in my district in northeastern Pennsylvania was hospitals were closing. I know why. I sat on the board of directors of a small hospital.

When you absorb it and you absorb it and you absorb the uninsured care year after year, eventually they start cutting back on nurses, start cutting back on essential services. Finally, there is nothing left to cut and they close the hospital.

That is a terrible detriment to your health care when your hospital is no longer 10 minutes away and it is 40 minutes away. That can be the difference between life and death. That is why the Affordable Care Act is something that I supported. We should not dismantle it.

I urge Members to vote against this bill.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), who serves on the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, since ObamaCare was forced onto the American people 6 long years ago, Americans have seen their premiums skyrocket and access to providers dwindle.

In fact, Chairman PRICE and I were in my district talking to a number of physicians at the emergency room. They said: Not a thing has changed, but we are still taking care of the people just like we did before this terrible bill.

Ever since I came to Congress, I have consistently heard from folks in the

12th District of Georgia about the burdens of ObamaCare and that Planned Parenthood should not receive one dime of their hard-earned tax money.

I have heard from a family of five whose previous healthcare policy was terminated and buying a new plan means their premiums will go from \$700 to over \$1,000. Those seeking treatment could not even pay their deductible.

A small-business owner's premiums more than doubled and benefits have been reduced. An individual projects 16 percent of his income will go toward health care this year alone.

This law is killing the economy. This law is crushing. Even worse, it is crushing Americans and American families and their ability to earn a good living.

Is the sake of a political legacy worth all of this? I think not. After 6 years of failed policy, Americans deserve better.

That is why I am proud to cast my vote to override the President's veto of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act. It is time to move forward in finding a cost-effective and patient-centered plan for our citizens.

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

We have heard a lot of talk about premiums going up. The dirty little secret, which every Member of this House knows or should know, is that premiums have been going up consistently for a very long period of time. The issue is: How fast do they go up?

If you look at this chart, you will find that, for employer-sponsored insurance, which is what most Americans are on, premium increases were huge between 2000 and 2010, before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, 9.5 percent. After the passage of the Affordable Care Act, those premium increases have dropped substantially, 4.8, now 2.7.

When Members of Congress get up here and talk about premiums going up, ask yourself the question: How fast are they going up? Because before the Affordable Care Act passed, it was through the roof, and they have dramatically slowed.

I said our Republican colleagues did the repeal part, but not the replace part. So they want to take out the part that has slowed down the premiums and go back to the day when you had skyrocketing premium increases.

So we need to talk in a fact-based conversation here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), a fellow member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, in an era where people are so easily offended, where nativity scenes are shut down, where racism is claimed at the tiniest of circumstances, it is surprising that,

in 2015, the Federal Government is still funding Planned Parenthood.

Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, once wrote: "We don't want the word to get out that we want to exterminate the Negro population, and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more rebellious members."

You can see that is a little bit out of context, but there is no doubt that Margaret Sanger is connected with some of the ugliest periods in our country's history involving racism or eugenics.

Her endorsements of promiscuity and opposition to Christian teachings and sexual conduct are well known. To this day, Planned Parenthood counsels minors without parental consent.

If you really want to strike a blow for equality and strike a blow for not offending people, we should stop spending the hundreds of millions of dollars we do every year on Planned Parenthood.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary who is focused on an evidence-based approach to all of these issues.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland. I do want to say to the gentleman that, as you well know, the Judiciary Committee, in many machinations over the years, has looked at this question of choice and the constitutional right that comes from *Roe v. Wade*. Unfortunately, our voices—those of us who are there who argue the constitutional premise—have not been heard.

Let me stand in opposition to, again, a Groundhog Day announcement, which is again trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The good news is that this is my daughter's birthday. So I can celebrate February 2nd in a good way.

This approach to again try to take away from the millions of people in Texas who are uninsured the right to be insured, to have insurance with pre-existing conditions, and this horrible provision to defund Planned Parenthood, which is a health prospect and a health project that gives good health care to women, is absurd.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, that we face some troubling times when people are unemployed, and Planned Parenthood has provided resources to those vulnerable women. I can't understand why this bill continues to come up.

I am glad to stand in opposition to support Planned Parenthood and its funding and to recognize that the Constitution does protect choice. We do need to provide health care.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think this is the chart that gets to the issue that is before us today the

most, and that is what is our responsibility to our constituents.

As I mentioned earlier, when this bill passed on the floor of the House in March of 2010 in a hyperpartisan vote, the American people opposed it.

The fact of the matter is the American people oppose it by greater numbers now than they did back then. It is because they have seen its implementation.

They know that their premiums have gone up. They know that their healthcare costs more. They know that they can't see the doctor that they want to see. They know that they can't go to the hospital or the clinic that they want to go to. They know that the quality of their health care is actually decreasing if they talk to their doctor, and they know that their choices have been harmed in so many ways.

So this is a little chart here that demonstrates that 52 percent, according to Gallup in November of last year, oppose this bill. According to Fox, in August of last year, 54 percent opposed this bill. According to Quinnipiac, in July of last year, 52 percent opposed this bill. Those numbers only increase.

Our responsibility, as Representatives of the people, is to represent them. That is what we are doing today. The President is standing in the way of the people's wishes on this piece of legislation. The President is standing in the way of patient-centered health care.

It is our job and our responsibility to stand up for the American people and the will of the American people. We will vote today to override this veto. I urge my colleagues to join in that activity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman prepared to close?

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). The gentleman from Maryland has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 5¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleague that, unless the Speaker shows up, I am prepared to close.

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

What the chairman of the Budget Committee said about the Affordable Care Act omitted the fact that a majority of Americans do not want to repeal and dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

We would be happy to work with our colleagues in smoothing out some of the edges, but our Republican colleagues are only determined to take it down entirely without a replacement.

In fact, when you ask the American public: "What one word describes how you feel about the ongoing political debate about the Affordable Care Act?" they respond: "ridiculous," "waste of time."

It is a waste of time. Here we are for the 63rd time trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. It is not going to happen. The President vetoed the bill. We will sustain the veto.

To add insult to injury, our Republican colleagues now want to ignore all the facts about the grand jury investigation into Planned Parenthood, which vindicated Planned Parenthood and concluded instead that they should indict Planned Parenthood's accusers.

Mr. Speaker, we will sustain the President's veto. We will protect health insurance for 22 million Americans, and we will protect women's access to reproductive care.

Let's sustain the President's veto. Let's get on with doing the people's business here.

□ 1400

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is important to appreciate the numbers of individuals who are supporting our work on this issue, the folks who support repealing this legislation: Associated Builders and Contractors, Christian Coalition of America, Concerned Women of America, the Family Research Council, FreedomWorks, National Right to Life, American Center for Law and Justice, American Commitment, American Conservative Union, American Principles Project, Americans for Prosperity, Americans for Tax Reform, Americans United for Life, Conservative Women for America, Focus on the Family, Heritage Action for America, Independent Women's Voice, Liberty Counsel Action, March for Life, the National Center for Policy Analysis, National Institute of Family and Life Advocates, National Taxpayers Union, Population Research Institute, Priests for Life, Students for Life, Susan B. Anthony, The Justice Foundation, Tradition, Family, Property, Incorporated, and Traditional Values Coalition. Mr. Speaker, the majority of the American people oppose the law in place.

As I close, the remarks that we make today, this is the time to try to set the record straight. We have heard from our friends on the other side what the Congressional Budget Office says. I will tell you what the Congressional Budget Office says about jobs. It says that this law will decrease the equivalent of over 2 million jobs in this Nation. Over 2 million jobs in this Nation lost because of this law.

Our friends talk about the CBO saying that 22 million individuals are going to lose their insurance. That is because CBO scores things in a way that doesn't recognize the other action that will occur, which is why we have in this bill a transition period to phase in to patient-centered health care; again, health care where patients and families and doctors are making decisions, not Washington, D.C.

We have a government of, by, and for the people, and we take that very, very

seriously. When the President is standing in the way of the desires and the wishes of the American people as it relates to something as personal as health care, our responsibility is to stand up for the American people, and that is precisely what we are doing today.

As it relates to women's health care, our bill actually would increase spending—increase spending—on women's health care across this great land and allow greater opportunity for access to community health centers by women to receive the kind of health care that they need.

Our friends on the other side talk about premiums going up only a little bit more than they had been in the past. Mr. Speaker, what that ignores is that the President of the United States promised—promised—the American people that premiums would go down on average \$2500 for a family of four. In fact, what they have done is gone up by nearly \$3,000 for a family of four.

Mr. Speaker, that is not comparing it to anything else. That is comparing it to what the President promised the American people, and the American people expect their Representatives and the President to keep their promises.

Deductibles have gone up incredibly. Our friends on the other side don't talk about that because what that means is that folks have health coverage out there, but they don't have health care. If you are a family of four, if you are an individual out there making \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000 a year, and your deductible is \$10,000 a year or \$12,000 a year, which is not unusual given this law, Mr. Speaker, you may have health coverage, but you don't have any health care.

As a formerly practicing physician, I can tell you I hear from my colleagues all the time about folks across this land who are making decisions, financial decisions because of this law, denying themselves and their family the ability to care for themselves and their family because of this law.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, we believe that the principles of health care that we all hold dear ought to be adhered to. We believe in a system that ought to be accessible for folks—everybody. We believe in a system that ought to be affordable for everybody, that is of the highest quality, and that expands choices for the American people. The American people ought to be the ones who are deciding who is taking care of them when and where and the like.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this law violates every one of those principles. Accessibility is going down across this great land. Affordability is going down. Costs are going up. Quality is decreasing. All you have to do is talk to the men and women who are charged with caring for the American people. Choices have been destroyed in our health care system.

The principles that the American people hold dear, regardless of their political stripe, have been violated by this law. That is why we are standing here today, standing up and representing the American people, standing up on behalf of the American people and demonstrating once again that the only thing that stands in the way of what the American people want and what is occurring right now is that the President of the United States refuses—refuses—to follow the will of the people.

I urge a vote in favor of this veto override. We can get on then with the hard work of making certain that we move in the direction of patient-centered health care where patients and families and doctors are making medical decisions and not Washington, D.C. Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the American People have spoken and they do not want Obama's high-cost, job-killing, conscience-violating healthcare law.

But the President refuses to listen. He vetoed Obamacare Reconciliation passed by both the House and Senate to dismantle Obamacare.

Americans have lost their insurance plans and their doctors. Their insurance premiums have skyrocketed and some have even lost their jobs because of Obamacare. Yet the Administration just sits by and watches while the American people suffer.

Today, the House continues to stand up for the people with this veto override. We will continue to fight for our constituents to defeat Obamacare and defend Planned Parenthood.

I urge a "yes" vote on this important measure to show the President and the America people that we will not stop until Obamacare is defeated.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 594; and

Adopting House Resolution 594, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Any remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3700, HOUSING OPPORTUNITY THROUGH MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 594) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3700) to provide housing opportunities in the United States through modernization of various housing programs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 178, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—236

Abraham	Foxx	McHenry
Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	McKinley
Allen	Garrett	McMorris
Amash	Gibbs	Rodgers
Amodei	Gibson	McSally
Babin	Gohmert	Meadows
Barietta	Goodlatte	Meehan
Barr	Gosar	Messer
Barton	Granger	Mica
Benishek	Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Graves (LA)	Miller (MI)
Bishop (MI)	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Bishop (UT)	Griffith	Mooney (WV)
Black	Grothman	Mullin
Blackburn	Guinta	Mulvaney
Blum	Guthrie	Murphy (PA)
Bost	Hanna	Neugebauer
Boustany	Hardy	Newhouse
Brady (TX)	Harper	Noem
Brat	Harris	Nugent
Bridenstine	Hartzler	Nunes
Brooks (AL)	Heck (NV)	Olson
Buchanan	Hensarling	Palazzo
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Palmer
Bucshon	Hill	Paulsen
Burgess	Holding	Pearce
Byrne	Hudson	Perry
Calvert	Huelskamp	Peterson
Carter (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Pittenger
Carter (TX)	Hultgren	Pitts
Chabot	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Chaffetz	Hurd (TX)	Polliquin
Clawson (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Posey
Coffman	Jenkins (KS)	Price, Tom
Cole	Jenkins (WV)	Ratcliffe
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Comstock	Jolly	Renacci
Conaway	Jones	Ribble
Cook	Joyce	Rice (SC)
Costello (PA)	Katko	Rigell
Cramer	Kelly (MS)	Roby
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Culberson	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Curbelo (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
Davis, Rodney	Kline	Rokita
Denham	Knight	Rooney (FL)
Dent	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
DeSantis	LaHood	Roskam
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Ross
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Rothfus
Dold	Lance	Rouzer
Donovan	Latta	Royce
Duffy	LoBiondo	Russell
Duncan (SC)	Long	Salmon
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Sanford
Ellmers (NC)	Love	Scalise
Emmer (MN)	Lucas	Schweikert
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Fincher	Lummis	Sessions
Fitzpatrick	MacArthur	Shimkus
Fleischmann	Marchant	Shuster
Fleming	Marino	Simpson
Flores	McCarthy	Smith (MO)
Forbes	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Fortenberry	McClintock	Smith (NJ)

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

NAYS—178

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

NOT VOTING—19

Brooks (IN)	Hice, Jody B.	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Huffman	Massie
Castro (TX)	Issa	Pompeo
Fattah	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Gowdy	Lujan Grisham	Westmoreland
Grijalva	(NM)	

□ 1426

Ms. TITUS changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 177, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

AYES—242

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

Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

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

NOES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cucciar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Davis, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeke
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nader
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
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
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—14

Brooks (IN)
Butterfield
Castro (TX)
Fattah
Gowdy

Hice, Jody B.
Issa
Jordan
Lujan Grisham
(NM)

Maloney, Sean
Massie
Smith (WA)
Takai
Westmoreland

□ 1433

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on Roll Call Number 48 on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3700. I am not recorded because I was absent due to awaiting the impending birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present I would have voted NAY.

Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on Roll Call Number 49 on H. Res. 594—Rule

providing for consideration of H.R. 3700—Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015. I am not recorded because I was absent due to awaiting the impending birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present I would have voted NAY.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITY THROUGH MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 3700, to provide housing opportunities in the United States through modernization of various housing programs, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 594 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. 3700.

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

□ 1437

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. 3700) to provide housing opportunities in the United States through modernization of various housing programs, and for other purposes, with Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania 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 Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act, offered by my friend, Chairman LUETKEMEYER of Missouri.

I want to thank him for his leadership on this bill that he has worked on for many, many months. It represents a true bipartisan approach to housing reform.

I also want to thank his fellow Missourian, the ranking member of the Housing Subcommittee, again, another gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), for his input into this legislation and for his leadership on his side of the aisle as well.

H.R. 3700 passed the Financial Services Committee with broad bipartisan

support back in December. Again, it is designed to help promote greater efficiency in our existing housing assistance programs.

In many different ways, Mr. Chairman, it modernizes a lot of outdated rules and regulations which, in some cases, have not even been updated in a generation. And so, in that respect, it takes the resources that we have and targets it to those who need it the most.

So you will find provisions here dealing with Section 8 rental assistance, public housing, rural housing, homeless assistance, and FHA mortgage insurance for condominiums. It is a very broad bill, and, again, it enjoys bipartisan support.

Let me talk a little bit about what H.R. 3700 doesn't do or what it is not. Few have been more critical about the poor focus of our HUD programs than I have been because, regardless of whatever their good intentions may be, the undeniable truth is current Federal housing policy remains fractured, remains costly, remains inefficient, and oftentimes does not help those who truly need it.

In 2012, the GAO found that 20 different Federal Government entities administer over 160 different programs, tax expenditures, and other tools that support home ownership and rental housing.

The Department of HUD has received approximately more than \$1.6 trillion in real dollars since it was born 50 years ago and today spends over \$45 billion annually on at least 85 active programs, again, many of which have not been modernized or updated in a generation.

And the results of all this?

Well, all too often housing affordability remains a very real challenge for many Americans. Too many neighborhoods still suffer from blight and neglect with substandard housing options for low-income families.

Most tellingly, the national poverty rate has remained essentially unchanged in the 50 years since HUD was first created. Mr. Chairman, we can do better.

Now, we all know that the best housing program is a job, a career path, one with a future. We know that the best housing program is economic opportunity for all, boundless economic opportunity for all. But there are still some that need assistance.

So that is not what this debate is about today. Today the debate is: What can we do on a bipartisan basis? Where can we come to agreement on current existing programs to try to make them work better for the poor and for our low-income people who need assistance through the HUD programs? What is it we can do to help move more people out of poverty to lives of self-sufficiency? How do we reform HUD's complex bureaucratic web of programs? How do we spread economic opportunity to all?

Those should be what our goals are.

H.R. 3700 addresses the question by finding many ways within HUD's bureaucracy to streamline the inspection protocol for rental assistance units, to simplify tenant income review so local housing officials can focus on housing, not data collection, and to target assistance, again, to households with the greatest need.

For the first time, H.R. 3700 will state that any occupant of a public housing unit that exceeds the area median income for 2 consecutive years either gives up their government subsidy or moves out of the unit. That provides more resources for those who deserve it.

H.R. 3700 also addresses the problem of over-income occupants. It creates for the first time a financial asset test for public housing residents. Currently, there is only a one-time income test.

Again, these are just two ways, Mr. Chairman, that we ensure that the resources that are devoted to these housing programs are targeted to those who are most in need.

I could go on and on about the benefits of the bill. But let me just say that, with any great project, there are those who are always saying we could do more. And, yes, we could do more, and we are working faster to implement even more reforms.

But today represents a start of a process, not the end of a process, a very ambitious project to transform how we deliver government housing assistance in America and help people graduate from Federal assistance to lives of self-sufficiency and financial independence.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of our Housing and Insurance Subcommittee, for his great leadership.

I commend the ranking member of that committee as well for working on a bipartisan basis.

I hope all Members will support H.R. 3700. It is a bipartisan first step in fixing a broken housing system that we have.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today to discuss H.R. 3700, but I would like to start by saying how pleased I am that we are focusing on housing.

This is the first major housing bill that the Financial Services Committee has considered in the past several Congresses, and I hope that we can spend a lot more time focusing on the dire housing needs of low-income families in America as we move forward.

□ 1445

Today, only one in four households in this country who are eligible to receive housing assistance actually receive it, and there is a severe deficit of over 7 million rental units that are both affordable and available to extremely low-income Americans.

Furthermore, according to HUD's most recent point-in-time count, there

are nearly 600,000 Americans who are homeless in this country—a staggering number I find simply unconscionable. These statistics demonstrate that we must come together to make reforms to Federal housing programs, but also to commit new resources to tackle the extreme lack of affordable housing in this country.

I spend a lot of time visiting and talking with housing and homeless services providers. Recently, I visited the Downtown Women's Center in Los Angeles and N Street Village here in D.C. These homeless service providers are helping women and families get off the streets and into safe, decent, affordable, and supportive housing. Organizations such as these are not just applying compassion, they are applying evidence-based approaches to addressing homelessness in the most effective ways.

H.R. 3700 is a step in the right direction because it directly responds to concerns that I have heard over and over again from these housing and homeless service providers about how Federal housing programs can better support their efforts.

This bill would make several incremental changes across a number of Federal housing programs that will allow us to better serve low-income families in need of housing assistance while also relieving certain administrative burdens. These changes would affect public housing, section 8 Tenant and Project-Based Rental Assistance, the Federal Housing Administration, the Rural Housing Service, and HUD's homelessness programs, among others.

Many of the provisions are common-sense reforms that are long overdue. For example, this bill includes the text of my bill, the Project-Based Voucher Improvement Act of 2015, which would increase flexibility for public housing authorities to develop new units of housing to serve vulnerable populations, including those who are homeless in this country. It would also help to create housing opportunities in areas where vouchers are difficult to use.

Several national and local tenant advocacy organizations and affordable housing industry groups have expressed support for my bill. In addition, a number of other provisions in H.R. 3700 were included in previous section 8 reform bills that I have introduced. I am pleased that my Republican colleagues have expressed their support for these provisions that I have long advocated.

At the markup of this bill, I raised a serious concern that I had with one of the provisions in H.R. 3700 because it would effectively raise rents for low-income families with children who are living in certain HUD-assisted housing. I voted against the bill in committee. Although I voted against the bill at the committee markup for this reason, I am very pleased to say that I have worked, and my staff has worked, with my Republican colleagues so that we could find some common ground, and

they have indicated that they will support my amendment that I have offered to address this issue.

I am encouraged that my Republican colleagues shared in my concerns and that we were able to reach a meaningful compromise on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I am now urging my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 3700. It is high time we came together to pass a bipartisan housing bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee. He happens to be the author of the bill.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING, Ranking Member WATERS, and especially my good friend from Missouri, the ranking member, Mr. CLEAVER. We have had a labor of love with this bill, and it took two guys from the Show Me State to show them how to do it. We are excited about that, and I want to give a special shout-out to him.

Mr. Chairman, when I took the gavel of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, I told my colleagues I wanted to work with them across party lines to make meaningful changes that benefit all Americans. H.R. 3700 represents a major step forward, one to reform a system that is in many instances outdated, duplicative, and burdensome.

As a body, we should be committed to creating a more efficient government and greater opportunity for the American people and American businesses. H.R. 3700 helps us meet those commitments.

This legislation promotes greater efficiency in housing assistance programs and modernizes outdated rules and regulations, which in some cases have not been updated in more than a generation. H.R. 3700 streamlines the inspection protocol for rental assistance units, simplifies the income recertification policies for assisted households, clarifies homeless assistance program requirements, delegates rural housing loan approval authority, and provides targeted flexibility between public housing operating and capital funds.

H.R. 3700 also gives State and local housing agencies and private owners enhanced flexibility in meeting key program objectives such as reducing homelessness, improving access to higher-opportunity neighborhoods, and addressing repair needs of public housing.

The bill also, for the first time in over 30 years of public housing policy, provides a thoughtful limitation on public housing tenancy for over-income families. Importantly, this legislation also pays special attention to our homeless veterans and children aging

out of foster care, two vulnerable communities that need our support today.

H.R. 3700 does all of this and still manages to save the taxpayers money. CBO estimates that the underlying bill saves \$311 million over 5 years.

I will be the first to point out that H.R. 3700 will not necessarily change the world. It won't overhaul HUD or the Rural Housing Service, end homelessness overnight, or meet the overwhelming need for affordable housing. But it is a significant step in the long journey to reforming a broken system.

The majority of the provisions in this bill were agreed to years ago by Members of Congress, housing advocates, and industry groups. H.R. 3700 is a set of solutions on which all parties, in Congress, industry, and advocacy, have agreed and can agree.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation presents a bipartisan effort that has been drafted and debated over the past 6 months. I want to thank again Chairman HENSARLING for his support and Ranking Member WATERS for her work on the bill, which passed the Financial Services Committee in December by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 44-10.

I also want to recognize my good friend, the ranking member, Mr. CLEAVER from Missouri. Without his tireless efforts, this bill would be very difficult to have accomplished anything with.

Housing policy isn't easy. It is emotional. It touches lives. It sets the stage for future generations. Because it is so important, it isn't always easy to find policies on which we all agree. With H.R. 3700, we have an opportunity to show the Nation that we are committed to working together, and with a diverse group of stakeholders, for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I urge the Senate to consider it without delay so we can break a status quo that benefits too few at the cost of too many.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER). He is the leading Democratic sponsor of this bill, a member of the Financial Services Committee, and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I came to Congress, and because of my own experiences, I only had one ambition other than being a Member of Congress, and it was to take leadership in the Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance because, experientially, I thought I had experiences that might help. And secondly, having served as mayor, we dealt a lot with housing in Missouri's largest city. I had this opportunity. And I want to thank Ms. WATERS for the opportunity to be the lead Democrat on the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee.

I think it was fortunate, maybe even fortuitous, that two Missourians ended up working together, and we were able to, I think, do some things that prob-

ably might not have been done otherwise because I think we both have a spirit of working together, and it ended up in a good product. But that wouldn't have taken place without the chairman and the ranking member.

I lived in 404-B Bailey public housing in Wichita Falls, Texas. I went by on Christmas, and I just parked there for a long time and looked at the kids running around playing, thinking I used to do that on that same little piece of dirt that we called a yard. I wondered about the kids who were in that unit. Will they eventually have the opportunities that I was blessed to have? Or would they suffer the fate of many others with whom I grew up?

I thought in part we might be able to do some things here that will help the little boy I saw running around playing in front of the unit I once lived in with my mother, father, and three sisters. I think we have done this. These are probably the most sweeping changes in HUD regulations in a quarter of a century, perhaps ever; and what we have done is we have remodeled, or refashioned, or recast, or redesigned many of the programs impacting HUD.

I do not disagree with Chairman HENSARLING that we do have a great deal of redundancy in programs that we run with HUD and USDA. I do think at some point there is a need for us to get things molded a little bit better, but that is not going to take place I don't think any time soon.

I support H.R. 3700 because I had the opportunity to understand what these changes mean. I also need to say before I go any further that I don't believe that compromise means capitulation. In fact, I don't think democracy can work without comity and compromise. I think they are inseparable parts of democracy. So there are parts of this bill that I am not as thrilled with, as other parts, but that is what happens in a democracy.

Again, I cherish the opportunity to work with people who are willing to move and shake and move and shake and shake and move to get something to the floor.

The bill will streamline the inspection and income review process for families living in section 8 units. We are making, in this legislation, some very badly needed changes to the project-based voucher program by allowing a public housing authority, PHA, to project-base up to 20 percent of its authorized voucher allocation, rather than 20 percent of the voucher funding that we give. And then we give PHAs more flexibility with their funds by allowing them to transfer up to 20 percent of their capital funds to the operating fund.

Mr. Chairman, what this allows is for people who are on the ground, working with people, understanding where they need to have funds, the opportunity to move those funds around without violating any of the HUD regulations.

It helps our foster children by expanding eligibility for the Family Unification Program from the current

limit of 21 years of age to 24 years of age, and it increases the length of stay from 18 months to a maximum of 36 months. It also—and I think this is important—expands the eligibility of individuals who will leave foster care within 90 days.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), who is the chair of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman LUETKEMEYER and Ranking Member CLEAVER for their work on this very important piece of legislation.

I have been in the housing business probably for over 40-some-odd years. I have been involved in every aspect of it, from low-income housing, to rental housing, to new housing, to resale housing. One of the things that I have recognized over the years is what an important part housing is to the fabric of our country, how important housing is to families, and how people enter into the housing market in different ways. Certainly there are folks that go into market-based rental housing, and then there are folks that aren't quite ready to do that. Maybe they are getting started or have had a difficulty in their life, so lower-income housing provides an opportunity for them.

I think the goal of the housing programs over the years is to provide low-income housing as a stepping stone and not a permanent residence. One of the things I like about H.R. 3700 is that it encourages that process. It has been brought up in a number of these programs, and over the years sometimes a good idea spreads around. We have spent a lot of time probably creating new housing programs and probably spent a lot of time increasing the funding for housing programs, but in many cases maybe we didn't stop and do the review and make sure that the programs that we had put in place were efficient in delivering the services that needed to be delivered and helping those families accomplish the goal of moving through the housing cycle.

□ 1500

So one of the things that I like about this bill is that these families that have—in fact, the goal has been to increase their livelihood, and they have gotten better jobs and their income has increased. It is time, then, for those folks to move on. Because what we know is—and those statistics have been, I think, brought out today—we have got a number of people in the waiting line to get into some of this housing to better their lives. It is not fair that people whose incomes have far surpassed incomes that it takes to qualify to live in them should continue to do that.

So affluent families must pay market rental rates or they have got to leave the public housing arena. Higher asset families must leave public housing.

That is a normal cause. That is not cruel. That is just the way that these programs were designed to work.

The other thing, though, is we have a responsibility not only to the families and individuals around our country, but we have a responsibility to the United States of America. One of the things that I think is important about this piece of legislation is it doesn't really mess with mandatory spending but is, according to CBO, going to save \$300 million over 5 years.

What that points out—and this is done really without cutting any of the programs, but just cutting some efficiencies in those programs to make sure that those programs are being administered appropriately—is, if there are some regulatory things that are keeping people from operating some of these public housing facilities in a way that maximizes the benefit, then we give them some flexibility to do that by reducing some duplicative regulatory processes and, more importantly, empowering the local entities and the local operators of this public housing to be more innovative and creative.

As I have had an opportunity to visit some of our public housing facilities in my district, the 19th Congressional District, and sit down with a lot of those administrators, what they tell me is: RANDY, if we could have more flexibility, we know how to deliver this service much more efficiently than we have today. But in many cases, the Federal regulation is inhibiting their ability to be able to implement some of those things.

I want to commend the two gentlemen from Missouri for their outstanding work. Yes, we could probably do more, but the good thing is we got started. I think we are off to a good start, so I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3700.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), the ranking member of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for yielding. I rise in support of H.R. 3700, as amended by Ranking Member WATERS.

This is what you call regular order, folks. This bill came out of committee with a significant flaw that would have had a very negative impact on families and children and the ability of low-income people to deduct childcare expenses. If it were not fixed, it would have effectively raised rent on thousands of low-income families with children.

I just want to commend my colleagues, Ms. WATERS and Mr. CLEAVER—Ms. WATERS in particular—for really catching this flaw. But I also want to commend the Republicans who, instead of just taking their position as being in the majority and saying “we don't have to listen to you,”

continued to engage with us to fix this. Literally, the math did not work out.

I can tell you as once a single parent and as a grandmother, I know about the budget-busting cost of child care. I also know how central housing policy and access to child care is critical to positive social outcomes for children.

So often we demand that poor people, and especially women, pull themselves up by their bootstraps. We have programs that are designed to help them. But then what we do is we put program features in place that really cancel out the benefits of these programs.

But this bill, H.R. 3700, as amended by the ranking member, eliminates the unintended consequences for poor people who are raising children. Ranking Member WATERS and subcommittee Ranking Member CLEAVER have both been powerful advocates for affordable housing on the Financial Services Committee. I am so pleased to join them in fighting for these changes.

H.R. 3700 is supported by the National Association of Realtors, the National Alliance to End Homelessness, and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, among the over two dozen groups supporting it.

I urge adoption of the legislation, as amended by Ms. WATERS.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), the vice chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

About 5 years ago, I was in Roswell, New Mexico, at a meeting with veteran constituents. We were talking about policies and things like that. After about an hour, suddenly one gentleman overlooked in the whole group blurted out, “I am living in a rat hole.” It just caught us all by surprise. We dismantled the discussion there, and we went immediately to look at his house. Over the next 2 years, that community gathered money and businesses came together. They tore down the man's house and rebuilt it.

The problem is that not everyone out there can get access to communities and local businesses to help them through the problems, so we have the housing programs which are set up. Unfortunately, they are mired in bureaucratic red tape. We soak up the dollars that should be helping people with administrative burdens that make no sense, with duplicative requirements to go through the processes.

I commend both sides of the aisle, Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, for pushing this reform because it will allow us to direct the money to where it should be going.

Many times we think that we disagree with each other about policies. The truth is there is not significant disagreement that we should be helping those at the lowest income levels to raise themselves up. It is through their

progression towards prosperity and towards just making ends meet that we get rid of some of the deepest problems in our social cost of the government. It is not that we disagree; it is that sometimes we get trapped and that that program doesn't work very well so we want to cut funds.

I really think that this is a very important step today where we are trying to modernize the systems that are delivering help to those that need it the most in the belief that the human spirit will actually take those steps to make their own way out once we help them stabilize.

Again, just thanks for the work on both sides of the aisle.

I urge support of H.R. 3700.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act, as amended by Ranking Member WATERS.

While not a perfect bill, H.R. 3700 has been made considerably better by the amendment offered by Ranking Member WATERS. There are other amendments that I would love to see, including my own, but I must tell you that this bill does represent true bipartisanship. It is a major bipartisan step towards helping preserve our scarce housing resources while expanding housing opportunities and homeownership opportunities.

More specifically, this legislation makes critical changes that would help improve and expand the Section 502 Guaranteed Rural Housing Loan Program. This program helps provide low- and moderate-income households with homeownership opportunities in rural areas, like the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I am so proud to represent.

The sad reality is that too often, rural America faces severe barriers and obstacles to obtaining quality and affordable housing. This is largely due to the limited access to affordable mortgage credit.

The Section 502 Guaranteed Rural Housing Loan Program is designed to target rural residents who have a steady low or moderate income yet are unable to obtain adequate housing through conventional financing. Essentially, this program encourages private lenders to extend credit to responsible and creditworthy borrowers in rural America.

H.R. 3700 would help the Department of Agriculture improve and expand the Section 502 Guaranteed Rural Housing Loan Program by delegating loan approval authority to certain participating lenders. This is similar to the authority that the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development currently has for Federal Housing Administration's programs, and this legislative proposal was included in the President's FY 2016 budget.

This is a commonsense and pragmatic measure that will help improve the efficiency of an important rural housing program so that it can reach even more rural families. It is critically important that we continue to provide the necessary tools and incentives to help ensure all Americans are able to realize their dream of homeownership.

I want to commend my colleague from Missouri. I especially want to commend my colleague Congressman CLEAVER for his tireless leadership on this effort. I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their efforts.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3700.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTINGER).

Mr. PITTINGER. I thank Chairman LUETKEMEYER for his leadership on this bill, and I appreciate deeply the support and leadership of Congressman CLEAVER.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act, which contains provisions that expand housing opportunities while protecting American taxpayers.

This bipartisan legislation provides commonsense efforts for streamlining and reducing regulatory burdens for organizations working with HUD.

This bill looks to correct many wrongs within our housing system while also simplifying certification processes and providing permanent authority for direct endorsement for approved lenders to approve rural housing service loans.

Mr. Chairman, condominiums are often the first step on the housing ladder for first-time homeowners. They also can be the most affordable and desirable option for single people, young families, and those looking to downsize. Unfortunately, current FHA regulations prevent buyers from purchasing condos. H.R. 3700 eases restrictions, allowing more opportunity for homeownership.

This bill reins in duplicative and overly burdensome regulations, which not only create a slower process, but also increase government workload all without affecting any changes to direct spending.

Mr. Chairman, housing assistance should be solely for those who need it most of all, and this bill takes aim at ensuring this. For the first time in 80 years, this legislation provides limitations on public housing tenancy for over-income families.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the Appropriations Committee and someone who has been focused on dealing with poverty.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank our ranking member, Congresswoman WATERS, for leading and also

for her tremendous leadership on the Financial Services Committee as our ranking member. She has been phenomenal in terms of making sure that our legislation is bipartisan. Also, I remember serving on the Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance for many, many years with Congresswoman WATERS, and she constantly worked to make sure that people had access to affordable, accessible, clean, and safe housing. She has not wavered on that agenda. So I thank her very much.

The need for affordable housing has never been greater. That is why I am very happy to be here today to support the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015. This bill would make critical improvements to our Nation's public and assisted housing programs, and takes steps to ensure that low-income communities have access to safe and affordable housing.

Now, let me just tell you, in my district in Oakland, California, rents have risen faster than anywhere else in the Nation. In fact, if the average Oakland renter had to move tomorrow, they would be spending a staggering 70 percent of their income on housing—70 percent of their income. That is outrageous. My constituents, like many constituents around the country, can't afford this, so this is a crisis.

□ 1515

This bill takes steps to address this issue by protecting voucher holders from losing their subsidies when fair market rents drop, which is something that recently had a major impact on my community. Thankfully, with the help of Congresswoman WATERS and our Secretary of HUD, we were able to navigate the agency's redtape to find a solution so the tenants could keep their assistance and stay in their homes.

I support this bill and the critical amendments offered by Congresswoman WATERS and Congressmen PRICE and ADERHOLT.

It is also important that we update the formula that is used to distribute funds under the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS to reflect the changing nature of the HIV/AIDS epidemic and to ensure those communities in greatest need receive critical HOPWA funds. This is one issue that Congresswoman WATERS has been working on for many, many years to make sure these funds are targeted to the people and to the communities who need it the most.

The bill allows for homeownership for those whose American Dream of such has been shattered. Thank goodness, in this bill, we now have provisions that will allow that dream to be fulfilled.

I thank Congressman CLEAVER as well as our majority and minority members for this bill.

From just a very parochial point of view, in my district, I have to say how badly needed this bill is, as

gentrification is a big issue. My constituents constantly ask me what the Federal Government can do, and this is a major step in that direction.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3700, which is a modest but important first step to improving Federal housing policy through several commonsense reforms.

For the first time in HUD's 50-year history, there will now be a flexible formula directing over-income families to pay greater shares of their subsidized rents or to move out of public housing. Incomes and assets will be reevaluated to target assistance to those who are truly in need.

There are wait lists across the country for scarce public housing resources and Section 8 vouchers. I have listened to homeless advocates and to my constituents at the Lexington Housing Authority in Kentucky about the waiting lists that exist in my own district. A 2015 HUD audit found that 25,000 families had incomes too high to qualify for assistance; yet the families remained in taxpayer subsidized housing. Some of those families actually derived income from renting other residential properties that they, themselves, owned. One family highlighted in the report had a combined income of \$498,000.

Policy failures such as these not only waste taxpayer dollars, but, more importantly, they hurt those in need who might otherwise have roofs over their heads. I hope this bipartisan initiative is a down payment on the further reform of Federal housing programs.

Several of my colleagues and I are developing an empowerment agenda to holistically reform Federal assistance programs from housing to nutrition to workforce development. We start with the recognition that the Federal Government now runs more than 80 different antipoverty programs at an annual cost of nearly \$1 trillion; yet, after 50 years of this strategy, the poverty rate has barely budged from where it was in 1965. The goal is to assist Americans to achieve their God-given potential and to restore the American Dream to where the condition of one's birth does not determine the outcome of one's life.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and with members of this subcommittee in leveraging the empowerment agenda to craft additional reforms to Federal housing policies, which will improve outcomes by recognizing that poor Americans are not liabilities to be managed by some remote bureaucracy in Washington but who are untapped assets who can achieve the American Dream.

I congratulate Chairman LUETKEMEYER and Ranking Member CLEAVER for their work on this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 3700, and I invite my colleagues

on both sides of the aisle to join in additional efforts to reform HUD and to more effectively combat poverty.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, with this bill, we have an opportunity to address an inequity with how the Department of Housing and Urban Development treats condominiums, particularly in senior communities.

Across the country and in my district in the Bay Area, condo communities have been missing out on access to mortgages due to an unnecessarily restrictive rule. The rule's intent is good, but, in practice, it unduly harms seniors, families, and communities.

One community in my district in the East Bay of the Bay Area, Rossmoor, is home to thousands of seniors, many of whom need access to HUD-backed mortgages to enhance their financial security. I am pleased that this bill is a step in the right direction to allow these residents and residents in other condo communities around the country to benefit from the same mortgage rules that are available to other homeowners.

I appreciate the hard work done by the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee on this important issue, and I look forward to working with them to continue to protect these deserving communities.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), one of our young and up-and-coming members of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, for decades, the Federal Government has spent over \$1.6 trillion in an attempt to accomplish the laudable goal of ensuring that all Americans have access to affordable, decent housing.

I have visited many affordable housing sites during my time in Congress to listen to the concerns of residents, managers, and community leaders. In fact, just 2 weeks ago, I visited a public housing facility that is managed by the Housing Authority of Beaver County. These meetings and visits have underscored the importance of our housing assistance programs. If administered correctly, these efforts can be truly transformative for hardworking Americans. I have met many Pennsylvanians who have improved their lives and who have brightened their families' futures thanks, in part, to targeted Federal housing assistance provided to them in their time of need.

However, there are also cases in which outdated rules, waste, fraud, abuse, and general inefficiency have made it difficult to direct resources to those who need them the most. There are also instances in which housing as-

sistance programs have failed to help people lift themselves out of poverty. Members of both parties recognize this reality and have worked together to identify areas for improvement. H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act, is a bipartisan, commonsense bill that addresses many of these issues.

Among other things, this legislation makes it easier for tenants, owners, and investors to navigate rental assistance programs by reducing duplicative and inefficient regulations that make it harder to rent or to operate affordable housing. The Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act also incorporates safeguards to prevent well-off families from using scarce public housing units. We can all agree that housing assistance programs should be reserved for those who need help the most. This legislation also provides flexibility to public housing agencies in using Federal funds to meet local needs more effectively.

I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan effort to improve Federal housing assistance. We owe it to the many Americans who rely on these programs to enact this legislation's reforms.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill contains several provisions which I wholeheartedly support and would like to see passed into law.

For example, this bill includes a few provisions that were taken straight from bills that I have authored, including the text of my Project-Based Voucher Improvement Act of 2015, which would increase the flexibility for public housing authorities to develop new units of housing to serve vulnerable populations, including those who are homeless in this country. It would also help to create housing opportunities in areas where vouchers are difficult to use.

I introduced the Project-Based Voucher Improvement Act to address the severe lack of affordable housing, which is contributing to the epidemic of homelessness across the country. The Section 8 project-based voucher program is a valuable tool to help preserve and create more affordable housing, especially for the poorest and most vulnerable populations. Essentially, it helps housing providers leverage outside financing in order to create and maintain affordable housing in their communities.

My bill would help us maximize the effectiveness of this critical program by facilitating the ability of PHAs to enter into agreements with private and nonprofit owners and to partner with social service agencies to provide supportive housing. This will, ultimately, help provide stable housing for our most vulnerable populations.

Gaining access to affordable housing is becoming harder and harder for far too many families. We are in the midst

of a homeless crisis in my district and in many districts around the country, and we need more affordable housing to help get vulnerable populations off the streets. By making this Section 8 project-based voucher program easier to use, we could help to overcome this challenge.

I hope that the information that has been shared by some of my colleagues has not been lost. I certainly hope that we all heard what Congresswoman BARBARA LEE said about residents who are paying 70 percent of their income for housing, and it has become commonplace around this country for our citizens to be paying 50 percent of their income for housing. This is totally unacceptable.

I am very pleased that we are focusing on housing. I am very pleased as there are certain aspects of this bill that, I think, will be very beneficial to our residents and to our constituents throughout the country. I am hopeful that we will continue on this track and that this won't be the last housing effort that we make that comes out of the Financial Services Committee. I am very pleased to be a part of it.

I am proud of all of the work that has gone into this legislation. I am very pleased that we were able to work out any differences that we may have had. I am very proud of Mr. CLEAVER and of Mr. LUETKEMEYER, as they are two gentlemen from Missouri, for getting together to do this bill. It might have helped a little bit that I am from Missouri also. I think this bill is something we can all be proud of.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), one of our junior members of the committee but one of the senior Members with life experience who can bring a lot of good discussion to this debate we are having this afternoon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015.

Introduced by my good friend Chairman LUETKEMEYER and my friend Congressman CLEAVER, this bipartisan piece of legislation is the first step in many to help reform and modernize our outdated Federal housing system.

Mr. Chairman, for too long, government red tape has made many of these housing programs inefficient and ineffective, hurting the very people they aim to support. If signed into law, H.R. 3700 would seek to change that, all the while saving taxpayer-invested money.

First, as mentioned, the CBO projects this bill to be a cost saver. With the Federal deficit reaching almost \$19 trillion, the savings in discretionary spending are a direct result of allowing local housing officials and agencies to better manage their programs. Like most Federal programs, inefficient regulations exist that often balloon overall costs.

Additionally, as previously mentioned, for the first time in 80 years of public housing policy, this legislation restricts the use of already scarce public housing units to those who actually need them by establishing an earnings cap. Eliminating Federal subsidies for over-income families has always been key to this discussion. While most wait lists for public housing stretch into the tens of thousands, families who should not receive subsidies, in fact, often do. Plain and simple, public housing should be reserved for those who are most in need.

Finally, H.R. 3700 ensures that our veterans have fair access to HUD housing and homeless assistance programs. With nearly 50,000 homeless vets nationwide, we can and need to do more in this area.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Financial Services and of the House Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, I thank Chairman LUETKEMEYER for his leadership on this issue over the last year, as addressing housing reform is something that is not without controversy.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to close by again thanking my colleagues, Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. LUETKEMEYER, for their leadership in putting together a bipartisan affordable housing bill that addresses so many complicated issues in a responsible way and brings together so many different stakeholders in support of this bill.

There is a very long list of organizations that support this bill that includes tenant advocacy groups, public housing authority industry groups, real estate industry groups, rural housing groups, as well as community development organizations.

To name just a few, the supporters of this bill include the National Low Income Housing Coalition, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the National Housing Trust, CSH, the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities, the National Association of Realtors, the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Enterprise Community Partners, and many more.

The enthusiastic support from such a broad and diverse coalition of organizations is indicative of the hard-fought compromises that are included in this bill. In fact, I do not know of a single organization that is opposing this bill.

H.R. 3700 is made up of commonsense reforms that will make much-needed improvements to our housing programs

to make them work better for both public housing agencies and the tenants they serve.

If this bill is enacted into law, it will make the first major reforms to HUD's primary rental assistance programs since 1998, and that is an achievement that we can all be proud of.

So there is a lot at stake here. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, can you tell me how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MARCHANT). The gentleman from Missouri has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chair, I apologize to the ranking member. I do have one additional speaker. If the gentlewoman is out of time, I am more than willing to allow the gentlewoman to have some of our time to be able to rebut in case there is something that is an issue.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to speak in support of H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act, sponsored by Representatives LUETKEMEYER and CLEAVER.

This extremely bipartisan bill makes a number of critical reforms to our Federal housing programs. These programs will streamline processes and create much-needed efficiencies for government and, most importantly, our consumers.

I am happy to see the bill moving so quickly because it will solve a number of problems low-income Americans continue to face in acquiring safe and affordable housing.

This legislation would make commonsense changes to the Department of Housing and Urban Development in order to lighten administrative burdens for housing agencies and owners to assist low-income individuals and families to live in greater dignity.

It is very encouraging to see the bipartisan work that has been done on this bill. I commend both Chairman LUETKEMEYER and Ranking Member CLEAVER of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee. I thank Chairman LUETKEMEYER for allowing me to speak on this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 3700.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will just take these last few minutes that I have to say to those people who live in public housing that this is an important support effort of government to provide public housing for those who cannot afford market-rate housing.

I have represented over the years many public housing projects in California. While I do not represent them

all anymore, I still pay attention to public housing because I understand and know how very important it is to the lives of families and to the children who depend on having safe housing and affordable housing for them.

I would simply like to say that oftentimes people who live in public housing have been demonized. There are folks who think, oh, they could do better if they wanted to. There are people who say that they don't want to remove themselves from public housing.

I would like to have people know that many of the folks that I have known who live in public housing work every day for minimum wages. Many of them are trying very hard to be independent. Many of them would like to have job training. Many of them would like to have more support for childcare efforts. Many of them are working to get their GEDs. Many of them have returned to school.

For the people who live in public housing, they don't need to feel that somehow they are getting something they don't deserve.

I am proud of this government, and I am proud of this country that will provide a safety net for the least of these and safe public housing to those who cannot afford market-rate housing.

I want our Congress to continue to see how we can do a better job even of providing safe and secure housing for those who cannot afford it.

I want us to be able to provide additional support to those who live in public housing, for those who are saying to us: Help me with job training. Help me to ensure that my children can get the kind of support living in public housing that will give them access to a good education. Help us to have better health care so we can be better able to go out and take jobs to support our families. Help us to aspire to move upward and out, even. Help us to understand what is available to us out there. When we seek out help for our problems, don't look at us as if we are people who are not investing in ourselves, who are not relying on our own abilities. Simply see us as Americans who would like to do better. See us as Americans who unfortunately find ourselves in situations where we can't do better for now, but we are looking for the opportunity to do better and to have more and to enjoy everything that this country has to offer.

So as we support this legislation today—and I support it—I am optimistic about the fact that this is going to make a lot of lives better, but I am also optimistic that this is really a beginning for how we can begin to not only give support, but involve tenants in how they can help to make decisions about the units that they are living in and how they can serve on the boards that oversee them, how they can be a part of government, helping us to understand how we can do a better job with the authority that they have given us.

So I am very proud. I am very pleased. I thank Mr. CLEAVER and Mr.

LUETKEMEYER. I thank Mr. CLEAVER for telling his story about public housing. I want him to know that there are any number of Members in the Congress of the United States who have lived in public housing or their families, such as my family has lived in public housing.

I want him to know I have watched public housing that has been very helpful. I have watched public housing that has provided safe, decent, and secure opportunities for the people who live there. But I have also watched public housing when it didn't work.

The Pruitt-Igoe in St. Louis, Missouri, was an example of what didn't work. I was in that city when it was torn down. The space that it occupied is still vacant in that city. It should be a space where we had additional public housing that would support the families who so desperately need it.

So I don't take this bill lightly. I don't think about this as just another piece of legislation that we happen to get passed here in Congress, even with bipartisan support.

I think of this as an important step and a statement, a statement that says both sides of the aisle understand housing, both sides of the aisle would like to continue to do the best job that they can do to provide safe and secure housing, and that we are not going to stand by and watch homelessness continue to grow.

It was mentioned several times throughout this debate—maybe here today and when we were in committee—that, in Los Angeles County, homelessness has increased by 20 percent. People are sleeping on the sidewalks all the way up to city hall. We cannot abide that. We cannot stand by and watch that happen.

While I am pointing to Los Angeles County, there are many areas all across this Nation where homelessness is shameful and unconscionable. I am very pleased and proud that we are sending a signal here today that we won't stand for it.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to close with a few remarks here. It won't take very long.

I think you can see that this is a very important and, also, very emotional issue for many, many people and it is extremely important for those folks who are in and around and utilize public housing.

In putting this bill together, we tried to listen to all the different parties as well as both sides of the aisle and address all the concerns that everybody had. We have a few amendments to go here, but I think we are going to work through those pretty quickly.

I think you can see from the support that we have seen on both sides of the aisle today, from the discussions we have had that we have come to an agreement on what is in the provisions of this bill.

You have here a whole list of 30 different letters of support from different groups from around the country that represent all the different groups, from leased housing to housing authorities, to investment individuals, to Realtors, to you name it.

We have yet to receive a single letter against this proposal. So I think you can see that we managed to find the right balance with the bill, to find the middle ground where we can all agree that we can accept the provisions that we have.

In the bill, we have done things with flexibility that people within the different housing authorities have asked for who manage these things to be able to do things more efficiently, more effectively.

We got rid of duplicative rules. We built the condos up so they could now be part of the program. We have cut the costs not by cutting programs, but by cutting out the waste and the duplicative rules and have given flexibility to those groups that need it to be able to do the job.

Is this an end-all, be-all? No. We have a lot more to do. We recognize that. This is a good first step. We believe that we need to be empowering people and enabling people to be able to do better and help themselves. We believe that, when it comes to housing, it is not just a place to live, but people need to have a place to have a life.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chair, I have a question for the bill's managers regarding the project-based voucher provisions. The bill generally limits a public housing agency's use of voucher funds for project-based vouchers to 20 percent of the authorized voucher units for the agency, but contains an exception among others providing that units of project-based assistance that are attached to units previously receiving another type of long-term subsidy provided by HUD will not count against this limitation.

We have an exciting initiative in Boston that would replace our 75-year-old Charlestown public housing development with a substantially larger, new construction mixed-income community on the same site. The public housing units are to be fully replaced with project-based vouchers. This will require a large commitment of project-based vouchers by the Boston Housing Authority, which would reduce the BHA's flexibility to commit project-based vouchers elsewhere as needed if the Charlestown commitment is not covered by the exception. Is it the intention of the bill's managers that the commitment of project-based vouchers to replace the former public housing units in a newly constructed development such as this would fall within the bill's exception for units attached to units previously receiving another type of long-term HUD subsidy?

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chair, Congressman CAPUANO has asked whether it is the intention of the bill's managers that the commitment of project-based vouchers to replace the former public housing units in a newly constructed development such as one he described in Boston would fall within the bill's exception for units attached to units previously

receiving another type of long-term HUD subsidy. The answer is yes. It is the managers' intention that the replacement units for the current public housing units would be covered by the bill's exception for units previously receiving long-term HUD assistance, and thus that commitment of project-based vouchers to such units would not count against the 20 percent limitation.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 114-42. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3700

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—SECTION 8 RENTAL ASSISTANCE AND PUBLIC HOUSING

Sec. 101. Inspection of dwelling units.

Sec. 102. Income reviews.

Sec. 103. Limitation on public housing tenancy for over-income families.

Sec. 104. Limitation on eligibility for assistance based on assets.

Sec. 105. Units owned by public housing agencies.

Sec. 106. PHA project-based assistance.

Sec. 107. Establishment of fair market rent.

Sec. 108. Collection of utility data.

Sec. 109. Public housing Capital and Operating Funds.

Sec. 110. Family unification program for children aging out of foster care.

TITLE II—RURAL HOUSING

Sec. 201. Delegation of guaranteed rural housing loan approval.

TITLE III—FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR CONDOMINIUMS

Sec. 301. Modification of FHA requirements for mortgage insurance for condominiums.

TITLE IV—HOUSING REFORMS FOR THE HOMELESS AND FOR VETERANS

Sec. 401. Definition of geographic area for Continuum of Care Program.

Sec. 402. Inclusion of public housing agencies and local redevelopment authorities in emergency solutions grants.

Sec. 403. Special assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Sec. 404. Annual supplemental report on veterans homelessness.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 501. Inclusion of Disaster Housing Assistance Program in certain fraud and abuse prevention measures.

Sec. 502. Energy efficiency requirements under Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity program.

Sec. 503. Data exchange standardization for improved interoperability.

TITLE I—SECTION 8 RENTAL ASSISTANCE AND PUBLIC HOUSING

SEC. 101. INSPECTION OF DWELLING UNITS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 8(o)(8) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(8)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(A) **INITIAL INSPECTION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—For each dwelling unit for which a housing assistance payment contract is established under this subsection, the public housing agency (or other entity pursuant to paragraph (11)) shall inspect the unit before any assistance payment is made to determine whether the dwelling unit meets the housing quality standards under subparagraph (B), except as provided in clause (ii) or (iii) of this subparagraph.

“(ii) **CORRECTION OF NON-LIFE-THREATENING CONDITIONS.**—In the case of any dwelling unit that is determined, pursuant to an inspection under clause (i), not to meet the housing quality standards under subparagraph (B), assistance payments may be made for the unit notwithstanding subparagraph (C) if failure to meet such standards is a result only of non-life-threatening conditions, as such conditions are established by the Secretary. A public housing agency making assistance payments pursuant to this clause for a dwelling unit shall, 30 days after the beginning of the period for which such payments are made, withhold any assistance payments for the unit if any deficiency resulting in noncompliance with the housing quality standards has not been corrected by such time. The public housing agency shall recommence assistance payments when such deficiency has been corrected, and may use any payments withheld to make assistance payments relating to the period during which payments were withheld.

“(iii) **USE OF ALTERNATIVE INSPECTION METHOD FOR INTERIM PERIOD.**—In the case of any property that within the previous 24 months has met the requirements of an inspection that qualifies as an alternative inspection method pursuant to subparagraph (E), a public housing agency may authorize occupancy before the inspection under clause (i) has been completed, and may make assistance payments retroactive to the beginning of the lease term after the unit has been determined pursuant to an inspection under clause (i) to meet the housing quality standards under subparagraph (B). This clause may not be construed to exempt any dwelling unit from compliance with the requirements of subparagraph (D).”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (H); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following new subparagraph:

“(G) **ENFORCEMENT OF HOUSING QUALITY STANDARDS.**—

“(i) **DETERMINATION OF NONCOMPLIANCE.**—A dwelling unit that is covered by a housing assistance payments contract under this subsection shall be considered, for purposes of subparagraphs (D) and (F), to be in noncompliance with the housing quality standards under subparagraph (B) if—

“(I) the public housing agency or an inspector authorized by the State or unit of local government determines upon inspection of the unit that the unit fails to comply with such standards;

“(II) the agency or inspector notifies the owner of the unit in writing of such failure to comply; and

“(III) the failure to comply is not corrected—

“(aa) in the case of any such failure that is a result of life-threatening conditions, within 24 hours after such notice has been provided; and

“(bb) in the case of any such failure that is a result of non-life-threatening conditions, within

30 days after such notice has been provided or such other reasonable longer period as the public housing agency may establish.

“(ii) **WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE AMOUNTS DURING CORRECTION.**—The public housing agency may withhold assistance amounts under this subsection with respect to a dwelling unit for which a notice pursuant to clause (i)(II), of failure to comply with housing quality standards under subparagraph (B) as determined pursuant to an inspection conducted under subparagraph (D) or (F), has been provided. If the unit is brought into compliance with such housing quality standards during the periods referred to in clause (i)(III), the public housing agency shall recommence assistance payments and may use any amounts withheld during the correction period to make assistance payments relating to the period during which payments were withheld.

“(iii) **ABATEMENT OF ASSISTANCE AMOUNTS.**—The public housing agency shall abate all of the assistance amounts under this subsection with respect to a dwelling unit that is determined, pursuant to clause (i) of this subparagraph, to be in noncompliance with housing quality standards under subparagraph (B). Upon completion of repairs by the public housing agency or the owner sufficient so that the dwelling unit complies with such housing quality standards, the agency shall recommence payments under the housing assistance payments contract to the owner of the dwelling unit.

“(iv) **NOTIFICATION.**—If a public housing agency providing assistance under this subsection abates rental assistance payments pursuant to clause (iii) with respect to a dwelling unit, the agency shall, upon commencement of such abatement—

“(I) notify the tenant and the owner of the dwelling unit that—

“(aa) such abatement has commenced; and

“(bb) if the dwelling unit is not brought into compliance with housing quality standards within 60 days after the effective date of the determination of noncompliance under clause (i) or such reasonable longer period as the agency may establish, the tenant will have to move; and

“(II) issue the tenant the necessary forms to allow the tenant to move to another dwelling unit and transfer the rental assistance to that unit.

“(v) **PROTECTION OF TENANTS.**—An owner of a dwelling unit may not terminate the tenancy of any tenant because of the withholding or abatement of assistance pursuant to this subparagraph. During the period that assistance is abated pursuant to this subparagraph, the tenant may terminate the tenancy by notifying the owner.

“(vi) **TERMINATION OF LEASE OR ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS CONTRACT.**—If assistance amounts under this section for a dwelling unit are abated pursuant to clause (iii) and the owner does not correct the noncompliance within 60 days after the effective date of the determination of noncompliance under clause (i), or such other reasonable longer period as the public housing agency may establish, the agency shall terminate the housing assistance payments contract for the dwelling unit.

“(vii) **RELOCATION.**—

“(I) **LEASE OF NEW UNIT.**—The agency shall provide the family residing in such a dwelling unit a period of 90 days or such longer period as the public housing agency determines is reasonably necessary to lease a new unit, beginning upon termination of the contract, to lease a new residence with tenant-based rental assistance under this section.

“(II) **AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS.**—If the family is unable to lease such a new residence during such period, the public housing agency shall, at the option of the family, provide such family a preference for occupancy in a dwelling unit of public housing that is owned or operated by the agency that first becomes available for occupancy after the expiration of such period.

“(III) ASSISTANCE IN FINDING UNIT.—The public housing agency may provide assistance to the family in finding a new residence, including use of up to two months of any assistance amounts withheld or abated pursuant to clause (ii) or (iii), respectively, for costs directly associated with relocation of the family to a new residence, which shall include security deposits as necessary and may include reimbursements for reasonable moving expenses incurred by the household, as established by the Secretary. The agency may require that a family receiving assistance for a security deposit shall remit, to the extent of such assistance, the amount of any security deposit refunds made by the owner of the dwelling unit for which the lease was terminated.

“(viii) TENANT-CAUSED DAMAGES.—If a public housing agency determines that any damage to a dwelling unit that results in a failure of the dwelling unit to comply with housing quality standards under subparagraph (B), other than any damage resulting from ordinary use, was caused by the tenant, any member of the tenant’s household, or any guest or other person under the tenant’s control, the agency may waive the applicability of this subparagraph, except that this clause shall not exonerate a tenant from any liability otherwise existing under applicable law for damages to the premises caused by such tenant.

“(ix) APPLICABILITY.—This subparagraph shall apply to any dwelling unit for which a housing assistance payments contract is entered into or renewed after the date of the effectiveness of the regulations implementing this subparagraph.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue notice or regulations to implement subsection (a) of this section and such subsection shall take effect upon such issuance.

SEC. 102. INCOME REVIEWS.

(a) INCOME REVIEWS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING AND SECTION 8 PROGRAMS.—Section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the second sentence of paragraph (1), by striking “at least annually” and inserting “pursuant to paragraph (6)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(6) REVIEWS OF FAMILY INCOME.—

“(A) FREQUENCY.—Reviews of family income for purposes of this section shall be made—

“(i) in the case of all families, upon the initial provision of housing assistance for the family;

“(ii) annually thereafter, except as provided in paragraph (1) with respect to fixed-income families;

“(iii) upon the request of the family, at any time the income or deductions (under subsection (b)(5)) of the family change by an amount that is estimated to result in a decrease of 10 percent (or such lower amount as the Secretary may, by notice, establish, or permit the public housing agency or owner to establish) or more in annual adjusted income; and

“(iv) at any time the income or deductions (under subsection (b)(5)) of the family change by an amount that is estimated to result in an increase of 10 percent or more in annual adjusted income, or such other amount as the Secretary may by notice establish, except that any increase in the earned income of a family shall not be considered for purposes of this clause (except that earned income may be considered if the increase corresponds to previous decreases under clause (iii)), except that a public housing agency or owner may elect not to conduct such review in the last three months of a certification period.

“(B) IN GENERAL.—Reviews of family income for purposes of this section shall be subject to the provisions of section 904 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 3544).

“(7) CALCULATION OF INCOME.—

“(A) USE OF CURRENT YEAR INCOME.—In determining family income for initial occupancy or provision of housing assistance pursuant to clause (i) of paragraph (6)(A) or pursuant to reviews pursuant to clause (iii) or (iv) of such paragraph, a public housing agency or owner shall use the income of the family as estimated by the agency or owner for the upcoming year.

“(B) USE OF PRIOR YEAR INCOME.—In determining family income for annual reviews pursuant to paragraph (6)(A)(ii), a public housing agency or owner shall, except as otherwise provided in this paragraph and paragraph (1), use the income of the family as determined by the agency or owner for the preceding year, taking into consideration any redetermination of income during such prior year pursuant to clause (iii) or (iv) of paragraph (6)(A).

“(C) OTHER INCOME.—In determining the income for any family based on the prior year’s income, with respect to prior year calculations of income not subject to subparagraph (B), a public housing agency or owner may make other adjustments as it considers appropriate to reflect current income.

“(D) SAFE HARBOR.—A public housing agency or owner may, to the extent such information is available to the public housing agency or owner, determine the family’s income prior to the application of any deductions based on timely income determinations made for purposes of other means-tested Federal public assistance programs (including the program for block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, a program for Medicaid assistance under a State plan approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and the supplemental nutrition assistance program (as such term is defined in section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012)). The Secretary shall, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, develop procedures to enable public housing agencies and owners to have access to such income determinations made by other means-tested Federal programs that the Secretary determines to have comparable reliability. Exchanges of such information shall be subject to the same limitations and tenant protections provided under section 904 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act Amendments of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 3544) with respect to information obtained under the requirements of section 303(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503(i)).

“(E) PHA AND OWNER COMPLIANCE.—A public housing agency or owner may not be considered to fail to comply with this paragraph or paragraph (6) due solely to any de minimis errors made by the agency or owner in calculating family incomes.”;

(2) by striking subsections (d) and (e); and

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (d).

(b) CERTIFICATION REGARDING HARDSHIP EXCEPTION TO MINIMUM MONTHLY RENT.—Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to the Congress a certification that the hardship and tenant protection provisions in clause (i) of section 3(a)(3)(B) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(a)(3)(B)(i)) are being enforced at such time and that the Secretary will continue to provide due consideration to the hardship circumstances of persons assisted under relevant programs of this Act.

(c) INCOME; ADJUSTED INCOME.—Section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)) is amended by striking paragraphs (4) and (5) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(4) INCOME.—The term ‘income’ means, with respect to a family, income received from all sources by each member of the household who is 18 years of age or older or is the head of house-

hold or spouse of the head of the household, plus unearned income by or on behalf of each dependent who is less than 18 years of age, as determined in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the following requirements:

“(A) INCLUDED AMOUNTS.—Such term includes recurring gifts and receipts, actual income from assets, and profit or loss from a business.

“(B) EXCLUDED AMOUNTS.—Such term does not include—

“(i) any imputed return on assets, except to the extent that net family assets exceed \$50,000, except that such amount (as it may have been previously adjusted) shall be adjusted for inflation annually by the Secretary in accordance with an inflationary index selected by the Secretary;

“(ii) any amounts that would be eligible for exclusion under section 1613(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1382b(a)(7));

“(iii) deferred disability benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs that are received in a lump sum amount or in prospective monthly amounts;

“(iv) any expenses related to aid and attendance under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans who are in need of regular aid and attendance; and

“(v) exclusions from income as established by the Secretary by regulation or notice, or any amount required by Federal law to be excluded from consideration as income.

“(C) EARNED INCOME OF STUDENTS.—Such term does not include—

“(i) earned income, up to an amount as the Secretary may by regulation establish, of any dependent earned during any period that such dependent is attending school or vocational training on a full-time basis; or

“(ii) any grant-in-aid or scholarship amounts related to such attendance used—

“(I) for the cost of tuition or books; or

“(II) in such amounts as the Secretary may allow, for the cost of room and board.

“(D) EDUCATIONAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.—Income shall be determined without regard to any amounts in or from, or any benefits from, any Coverdell education savings account under section 530 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or any qualified tuition program under section 529 of such Code.

“(E) RECORDKEEPING.—The Secretary may not require a public housing agency or owner to maintain records of any amounts excluded from income pursuant to this subparagraph.

“(5) ADJUSTED INCOME.—The term ‘adjusted income’ means, with respect to a family, the amount (as determined by the public housing agency or owner) of the income of the members of the family residing in a dwelling unit or the persons on a lease, after any deductions from income as follows:

“(A) ELDERLY AND DISABLED FAMILIES.—\$525 in the case of any family that is an elderly family or a disabled family.

“(B) DEPENDENTS.—In the case of any family, \$525 for each member who—

“(i) is less than 18 years of age or attending school or vocational training on a full-time basis; or

“(ii) is a person who is 18 years of age or older, resides in the household, and is certified as disabled and unable to work by the public housing agency of jurisdiction.

“(C) CHILD CARE.—The amount, if any, that exceeds 5 percent of annual family income that is used to pay for unreimbursed child care expenses, which shall include child care for preschool-age children, for before- and after-care for children in school, and for other child care necessary to enable a member of the family to be employed or further his or her education.

“(D) HEALTH AND MEDICAL EXPENSES.—The amount, if any, by which 10 percent of annual family income is exceeded by the sum of—

“(i) in the case of any elderly or disabled family, any unreimbursed health and medical care expenses; and

“(ii) any unreimbursed reasonable attendant care and auxiliary apparatus expenses for each handicapped member of the family, if determined necessary by the public housing agency or owner to enable any member of such family to be employed.

The Secretary shall, by regulation, provide hardship exemptions to the requirements of this subparagraph and subparagraph (C) for impacted families who demonstrate an inability to pay calculated rents because of financial hardship. Such regulations shall include a requirement to notify tenants regarding any changes to the determination of adjusted income pursuant to such subparagraphs based on the determination of the family's claim of financial hardship exemptions required by the preceding sentence. Such regulations shall be promulgated in consultation with tenant organizations, industry participants, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, with an adequate comment period provided for interested parties.

“(E) PERMISSIVE DEDUCTIONS.—Such additional deductions as a public housing agency may, at its discretion, establish, except that the Secretary shall establish procedures to ensure that such deductions do not materially increase Federal expenditures.

The Secretary shall annually calculate the amounts of the deductions under subparagraphs (A) and (B), as such amounts may have been previously calculated, by applying an inflationary factor as the Secretary shall, by regulation, establish, except that the actual deduction determined for each year shall be established by rounding such amount to the next lowest multiple of \$25.”

(d) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER PROGRAM.—Section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(D), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that a public housing agency may establish a payment standard of not more than 120 percent of the fair market rent where necessary as a reasonable accommodation for a person with a disability, without approval of the Secretary. A public housing agency may use a payment standard that is greater than 120 percent of the fair market rent as a reasonable accommodation for a person with a disability, but only with the approval of the Secretary. In connection with the use of any increased payment standard established or approved pursuant to either of the preceding two sentences as a reasonable accommodation for a person with a disability, the Secretary may not establish additional requirements regarding the amount of adjusted income paid by such person for rent”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “ANNUAL REVIEW” and inserting “REVIEWS”;

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “the provisions of” and inserting “paragraphs (1), (6), and (7) of section 3(a) and to”; and

(ii) by striking “and shall be conducted” and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting a period; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking the second sentence.

(e) ENHANCED VOUCHER PROGRAM.—Section 8(t)(1)(D) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(t)(1)(D)) is amended by striking “income” each place such term appears and inserting “annual adjusted income”.

(f) PROJECT-BASED HOUSING.—Paragraph (3) of section 8(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(c)(3)) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(g) IMPACT ON PUBLIC HOUSING REVENUES.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS TO OPERATING FORMULA.—If the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines that the application of subsections (a) through (e) of this section results in a material and disproportionate reduction in the rental income of certain public housing agencies

during the first year in which such subsections are implemented, the Secretary may make appropriate adjustments in the formula income for such year of those agencies experiencing such a reduction.

(2) HUD REPORTS ON REVENUE AND COST IMPACT.—In each of the first two years after the first year in which subsections (a) through (e) are implemented, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit a report to Congress identifying and calculating the impact of changes made by such subsections and section 104 of this Act on the revenues and costs of operating public housing units, the voucher program for rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, and the program under such section 8 for project-based rental assistance. If such report identifies a material reduction in the net income of public housing agencies nationwide or a material increase in the costs of funding the voucher program or the project-based assistance program, the Secretary shall include in such report recommendations for legislative changes to reduce or eliminate such a reduction.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue notice or regulations to implement this section and this section shall take effect after such issuance, except that this section may only take effect upon the commencement of a calendar year.

SEC. 103. LIMITATION ON PUBLIC HOUSING TENANCY FOR OVER-INCOME FAMILIES.

Subsection (a) of section 16 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437n(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) LIMITATIONS ON TENANCY FOR OVER-INCOME FAMILIES.—

“(A) LIMITATIONS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), in the case of any family residing in a dwelling unit of public housing whose income for the most recent two consecutive years, as determined pursuant to income reviews conducted pursuant to section 3(a)(6), has exceeded the applicable income limitation under subparagraph (C), the public housing agency shall—

“(i) notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, charge such family as monthly rent for the unit occupied by such family an amount equal to the greater of—

“(I) the applicable fair market rental established under section 8(c) for a dwelling unit in the same market area of the same size; or

“(II) the amount of the monthly subsidy provided under this Act for the dwelling unit, which shall include any amounts from the Operating Fund and Capital Fund under section 9 used for the unit, as determined by the agency in accordance with regulations that the Secretary shall issue to carry out this subclause; or

“(ii) terminate the tenancy of such family in public housing not later than 6 months after the income determination described in subparagraph (A).

“(B) NOTICE.—In the case of any family residing in a dwelling unit of public housing whose income for a year has exceeded the applicable income limitation under subparagraph (C), upon the conclusion of such year the public housing agency shall provide written notice to such family of the requirements under subparagraph (A).

“(C) INCOME LIMITATION.—The income limitation under this subparagraph shall be 120 percent of the median income for the area, as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families, except that the Secretary may establish income limitations higher or lower than 120 percent of such median income on the basis of the Secretary's findings that such variations are necessary because of prevailing levels of construction costs, or unusually high or low family incomes, vacancy rates, or rental costs.

“(D) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a family occupying a dwelling unit in public housing pursuant to paragraph (5) of section 3(a) (42 U.S.C. 1437a(a)(5)).

“(E) REPORTS ON OVER-INCOME FAMILIES AND WAITING LISTS.—The Secretary shall require that each public housing agency shall—

“(i) submit a report annually, in a format required by the Secretary, that specifies—

“(I) the number of families residing, as of the end of the year for which the report is submitted, in public housing administered by the agency who had incomes exceeding the applicable income limitation under subparagraph (C); and

“(II) the number of families, as of the end of such year, on the waiting lists for admission to public housing projects of the agency; and

“(ii) make the information reported pursuant to clause (i) publicly available.”.

SEC. 104. LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE BASED ON ASSETS.

Section 16 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437n) is amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE BASED ON ASSETS.—

“(1) LIMITATION ON ASSETS.—Subject to paragraph (3) and notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a dwelling unit assisted under this Act may not be rented and assistance under this Act may not be provided, either initially or at each recertification of family income, to any family—

“(A) whose net family assets exceed \$100,000, as such amount is adjusted annually by applying an inflationary factor as the Secretary considers appropriate; or

“(B) who has a present ownership interest in, a legal right to reside in, and the effective legal authority to sell, real property that is suitable for occupancy by the family as a residence, except that the prohibition under this subparagraph shall not apply to—

“(i) any property for which the family is receiving assistance under subsection (y) or (o)(12) of section 8 of this Act;

“(ii) any person that is a victim of domestic violence; or

“(iii) any family that is offering such property for sale.

“(2) NET FAMILY ASSETS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘net family assets’ means, for all members of the household, the net cash value of all assets after deducting reasonable costs that would be incurred in disposing of real property, savings, stocks, bonds, and other forms of capital investment. Such term does not include interests in Indian trust land, equity in property for which the family is receiving assistance under subsection (y) or (o)(12) of section 8, equity accounts in homeownership programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or Family Self Sufficiency accounts.

“(B) EXCLUSIONS.—Such term does not include—

“(i) the value of personal property, except for items of personal property of significant value, as the Secretary may establish or the public housing agency may determine;

“(ii) the value of any retirement account;

“(iii) real property for which the family does not have the effective legal authority necessary to sell such property;

“(iv) any amounts recovered in any civil action or settlement based on a claim of malpractice, negligence, or other breach of duty owed to a member of the family and arising out of law, that resulted in a member of the family being disabled;

“(v) the value of any Coverdell education savings account under section 530 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or any qualified tuition program under section 529 of such Code; and

“(vi) such other exclusions as the Secretary may establish.

“(C) TRUST FUNDS.—In cases in which a trust fund has been established and the trust is not revocable by, or under the control of, any member of the family or household, the value of the

trust fund shall not be considered an asset of a family if the fund continues to be held in trust. Any income distributed from the trust fund shall be considered income for purposes of section 3(b) and any calculations of annual family income, except in the case of medical expenses for a minor.

“(3) SELF-CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) NET FAMILY ASSETS.—A public housing agency or owner may determine the net assets of a family, for purposes of this section, based on a certification by the family that the net assets of such family do not exceed \$50,000, as such amount is adjusted annually by applying an inflationary factor as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(B) NO CURRENT REAL PROPERTY OWNERSHIP.—A public housing agency or owner may determine compliance with paragraph (1)(B) based on a certification by the family that such family does not have any current ownership interest in any real property at the time the agency or owner reviews the family’s income.

“(C) STANDARDIZED FORMS.—The Secretary may develop standardized forms for the certifications referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

“(4) COMPLIANCE FOR PUBLIC HOUSING DWELLING UNITS.—When recertifying family income with respect to families residing in public housing dwelling units, a public housing agency may, in the discretion of the agency and only pursuant to a policy that is set forth in the public housing agency plan under section 5A for the agency, choose not to enforce the limitation under paragraph (1).

“(5) ENFORCEMENT.—When recertifying the income of a family residing in a dwelling unit assisted under this Act, a public housing agency or owner may choose not to enforce the limitation under paragraph (1) or may establish exceptions to such limitation based on eligibility criteria, but only pursuant to a policy that is set forth in the public housing agency plan under section 5A for the agency or under a policy adopted by the owner. Eligibility criteria for establishing exceptions may provide for separate treatment based on family type and may be based on different factors, such as age, disability, income, the ability of the family to find suitable alternative housing, and whether supportive services are being provided.

“(6) AUTHORITY TO DELAY EVICTIONS.—In the case of a family residing in a dwelling unit assisted under this Act who does not comply with the limitation under paragraph (1), the public housing agency or project owner may delay eviction or termination of the family based on such noncompliance for a period of not more than 6 months.”

SEC. 105. UNITS OWNED BY PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES.

Paragraph (11) of section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(11)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(11) LEASING OF UNITS OWNED BY PHA.—If” and inserting the following:

“(11) LEASING OF UNITS OWNED BY PHA.—

“(A) INSPECTIONS AND RENT DETERMINATIONS.—If” and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) UNITS OWNED BY PHA.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘owned by a public housing agency’ means, with respect to a dwelling unit, that the dwelling unit is in a project that is owned by such agency, by an entity wholly controlled by such agency, or by a limited liability company or limited partnership in which such agency (or an entity wholly controlled by such agency) holds a controlling interest in the managing member or general partner. A dwelling unit shall not be deemed to be owned by a public housing agency for purposes of this subsection because the agency holds a fee interest as ground lessor in the property on which the unit is situated, holds a security interest under a mortgage or deed of trust on the

unit, or holds a non-controlling interest in an entity which owns the unit or in the managing member or general partner of an entity which owns the unit.”

SEC. 106. PHA PROJECT-BASED ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (13) of section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(13)) is amended—

(1) by striking “structure” each place such term appears and inserting “project”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(B) PERCENTAGE LIMITATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), a public housing agency may use for project-based assistance under this paragraph not more than 20 percent of the authorized units for the agency.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—A public housing agency may use up to an additional 10 percent of the authorized units for the agency for project-based assistance under this paragraph, to provide units that house individuals and families that meet the definition of homeless under section 103 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11302), that house families with veterans, that provide supportive housing to persons with disabilities or elderly persons, or that are located in areas where vouchers under this subsection are difficult to use, as specified in subparagraph (D)(ii)(I). Any units of project-based assistance that are attached to units previously subject to federally required rent restrictions or receiving another type of long-term housing subsidy provided by the Secretary shall not count toward the percentage limitation under clause (i) of this subparagraph. The Secretary may, by regulation, establish additional categories for the exception under this clause.”

(3) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(D) INCOME-MIXING REQUIREMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), not more than the greater of 25 dwelling units or 25 percent of the dwelling units in any project may be assisted under a housing assistance payment contract for project-based assistance pursuant to this paragraph. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘project’ means a single building, multiple contiguous buildings, or multiple buildings on contiguous parcels of land.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(I) CERTAIN FAMILIES.—The limitation under clause (i) shall not apply to dwelling units assisted under a contract that are exclusively made available to elderly families or to households eligible for supportive services that are made available to the assisted residents of the project, according to standards for such services the Secretary may establish.

“(II) CERTAIN AREAS.—With respect to areas in which tenant-based vouchers for assistance under this subsection are difficult to use, as determined by the Secretary, and with respect to census tracts with a poverty rate of 20 percent or less, clause (i) shall be applied by substituting ‘40 percent’ for ‘25 percent’, and the Secretary may, by regulation, establish additional conditions.

“(III) CERTAIN CONTRACTS.—The limitation under clause (i) shall not apply with respect to contracts or renewal of contracts under which a greater percentage of the dwelling units in a project were assisted under a housing assistance payment contract for project-based assistance pursuant to this paragraph on the date of the enactment of the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015.

“(IV) CERTAIN PROPERTIES.—Any units of project-based assistance under this paragraph that are attached to units previously subject to federally required rent restrictions or receiving other project-based assistance provided by the Secretary shall not count toward the percentage limitation imposed by this subparagraph (D).

“(iii) ADDITIONAL MONITORING AND OVERSIGHT REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may establish

additional requirements for monitoring and oversight of projects in which more than 40 percent of the dwelling units are assisted under a housing assistance payment contract for project-based assistance pursuant to this paragraph.”

(4) by striking subparagraph (F) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(F) CONTRACT TERM.—

“(i) TERM.—A housing assistance payment contract pursuant to this paragraph between a public housing agency and the owner of a project may have a term of up to 20 years, subject to—

“(I) the availability of sufficient appropriated funds for the purpose of renewing expiring contracts for assistance payments, as provided in appropriation Acts and in the agency’s annual contributions contract with the Secretary, provided that in the event of insufficient appropriated funds, payments due under contracts under this paragraph shall take priority if other cost-saving measures that do not require the termination of an existing contract are available to the agency; and

“(II) compliance with the inspection requirements under paragraph (8), except that the agency shall not be required to make biennial inspections of each assisted unit in the development.

“(ii) ADDITION OF ELIGIBLE UNITS.—Subject to the limitations of subparagraphs (B) and (D), the agency and the owner may add eligible units within the same project to a housing assistance payments contract at any time during the term thereof without being subject to any additional competitive selection procedures.

“(iii) HOUSING UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR RECENTLY CONSTRUCTED.—An agency may enter into a housing assistance payments contract with an owner for any unit that does not qualify as existing housing and is under construction or recently has been constructed whether or not the agency has executed an agreement to enter into a contract with the owner, provided that the owner demonstrates compliance with applicable requirements prior to execution of the housing assistance payments contract. This clause shall not subject a housing assistance payments contract for existing housing under this paragraph to such requirements or otherwise limit the extent to which a unit may be assisted as existing housing.

“(iv) ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS.—The contract may specify additional conditions, including with respect to continuation, termination, or expiration, and shall specify that upon termination or expiration of the contract without extension, each assisted family may elect to use its assistance under this subsection to remain in the same project if its unit complies with the inspection requirements under paragraph (8), the rent for the unit is reasonable as required by paragraph (10)(A), and the family pays its required share of the rent and the amount, if any, by which the unit rent (including the amount allowed for tenant-based utilities) exceeds the applicable payment standard.”

(5) in subparagraph (G), by striking “15 years” and inserting “20 years”;

(6) by striking subparagraph (I) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(I) RENT ADJUSTMENTS.—A housing assistance payments contract pursuant to this paragraph entered into after the date of the enactment of the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015 shall provide for annual rent adjustments upon the request of the owner, except that—

“(i) by agreement of the parties, a contract may allow a public housing agency to adjust the rent for covered units using an operating cost adjustment factor established by the Secretary pursuant to section 524(c) of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (which shall not result in a negative adjustment), in which case the contract may require an additional adjustment, if requested, up to the reasonable rent periodically during the

term of the contract, and shall require such an adjustment, if requested, upon extension pursuant to subparagraph (G);

“(ii) the adjusted rent shall not exceed the maximum rent permitted under subparagraph (H);

“(iii) the contract may provide that the maximum rent permitted for a dwelling unit shall not be less than the initial rent for the dwelling unit under the initial housing assistance payments contract covering the units; and

“(iv) the provisions of subsection (c)(2)(C) shall not apply.”;

(7) in subparagraph (J)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “shall” and inserting “may”; and

(ii) by inserting before the period the following: “or may permit owners to select applicants from site-based waiting lists as specified in this subparagraph”;

(B) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “The agency or owner may establish preferences or criteria for selection for a unit assisted under this paragraph that are consistent with the public housing agency plan for the agency approved under section 5A and that give preference to families who qualify for voluntary services, including disability-specific services, offered in conjunction with assisted units.”; and

(C) by striking the fifth and sixth sentences and inserting the following: “A public housing agency may establish and utilize procedures for owner-maintained site-based waiting lists, under which applicants may apply at, or otherwise designate to the public housing agency, the project or projects in which they seek to reside, except that all eligible applicants on the waiting list of an agency for assistance under this subsection shall be permitted to place their names on such separate list, subject to policies and procedures established by the Secretary. All such procedures shall comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Housing Act, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and other applicable civil rights laws. The owner or manager of a project assisted under this paragraph shall not admit any family to a dwelling unit assisted under a contract pursuant to this paragraph other than a family referred by the public housing agency from its waiting list, or a family on a site-based waiting list that complies with the requirements of this subparagraph. A public housing agency shall disclose to each applicant all other options in the selection of a project in which to reside that are provided by the public housing agency and are available to the applicant.”;

(8) in subparagraph (M)(ii), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “relating to funding other than housing assistance payments”; and

(9) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(N) **STRUCTURE OWNED BY AGENCY.**—A public housing agency engaged in an initiative to improve, develop, or replace a public housing property or site may attach assistance to an existing, newly constructed, or rehabilitated structure in which the agency has an ownership interest or which the agency has control of without following a competitive process, provided that the agency has notified the public of its intent through its public housing agency plan and subject to the limitations and requirements of this paragraph.

“(O) **SPECIAL PURPOSE VOUCHERS.**—A public housing agency that administers vouchers authorized under subsection (o)(19) or (x) of this section may provide such assistance in accordance with the limitations and requirements of this paragraph, without additional requirements for approval by the Secretary.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue notice or regulations to implement subsection (a) of this section and such subsection shall take effect upon such issuance.

SEC. 107. ESTABLISHMENT OF FAIR MARKET RENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (1) of section 8(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” after the paragraph designation;

(2) by striking the fourth, seventh, eighth, and ninth sentences; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) Fair market rentals for an area shall be published not less than annually by the Secretary on the site of the Department on the World Wide Web and in any other manner specified by the Secretary. Notice that such fair market rentals are being published shall be published in the Federal Register, and such fair market rentals shall become effective no earlier than 30 days after the date of such publication. The Secretary shall establish a procedure for public housing agencies and other interested parties to comment on such fair market rentals and to request, within a time specified by the Secretary, reevaluation of the fair market rentals in a jurisdiction before such rentals become effective. The Secretary shall cause to be published for comment in the Federal Register notices of proposed material changes in the methodology for estimating fair market rentals and notices specifying the final decisions regarding such proposed substantial methodological changes and responses to public comments.”.

(b) **PAYMENT STANDARD.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 8(o)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that no public housing agency shall be required as a result of a reduction in the fair market rental to reduce the payment standard applied to a family continuing to reside in a unit for which the family was receiving assistance under this section at the time the fair market rental was reduced. The Secretary shall allow public housing agencies to request exception payment standards within fair market rental areas subject to criteria and procedures established by the Secretary”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 108. COLLECTION OF UTILITY DATA.

Section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(20) **COLLECTION OF UTILITY DATA.**—

“(A) **PUBLICATION.**—The Secretary shall, to the extent that data can be collected cost effectively, regularly publish such data regarding utility consumption and costs in local areas as the Secretary determines will be useful for the establishment of allowances for tenant-paid utilities for families assisted under this subsection.

“(B) **USE OF DATA.**—The Secretary shall provide such data in a manner that—

“(i) avoids unnecessary administrative burdens for public housing agencies and owners; and

“(ii) protects families in various unit sizes and building types, and using various utilities, from high rent and utility cost burdens relative to income.”.

SEC. 109. PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL AND OPERATING FUNDS.

(a) **CAPITAL FUND REPLACEMENT RESERVES.**—Section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) is amended—

(1) in subsection (j), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) **TREATMENT OF REPLACEMENT RESERVE.**—The requirements of this subsection shall not apply to funds held in replacement reserves established pursuant to subsection (n).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(n) **ESTABLISHMENT OF REPLACEMENT RESERVES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Public housing agencies shall be permitted to establish a replacement reserve to fund any of the capital activities listed in subsection (d)(1).

“(2) **SOURCE AND AMOUNT OF FUNDS FOR REPLACEMENT RESERVE.**—At any time, a public housing agency may deposit funds from such agency’s Capital Fund into a replacement reserve, subject to the following:

“(A) At the discretion of the Secretary, public housing agencies may transfer and hold in a replacement reserve funds originating from additional sources.

“(B) No minimum transfer of funds to a replacement reserve shall be required.

“(C) At any time, a public housing agency may not hold in a replacement reserve more than the amount the public housing authority has determined necessary to satisfy the anticipated capital needs of properties in its portfolio assisted under this section, as outlined in its Capital Fund 5-Year Action Plan, or a comparable plan, as determined by the Secretary.

“(D) The Secretary may establish, by regulation, a maximum replacement reserve level or levels that are below amounts determined under subparagraph (C), which may be based upon the size of the portfolio assisted under this section or other factors.

“(3) **TRANSFER OF OPERATING FUNDS.**—In first establishing a replacement reserve, the Secretary may allow public housing agencies to transfer more than 20 percent of its operating funds into its replacement reserve.

“(4) **EXPENDITURE.**—Funds in a replacement reserve may be used for purposes authorized by subsection (d)(1) and contained in its Capital Fund 5-Year Action Plan.

“(5) **MANAGEMENT AND REPORT.**—The Secretary shall establish appropriate accounting and reporting requirements to ensure that public housing agencies are spending funds on eligible projects and that funds in the replacement reserve are connected to capital needs.”.

(b) **FLEXIBILITY OF OPERATING FUND AMOUNTS.**—Paragraph (1) of section 9(g) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(g)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(1)” and all that follows through “—Of” and inserting the following:

“(1) **FLEXIBILITY IN USE OF FUNDS.**—

“(A) **FLEXIBILITY FOR CAPITAL FUND AMOUNTS.**—Of”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) **FLEXIBILITY FOR OPERATING FUND AMOUNTS.**—Of any amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2016 or any fiscal year thereafter that are allocated for fiscal year 2016 or any fiscal year thereafter from the Operating Fund for any public housing agency, the agency may use not more than 20 percent for activities that are eligible under subsection (d) for assistance with amounts from the Capital Fund, but only if the public housing plan under section 5A for the agency provides for such use.”.

SEC. 110. FAMILY UNIFICATION PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN AGING OUT OF FOSTER CARE.

Section 8(x) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(x)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(A) by striking “18 months” and inserting “36 months”;

(B) by striking “21 years of age” and inserting “24 years of age”; and

(C) by inserting after “have left foster care” the following: “, or will leave foster care within 90 days, in accordance with a transition plan described in section 475(5)(H) of the Social Security Act, and is homeless or is at risk of becoming homeless”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) **COORDINATION BETWEEN PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES AND PUBLIC CHILD WELFARE AGENCIES.**—The Secretary shall, not later than the

expiration of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015 and after consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, issue guidance to improve coordination between public housing agencies and public child welfare agencies in carrying out the program under this subsection, which shall provide guidance on—

“(A) identifying eligible recipients for assistance under this subsection;

“(B) coordinating with other local youth and family providers in the community and participating in the Continuum of Care program established under subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 et seq.);

“(C) implementing housing strategies to assist eligible families and youth;

“(D) aligning system goals to improve outcomes for families and youth and reducing lapses in housing for families and youth; and

“(E) identifying resources that are available to eligible families and youth to provide supportive services available through parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq.; 670 et seq.) or that the head of household of a family or youth may be entitled to receive under section 477 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 677).”

TITLE II—RURAL HOUSING

SEC. 201. DELEGATION OF GUARANTEED RURAL HOUSING LOAN APPROVAL.

Subsection (h) of section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(18) DELEGATION OF APPROVAL.—The Secretary may delegate, in part or in full, the Secretary’s authority to approve and execute binding Rural Housing Service loan guarantees pursuant to this subsection to certain preferred lenders, in accordance with standards established by the Secretary.”

TITLE III—FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR CONDOMINIUMS

SEC. 301. MODIFICATION OF FHA REQUIREMENTS FOR MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR CONDOMINIUMS.

Section 203 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(y) REQUIREMENTS FOR MORTGAGES FOR CONDOMINIUMS.—

“(1) PROJECT RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other law, regulation, or guideline of the Secretary, including chapter 2.4 of the Condominium Project Approval and Processing Guide of the FHA, the Secretary shall streamline the project certification requirements that are applicable to the insurance under this section for mortgages for condominium projects so that recertifications are substantially less burdensome than certifications. The Secretary shall consider lengthening the time between certifications for approved properties, and allowing updating of information rather than resubmission.

“(2) COMMERCIAL SPACE REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other law, regulation, or guideline of the Secretary, including chapter 2.1.3 of the Condominium Project Approval and Processing Guide of the FHA, in providing for exceptions to the requirement for the insurance of a mortgage on a condominium property under this section regarding the percentage of the floor space of a condominium property that may be used for nonresidential or commercial purposes, the Secretary shall provide that—

“(A) any request for such an exception and the determination of the disposition of such request may be made, at the option of the requester, under the direct endorsement lender review and approval process or under the HUD review and approval process through the applicable field office of the Department; and

“(B) in determining whether to allow such an exception for a condominium property, factors

relating to the economy for the locality in which such project is located or specific to project, including the total number of family units in the project, shall be considered.

Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall issue regulations to implement this paragraph, which shall include any standards, training requirements, and remedies and penalties that the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(3) TRANSFER FEES.—Notwithstanding any other law, regulation, or guideline of the Secretary, including chapter 1.8.8 of the Condominium Project Approval and Processing Guide of the FHA and section 203.41 of the Secretary’s regulations (24 C.F.R. 203.41), existing standards of the Federal Housing Finance Agency relating to encumbrances under private transfer fee covenants shall apply to the insurance of mortgages by the Secretary under this section to the same extent and in the same manner that such standards apply to the purchasing, investing in, and otherwise dealing in mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation. If the provisions of part 1228 of the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency’s regulations (12 C.F.R. part 1228) are amended or otherwise changed after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall adopt any such amendments or changes for purposes of this paragraph, unless the Secretary causes to be published in the Federal Register a notice explaining why the Secretary will disregard such amendments or changes within 90 days after the effective date of such amendments or changes.

“(4) OWNER-OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT OF PERCENTAGE REQUIREMENT.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall, by rule, notice, or mortgagee letter, issue guidance regarding the percentage of units that must be occupied by the owners as a principal residence or a secondary residence (as such terms are defined by the Secretary), or must have been sold to owners who intend to meet such occupancy requirements, including justifications for the percentage requirements, in order for a condominium project to be acceptable to the Secretary for insurance under this section of a mortgage within such condominium property.

“(B) FAILURE TO ACT.—If the Secretary fails to issue the guidance required under subparagraph (A) before the expiration of the 90-day period specified in such clause, the following provisions shall apply:

“(i) 35 PERCENT REQUIREMENT.—In order for a condominium project to be acceptable to the Secretary for insurance under this section, at least 35 percent of all family units (including units not covered by FHA-insured mortgages) must be occupied by the owners as a principal residence or a secondary residence (as such terms are defined by the Secretary), or must have been sold to owners who intend to meet such occupancy requirement.

“(ii) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—The Secretary may increase the percentage applicable pursuant to clause (i) to a condominium project on a project-by-project or regional basis, and in determining such percentage for a project shall consider factors relating to the economy for the locality in which such project is located or specific to project, including the total number of family units in the project.”

TITLE IV—HOUSING REFORMS FOR THE HOMELESS AND FOR VETERANS

SEC. 401. DEFINITION OF GEOGRAPHIC AREA FOR CONTINUUM OF CARE PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITION.—Subtitle C of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 432 and 433 (42 U.S.C. 11387, 11388) as sections 433 and 434, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 431 (42 U.S.C. 11386e) the following new section:

“SEC. 432. GEOGRAPHIC AREAS.

“(a) REQUIREMENT TO DEFINE.—For purposes of this subtitle, the term ‘geographic area’ shall have such meaning as the Secretary shall by notice provide.

“(b) ISSUANCE OF NOTICE.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015, the Secretary shall issue a notice setting forth the definition required by subsection (a).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 101(b) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 note) is amended by striking the items relating to sections 432 and 433 and inserting the following new items:

“Sec. 432. Geographic areas.

“Sec. 433. Regulations.

“Sec. 434. Reports to Congress.”

SEC. 402. INCLUSION OF PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES AND LOCAL REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES IN EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANTS.

Section 414(c) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11373(c)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “, PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES, AND LOCAL REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES” after “ORGANIZATIONS”; and

(2) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, to public housing agencies (as defined under section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937), or to local redevelopment authorities (as defined under State law)”.

SEC. 403. SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

(a) TRANSFER OF POSITION TO OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.—Section 4 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3533) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

“(1) POSITION.—There shall be in the Office of the Secretary a Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs, who shall report directly to the Secretary.

“(2) APPOINTMENT.—The Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs shall be appointed based solely on merit and shall be covered under the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

“(3) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs shall be responsible for—

“(A) ensuring veterans have fair access to housing and homeless assistance under each program of the Department providing either such assistance;

“(B) coordinating all programs and activities of the Department relating to veterans;

“(C) serving as a liaison for the Department with the Department of Veterans Affairs, including establishing and maintaining relationships with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs;

“(D) serving as a liaison for the Department, and establishing and maintaining relationships with the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness and officials of State, local, regional, and nongovernmental organizations concerned with veterans;

“(E) providing information and advice regarding—

“(i) sponsoring housing projects for veterans assisted under programs administered by the Department; or

“(ii) assisting veterans in obtaining housing or homeless assistance under programs administered by the Department;

“(F) coordinating with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary

of Veterans Affairs in carrying out section 404 of the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015; and

“(G) carrying out such other duties as may be assigned to the Special Assistant by the Secretary or by law.”.

(b) TRANSFER OF POSITION IN OFFICE OF DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL NEEDS.—On the date that the initial Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs is appointed pursuant to section 4(h)(2) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act, as added by subsection (a) of this section, the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Programs in the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Needs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be terminated.

SEC. 404. ANNUAL SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON VETERANS HOMELESSNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, shall submit annually to the Committees of the Congress specified in subsection (b), together with the annual reports required by such Secretaries under section 203(c)(1) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11313(c)(1)), a supplemental report that includes the following information with respect to the preceding year:

(1) The same information, for such preceding year, that was included with respect to 2010 in the report by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs entitled “Veterans Homelessness: A Supplemental Report to the 2010 Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress”.

(2) Information regarding the activities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development relating to veterans during such preceding year, as follows:

(A) The number of veterans provided assistance under the housing choice voucher program for Veterans Affairs supported housing under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)), the socioeconomic characteristics of such homeless veterans, and the number, types, and locations of entities contracted under such section to administer the vouchers.

(B) A summary description of the special considerations made for veterans under public housing agency plans submitted pursuant to section 5A of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437c-1) and under comprehensive housing affordability strategies submitted pursuant to section 105 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12705).

(C) A description of the activities of the Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(D) A description of the efforts of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the other members of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness to coordinate the delivery of housing and services to veterans.

(E) The cost to the Department of Housing and Urban Development of administering the programs and activities relating to veterans.

(F) Any other information that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs consider relevant in assessing the programs and activities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development relating to veterans.

(b) COMMITTEES.—The Committees of the Congress specified in this subsection are as follows:

(1) The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate.

(3) The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(4) The Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(5) The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(6) The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 501. INCLUSION OF DISASTER HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IN CERTAIN FRAUD AND ABUSE PREVENTION MEASURES.

The Disaster Housing Assistance Program 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 Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 3544) for the purpose of income verifications.

SEC. 502. ENERGY EFFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS UNDER SELF-HELP HOMEOWNER-SHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM.

Section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 12805) is amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) ENERGY EFFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may not require any dwelling developed using amounts from a grant made under this section to meet any energy efficiency standards other than the standards applicable at such time pursuant to section 109 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12709) to housing specified in subsection (a) of such section.”.

SEC. 503. DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.

(a) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION.—Title I of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 37. DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.

“(a) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget, and considering State government perspectives, designate data exchange standards to govern, under this Act—

“(1) necessary categories of information that State agencies operating related programs are required under applicable law to electronically exchange with another State agency; and

“(2) Federal reporting and data exchange required under applicable law.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The data exchange standards required by subsection (a) shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

“(1) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, computer-readable format, such as the eXtensible Markup Language;

“(2) contain interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

“(3) incorporate interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance;

“(4) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

“(5) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

“(6) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

“(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section requires a change to existing data exchange standards for Federal reporting found to be effective and efficient.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue a proposed rule to carry out the amendments made by subsection (a).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The rule shall—

(A) identify federally required data exchanges;

(B) include specification and timing of exchanges to be standardized;

(C) address the factors used in determining whether and when to standardize data exchanges;

(D) specify State implementation options; and

(E) describe future milestones.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-411. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-411.

Mr. BUCHANAN. 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 16, line 2, after “develop” insert “electronic”.

Page 16, line 4, strike “income” and insert “benefit”.

Page 16, after line 14, insert the following:

“(E) ELECTRONIC INCOME VERIFICATION.—The Secretary shall develop a mechanism for disclosing information to a public housing agency for the purpose of verifying the employment and income of individuals and families in accordance with section 453(j)(7)(E) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(j)(7)(E)), and shall ensure public housing agencies have access to information contained in the ‘Do Not Pay’ system established by section 5 of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-248; 126 Stat. 2392).”.

Page 16, line 15, strike “(E)” and insert “(F)”.

Page 34, line 14, strike the closing quotation marks and the last period.

Page 34, after line 14, insert the following:

“(7) VERIFYING INCOME.—

“(A) Beginning in fiscal year 2018, the Secretary shall require public housing agencies to require each applicant for, or recipient of, benefits under this Act to provide authorization by the applicant or recipient (or by any other person whose income or resources are material to the determination of the eligibility of the applicant or recipient for such benefits) for the public housing agency to obtain (subject to the cost reimbursement requirements of section 1115(a) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act) from any financial institution (within the meaning of section 1101(1) of such Act) any financial record (within the meaning of section 1101(2) of such Act) held by the institution with respect to the applicant or recipient (or any such other person) whenever the public housing agency determines the record is needed in connection with a determination with respect to such eligibility or the amount of such benefits.

“(B) Notwithstanding section 1104(a)(1) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act, an authorization provided by an applicant or recipient (or any other person whose income or resources are material to the determination of the eligibility of the applicant or recipient) pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall remain effective until the earliest of—

“(i) the rendering of a final adverse decision on the applicant’s application for eligibility for benefits under this Act;

“(ii) the cessation of the recipient’s eligibility for benefits under this Act; or

“(iii) the express revocation by the applicant or recipient (or such other person referred to in subparagraph (A)) of the authorization, in a written notification to the Secretary.

“(C)(i) An authorization obtained by the public housing agency pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered to meet the requirements of the Right to Financial Privacy Act for purposes of section 1103(a) of such Act, and need not be furnished to the financial institution, notwithstanding section 1104(a) of such Act.

“(ii) The certification requirements of section 1103(b) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act shall not apply to requests by the public housing agency pursuant to an authorization provided under this clause.

“(iii) A request by the public housing agency pursuant to an authorization provided under this clause is deemed to meet the requirements of section 1104(a)(3) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act and the flush language of section 1102 of such Act.

“(iv) The public housing agency shall inform any person who provides authorization pursuant to this paragraph of the duration and scope of the authorization.

“(D) If an applicant for, or recipient of, benefits under this Act (or any such other person referred to in subparagraph (A)) refuses to provide, or revokes, any authorization made by the applicant or recipient for the public housing agency to obtain from any financial institution any financial record, the public housing agency may, on that basis, determine that the applicant or recipient is ineligible for benefits under this title.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to first thank the subcommittee chair of Financial Services, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, for his leadership on such important issues.

As chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee of Ways and Means, I have the distinct privilege of overseeing a number of means-tested programs aimed at providing low-income individuals and families an opportunity to move up the economic ladder.

There are a lot of lessons we have learned, and we should be using them to better serve recipients and taxpayers.

In June of last year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Office of Inspector General found that the Federal Government paid public housing benefits to families with excessive income and assets when those benefits should have gone to low-income families in real need.

This amendment builds on reforms made by the underlying bill. This amendment reduces that burden on families by using systems they are most likely already interacting with for other means-tested programs. It

also improves accuracy for housing authorities and landlords, providing them with more timely and reliable information.

□ 1545

Ultimately, it ensures that those with assets well above the eligibility limits will not be using benefits directed to those Americans who need the most help.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment and support the underlying bill.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I have concerns that there are a lot of unanswered questions regarding the new income verification system that is being proposed in this amendment, and I think it needs to be addressed.

First, it appears that there would be a cost associated with this amendment. Housing authorities would have to spend some of their operating fund dollars to comply with the new requirements in this amendment, and that takes away from other important things that they must prioritize.

It is important to note that the public housing operating fund and administrative fees are severely underfunded, so public housing authorities are already struggling to make ends meet. H.R. 3700 is intended to ease administrative burdens, but this amendment seems to be increasing burdens without any additional funding. In other words, it is an unfunded mandate.

Secondly, it is unclear whether all housing authorities have the electronic infrastructure in place to securely maintain and protect residents’ personal financial data, which could include bank account information, in a manner that is inconsistent with what current financial regulators have. If housing authorities need to upgrade their systems, that would also cost money that is not provided for in this amendment.

Third, it is not clear how this amendment would work for residents who are unbanked. This amendment virtually ignores millions of Americans that are unbanked.

Fourth, this amendment seems to be addressing a problem that doesn’t exist because I have not seen any evidence that residents are currently not providing accurate information when applying for housing assistance.

Lastly, H.R. 3700 already includes a provision to address over-income households in public housing to help ensure that taxpayers are not subsidizing these households. For every piece of legislation that we pass, it should be carefully considered, which is why we should not adopt this hasty

amendment that has not been thoroughly studied by congressional staff or our housing groups, the administration, and carefully negotiated by both parties.

Mr. Chairman and Members, let me just say this: We have a good bill here. We have gone a long way in dealing with whatever concerns either side may have. We have a compromise piece of legislation. We have a consensus piece of legislation. Let’s not mess it up. We don’t need this amendment. I would ask for a “no” vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to speak in support of the amendment.

I believe the amendment reduces the burden on families for using solutions that already are likely to be in place with regards to interacting through other means testing programs. I think it improves the efficiency for public housing authorities and landlords, providing more accurate and timely eligibility information. It minimizes the risk of waste, fraud, and abuse of tax dollars and ensures limited resources are better targeted to families in need by requiring public housing agencies to access data used by other means tested programs or by assets.

This amendment further strengthens the response to the 2015 inspector general’s audit, which revealed individuals with substantial assets were receiving rental subsidies. This amendment builds on the progress made by the Committee on Financial Services to better target housing assistance to the needs of low-income individuals and families.

The current system in determining eligibility for rental subsidies is burdensome to program recipients to report income that can vary as much as every week and time consuming for public housing agencies and landlords to collect and verify this information, unfair to taxpayers who expect tax dollars to be targeted to families most in need.

I think you can see what I believe is an asset here from the standpoint it is going to streamline the system. It is going to save money. I think it makes it easier for the people to access, it is going to make it easier for the individuals who are working with those folks to be able to do a better job of getting and accumulating the information as quickly as possible to better ferret out the ones who need the help and ones who don’t, and therefore do a good job of managing our taxpayer dollars.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman and Members, I basically made an appeal to my Republican colleagues to reject this amendment. I basically talked about the fact that we

have gone a long way toward reconciling our differences and that we don't need to endanger the bill at all with an amendment like this.

I am not sure exactly what the gentleman is attempting to do. We already have systems in existence by which those who wish to live in public housing have to verify their income. I don't know what is being attempted here. If the attempt is to try and go to financial institutions and say to them, is it true that this person only has \$5 in their bank account or what have you? I am not sure that the housing authority would want to assume that additional responsibility and that additional cost, so I have to continue to oppose this amendment. Perhaps there is a better explanation than I have heard, but I have not heard a good explanation about why we should adopt it.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, my understanding is PHAs asked for this, but let me just say my amendment will reduce the burdens on families by using solutions they are already interacting with through other means-tested programs.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment and to support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the gentleman talked about having talked with the public housing authorities because we did, too, and they had no idea what your bill is. They didn't know anything about it, they didn't understand why it was being done, so we have a difference of opinion, I suppose, about what the public housing authorities are saying.

I am saying that based on our inquiries, they did not support your legislation because they didn't understand it. They didn't know it exists. They didn't know what it was all about.

I would, again, ask for a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-411.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. 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:

Strike line 17 on page 20 and all that follows through page 21, line 10, and insert the following:

“(B) MINORS, STUDENTS, AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.—\$480 for each member of the family residing in the household (other than the head of the household or his or her

spouse) who is less than 18 years of age or is attending school or vocational training on a full-time basis, or who is 18 years of age or older and is a person with disabilities.

“(C) CHILD CARE.—Any reasonable child care expenses necessary to enable a member of the family to be employed or to further his or her education.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would remove the harmful provision in H.R. 3700 that would effectively raise rent for thousands of families with children who are living in HUD-assisted housing by limiting the amount they can deduct from their income for childcare expenses. These are parents, particularly single parents, who are already struggling to pay for the cost of child care in order to work or to go to school.

I believe we should not be crippling their ability to juggle these responsibilities. We should be supporting them. I believe that my Republican colleagues share my concerns. We simply did not have the data that we needed at the markup to truly understand how this provision would affect these households.

As I mentioned in my opening statement, the Republicans have indicated that they will support this amendment, which will remove this harmful language and preserve the current law. This will ensure that families with children will not be burdened with a rent increase as a result of this bill.

I would like to thank my colleagues across the aisle for working with me on this issue to find common ground.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, if nothing else, I would just like to throw the ranking member a curve ball and actually accept one of her amendments, just to show that minor miracles can still occur within the Halls of Congress and on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. Particularly after a very robust debate this morning on the budget views and estimates, this might be a welcome departure.

Anyway, I am prepared to accept the ranking member's amendment. Again, as she said, H.R. 3700 will allow only families to deduct childcare expenses that exceed 5 percent. The ranking

member's amendment would revert back to current law. I think that in this particular case there are some trade-offs to be made, and I am willing to accept this particular trade-off and work with the ranking member to forward the overall bill.

I urge all Members to accept it and vote for it.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business and a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the gentlewoman from California's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in New York City access to safe and affordable housing is a critical issue. Just in Brooklyn, the city's housing shortage has driven rents to over \$2,500 a month for a 1-bedroom apartment. As a result, a majority of households spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing, making these individuals and families rent burdened.

For this reason, the New York City Housing Authority, the Nation's largest public housing authority, provides a home to more than 4,000 New Yorkers. Unfortunately, tens of thousands of families remain on waiting lists for units.

Congress cannot dictate market rents, but we can change Federal programs empowering public housing authorities to address budgetary shortfalls, adapt to changing conditions, and better assist current and prospective tenants. That is why we provided the Secretary the ability to adjust the over-income threshold for public housing tenancy, to assist those tenants and families living in public housing where rents and incomes are well above average, like New York.

While this bill makes several reforms like these to public housing and Section 8 rental assistance, many of which are bipartisan and have been discussed for years, I am concerned about the bill's impact on families with children.

According to a recent study by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, H.R. 3700's changes to the childcare deduction could cost 52,000 families with children to face a rent increase of \$25 or more. More than half the families affected are extremely low income and would be hard pressed to afford such an increase. Mr. Chair, \$25, \$50, or \$75 might not sound like a lot of money for us, but for low-income families that have to struggle every day, this is a lot of money.

While updating and improving our Nation's rental assistance and public housing programs are important goals—one I will continue fighting for—they cannot be accomplished on the backs of the Nation's children.

I, therefore, urge adoption of the gentlewoman's amendment, which will

strike the burdensome childcare deduction language.

I am very impressed with the chairman today. I hope that from now on we can work in a bipartisan, humane way to address the issues of the shortage of housing in our Nation. I congratulate the ranking member.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would simply thank all of the Members who have worked on this bill, and I thank all of the support that I am getting for this amendment.

I want to thank the chairman. Despite the fact he had a rather difficult time on committee today, he conducted himself rather well, and I enjoyed working with him. I am very thankful that he is here to give support on this amendment and the leadership he has given.

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 (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1600

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. SEWELL OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-411.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. 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 26, after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

(h) STUDY ON IMPACT ON ELDERLY AND DISABLED FAMILIES OF DECREASED DEDUCTIONS IN INCOME.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall conduct a study to determine the impacts, on rents paid by elderly and disabled individuals and families assisted under the section 8 rental assistance and public housing programs under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq), of any decreases in the amounts of any deductions from income (for purposes of section 3(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b))), as compared to such deductions under such section 3(b) as in effect before the effectiveness of this section, resulting from the amendments made by this section.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth the results of the study conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding subsection (h) of this section, this subsection shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 3700.

My amendment is commonsense and straightforward. It simply requires the Secretary of HUD to conduct a study to determine the impact of the decreased deductions on rent paid by elderly, disabled individuals, and families assisted under the Section 8 rental assistance and housing programs.

Being able to assess quality, safe, and affordable housing is critically important to all Americans. The Section 8 voucher program and other rental assistance programs play a vital role in providing this type of housing for our Nation's most vulnerable citizens, including seniors, disabled persons, and low-income families. In fact, nearly all of the households currently under HUD rental assistance include children, the elderly, or disabled individuals.

These rental assistance programs house over 10 million individuals in roughly 4.6 million rental units across the country. It is clear that these voucher and rental assistance programs continue to perform the task for which they were created, which is providing shelter for millions of Americans.

In spite of its enormous success, the Section 8 voucher program, arguably, still suffers under the weight of too many inefficient and duplicative requirements that threaten the overall effectiveness of the program.

As drafted, H.R. 3700 takes major bipartisan steps toward helping preserve our scarce housing resources while expanding housing availability. However, as we attempt to reform these programs, we must be mindful and ever diligent in ensuring that the proposed changes are beneficial to their overall implementation and that there are no negative, unintended consequences on the program's participants. To that end, my amendment allows us to gauge the effectiveness of some of the changes being made here today and their impact on the most vulnerable segments of our population: the elderly and disabled.

We all know that no program is perfect. We must work together to strike a delicate balance and ensure programs are both workable and do what they intend to do without adverse impacts on those who are greatly benefited by them. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for her amendment. It is a bipartisan amendment. She makes some good points. We are happy to accept it.

As long as I am here, I would like to point out to the distinguished ranking

member that anytime my side wins all the votes, I am not having a tough day. I am having a really good day.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. I thank the chairman for accepting my amendment. I think that all Americans win when we act in a bipartisan manner. I am really grateful for your assistance in making this legislation stronger.

I want to thank the ranking member for her leadership on this bill, as well as my colleague, Representative CLEAVER, for his leadership on this bill.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-411.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HINOJOSA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-411.

Mr. HINOJOSA. 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 55, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 202. GUARANTEED UNDERWRITING USER FEE.

Section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) GUARANTEED UNDERWRITING USER FEE.—

“(1) AUTHORITY; MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The Secretary may assess and collect a fee for a lender to access the automated underwriting systems of the Department in connection with such lender's participation in the single family loan program under this section and only in an amount necessary to cover the costs of information technology enhancements, improvements, maintenance, and development for automated underwriting systems used in connection with the single family loan program under this section, except that such fee shall not exceed \$50 per loan.

“(2) CREDITING; AVAILABILITY.—Any amounts collected from such fees shall be credited to the Rural Development Expense Account as offsetting collections and shall remain available until expended, in the amounts provided in appropriation Acts, solely for expenses described in paragraph (1).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 3700, entitled, the Housing Opportunities Through Modernization Act of 2015.

I want to thank Mr. LUETKEMEYER for his hard work on this bill and for the bipartisan and collaborative way in which he went about this important housing reform. I also wish to thank

the ranking member, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, for her hard work and for always looking out for those most needy in our society and for working to improve this bill.

My amendment would authorize a nominal user fee on lenders accessing the underwriting systems for the Section 502 Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program. This fee would not exceed \$50 per loan and would enable the United States Department of Agriculture to make much-needed upgrades to their automated underwriting system in order to match industry standards.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that access to safe, decent, and affordable housing can transform lives. Federal programs like the Section 502 Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program play a critical role in expanding home ownership and opportunity for our rural communities. This Federal program has helped over 2 million families build wealth through the equity in their home and encourages lenders to provide loans to those who cannot usually obtain conventional financing.

Through this program, lenders are enabled and encouraged to serve borrowers they might typically reject without the guarantee, increasing borrowers' access to home ownership opportunities. We owe it to our rural communities to provide the Section 502 program with the resources it needs to modernize and to continue expanding home ownership and opportunity in our most underserved rural communities.

The Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program relies on the Guaranteed Underwriting System for determining loan approvals quickly and accurately. Unfortunately, the current system is in need of substantial technological improvements in order to process risk requests more efficiently. Guaranteed Underwriting System development is necessary for sound portfolio risk management and will benefit USDA field staff, rural borrowers, and private sector lenders alike.

My amendment will cover the cost of developing and maintaining the Guaranteed Underwriting System and enable the Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program to be administered in a more effective manner, despite recent staffing reductions.

The nominal fee authorized by my amendment will be used to enhance and maintain the Guaranteed Underwriting System and bring it into the 21st century. It is expected that a fee ranging between \$25 and \$50 will generate approximately \$4 million a year, starting in 2018. The fee will support important program improvements, including the delegation of underwriting to preferred lenders.

The fee will also develop the underwriting system's technological capabilities to current standards, including enhanced loan and lender oversight, metrics, and programmatic controls. This efficiency upgrade will allow USDA staff to allocate the necessary

time and resources to the most complex underwriting decisions.

Finally, Congress has long invested in making rural home ownership a reality. The Section 502 Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program receives \$24 billion a year and has helped millions of families reach the dream of home ownership.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment supports the USDA fiscal year 2016 budget request and is supported by prominent rural housing advocacy groups such as the National Rural Housing Coalition and the Housing Assistance Council. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. I thank him for his leadership in this area of rural housing. I think it plays a role in helping develop a more modern and efficient management and underwriting system to assess mortgage credit risk, prevent foreclosures, and manage a billion-dollar portfolio.

This is a bipartisan amendment and a bipartisan bill. We are happy to accept it. I urge Members 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 Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114-411.

Ms. MENG. 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 55, after line 11, add the following new section:

SEC. 111. PUBLIC HOUSING HEATING GUIDELINES.

Section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(o) PUBLIC HOUSING HEATING GUIDELINES.—The Secretary shall publish model guidelines for minimum heating requirements for public housing dwelling units operated by public housing agencies receiving assistance under this section.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, this amendment would require HUD to publish model guidelines for minimum heating requirements for public housing units.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chair, some public housing agencies across this country have struggled with the fundamental task of providing adequate housing and heating to low-income residents.

Less than 2 months ago, the New York Daily News and Reuters published a series of articles about tenants at the Frederick Douglass Houses in New York City, complaining that they were without heat for several frigid evenings in a row.

In response to these complaints, New York City public advocate Letitia James and Legal Services New York City filed a lawsuit on behalf of the tenants, and in their filing they quote a November 25 email from Robert Knapp, head of the New York City Housing Authority's heating management services unit, stating:

NYCHA official policy . . . is heat shut off between 10 p.m. and 5 a.m. when the outside temperatures are above 20 degrees. When the outside temperature falls below 20 degrees, heat is given through the night.

Frankly, this is appalling.

Many Democratic Representatives from New York City agreed with me, and that is why we submitted a letter, led by my good friends and colleagues, Representatives ENGEL and RANGEL, to the head of NYCHA, urging it to completely abandon the current heating policy. That letter was submitted to NYCHA—the largest housing agency in the country, overseeing more than 400,000 residents living in 2,500 buildings—more than a month ago, and we have yet to receive a response. That is why I have come to the floor today.

While it is not in our authority to mandate what a building's heating requirements should be in any particular city across this vast country, clearly some help is needed. Apparently, some local agencies might need official guidance from HUD outlining the fact that it is a good idea to turn the heat on at night when the temperature outside is below freezing.

I was hopeful things would not come to this point, but right now, in the middle of winter, when almost one in five public housing residents in my city are age 62 or older, and more than a quarter of them are children under the age of 18, I feel that this matter could ultimately be one of life or death.

□ 1615

We do not want to return to an age in which tenants of local public housing authorities are forced to revert to heating their homes with stoves.

Many of us here are all too familiar with the unfortunate tragedies that occur as a result of that practice and the fires that can also occur when residents are forced to rely on individual space heaters.

For not only the safety of public housing residents across America, but

also their humanity, heating standards must be improved.

It is my hope that this amendment today, which mandates that HUD produce model heating guidelines, will assist in this endeavor. It is also my hope that all of my colleagues will support this effort.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to the gentleman's comments on the floor. I am prepared to accept the amendment. She makes some reasonable arguments. I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MENG. I thank the Chairman for his support.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MENG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. I certainly support what she is trying to do.

Last December it came to light that the New York City Housing Authority, NYCHA, has as recently as 2013 shut down boilers in public housing properties unless outside temperatures drop below 25 degrees. This forces residents to go without heat during the coldest months of the year.

I grew up in affordable housing. I grew up in city housing. So I am particularly sensitive to everything that the New York City Housing Authority does.

I was outraged by this revelation. More than 400,000 New Yorkers live in NYCHA buildings, and, what's more, more than half of these residents live below the poverty line.

These New Yorkers, along with every American living in public housing, pay rent and, in return, depend on Housing Authority leadership to fulfill the very reasonable need, a safe and decent shelter.

A practice that forces tenants to grapple with bitter temperatures just doesn't fail to meet that need, it is reckless and demeaning.

Myself, Ms. MENG, and eight other members of the New York City delegation sent a letter to the New York City Housing Authority asking that they immediately issue guidance condemning this practice and make certain that none of their buildings continue to adhere to this outrageous policy.

It is important, though, that no American living in public housing be forced to suffer through the winter months, and that is exactly what this

amendment will prevent by requiring the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to issue guidelines on minimum heating requirements.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this and ensure that public housing residents' health and safety are protected.

I want to thank my colleague from New York (Ms. MENG) for partnering with me on this important issue, and I thank her for her leadership.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITY THROUGH MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 114-411.

Mr. PALAZZO. 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 55, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 111. EXCEPTION TO PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY RESIDENT BOARD MEMBER REQUIREMENT.

Subsection (b) of section 2 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN JURISDICTIONS.—

“(A) EXCEPTION.—A covered agency (as such term is defined in subparagraph (C) of this paragraph) shall not be required to include on the board of directors or a similar governing board of such agency a member described in paragraph (1).

“(B) ADVISORY BOARD REQUIREMENT.—Each covered agency that administers Federal housing assistance under section 8 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) that chooses not to include a member described in paragraph (1) on the board of directors or a similar governing board of the agency shall establish an advisory board of not less than 6 residents of public housing or recipients of assistance under section 8 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to provide advice and comment to the agency or other administering entity on issues related to public housing and section 8. Such advisory board shall meet not less than quarterly.

“(C) COVERED AGENCY OR ENTITY.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘covered agency’ means a public housing agency or such other entity that administers Federal housing assistance for—

“(I) the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California; or

“(ii) any of the States of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, today's bill to improve public housing is a strong step in streamlining a massive Federal program. I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for allowing us to have this debate.

As a former public housing authority executive, I know all too well how important it is to balance financial and managerial responsibility and oversight while, at the same time, ensuring residents' needs are met.

This amendment is simple and addresses an outdated and misinformed statute in the United States Housing Act that requires the membership of directors of a public housing agency contain one member who is directly assisted by the agency.

Opposition to this rule is not new. When HUD proposed these rules in 1999, PHAs across the United States issued statements of opposition.

Some would argue that requiring resident members to serve on the board is a blatant conflict of interest, as he or she would be making decisions that financially impact his or her family and their well-being. While I agree, I am not here to debate that today.

This amendment addresses only the PHAs in three States and one county. This is because, in our respective State constitutions, there are provisions that expressly oppose the idea of a board member of any group receiving benefits from the very agency upon which he or she serves.

This amendment does not rob the residents in specified areas of a voice in the affairs of their housing. In fact, it is a Federal requirement that each PHA have a resident advisory board comprised of at least one resident who serves as a liaison between the PHA and housing residents. I speak from experience when I say that their input is always acknowledged and much appreciated.

This commonsense provision is usually passed through the appropriations process, as it has been for decades. My amendment simply makes it permanent. I encourage adoption of this commonsense provision.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman and Members, I have serious concerns about providing a permanent exemption for the listed entities from existing requirements that each public housing authority must have a resident commissioner serve on the governing board.

In 1998, Congress passed this requirement into law in recognition of the need for the perspective and participation of tenants in the governance of public housing authorities. To this day, this requirement helps to ensure that residents are included in board-level decisionmaking.

However, in appropriations bills over the last decade, four entities have received an exemption from this requirement so long as they maintain a separate advisory board with at least six residents of public or assisted housing.

The Housing Authority of the County of Los Angeles is one of the four entities that received this exemption. However, last year I learned that HACOLA was not in compliance with the part of the exemption that requires that they maintain an advisory board of at least six residents, and this noncompliance had been going on for many years.

HACOLA's noncompliance resulted in a lack of meaningful engagement by residents on important policy issues affecting programs that HACOLA administers.

I successfully offered an amendment in the funding year 2016 housing funding bill to strike HACOLA's exemption. While this amendment was ultimately not included in the final omnibus, it did put Congress, HUD, and the Housing Authority on notice that failure to comply with this important law is simply unacceptable.

This demonstrates that we need to be extremely careful when providing exemptions for a requirement as important as this one. The exemption for HACOLA and others was intended to provide them with special accommodations while still ensuring meaningful tenant engagement. But HACOLA's behavior displayed blatant disregard for the law and the intent behind the law. That is why I do not believe that we should be making this exemption permanent. Instead, I think we should be thinking about ways to enhance compliance with the existing exemption requirements.

For these reasons, of course I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members, it is just inconceivable that we don't understand that, if you want to not only educate tenants, but want to involve tenants in decisionmaking and help them to understand how democracy works and help them to understand the rules of public housing and what can and cannot be done and why these rules are adopted—if we don't understand that, we don't understand anything.

It is inconceivable to me that we would simply say that we do not want just one commissioner, one resident, to

be a part of the governing board, and it is inconceivable to me that we don't understand that we allow for exemptions to say: Okay. If you don't want just one commissioner to serve on the board with you, we will allow you to have an advisory board of six residents that could involve themselves in the decisions that are made by the governing board.

I talk about this importance because I think it is so important, as we engage and lift people out of poverty, that they understand the rules of the game. The only way you get to understand the rules of the game is if you get to play. You get to understand how decisions are made. You get to understand what the rules are and how government works. To exclude them does not make good sense to me.

Now, I know why my own county would like to have this done. They would like to have this done because—guess what. We discovered that they were trying to sell off 241 units of Section 8-type housing at the same time that they were providing the museum with over \$120 million, and they said they could not afford the upkeep of those units.

They didn't like it that we went out and talked with the residents. I went out to the homes and I said: Did you know that these units are about to be sold? Do you know what is going to happen to you and why the county is giving up these units?

No. They didn't know. They didn't have a clue because they didn't have proper notification. They didn't have one resident that served on the governing board. They didn't have an advisory committee, even though L.A. County had gotten an exemption. They refused to even comply with the exemption to simply have an advisory board.

This is not right. This does not make good sense. I don't know why you would support something like this. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my colleague for expressing some good points. This amendment actually continues to allow residents of housing authorities to have a strong voice.

It monitors the situation not just in our housing authorities that we are trying to exempt under States where their constitution prohibits board members from being able to sit on boards where they have a monetary or fiscal interest in that. It is a huge conflict of interest.

We are not going after all 2,700-plus public housing authorities. We are just trying to make sure the States that have constitutions prohibiting such blatant disregard to common sense and having that conflict of interest are protected.

Apparently, there is a personal interest in the one jurisdiction. Hopefully, when my amendment is adopted, if we are going through the conference proc-

ess with the Senate, we can work with my colleague to make sure that her State HA that she is referencing is taken care of.

But, again, my amendment I think adds more voices to the governing process for them to know what is going on in their local housing authority.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

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

Mr. PALAZZO. 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 Mississippi will be postponed.

□ 1630

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114-411.

Mr. WELCH. 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 55, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 111. USE OF VOUCHERS FOR MANUFACTURED HOUSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(o)(12) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(12)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of the first sentence and all that follows through "of" in the second sentence and inserting "and rents"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking "the rent" and all that follows and inserting the following: "rent shall mean the sum of the monthly payments made by a family assisted under this paragraph to amortize the cost of purchasing the manufactured home, including any required insurance and property taxes, the monthly amount allowed for tenant-paid utilities, and the monthly rent charged for the real property on which the manufactured home is located, including monthly management and maintenance charges."; and

(B) by striking clause (ii); and

(C) in clause (iii)—

(i) by inserting after the period at the end of the following: "If the amount of the monthly assistance payment for a family exceeds the monthly rent charged for the real property on which the manufactured home is located, including monthly management and maintenance charges, a public housing agency may pay the remainder to the family, lender or utility company, or may choose to make a single payment to the family for the entire monthly assistance amount."; and

(ii) by redesignating such clause as clause (ii).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue notice to implement the amendments made by subsection (a) and such amendments shall take effect upon such issuance.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I am a strong supporter of the good work that is represented in H.R. 3700, and I congratulate Chairman LUETKEMEYER and Ranking Member CLEAVER for their hard work on this, as well as Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS.

This bill is a really solid, bipartisan improvement over the status quo. This amendment would extend some of the benefits of H.R. 3700 to folks who live in mobile homes, and that happens to be an awful lot of Vermonters who are working real hard trying to make ends meet. The idea of a bricks and sticks house is a dream for them, but they love the mobile home they have, and they have economic challenges in that home. I think that is true not just in Vermont but really across rural America.

What this amendment would allow is for the Section 8 housing vouchers to be used for some of the obvious expenses that are associated with owning a mobile home, Mr. Chairman. Right now, only the land rent is what can be included in the voucher. But in addition to that, obviously, you have got the true cost of the mobile home that the owner pays for the housing. In addition to the land rent underneath the home, mobile homeowners often pay a number of other costs, including utilities, insurance, and financing for their mobile homes.

People renting apartments where it is not a mobile home, all of those are factored into the rent. So what this amendment would do is allow those costs to be included in the calculation for Section 8 that in our view put an unnecessary and unfair limitation on what can be considered. Compare that to the housing cost vouchers that individuals in rental units get. All of those are included in the rent.

So this amendment would address that issue by allowing the property taxes on a mobile home, as well as insurance, utilities, and financing, to be included as components of the housing costs eligible for a voucher.

It would make a huge difference in affordability for Vermonters and for Americans across this country who are working hard every day and whose option for safe shelter is a mobile home.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that my colleagues support this amendment. I thank my colleagues for the bipartisan, solid work they have done on this bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from

Vermont. I appreciate his amendment. I think that this helps equalize for a number of Section 8 users the ability to use manufactured housing to help equalize this with other housing options. So I think it is an important step forward.

I thank the gentleman from Vermont for his leadership, and I recommend Members vote for it.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his gracious remarks. He spent a fair amount of time in the Green Mountain State, so he knows about these mobile homes. I am going to go back and tell folks that you are still the good guy you were when you were spending more time in the Green Mountain State.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114-411.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk on behalf of Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 64, line 16, strike "and".

Page 64, after line 16, insert the following new subparagraph:

“(G) collaborating with the Department of Veterans Affairs on making joint recommendations to the Congress, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on how to better coordinate and improve services to veterans under both Department of Housing and Urban Development and Department of Veteran Affairs veterans housing programs, including ways to improve the Independent Living Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and”

Page 64, line 17, strike “(G)” and insert “(H)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment for my friend, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

As of 2014, there were over 130,000 veterans living in shelters and transitional housing in the United States. About 56 percent of these veterans have a disability. I think we agree that that is unacceptable.

Since 2009, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Veterans Affairs have made significant progress to reduce the number of homeless veterans. But more

must be done to get veterans off the streets and into permanent housing.

This can be seen in my home district where we have one of the largest homeless populations in the country, and also perhaps the largest populations of homeless veterans.

The underlying bill improves housing services for veterans by creating a new special assistant for veterans within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This new position will coordinate veterans' housing efforts within HUD, serve as a liaison with the VA, and ensure veterans have fair access to housing programs.

The amendment builds upon those improvements to further coordination between the VA and HUD, both of which provide a range of veteran homeless services and support. The amendment requires the Special Assistant to work with the VA and provide recommendations to each department and to Congress on how to improve coordination and housing services for our Nation's veterans.

We can do much more to not only keep veterans off the streets, but to provide them with the resources and support they need to have a safe, stable place to live and build a life after completing their service.

In San Diego, organizations like zero8hundred and the Veterans Village of San Diego offer the kind of comprehensive transition support to help veterans be successful.

These are also the collective goals of many HUD and VA programs, including the VA's Independent Living Program, which assists veterans to become more independent in their homes so they never become homeless in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that HUD and VA coordinate their efforts on addressing the many different issues and aspects associated with veteran homelessness.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, we all know on this House floor there is not enough we can ever do for our veterans, the brave men and women who served us in uniform. I think that the author of the amendment, in attempting to get HUD and the VA to work more closely together to address problems like veterans' homelessness, is an important thing to do. I hope it has some benefit.

Mr. Chairman, again, I just want to accept the amendment and urge all Members to adopt it.

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his gracious support and for his work on behalf of veterans.

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. PETERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114-411.

Mr. PETERS. 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 68, after line 4, insert the following new section:

SEC. 405. REOPENING OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR CONTINUUM OF CARE PROGRAM REGULATIONS.

Not later than the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall re-open the period for public comment regarding the Secretary's interim rule entitled "Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing: Continuum of Care Program", published in the Federal Register on July 31, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 45422; Docket No. FR-5476-I-01). Upon re-opening, such comment period shall remain open for a period of not fewer than 60 days.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, each Member of this body represents a district that is affected to some degree by homelessness. We all work diligently to grow the economy, create high-quality jobs, and create opportunity so that no one has to live on the streets. But for many in our districts, ending the scourge of homelessness is an ongoing battle that take resources and coordination from our communities.

All of our districts are supported by the Continuum of Care program, which assists local leaders working diligently to distribute funding to public and non-profit institutions that shelter the homeless, set up transitional housing, and provide support programs.

In San Diego we recently completed our Point in Time count. My office and other public servants counted the homeless living on the street and in shelters to determine how better to serve them as we work to end homelessness. In 2014, this count found that San Diego had the fifth largest homeless population in our country. But in that same year, our Continuum of Care program received the 23rd highest level of Federal anti-homelessness funds.

San Diego is not the only city that is disadvantaged by the formula that is used to determine how Federal anti-homelessness funds are distributed. Other western cities like Houston, Las

Vegas, Seattle, San Jose, and Denver also receive a disproportionately low amount of Federal resources.

My amendment would require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to reopen the public comment period on the Continuum of Care formula. This would allow service organizations, housing providers, community faith leaders, and elected officials the opportunity to provide input on how HUD's limited and valuable resources can be most equitably and effectively used to end homelessness in our country. The amendment would not change the formula, and it would not unfairly disadvantage the district of any Member of this body.

Since coming to Congress, I have been fighting to ensure that every city receives its fair share of Federal funding to help the homeless. I have corresponded with both Secretary Donovan and now-Secretary Castro to advocate for changes to the Continuum of Care formula and ask for a public comment period. The people working on the ground to end homelessness deserve the opportunity to weigh in on how this formula is affecting them and the work they are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure we are doing all we can to end the scourge of homelessness in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I think the comment period does need to be reopened. It is an important issue. Voices need to be heard.

The gentleman from California is now batting a thousand. I am not sure if he has any other amendments. He may be pressing his luck after that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of what success looks like in this body, and I am finished offering amendments. I want to thank all the people, including the ranking member and Chairman HENSARLING, for their hard work on this bill. This is a good piece of work.

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. PETERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 114-411.

Mr. ELLISON. 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:

Add at the end of the bill the following new title:

TITLE VI—FURNISHING RENT PAYMENT INFORMATION TO CREDIT REPORTING AGENCIES

SEC. 504. FURNISHING INFORMATION ABOUT RENT PAYMENTS TO A CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or any other person having authorized access may furnish to a consumer reporting agency (as defined in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a)) information relating to the on-time performance of an individual in making payments under a lease agreement with respect to a dwelling unit for which any subsidy or assistance for occupancy in the dwelling unit is provided under a program administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR FURNISHERS.—Any person who furnishes such information shall—

(1) ensure that the payment information is reported in a manner that does not by itself identify the individual as a recipient of housing assistance under a program administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; and

(2) notify the individual that such information will be provided to a consumer reporting agency before providing such information to a consumer reporting agency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman, Ranking Member WATERS, and Chair HENSARLING for their leadership on the committee.

Mr. Chairman, too many people are excluded from the financial mainstream. Fifty million Americans lack a credit score. Either they have no credit file at all, or they have too few trade lines to establish a credit score.

There have been some real innovations in helping these people we call "credit invisibles" to build an accurate score. FICO, which has a large presence in my State, has been a real leader in building more inclusive and accurate scoring methodology.

But credit scoring agencies cannot score information they don't have, and they tend to have late payment information but not on-time payment information. In other words, Mr. Chairman, if somebody doesn't pay a bill, probably it is scored. If they do pay it, probably it is not.

This is the case for HUD residents. That is why we need to make it easier for firms to provide customers' on-time payment data.

My amendment specifically aims to help some of the 3 million people who live in HUD-assisted housing. By law,

families, people with disabilities, and the elderly who receive HUD assistance pay 30 percent of their income for rent. I want to see them get credit they deserve for paying their rent on time. These folks pay their rent on time, yet it never shows up in their FICO score.

Why are we not reporting their on-time rental payment? Because the law requires each tenant to provide prior written consent before having their on-time rental payment information reported, but it does not require the same information to report late payments of rent. So they can get hit for late payment, no credit for on-time.

The prior written consent is mandated by the Privacy Act of 1974, which I believe was a well-meaning and good piece of legislation—except it needs to be updated. This piece of legislation, the Privacy Act of 1974, wants to protect the privacy of affordable housing residents, which is good, and I support that. But in this case, it is causing more harm than good. Requiring each resident to grant written permission and then have the housing provider manage all those forms is a burden.

□ 1645

We have empirical evidence to show that such rent reporting helps tenants. Recently, Credit Builders Alliance led a Rent Reporting for Credit Building pilot in eight communities. The Rent Reporting for Credit Building pilot reported rent payments of 1,255 low-income residents who lived in assisted housing.

The research found that credit-invisible residents who participated in the pilot were able to build a high nonprime of 646, or prime score of 688 with the inclusion of their rental payment history. Even if they don't want to borrow money, their scores are going up, meaning that they apply for, perhaps, lower interest rates, apply for jobs, and have a better situation all around.

To repeat: from credit-invisible to credit scores above 646, and some much higher. Even those who had a credit score already saw it go up. Seventy-nine percent—a vast majority—saw an increase in credit scores. This was an average increase of 23 points.

Credit Builders Alliance and other researchers want to expand their efforts to help more residents. Another pilot program is pending. HUD is partnering with Experian; FICO; LexisNexis; the Policy and Economic Research Council, PERC; and TransUnion to evaluate the impact of reporting rental payment history on credit scores of subsidized housing residents and the general population.

The Privacy Act requirement has hindered their effort. Already overworked housing staffs struggle to maintain the paperwork necessary to report renters' on-time payment. Housing staffs find that it is difficult to set up automated payment data transmission between property managers and the credit bureaus with an always changing database.

My amendment includes language from H.R. 4172, the Credit Access and Inclusion Act. H.R. 4172 has 20 cosponsors. Ten are Republican. Seven of the ten Republicans serve with me on the Financial Services Committee.

In conclusion, please support this amendment because it would do a number of very important things:

It would help credit invisibility for hundreds, if not thousands—millions, even, and that is not an exaggeration—of very low-income people.

It makes it easier to provide predictive data of someone's ability to pay and willingness to repay. And based on solid empirical evidence, that rental payment data can move people from unscorable to prime or near prime.

We should help HUD-assisted tenants enter the financial mainstream. Let's implement rent reporting on a large scale.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to the gentleman from Minnesota. He makes a number of important points. We have had this discussion previously. I know the gentleman from Minnesota is aware of my commitment that, within the committee, we will have a hearing that will include the subject matter of his amendment.

I think the gentleman's amendment, obviously, addresses the Fair Credit Reporting Act, which is not part of this underlying housing bill. Again, we will debate his issue, research his issue, and take testimony on his issue in the future.

I do not believe that this is the appropriate bill for his particular amendment, so I am going to urge rejection at this time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, in listening to the discussion with the gentleman from Minnesota with regard to his amendment, he made the comment that they already report it whenever the people don't make their payments, and they need to be reporting it when they do make their payments. Does that mean we are going to have to start reporting car payments, house payments, and all those things, too, when people make them on time? Because this is what he is asking us to do is, every time somebody does something right, suddenly now we have got to be reporting that. If you go down that road, then I think we have got some problems.

Also, in your amendment here, you indicate that, with the data as reported, they are not able to identify if the person is a recipient of housing assistance—we are going to tie their hands, yet force them to do some stuff.

I think this is a rather ill-conceived amendment, quite frankly, Mr. Chair-

man. I certainly urge the body to reject it.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair reminds Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 114-411.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. 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, add the following new title:

TITLE VI—FHA PILOT PROGRAM FOR ADDITIONAL CREDIT RATING INFORMATION

SEC. 601. PILOT PROGRAM FOR ADDITIONAL CREDIT RATING INFORMATION FOR FHA MORTGAGORS.

Section 258 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-24) is amended as follows:

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—In the first sentence of subsection (a), by striking “shall” and inserting “may”.

(2) **EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.**—By striking subsection (d).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that is known to the ranking member as well as the chairman of the committee. I will not complicate it. It is a very simple amendment. It simply says that HUD may—HUD may—develop a pilot program to consider additional credit scoring information.

We know that there are people who have insufficient credit files and, as a result, they don't get consideration for a light bill, gas bill, water bill, or phone bill. These are some of the things that we have people making payments on quite regularly timely, but they don't get considered.

We are simply asking HUD to develop a pilot program. We say “may develop.” There really is no requirement that HUD do it within some statutory period of time. There is no requirement that HUD will perform this in a certain way. But just see if there is some way to help people who make these payments timely such that this can become a part of the additional credit information.

Now, I am emphasizing “additional” because, quite frankly, I had “alternative” at one time, “alternative credit scoring.” That created some confusion because we are not using this as an alternative. This becomes additional information.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, because the gentleman from Texas is a friend—and you hear Members say that frequently, but in this case it is as sincere as it can be—the committee has attempted to work with the gentleman from Texas. Both sides worked in good faith. Regrettably, we did not come to a point of mutual agreement on the resolution of his amendment, so I am going to oppose it at this time.

The amendment would essentially provide a reauthorization of a program that the Obama administration even believed was too risky to establish because they had years to establish it and they chose not to.

I appreciate the effort. I appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman from Texas. I understand what he is trying to do. But I also fear that, ultimately, the impact of what the gentleman is trying to do very well could help hasten the insolvency and bankruptcy of the FHA, hurting their financials.

I am happy that the FHA, after 7 years, has finally decided to actually obey the law, but I am not sure that the program that the gentleman from Texas is advocating could not put further pressure on FHA's insurance fund, ultimately hurting those it is designed to help.

I would say again that, regardless of one's good intentions, I am still very, very fearful of pilot programs' mayes and shalls that somehow get the political process involved in telling lenders, or cajoling lenders, or suggesting to lenders what credit standards they should use. That is exactly what helped bring us to the housing crisis in the first place.

No matter how well-intentioned Federal policy was, ultimately, there was Federal policy that incited, cajoled, and, in some cases, mandated financial institutions to put people into homes they could not afford to keep. It didn't do the economy any good, it didn't do the taxpayer any good, and it certainly didn't do the homeowner any good to put them in a home they could not afford to keep.

Again, I have no doubt that is not the intention of the gentleman from Texas. But I have fears—I have fears—that once we start going down this road of telling lenders essentially what type of—and, ultimately, that is what we are doing with FHA. You are, ultimately, telling lenders, or suggesting to lenders, what credit standards they should employ.

I am fearful of going down this road. We had discussed a number of compromises. We came close. Unfortunately, we didn't get there with the gentleman from Texas.

I am going to oppose this amendment, simply because of who he is, somewhat reluctantly. But, nonetheless, the bottom line is the bottom

line. I will oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is imminently correct. We are friends. I say it in the sincerest way as well. He and I have collaborated on many issues, and we have gotten a lot of things done in Congress. I hope that doesn't hurt him back home, letting people know that we have worked on things together.

But, obviously, I have a different perch, and from my perch here is what I see. I see an opportunity for additional credit scoring to be used, and if it is negative, it is not going to benefit the person that is being scored. It does not prevent any other negative information from being properly scored. It simply says that HUD may use this information, indicating that persons have paid a light bill, gas bill, water bill, or phone bill as additional information. That is all it says, that it may do this and it may create the scoring.

Now, with reference to HUD, HUD has given me an indication—and I don't have it in writing to hand to you, Mr. Chairman, but I believe you would trust my word—that they are not opposing this.

One of the reasons why it wasn't done previously was a function of HUD's budget. I believe this to be the reason. And because of budgetary concerns, it did not get done—it was codified in the law—and that is why I am reintroducing it. But this is a milder version of what I introduced previously, because previously we said HUD shall do this, and this time we have made it as mild as possible.

The Realtors are very much supportive of it. This will give 50 million people who are currently with light credit files, don't have sufficient credit scores, to have some additional information to be considered.

But it does not in any way require that negative information be received in a positive manner. If it is negative, it remains negative. If you haven't paid your car note, it is still a negative. If you haven't paid your light bill, gas bill, or water bill, it is still a negative.

It only gives the opportunity to add these other things as things to consider for many people who, quite frankly, don't have a lot of traditional credit. They don't have bad credit; they just don't have traditional credit. There are a lot of my constituents who fall into this category.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, as persuasive as my friend is from Texas, he wasn't quite persuasive enough. At this particular moment, I continue to oppose the amendment of from the gentleman from Texas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 114-411.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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, add the following new title:

TITLE VI—REPORTS

SEC. 601. REPORT ON INTERAGENCY FAMILY ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT STRATEGIES.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall submit a report to the Congress annually that describes—

(1) any interagency strategies of such Departments that are designed to improve family economic empowerment by linking housing assistance with essential supportive services, such as employment counseling and training, financial education and growth, childcare, transportation, meals, youth recreational activities, and other supportive services; and

(2) any actions taken in the preceding year to carry out such strategies and the extent of progress achieved by such actions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and ranking member of the full committee and express my excitement in talking about reform and real housing issues.

If there is ever an issue that we, as Members of Congress, are confronted with when we go home to our districts, it is about people who need housing, about people who don't have housing, about people who have poor housing, about seniors who need housing, about young families who need housing.

I am delighted to be part of this reformation that has been done by the Committee on Financial Services and to acknowledge the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee from which this comes and to congratulate this bipartisan process.

I am delighted to offer an amendment. I thank the Rules Committee for making it in order, for I think it adds to the improvement of some of the issues that we are confronted with.

My amendment indicates that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor and with other relevant agencies, shall submit a report to Congress annually that goes to the heart of some of the issues unaddressed of interagency strategies of such departments that are designed to improve family economic empowerment by linking housing assistance with essential supportive services, such as employment, counseling, training, financial education and growth, child care, transportation, meals, youth recreational activities, and other supportive services.

It goes on to say: any actions taken in the preceding year to carry out such strategies and the extent of progress achieved by such actions.

My amendment recognizes that, in addition to housing connecting low-income families to job training and supportive services, such as child care, transportation, it is key to enabling families across the country—from Texas to California, from New York to California—to access employment and other services that foster upward economic mobility and family stability. It allows them to look at their family structure and at people who are in need.

My amendment acknowledges and recognizes that helping families achieve economic empowerment requires interagency collaboration.

Let me cite, Mr. Chairman, two supportive letters from the National Coalition for the Homeless and from the Heartland Alliance, which are supporting this constructive and instructive amendment to find out what our families need to be strong.

LEADING HOUSTON HOME,
February 2, 2016.

Speaker PAUL RYAN,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance Financial Services Committee, Washington, DC.

Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI,
Washington, DC.

Hon. EMANUEL CLEAVER,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance Financial Services Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The Coalition for the Homeless of Houston/Harris County is dedicated to preventing and ending homelessness in Houston, Harris County, and Fort Bend County. We are writing in support of H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity through Modernization Act. The proposed legislation includes many provisions that would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of critical rental assistance programs that serve extremely low-income households.

In particular, we are writing in support of Amendment Four, submitted by Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee (TX-18) to the Rules Committee. Representative Jackson Lee's Amendment Four directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to work with the Secretary of Labor to produce an annual report on interagency strategies to strengthen family economic empowerment by linking housing with essential supportive services such as employment coun-

seling and training, financial growth, childcare, transportation, meals, and other support services.

Representative Jackson Lee's amendment recognizes that in addition to housing, connecting low-income families to job training and supportive services are key to helping families access employment and economic opportunity and achieve stability. Representative Jackson Lee's amendment also recognizes that helping families achieve economic empowerment requires interagency collaboration. We know that public systems are better at solving big problems when they work together to share capacity, knowledge, and resources. We commend Representative Jackson Lee for encouraging systems collaboration to help ensure that low-income families succeed in housing and employment. We further encourage HUD to collaborate with the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture, as these agencies can offer families critical supports such as child care and nutrition assistance that are necessary for success.

The Coalition for the Homeless of Houston/Harris County, as a leader of The Way Home, the collaborative model to prevent and end homelessness in Houston, Harris County, and Fort Bend County knows the importance of interagency collaboration and the incredible successes that can be achieved as a result of shared capacity, knowledge and resources. We have made tremendous progress in our community and are happy to serve as a resource moving forward. Thank you for recognizing the important role of employment in helping low-income families achieve housing and financial stability.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Marilyn Brown (mbrown@homelesshouston.org), President/CEO of the Coalition for the Homeless of Houston/Harris County.

Sincerely,

MARILYN L. BROWN,
President/CEO.

HEARTLAND ALLIANCE NATIONAL
INITIATIVES,
February 1, 2016.

Speaker PAUL RYAN,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance Financial Services Committee, Washington, DC.

Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI,
Washington, DC.

Hon. EMANUEL CLEAVER,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance Financial Services Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI, Heartland Alliance's National Initiatives on Poverty & Economic Opportunity is dedicated ending chronic unemployment and poverty. We are writing in support of H.R. 3700, the Housing Opportunity through Modernization Act. The proposed legislation includes many provisions that would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of critical rental assistance programs that serve extremely low-income households.

In particular, we are writing in support of Amendment Four, submitted by Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee's (TX-18) to the Rules Committee. Representative Jackson Lee's Amendment Four directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to work with the Secretary of Labor to produce an annual report on interagency strategies to strengthen family economic empowerment by linking housing with essential supportive services such as employment counseling and training, financial growth, childcare, transportation, meals, and other support services.

Representative Jackson Lee's amendment recognizes that in addition to housing, con-

necting low-income families to job training and supportive services such as childcare and transportation are key to helping these families access employment and economic opportunity and achieve stability. Representative Jackson Lee's amendment also recognizes that helping families achieve economic empowerment requires interagency collaboration. We know that public systems are better at solving big problems when they work together to share capacity, knowledge, and resources, and we commend Representative Jackson Lee for encouraging systems collaboration to help ensure that low-income families can succeed in housing and employment. We further encourage HUD to collaborate with the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture, as these agencies can offer families critical supports such as child care and nutrition assistance that are necessary for employment success.

Heartland Alliance's National Initiatives Team has a number of resources and tools that can support efforts to help individuals and families facing barriers to employment succeed in the work. We are happy to serve as a resource moving forward, and thank you for recognizing the important role of employment in helping low-income families achieve housing and financial stability.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Melissa Young, Director of Heartland Alliance's National Initiatives on Poverty & Economic Opportunity.

Sincerely,

MELISSA YOUNG,
Director, Heartland
Alliance's National
Initiatives on Poverty
& Economic Opportunity.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I am delighted to tell the story of Finney from the Houston Housing Authority where we gave her supportive services through the Family Sufficiency Program. She has gotten to the point of attaining a credit score of 640, and she is now a proud homeowner. What a legacy.

So I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED
BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, as my dear colleague from Guam missed her time in which to offer her amendment, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment with the modification by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), which I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

Page 55, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 111. PREFERENCE FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS OR NATIONALS.

Section 214(a)(7) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 1436a(a)(7)) is amended by striking "such alien" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "any citizen or

national of the United States shall be entitled to a preference or priority in receiving financial assistance before any such alien who is otherwise eligible for assistance.”.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment fixes a misinterpretation of law and gives U.S. citizens and nationals a preference over migrants from the Republic of Palau, from the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and from the Federated States of Micronesia when receiving Federal aid.

I continue to support allowing these migrants to receive housing assistance. Otherwise, our housing situation in Guam and in other affected jurisdictions would get even worse. However, it was not the intent of Congress to displace our citizens when it extended eligibility to migrants in 2000.

Unfortunately, limited resources have led many U.S. citizens in Guam to be displaced by COFA migrants who have entered our country as a result of the Compact of Free Association. Guam's local housing authority has indicated that demand for housing assistance far outweighs the resources available.

A recent Guam PDN article indicated that homeless data shows that local residents of Guam make up nearly 42 percent of the homeless on Guam, that 536 Chamorros, the indigenous people, and 42 Filipinos were considered homeless.

I ask for the support of my amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, first, in dealing with the amendment from the gentlewoman from Texas, I often don't have an opportunity to work with her. I am happy to work with her on this matter and to recognize that this report could, indeed, add value.

I think anything that we can do to help with family economic empowerment in the areas that she has identified, such as in employment counseling and training and the coordination of these areas, can be very valuable.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's amendment, and I am prepared to ac-

cept it. The same is true for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

I am sorry she missed her opportunity earlier, but I am glad she has her opportunity now. I am prepared to accept her amendment as well.

I urge adoption.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I was very pleased to help out the gentlewoman from Guam, and I want to indicate that these are two amendments that stand on their own right.

I close by indicating the purpose of the amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON LEE to again refer to Finney, a woman who tried to get a home.

She stayed in the program and completed the criteria that was needed for her to qualify. She earned wages of at least \$20,000 and got that credit score and established a savings account of \$1,000.

This is what we are talking about with regard to supportive services. What we want to do is to emphasize employment counseling, financial education, growth, child care, transportation, meals, youth recreational activities, and other supportive services.

I am very glad to have the support, if you will, of the National Coalition for the Homeless of Houston, Harris County, as well as of the Heartland Alliance to be able to say that this makes for a better roadmap for getting housing to people who are in need.

I celebrate the fact that we are on the floor with this reform bill, talking about housing. I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, let me express my appreciation to Chairman LUETKEMEYER and Ranking Member CLEAVER for their leadership, commitment and effort to modernize and improve Federal Housing programs for millions of Americans who are working their way up to economic empowerment and stability.

I also wish to thank Chairman SESSIONS, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER, and the members of the Rules Committee for making in order Jackson Lee amendment Number 13.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which provides:

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor and other relevant agencies, shall submit a report to the Congress annually that describes—

(1) any interagency strategies of such Departments that are designed to improve family economic empowerment by linking housing assistance with essential supportive services, such as employment counseling and training, financial education and growth, childcare, transportation, meals, youth recreational activities, and other supportive services; and

(2) any actions taken in the preceding year to carry out such strategies and the extent of progress achieved by such actions.

Mr. Chair, my amendment recognizes that in addition to housing, connecting low-income

families to job training and supportive services such as childcare and transportation are key to enabling families across the country from Texas to California access to employment and other services that foster upward economic mobility and family stability.

Jackson Lee amendment Number 13 acknowledges and recognizes that helping families achieve economic empowerment requires interagency collaboration.

I am pleased to submit into the RECORD letters supporting my amendment authored by the Coalition for the Homeless of Houston/Harris County and the Heartland Alliance National Initiatives on Poverty and Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Chair, we all know that public systems are better at solving big problems when there is coordination amongst various implementing agencies motivated to work together to share capacity, knowledge, and resources.

My amendment encourages agency collaboration to help ensure that low-income families can succeed in housing, in employment and in life.

Interagency collaborations between agencies such as the Department of Labor, Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture can offer families critical support such as child care and nutrition assistance that are necessary for family stability and employment success.

Livelihood and self-dignity are tied to employment and employment is critical to achieving financial independence and stability and stimulation of the economy.

My amendment seeks to bridge the opportunities that abound when there is interagency/ intersystem collaboration and the success that can come about.

Take for instance the success story of Fini Tuamokumo, a single mother of three children and former Housing Choice Voucher participant, enrolled in the Houston Housing Authority's Family Self-Sufficiency program (FSS).

Among other supportive services, the Houston Housing Authority's FSS program facilitates a pathway for public housing tenants to meet their individual goals by connecting them to community resources and homeownership assistance.

Aspiring home owners like Fini receive support and resources towards employment success and homeownership.

I am proud to report that Fini began the process, stayed the course and completed the criteria needed to qualify for homeownership: earned wages of at least \$20,000 per year, a credit score of 640 or higher, the establishment of an Individualized Development (savings) Account with a minimum balance of \$1,000, and completion of the FSS program's Financial Literacy and First Time Home Ownership classes.

Fini is now a proud homeowner and can now pass on the legacy of the importance of a work ethic, grit and homeownership to her children.

Fini is just one of many success stories of intersystem/interagency coordination as a nexus towards federal housing and economic empowerment.

Mr. Chair, my amendment will create the space and opportunity for the economic mobility of federal housing recipients through linking housing assistance with essential supportive services such as employment counseling and

opportunities, financial education and growth, childcare, transportation, meals, youth recreational activities and other supportive services.

For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me and support Jackson Lee Amendment Number 13.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 114-411.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. 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, add the following new title:

TITLE VI—HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

SEC. 601. FORMULA AND TERMS FOR ALLOCATIONS TO PREVENT HOMELESSNESS FOR INDIVIDUALS LIVING WITH HIV OR AIDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 854 of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)) is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (5); and

(2) striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES.—

“(A) ALLOCATION FORMULA.—The Secretary shall allocate 90 percent of the amount approved in appropriations Acts under section 863 among States and metropolitan statistical areas as follows:

“(I) 75 percent of such amounts among—

“(I) cities that are the most populous unit of general local government in a metropolitan statistical area with a population greater than 500,000, as determined on the basis of the most recent census, and with more than 2,000 individuals living with HIV or AIDS, using the data specified in subparagraph (B); and

“(II) States with more than 2,000 individuals living with HIV or AIDS outside of metropolitan statistical areas.

“(ii) 25 percent of such amounts among States and metropolitan statistical areas based on the method described in subparagraph (C).

“(B) SOURCE OF DATA.—For purposes of allocating amounts under this paragraph for any fiscal year, the number of individuals living with HIV or AIDS shall be the number of such individuals as confirmed by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as of December 31 of the most recent calendar year for which such data is available.

“(C) ALLOCATION UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (A)(ii).—For purposes of allocating amounts under subparagraph (A)(ii), the Secretary shall develop a method that accounts for—

“(I) differences in housing costs among States and metropolitan statistical areas based on the fair market rental established pursuant to section 8(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(c)) or another methodology established by the Secretary through regulation; and

“(ii) differences in poverty rates among States and metropolitan statistical areas

based on area poverty indexes or another methodology established by the Secretary through regulation.

“(2) MAINTAINING GRANTS.—

“(A) CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY OF FISCAL YEAR 2016 GRANTEEES.—A grantee that received an allocation in fiscal year 2016 shall continue to be eligible for allocations under paragraph (1) in subsequent fiscal years, subject to—

“(I) the amounts available from appropriations Acts under section 863;

“(ii) approval by the Secretary of the most recent comprehensive housing affordability strategy for the grantee approved under section 105; and

“(iii) the requirements of subparagraph (C).

“(B) ADJUSTMENTS.—Allocations to grantees described in subparagraph (A) shall be adjusted annually based on the administrative provisions included in fiscal year 2016 appropriations Acts.

“(C) REDETERMINATION OF CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary shall redetermine the continued eligibility of a grantee that received an allocation in fiscal year 2016 at least once during the 10-year period following fiscal year 2016.

“(D) ADJUSTMENT TO GRANTS.—For each of fiscal years 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021, the Secretary shall ensure that a grantee that received an allocation in the prior fiscal year does not receive an allocation that is 5 percent less than or 10 percent greater than the amount allocated to such grantee in the preceding fiscal year.

“(3) ALTERNATIVE GRANTEEES.—

“(A) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may award funds reserved for a grantee eligible under paragraph (1) to an alternative grantee if—

“(I) the grantee submits to the Secretary a written agreement between the grantee and the alternative grantee that describes how the alternative grantee will take actions consistent with the applicable comprehensive housing affordability strategy approved under section 105 of this Act;

“(ii) the Secretary approves the written agreement described in clause (I) and agrees to award funds to the alternative grantee; and

“(iii) the written agreement does not exceed a term of 10 years.

“(B) RENEWAL.—An agreement approved pursuant to subparagraph (A) may be renewed by the parties with the approval of the Secretary.

“(C) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘alternative grantee’ means a public housing agency (as defined in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b))), a unified funding agency (as defined in section 401 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360)), a State, a unit of general local government, or an instrumentality of State or local government.

“(4) REALLOCATIONS.—If a State or metropolitan statistical area declines an allocation under paragraph (1)(A), or the Secretary determines, in accordance with criteria specified in regulation, that a State or metropolitan statistical area that is eligible for an allocation under paragraph (1)(A) is unable to properly administer such allocation, the Secretary shall reallocate any funds reserved for such State or metropolitan statistical area as follows:

“(A) For funds reserved for a State—

“(I) to eligible metropolitan statistical areas within the State on a pro rata basis; or

“(ii) if there is no eligible metropolitan statistical areas within a State, to metropolitan cities and urban counties within the State that are eligible for grant under section 106 of the Housing and Community De-

velopment Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5306), on a pro rata basis.

“(B) For funds reserved for a metropolitan statistical area, to the State in which the metropolitan statistical area is located.

“(C) If the Secretary is unable to make a reallocation under subparagraph (A) or (B), the Secretary shall make such funds available on a pro rata basis under the formula in paragraph (1)(A).”

(b) AMENDMENT TO DEFINITIONS.—Section 853 of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12902) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or ‘AIDS’” before “means”; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(15) The term ‘HIV’ means infection with the human immunodeficiency virus.

“(16) The term ‘individuals living with HIV or AIDS’ means, with respect to the counting of cases in a geographic area during a period of time, the sum of—

“(A) the number of living non-AIDS cases of HIV in the area; and

“(B) the number of living cases of AIDS in the area.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 594, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of our colleague from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) and myself.

I thank the chairman, the ranking member, and the staffs on both sides for their cooperation in moving this amendment forward.

This is a bipartisan amendment that provides a long, overdue update to HUD’s statutory funding formula for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS Program, also known as HOPWA.

HOPWA is the only Federal program that is solely dedicated to providing housing assistance and related supportive services for low-income people and their families who are living with HIV/AIDS.

In short, this amendment would base the distribution of HOPWA funds on the current number of people who are living with HIV/AIDS, who desperately need this support.

This would replace the current formula based, incredibly, on the cumulative number of AIDS cases since the epidemic began decades ago. Last year more than 50 percent of the people counted in the HOPWA formula were deceased.

To say the least, this has drastically reduced HOPWA’s ability to aid jurisdictions where the present need is most acute. This is particularly true in rural areas and in cities that are currently bearing the brunt of the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has sensibly adjusted other AIDS support programs, including the Ryan White program. So formula funds are distributed based on the number of living HIV and AIDS cases in a given jurisdiction. Only the HOPWA formula remains out of whack, and it is denying thousands of those

with HIV/AIDS the housing support they need.

The Price-Aderholt amendment makes three changes to the current HOPWA formula:

Firstly, it utilizes living HIV/AIDS cases as the major basis of funding distribution, consistent with changes made to the Ryan White program.

Secondly, it directs HUD to take into consideration housing costs and local poverty rates to ensure the HOPWA program can better address varied housing needs within jurisdictions.

Thirdly, the amendment provides for a gradual implementation of the new funding formula over 5 years in order to ensure that jurisdictions have adequate time to adjust to the new funding levels. A stop-loss provision is also included so that no jurisdiction can lose more than 5 percent of its funding or gain more than 10 percent of its funding on a year-over-year basis.

Mr. Chairman, ever since 1997, the Government Accountability Office has identified the need to update the HOPWA formula. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has included similar proposals to update the formula in its budget requests year after year. According to the Department's most recent formula projections, 115 out of 139 jurisdictions in this country would benefit under the proposed formula change.

The AIDS advocacy community also supports updating the HOPWA formula to account for living cases of HIV/AIDS. These groups include the National AIDS Housing Coalition, AIDS United, the National Low Income Housing Coalition, and the AIDS Institute.

In closing, this bipartisan amendment will ensure that our existing Federal dollars, without additional spending or new revenue, are allocated most efficiently and most effectively and most fairly to help those who are living with HIV/AIDS.

HOPWA is often the difference between homelessness and access to life-saving treatment for low-income people with this awful disease. It is long past time to update the HOPWA formula to bring it in line with Ryan White and other AIDS support programs.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

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

□ 1715

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, for more than 20 years, I have been an adamant supporter of HOPWA. I share many of Mr. PRICE's concerns about the outdated formula for how HOPWA funding is al-

located. However, I cannot support this amendment.

The current formula's reliance on cumulative AIDS cases is problematic and does need to be updated to better reflect the new reality of the incidence of the disease.

Mr. PRICE's proposal, while well intended, will just shift scarce resources around, cutting off thousands of current beneficiaries to move the money to different parts of the country.

If the amendment changed the formula for new HOPWA funds, if there were new HOPWA funds, it would be more acceptable, but the amendment would shift existing funds on which people now rely.

New York City is a stark example. This formula change would eventually cut the city's annual HOPWA funding by nearly 25 percent. That cut would translate into real people.

A quarter of New Yorkers living with AIDS and currently receiving HOPWA support for their housing would be thrown out of their homes. We are talking about people living with AIDS with HOPWA support being ousted from their present homes.

I understand that people in many areas living with AIDS need housing, but Congress should be focused on growing HOPWA and expanding the number of people enrolled in the program, not on throwing more people living with AIDS out of their present homes.

If people living with AIDS in Mr. PRICE's district and in other districts need more HOPWA funding—and they do—Congress should provide it to them without depriving people living with AIDS in New York, Atlanta, and San Francisco of their existing housing.

Rather than shifting around limited pools of money and helping homeless people in one part of the country by creating more homelessness in another part of the country, we should be increasing funding for HOPWA to meet the actual needs of the people living with AIDS in the United States.

That is why every year I offer an amendment to the T-HUD appropriations bill increasing HOPWA funding and will continue to do so.

I recognize Mr. PRICE's hard work and long years of advocacy for HOPWA, but I cannot support this amendment as written today.

I hope that, going forward through regular legislative order, we can identify a fair, equitable formula update that does not harm current beneficiaries, that is to say, harm people living with AIDS because of their HOPWA funding in their homes today.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I inadvertently used the last minute of my time that I hoped to yield to Mr. QUIGLEY. I wonder if the gentleman might yield to Mr. QUIGLEY.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, do I have 1 minute remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Price-Aderholt amendment, which seeks to modernize the Housing for Persons with AIDS Program to better reflect the current case concentration and understanding of HIV/AIDS.

This will help ensure that funds are directed in a more equitable and effective manner. The AIDS population in Chicago certainly stands to benefit from such an update.

The HOPWA program is a national safety net for people battling HIV/AIDS, providing competitive formula grants since 1992. HOPWA prevents homelessness and permits thousands of households coping with the debilitating and impoverishing impact of HIV/AIDS to access and remain in care.

It is also a proven prevention mechanism by helping people achieve lower viral loads, thus becoming less infectious. This is the foundation for better individual and community health outcomes.

It is time for us to change the HOPWA distribution formula from one based on cumulative HIV/AIDS cases to a more updated formula based on current HIV/AIDS cases that reflect today's needs.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-411 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. PALAZZO of Mississippi.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) 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 236, noes 178, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

AYES—236

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

NOES—178

Adams Boyle, Brendan
 Aguilar F.
 Amash Brady (PA)
 Ashford Brown (FL)
 Bass Brownley (CA)
 Beatty Bustos
 Becerra Butterfield
 Bera Capps
 Bishop (GA) Capuano
 Blumenauer Cardenas
 Bonamici Carney

Connolly Jones
 Conyers Kaptur
 Cooper Keating
 Costa Kelly (IL)
 Courtney Kennedy
 Crowley Kildee
 Cuellar Kilmer
 Cummings Kind
 Davis (CA) Kirkpatrick
 Davis, Danny Kuster
 DeFazio Langevin
 DeGette Larsen (WA)
 Delaney Larson (CT)
 DeLauro Lawrence
 DelBene Lee
 DeSaulnier Levin
 Deutch Lieu, Ted
 Dingell Lipinski
 Doggett Loeb sack
 Doyle, Michael Lowenthal
 F. Lowey
 Duckworth Lujan Grisham
 Edwards (NM)
 Ellison Luján, Ben Ray
 Engel (NM)
 Eshoo Lynch
 Esty Maloney, Carolyn
 Farr Foster
 Foster Maloney, Sean
 Frankel (FL) Matsui
 Fudge McCollum
 Gabbard McGovern
 Gallego McNeerney
 Garamendi Meeks
 Graham Meng
 Grayson Moore
 Green, Al Murphy (FL)
 Grijalva Nadler
 Hahn Napolitano
 Hastings Neal
 Heck (WA) Nolan
 Higgins Norcross
 Himes O'Rourke
 Hinojosa Pallone
 Honda Pascrell
 Hoyer Hoyer
 Huffman Pelosi
 Israel Perlmutter
 Jackson Lee Peters
 Jeffries Peterson
 Johnson, E. B. Pingree

NOT VOTING—19

Beyer Lofgren
 Castro (TX) Marchant
 Fattah Massie
 Green, Gene McCaul
 Gutiérrez McDermott
 Huizenga (MI) Moulton
 Johnson (GA) Roby

□ 1740

Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Messrs. KEATING and SANFORD changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. RIGELL changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 50, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, during Rollcall vote No. 50 on the Pazazzo Amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 239, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

AYES—181

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

NOES—239

Abraham	Brat	Comstock
Aderholt	Bridenstine	Conaway
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Cook
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Costello (PA)
Amodei	Buchanan	Cramer
Babin	Buck	Crawford
Barletta	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Barr	Burgess	Culberson
Barton	Byrne	Curbelo (FL)
Benishek	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Denham
Bishop (MI)	Carter (TX)	Dent
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	DeSantis
Black	Chaffetz	DesJarlais
Blackburn	Clawson (FL)	Diaz-Balart
Blum	Coffman	Donovan
Bost	Cole	Duffy
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)

Ellmers (NC) Labrador
 Emmer (MN) LaHood
 Farenthold LaMalfa
 Fincher Lamborn
 Fitzpatrick Lance
 Fleischmann Latta
 Fleming LoBiondo
 Flores Long
 Forbes Loudermilk
 Fortenberry Love
 Foxx Lucas
 Franks (AZ) Luetkemeyer
 Frelinghuysen Lummis
 Garrett MacArthur
 Gibbs Marchant
 Gohmert Marino
 Goodlatte McCarthy
 Gosar McCaul
 Gowdy McClintock
 Granger McHenry
 Graves (GA) McKinley
 Graves (LA) McMorris
 Graves (MO) Rodgers
 Griffith McSally
 Grothman Meadows
 Guinta Meehan
 Guthrie Messer
 Hanna Mica
 Hardy Miller (FL)
 Harper Miller (MI)
 Harris Moonenaar
 Hartzler Mooney (WV)
 Heck (NV) Mullin
 Hensarling Murphy (PA)
 Herrera Beutler Neugebauer
 Hice, Jody B. Newhouse
 Hill Noem
 Holding Nugent
 Hudson Nunes
 Huelskamp Olson
 Hultgren Palazzo
 Hunter Palmer
 Hurd (TX) Paulsen
 Hurt (VA) Pearce
 Issa Perry
 Jenkins (KS) Pittenger
 Jenkins (WV) Pitts
 Johnson (OH) Poe (TX)
 Johnson, Sam Poliquin
 Jolly Pompeo
 Jones Posey
 Jordan Price, Tom
 Joyce Ratcliffe
 Katko Reed
 Kelly (MS) Reichert
 Kelly (PA) Renacci
 King (IA) Ribble
 King (NY) Rice (SC)
 Kinzinger (IL) Rigell
 Kline Roby
 Knight Roe (TN)

NOT VOTING—13

Castro (TX) Lowenthal
 DeSaulnier Massie
 Fattah McDermott
 Green, Gene Meeks
 Huizenga (MI) Moulton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1744

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, during roll-
 call Vote No. 51 on H.R. 3700, I mistakenly
 recorded my vote as “no” when I should have
 voted “Yes.”

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, dur-
 ing rollcall vote No. 51 on the AI Green
 amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had
 I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The Acting CHAIR. The question is
 on the amendment in the nature of a
 substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule,
 the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;
 and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

WOMACK) having assumed the chair,
 Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair of the
 Committee of the Whole House on the
 state of the Union, reported that that
 Committee, having had under consider-
 ation the bill (H.R. 3700) to provide
 housing opportunities in the United
 States through modernization of var-
 ious housing programs, and for other
 purposes, and, pursuant to House Reso-
 lution 594, he reported the bill back to
 the House with an amendment adopted
 in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
 the rule, the previous question is or-
 dered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any
 amendment to the amendment re-
 ported from the Committee of the
 Whole?

If not, the question is on the amend-
 ment in the nature of a substitute, as
 amended.

The amendment was 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
 question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursu-
 ant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the
 order of the House of January 25, 2016,
 this 5-minute vote on passage of H.R.
 3700 will be followed by 5-minute votes
 on passage of H.R. 3762, the objections
 of the President to the contrary not-
 withstanding, and passage of H.R. 3662.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—yeas 427, nays 0,
 not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—427

Abraham Brady (TX)
 Adams Brat
 Aderholt Bridenstine
 Aguilera Brooks (AL)
 Allen Brooks (IN)
 Amash Brown (FL)
 Amodei Brownley (CA)
 Ashford Buchanan
 Babin Buck
 Barletta Bucshon
 Barr Burgess
 Barton Bustos
 Bass Butterfield
 Beatty Byrne
 Becerra Calvert
 Benishek Capps
 Bera Capuano
 Beyer Cárdenas
 Bilirakis Carney
 Bishop (GA) Carson (IN)
 Bishop (MI) Carter (GA)
 Bishop (UT) Carter (TX)
 Black Cartwright
 Blackburn Castor (FL)
 Blum Chabot
 Blumenauer Chaffetz
 Bonamici Chu, Judy
 Bost Cicilline
 Boustany Clark (MA)
 Boyle, Brendan Clarke (NY)
 F. Clawson (FL)
 Brady (PA) Clay

Denham Johnson, Sam
 Dent Jolly
 DeSantis Jones
 DeSaulnier Jordan
 DesJarlais Joyce
 Deutch Kaptur
 Diaz-Balart Katko
 Dingell Keating
 Doggett Kelly (IL)
 Dold Kelly (MS)
 Donovan Kelly (PA)
 Doyle, Michael Kennedy
 F. Kildee
 Duckworth Kilmer
 Duffy Kind
 Duncan (SC) King (IA)
 Duncan (TN) King (NY)
 Edwards Kinzinger (IL)
 Ellison Kirkpatrick
 Ellmers (NC) Kline
 Emmer (MN) Knight
 Engel Kuster
 Eshoo Labrador
 Esty LaHood
 Farenthold LaMalfa
 Farr Lamborn
 Fincher Lance
 Fitzpatrick Langevin
 Fleischmann Larsen (WA)
 Fleming Larson (CT)
 Flores Latta
 Forbes Lawrence
 Fortenberry Lee
 Foster Levin
 Foxx Lewis
 Frankel (FL) Lieu, Ted
 Franks (AZ) Rogers (AL)
 Frelinghuysen LoBiondo
 Fudge Loeb sack
 Gabbard Lofgren
 Gallego Long
 Garamendi Loudermilk
 Garrett Love
 Gibbs Lowenthal
 Gibson Lowey
 Gohmert Lucas
 Goodlatte Luetkemeyer
 Gosar Lujan Grisham
 Gowdy (NM)
 Graham Luján, Ben Ray
 Granger (NM)
 Graves (GA) Lummis
 Graves (LA) Lynch
 Graves (MO) MacArthur
 Grayson Maloney,
 Green, Al Carolyn
 Green, Gene Maloney, Sean
 Griffith Marchant
 Grijalva Marino
 Grothman Matsui
 Guinta McCarthy
 Guthrie McCaul
 Gutiérrez McClintock
 Hahn McCollum
 Hanna McGovern
 Hardy McHenry
 Harper McKinley
 Harris McMorris
 Hartzler Rodgers
 Hastings McNERNEY
 Heck (NV) McSally
 Heck (WA) Meadows
 Hensarling Meehan
 Herrera Beutler Meeks
 Hice, Jody B. Meng
 Higgins Messer
 Hill Mica
 Himes Miller (FL)
 Hinojosa Miller (MI)
 Holding Moonenaar
 Honda Mooney (WV)
 Hoyer Moore
 Hudson Moulton
 Huelskamp Mullin
 Huffman Mulvaney
 Huizenga (MI) Murphy (FL)
 Hultgren Hunter
 Hurd (TX) Hurler
 Hurt (VA) Napolitano
 Israel Neugebauer
 Issa Newhouse
 Jackson Lee Noem
 Jeffries Nolan
 Jenkins (KS) Norcross
 Jenkins (WV) Nugent
 Delaney Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH) O'Rourke
 Johnson, E. B. Olson

Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (NC)
 Price, Tom
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Larson (CT)
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Russell
 Ryan (OH)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Speier
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takai
 Takano
 Neal
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 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
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield

Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knights
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
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
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
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
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter

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—6

Castro (TX)
Fattah

Massie
Smith (WA)
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1752

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VE TO MESSAGE ON H.R. 3762, RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question whether the House, on reconsideration, will pass the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

In accord with the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 186, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—241

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
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
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

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
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

NAYS—186

Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
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
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee

Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.

NOT VOTING—6

Castro (TX)
Fattah

Massie
Smith (WA)
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1758

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The veto message and the bill are referred to the Committee on the Budget.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

IRAN TERROR FINANCE TRANSPARENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, January 25, 2016, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 3662) to enhance congressional oversight over the administration of sanctions against certain Iranian terrorism financiers, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 181, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—246

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

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
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)

Hensarling McSally
 Herrera Beutler Meadows
 Hice, Jody B. Meehan
 Hill Messer
 Holding Mica
 Hudson Miller (FL)
 Huelskamp Miller (MI)
 Huizenga (MI) Moolenaar
 Hultgren Mooney (WV)
 Hunter Mullin
 Hurd (TX) Mulvaney
 Hurt (VA) Murphy (PA)
 Issa Neugebauer
 Jenkins (KS) Newhouse
 Jenkins (WV) Noem
 Johnson (OH) Nugent
 Johnson, Sam Nunes
 Jolly Olson
 Jones Palazzo
 Jordan Palmer
 Joyce Paulsen
 Katko Pearce
 Kelly (MS) Perry
 Kelly (PA) Peterson
 King (IA) Pittenger
 King (NY) Pitts
 Kinzinger (IL) Poe (TX)
 Kline Poliquin
 Knight Pompeo
 Labrador Posey
 LaHood Price, Tom
 LaMalfa Ratchiffe
 Lamborn Reed
 Lance Reichert
 Latta Renacci
 LoBiondo Ribble
 Long Rice (SC)
 Loudermilk Rigell
 Love Roby
 Lucas Roe (TN)
 Luetkemeyer Rogers (AL)
 Lummis Rogers (KY)
 MacArthur Rohrabacher
 Marchant Rokita
 Marino Rooney (FL)
 McCarthy Ros-Lehtinen
 McCaul Roskam
 McClintock Ross
 McHenry Rothfus
 McKinley Rouzer
 McMorris Royce
 Rodgers Russell

NAYS—181

Adams Delaney
 Aguilar DeLauro
 Ashford DelBene
 Bass DeSaulnier
 Beatty Deutch
 Becerra Dingell
 Bera Doggett
 Beyer Doyle, Michael
 Bishop (GA) F.
 Blumenauer Duckworth
 Bonamici Edwards
 Boyle, Brendan Ellison
 F. Engel
 Brady (PA) Eshoo
 Brown (FL) Esty
 Brownley (CA) Farr
 Bustos Foster
 Butterfield Frankel (FL)
 Capps Fudge
 Capuano Gabbard
 Cárdenas Gallego
 Carney Garamendi
 Carson (IN) Grayson
 Cartwright Green, Al
 Castor (FL) Green, Gene
 Chu, Judy Grijalva
 Cicilline Gutiérrez
 Clark (MA) Hahn
 Clarke (NY) Hastings
 Clay Heck (WA)
 Cleaver Higgins
 Clyburn Himes
 Cohen Hinojosa
 Connolly Honda
 Conyers Hoyer
 Cooper Huffman
 Costa Israel
 Courtney Jackson Lee
 Crowley Jeffries
 Cuellar Johnson (GA)
 Cummings Johnson, E. B.
 Davis (CA) Kaptur
 Davis, Danny Keating
 DeFazio Kelly (IL)
 DeGette Kennedy

Perlmutter Sarbanes
 Peters Schakowsky
 Pingree Schiff
 Pocan Schrader
 Polis Scott (VA)
 Price (NC) Serrano
 Quigley Sewell (AL)
 Rangel Sherman
 Rice (NY) Sinema
 Richmond Sires
 Roybal-Allard Slaughter
 Ruiz Speier
 Ruppertsberger Swalwell (CA)
 Rush Takai
 Ryan (OH) Takano
 Sánchez, Linda Thompson (CA)
 T. Thompson (MS)
 Sanchez, Loretta Titus

NOT VOTING—6
 Castro (TX) Massie
 Fattah McDermott

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

□ 1804

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on Roll Call No. 50 on the Palazzo Amendment to H.R. 3700, Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present I would have voted NAY.

Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on Roll Call No. 51 on the Al Green of Texas Amendment to H.R. 3700, Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present I would have voted AYE.

Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on Roll Call No. 52 on HR. 3700, Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2015. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present I would have voted AYE.

Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on Roll Call No. 53 on H.R. 3762, the Objections of the President Notwithstanding (Veto Override). I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present I would have voted NAY.

Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on Roll Call No. 54 on H.R. 3662—Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act. I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my son in San Antonio, Texas. Had I been present I would have voted NAY.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 51 (On the Al Green of Texas Amendment to H.R. 3700), had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

On rollcall vote 52 (On final passage of H.R. 3700), had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

On rollcall vote 53 (On passage of H.R. 3762), the Objections of the President Notwithstanding (Veto Override), had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

On rollcall vote 54 (On passage of H.R. 3662), had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1675, ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 766, FINANCIAL INSTITUTION CUSTOMER PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. STIVERS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-414) on the resolution (H. Res. 595) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1675) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise its rules so as to increase the threshold amount for requiring issuers to provide certain disclosures relating to compensatory benefit plans, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 766) to provide requirements for the appropriate Federal banking agencies when requesting or ordering a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, to provide for additional requirements related to subpoenas issued under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET AND FINANCIAL PLAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-96)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to my constitutional authority and as contemplated by section 446 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act as amended in 1989, I am transmitting the District of Columbia's fiscal year (FY) 2016 Budget and Financial Plan. This transmittal does not represent an endorsement of the contents of the D.C. government's requests.

The proposed FY 2016 Budget and Financial Plan reflects the major programmatic objectives of the Mayor and the Council of the District of Columbia. For FY 2016, the District estimates total revenues and expenditures of \$13.0 billion.

BARACK OBAMA.
 THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2, 2016.

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN HEART MONTH

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize February as American Heart Month.

According to the American Heart Association, one out of every four deaths in our great country is cardiac-related, and you may be surprised to hear that heart disease claims more female victims than any other disease.

But the real tragedy, Madam Speaker, is that so many of these deaths are preventable. America's amazing medical researchers, doctors, and nurses have been doing their part to stop heart disease and save lives.

It is time for the rest of us to step up and do our part. Remember that even small improvements in diet and exercise can have big impacts on your heart health and overall well-being.

So as you think of your Valentine later this month, don't forget to love your heart, too.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, it has been over 3 years since the Carl D. Perkins Act expired, the primary source of funding for workforce development programs across the country.

We now have the opportunity to remake Perkins in a way that works for the 21st century economy. Perkins reauthorization must deliver student-centered education that provides 21st century skills for successful careers.

Across the country students continue to seek out career pathways, but funding has been reduced from its peak level in 2010 of \$1.3 billion. If we fail to match this demand for CTE, we run the risk of our economy falling behind as companies pursue skilled workers in other parts of the world.

Madam Speaker, our country and our economy need a Perkins reauthorization that focuses on skills that matter and work that pays, skills that matter and work that pays. Let's get this done.

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, this afternoon Jacqueline Taylor of the Texas Gulf Coast Small Business Development Center Network stopped by to share a story about the American Dream.

The dreamer's name is Derrick Harris. His company is called Soaring With Eagles. Derrick had a hard time making his company grow. He got advice about marketing and sales from Todd Scott of the local SBDC. Shortly after, Derrick was awarded contracts with

the Pearland and Pasadena Independent School Districts. He now employs over 30 people.

He said: I tell every business owner I meet to contact their local SBDC. Their assistance has made a huge difference in my business.

That is the American Dream, and that is the local SBDC.

WORLD WAR I DOUGHBOY TEXAN CORPORAL SAMUEL SAMPLER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the brutal trench hand-to-hand combat of World War I claimed more American lives than Vietnam and Korea combined. The war to end all wars between European monarchies was at a standstill until the United States entered the war.

Texas boys like Corporal Samuel Sampler stood up and fought over there across the sea to successfully break the deadlocked war.

On October 18, 1918, in France, this young Army corporal became the third Texan in World War I to be awarded the Medal of Honor.

When his company suffered severe, devastating casualties during an advance, Sampler took action. Grenades in hand, he left the line and rushed in through enemy machinegun fire until he engaged the enemy directly.

His grenades hit the target, killing two and silencing all the machineguns. Twenty-eight other Germans surrendered, allowing the American doughboys to resume their advance.

The 100-year anniversary of the great war is upon us. We remember Texans like Sampler and all Americans who proudly served our country in lands far away 100 years ago and won the ultimate victory in World War I.

And that is just the way it is.

HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN TOM BLILEY

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

Mr. BRAT. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor my friend, former Congressman Tom Bliley, who proudly represented Virginia's Seventh District for 20 consecutive years, on the occasion of his 84th birthday.

He began his political career in 1968, when he was elected to the City Council of Richmond, Virginia, moving on to serve as mayor from 1970 to 1977.

He was elected to his first congressional term in 1980, and under a Democratic President he helped pass legislation that modernized the regulation of pharmaceuticals, telecommunications, and the financial markets.

I hope he had a wonderful birthday, and I wish him many more.

PROTECT TRAFFICKING VICTIMS AT THE SUPER BOWL

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, the trafficking of young girls and boys continues to be a crime that plagues many of our communities.

While I am proud to have led efforts last year to help pass important legislation to combat this problem, law enforcement on the ground needs to remain vigilant to stop this horrific crime.

With the Super Bowl taking place on Sunday in California, concerns are once again being raised that traffickers will bring children in from out of town for exploitation.

It is also an opportunity for law enforcement to reach out to these victims to try to bring them out of the shadows and bring traffickers to justice.

That is why it is encouraging to see the FBI take a different victim-centered approach this year that focuses on first gaining the trust of young victims, sometimes as young as 12, 13, and 14 years old. This helps victims get the services they need and brings the traffickers to justice with their arrest.

Madam Speaker, a victim-centered approach is the right way to attack this problem. I commend the FBI on their efforts during the Super Bowl this week.

CONTINUING THE CRUSADE AGAINST BOKO HARAM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, almost 2 years ago I led a bipartisan delegation, the first congressional delegation, to Nigeria to assess and address the crisis of Boko Haram.

At that time, it was in the immediate aftermath of the taking of the Chibok girls in a previous administration. Boko Haram was doing the kind of raiding and rabble-raising that may have been part of burning villages.

That time has now passed. And in the last 48 hours, Boko Haram poured gasoline on children and burned them. Boko Haram has now become a marauding and crusading, vile, evil, and vicious group. It takes in the space and areas of Nigeria, Cameroon, Chad, and Niger.

It is important for us, as Members of Congress working with the administration, to call upon these nations to again collaborate and work together.

They have pledged their support to ISIL. I am very glad that, in the course of the Homeland Security Committee, Judiciary Committee, Intelligence Committee, Armed Forces Committee, Boko Haram is not going to get away.

There will not be boots on the ground, but we must stomp out Boko

Haram because they are killing children all in Africa and they are dastardly committers of violence against civil society.

□ 1815

PALESTINIAN TERRORISTS
REMAIN UNPROSECUTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, news has come out, February 2, Groundhog Day, in this article from Adam Kredo entitled, "The Obama Administration Has Not Prosecuted a Single Palestinian Terrorist Who Killed Americans."

"The Obama administration has not prosecuted a single Palestinian terrorist responsible for killing Americans abroad, despite a congressional mandate ordering the Justice Department to take action against these individuals" . . . "Palestinian terrorists have murdered at least 64 Americans, including two unborn children, since 1993. Yet the U.S. Government has failed to take legal action against those who committed the crimes, lawmakers disclosed during a Tuesday hearing on the Justice Department's failure to live up to its mandate to bring these terrorists to justice.

"Many of the terrorists continue to roam free across the Middle East, with one hosting a Hamas-affiliated television show in Jordan.

"With criticism mounting from Congress and U.S. victims of terrorism, Justice Department officials say they are working to initiate cases, but warn that this could take 'many years' to play out.

"The Justice Department has repeatedly declined to comment when faced with questions from Congress about the lack of prosecutions, according to Representative RON DESANTIS of Florida, chair of the House Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on National Security.

"The Justice Department 'has not been able to cite one example for this committee of even a single terrorist who has been prosecuted in the U.S. for any of the 64 attacks against Americans in Israel,' DeSantis said. 'Indeed, many of these terrorists roam free as the result of prisoner exchanges or evasion.

"This is not what Congress intended' when it created the DOJ's Office of Justice for Victims of Overseas Terrorism in 2005,' DeSantis added. 'This is not what the American people want, and this does not provide justice to the victims' families that has been so tragically elusive.'

"The Justice Department has sought to evade questions about its failure to prosecute known terrorists responsible for the murder of U.S. citizens.

"This includes its failure to level charges against Ahlam Tamimi, the Palestinian woman responsible for blowing up a Jerusalem pizza shop in 2001. The attacks killed 15, including a pregnant American woman. Tamimi currently resides in Jordan and hosts a television show on the Hamas-owned Al Quds station.

"When the Oversight and Government Reform Committee questioned the Department of Justice about this case, the Department declined to comment,' DeSantis said. 'If in fact bringing to justice the perpetrators of terrorism against Americans in Israel is a high priority for the DOJ, then surely people of this nature should be prosecuted for their crimes.'" . . . "American victims of terrorist attacks abroad who testified at the hearing offered sharp criticism of the Justice Department for failing to take on terrorists in the U.S. courts.

"Sari Singer, who was injured in a 2003 Palestinian terror attack on a bus in Jerusalem, said that she has lost faith in the government."

Singer said, "I grew up believing that my country would be there for me and protect me no matter where I was in the world. These last years have left me feeling let down."

I would insert parenthetically, Madam Speaker, that she shares that same feeling with the victims in our State Department of the attacks at Benghazi, and the many hours people waited thinking surely our government will come to our aid.

So it sounds like victims of terrorists abroad share this, whether it is from Benghazi or whether it is from other terrorist attacks, that the administration is not going to be there for you.

The article goes on: "Peter Schwartz, whose nephew Ezra was shot in the head by a Palestinian terrorist in November 2015, said that the Obama administration has not been forthcoming about any potential investigations into the incident" . . . "The Obama administration was criticized in August when it sought to limit the restitution American victims of terrorism could receive. The administration argued in a legal briefing issued to the court that a large cash award to these victims could complicate the administration's efforts to foster peace between Israel and the Palestinians."

Clearly, the administration's interests, as Sari Singer observed, is not with American victims of foreign terrorism. It is with the foreign terrorists that maybe if we side up to them enough, maybe if we will be nice to them and not punish them, then maybe they won't keep killing American citizens. That is false thinking.

Madam Speaker, I can't help but think as we find out this week that this administration has released \$100 billion to the largest supporter of terrorism in the world—Iran—and Iran has made clear that once they got this money from the Obama administration that they were going to increase their

help to terrorists like Hamas and Hezbollah. In other words, they told us in advance that when America cedes to Iran \$100 billion extra, they are going to be able to help more terrorists commit more of their acts of terrorism.

Now, back when I was a judge or even back years and years ago as a prosecutor, we always approached cases that if you assisted somebody, say you gave them money, and they told you before you gave them the money that they are going to use some of this money to commit a criminal act, then we always felt like you could prosecute those people. Jurors could bear that out because if you knowingly aid, assist—even encourage—you don't even have to give them money. If you just encourage them to commit a violent act or encourage them to go about what they plan to do, and they already said, "We plan to commit more terrorism with what you give us," then you were an accomplice. Under the laws federally, and as well as in the laws I am aware of in most States, certainly in Texas, you would be charged as a principal. So if you gave money to someone knowing that they said, "We are going to use money and help kill people and help terrorism," and then they committed the terrorism, you could be convicted of the same terrorism of those you gave the money to help.

It is interesting that those principles seem to apply to all other Americans, but this administration feels surely they won't apply to this administration. Sure, Iran has said they are going to support more terrorism once they get all this extra money from the Obama administration. But apparently the Obama administration, according to these pleadings they filed, if you just be nice to the terrorists, let them keep their own money, gee, they will probably quit killing Americans. It doesn't work that way.

Let's take a look at who this administration, this Commander in Chief's administration, is willing to punish. I have a letter here that was sent by my friend, our fellow colleague, DUNCAN HUNTER, to the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee when he discusses Sergeant First Class Charles Martland and points out he is considered a first-rate warrior.

"While in Afghanistan in 2011, at a remote outpost, Martland confronted an Afghan Local Police commander for kidnapping a young boy and raping him repeatedly over several days. The issue was brought to the attention of Martland and his fellow soldiers after the boy's mother asked for help, after she also was attacked by the ALP—or Afghan Local Police—commander.

□ 1830

"When Martland and Captain Danny Quinn confronted the rapist, he admitted to the charge and laughed in their faces—at which point Martland and Quinn took matters into their own hands. This occurred after two separate

but similar human rights violations, including another rape, near the outpost, resulting in no punitive action whatsoever.

“The Afghan Local Police commander was dragged to the perimeter gate, where he was thrown out and told never to come back. It is important to note that the Afghan Local Police commander left on his own, only to deliberately exaggerate his injuries. Multiple sources have confirmed this fact, including a linguist and authorities who were never interviewed by Army investigators after the incident.

“For this action, Martland was removed from the outpost and faced reprimand. He later was allowed to reenlist, only to face a Qualitative Management Program review board in February 2015.”

That would be a year ago.

“The Army argued that the black mark on his record, which states he assaulted ‘a corrupt Afghan commander’ is cause to expel him from duty, despite the fact that he has the full support of his command and immediate leadership. In fact, the Department of Defense Inspector General reported to me that”—this is a letter from DUNCAN HUNTER—“‘personnel are very supportive of the Sergeant and his efforts to remain in the U.S. Army. . . .’ And there continue to be efforts within his command to not ‘inadvertently hamper his efforts.’ This was in response to an alleged gag order put on Martland and his fellow soldiers”—apparently, about trying to stop the rapes that were going on in Afghanistan.

“Importantly, Martland was permitted to resubmit an appeal to the Qualitative Management Program decision after his first appeal was denied outright. And recently, a decision within Army Human Resources Command recommended that the Army uphold the judgment that Martland be removed from service, although a final decision has yet to be made about his future.”

Madam Speaker, we have an American hero in Sergeant First Class Charles Martland. Dragging a child rapist out of the confined area that this child rapist was using to be a serial rapist, doing harm to children in Afghanistan, is an act of heroism, not an act to be condemned. In fact, courts I am aware of, certainly juries in Texas, would say that was acting in defense of a third person. This man is guilty of nothing except a heroic act to save children and women from being raped by a corrupt police commander.

But under this administration, where we give money to supporters of terrorism, the largest supporters of terrorism in the world, and where we beg courts not to give large reimbursements to victims of terrorism, our own American victims of foreign terrorism because that might not help, it might make the foreign terrorists mad if they have a judgment against them, then it seems like this is perfectly consistent with the policies of this administra-

tion. We give money to terrorists who say they are going to use it to support terrorism; we don’t give money to victims of terrorism.

In fact, this administration should have done what the House passed and implored the administration to do, and that is to make sure that not a dime was allowed to be released to Iran until the verdicts outstanding against Iran by American victims of Iranian terrorism were paid first. But in its haste to get all this money to those who say they are going to use a bunch of it to support terrorism, the American victims were left in the lurch. It is more than irresponsible. It is unconscionable what has been going on.

At some point, people in this administration have got to figure out what most of the American people have figured out, and that is you are not going to stop terrorism by trying to be sweet and kind to the terrorists. Some of us learned it on the playground growing up. I guess now that the Federal Government has control of education to such an extent that schools are forced to teach to the test—I have even had elementary schools tell me: We have had to do away with recess in elementary school because we just don’t have time. We have got to teach them to the test so that we can get that Federal money and we can stay open.

But if you allow recess and kids are on the playground and you have kids that were smaller like I was, you learn you are not going to stop bullying by giving your money to a bully. If you give a bully money, not only do they not respect you, they have more contempt and it encourages their bullying. You can’t do that. You have to stand up to bullying. You find out when you do that, sometimes you will have a teacher, like my fifth grade teacher, that took up for the bullies, but you will ultimately find more teachers will not tolerate that kind of conduct.

This administration never learned that. Maybe there was no chance to learn that in the young schools in Indonesia. Maybe that is why we have a Commander in Chief that thinks we should reward the terrorists, the supporters of terrorism, and punish the victims of terrorism by not letting them have proper financial restitution.

But it is tragic what is going on. It is tragic.

There are a number of stories about Sergeant Martland, including from my friend Jay Sekulow. He said:

“Yet, for his actions, he was immediately pulled from the battlefield and this decorated war hero is now facing expulsion from the military.”

This administration’s priorities are so completely out of step with truth, justice, and the American way—what used to be the American way. Perhaps the American way has been fundamentally transformed in the last 7 years, so now the American way has become that we help terrorists, give them money, and we punish those who are victims.

Well, of course, we know that our Secretary of State thanked Iran for their activities. I haven’t heard whether or not Secretary of State Kerry has thanked Iran for this latest story. This from foxnews.com, “Iran’s Supreme Leader Awards Medals to Troops Who ‘Captured’ U.S. Sailors.” The story says:

“Iran’s supreme leader has awarded medals to five members of the Iranian Navy whom he said ‘captured intruding’ U.S. Navy sailors during a tense incident in January.

“Ayatollah Ali Khamenei awarded the Order of Fat’h medal to Admiral Ali Fadavi, the head of the navy of the Revolutionary Guards, and four commanders who seized the two U.S. Navy vessels, according to Reuters. Iran’s state media reported the news on Sunday.

“Order of Fat’h given by Chief Commander of Armed Forces to IRGC Navy commanders who captured intruding U.S. marines”. . . “In a tweet from his account Sunday, Khamenei misidentified those who were ‘captured’ as being members of the Marines.

“On January 12, Iran captured the ten sailors whose boats ‘misnavigated’ into Iranian waters, according to Defense Secretary Ash Carter. Though the sailors were released the following day, Iran released video of the sailors being captured, detained and apologizing for the incursion.

“Though Iran initially accused the sailors of spying, Fadavi later said an investigation had established the sailors were led astray by ‘a broken navigation system’ and the trespassing was ‘not hostile or for spying purposes’.

“The sailors were attempting to navigate from Kuwait to Bahrain when they crossed into Iranian waters.”

Well, Madam Speaker, we have got satellites that could show exactly what happened. I would think that if this administration wanted to defend our sailors, they would show the satellite footage of where they were and we would be able to see for sure whether or not they did cross into Iranian waters.

But consistent with these reports and stories we have already looked at this evening, it seems if they are going to act consistent with this administration’s prior actions, this administration wouldn’t want to embarrass the Iranian military, the supporters of terrorism, and so we wouldn’t want to show that they were liars. So we won’t show by satellite footage exactly where our sailors were, and we won’t show exactly where our other naval vessels were. These were reported to be small vessels. Well, you don’t have small Navy vessels unless they are near much larger Navy vessels. Normally, if they are larger Navy vessels, there are other small vessels that can go rather quickly.

If you have the Navy vessels there, there is a good chance there is a carrier nearby, an airstrip, where jets could be there in no time whatsoever. It used to

be under other Commanders in Chief, not this one, but other Commanders in Chief, that if we had sailors who were in danger of being captured by a country, particularly the largest supporter of terrorism in the world, our jets would be put in the air. They would get there immediately. They would keep flying overhead and protecting those sailors until the Navy itself could get there to rescue them.

For some reason, this administration thought it was a better idea not to put our aircraft in the air—kind of reminiscent of Benghazi. We are not going to send aircraft that could have been there in minutes. But, heck, I was asking a former commander at Ramstein Air Base clear up in Germany. He didn't realize where I was going.

I asked: How long would it take, say, to get to North Africa from Ramstein?

He said: About 3, 3½ hours at the most.

I said: So you could have been at Benghazi in 3½ hours?

He said: Oh, well, we had ordnance on the planes that particular evening, and it would have taken awhile to reconfigure those.

Well, if you can get clear from Ramstein Air Base to Benghazi in 3, 3½ hours, tops—we have got planes a whole lot closer to where these Navy vessels were—they should have been able to be there in minutes. I am sure some commander or some admiral who is afraid of the Commander in Chief would never admit that, not these days.

But the fact is this once proud United States military who protected its own for the last 70 years and now it calls upon the largest supporter of terrorism to come get our sailors and to have them kneel on their knees, hands behind their heads, as if they are POWs, embarrass them to the maximum, for that, Secretary of State Kerry thanked Iran.

Well, Madam Speaker, I see my friend from Nebraska is here. I yield to my friend.

□ 1845

NEBRASKA VALUES

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I want to point out something about Mr. GOHMERT. He was speaking about our military a moment ago. He, himself, is a veteran. He served in the United States Army during the Vietnam war, and I appreciate his service.

Madam Speaker, I also want to share something with the body today. I write a weekly report, generally, called the Fort Report. This week, I sent one that I hoped would have a broader meaning to the House of Representatives and, perhaps, to anyone else who might encounter this. It is entitled, "Nebraska Values." It is stories about America's political and economic and cultural crises. As we all know, they are dominating the headlines across our Nation. There is widespread, bipartisan dis-

satisfaction with the status quo, and it is propelling a new conversation against the dysfunction and gridlock that have long thwarted effective government here in Washington, D.C.

As families across our Nation face pressing challenges, it is sad, but elected officials often prioritize divisive rhetoric instead of empathy and understanding. Now our disagreements have widened into chasms. It is exhausting—exhausting to America's spirit—and it is distracting us from the possibilities that are before us. In the midst of this contentious Presidential primary season, Madam Speaker, maybe it is time to just pause, change the subject, and celebrate some of the best examples that our country has to offer.

In a small town gym in Beemer, Nebraska, at Beemer Elementary School, the community recently gathered to celebrate the life of Joseph Lemm. While deep sadness marked the occasion, the community's desire to gather and tell stories and honor this remarkable man pointed to a much deeper understanding of the values that bind us.

Joe chose to put on three different uniforms in his life—first, by enlisting in the United States Air Force after high school. Then he went on to have a career with the New York City Police Department and, finally, with the New York Air National Guard. Joe served three tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan. This past December, Joseph Lemm gave his all for his country, along with five other Americans who were killed in Afghanistan. Although Joe left Nebraska a very long time ago, I am quite certain that he carried his early formation with him throughout his life of service, and I suspect my State, Nebraska, was never far from Joe's heart.

Before the service that memorialized him, I saw Joe's mother, Shirley. Shirley embraced me as though we were family members, and, perhaps, we were. She embraced our Governor, Governor Ricketts, and United States Senator SASSE in the same way. Everyone in the gym in the little town of Beemer knew, in the midst of this deep grief and loss, that Joseph Lemm's life had great value, had great purpose.

Madam Speaker, several weeks ago, Washington, D.C., was buried in an avalanche of snow, the remnants of which are still around. I was intending to come back to Washington but had to cancel that trip, and I had more time than I had anticipated in my hometown of Lincoln. As I was in my office, I noticed some young people who were walking around the complex in their signature blue Future Farmers of America jackets, the FFA jackets. I love those jackets, Madam Speaker. They are emblazoned with the name of their hometown below the FFA symbol. These young people had gathered along with others from the Distributive Education Clubs of America; the Future Business Leaders of America; the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America; Educators Rising;

and the Future Health Professionals Skills USA to talk about a very important issue: food security.

In Nebraska, we are very fortunate to have a very, very low unemployment rate. We have the convergence of some extraordinary natural resources, that of our farming and ranch community; we have manufacturing; we have a financial sector; we have had a long tradition of solid community leadership, which has left our economic situation much better than most across the country. Even so, even in our State, we face problems with structural poverty.

These young students came together because they recognized the need to engage in the issue of children who face hunger—of children who return from school hungry, of children who have to worry about not having enough to eat when they get up in the morning. These young people were there, gathered to lead the way—to find realtime solutions in their own small communities, to help the impoverished, vulnerable members who are all around them.

Madam Speaker, that same snowstorm that kept me out of Washington, though, did not deter hundreds of other Nebraska students who left the comforts of their homes and drove on buses through the night to exercise their fundamental American rights: the freedom to assemble and the freedom of speech.

In the face of that devastating blizzard a couple of weeks ago, these principled boys and girls participated in the annual March for Life. They are young people in our country who refuse to accept the current settlement in our wounded culture. They refuse to stare at pain and woundedness and then walk away. They refuse to accept what has been fostered upon us for the last four decades of brokenness, of fracturing in family life, and the deep wounds that abortion has caused in so many women. They are demanding that we do better as a country. They are saying to all of us that women deserve better, that we deserve better. They traveled to Washington to explicitly express this pro-life perspective and to proclaim that we should care for unborn children, for their mothers, and for our society as a whole.

This is the new generation—the Millennial Generation—that, in many ways, is standing upon the ash heap of broken tradition, and they are longing for more. They are saying there is a better way no matter how deep and difficult the problem is. Although our Nation, particularly in our politics, still experiences deep and sad divisions over the question of abortion, I do think we should all commend these students for responsibly exercising their rights to peaceably demonstrate, for standing up for what they believe. That is a source of renewal and strength in America. Sometimes it discomferts us. Sometimes it challenges those of us in power when truth has spoken to us. Sometimes it bumps up against systems that seem stacked against the ordinary person.

These young people are not willing to accept the current economic, political, and cultural settlement in our country. They are saying let's strive for more. Let's imagine what we could be. Let's put aside the pain. Let's heal the past and look forward when all life is celebrated as a beautiful gift. I respect what they did, and I think, again, all of us here can look to these young people who have responsibly demonstrated in front of us as good future stewards of a rebuilt America.

So, Madam Speaker, that is really what I wanted to say to you today. I am proud of these Nebraskans who have continued to demonstrate a better pathway for America in public servants and in military heroes, such as Joseph Lemm, who gave his life for his country, in the young people back home who are deciding to tackle systemic childhood poverty and hunger, and in the students who trekked all this way in hazardous conditions to stand in defense of vulnerable persons.

Perhaps, in the example of these young people, we can find an answer to what is right about America at a time when so much seems to be going wrong. We can carry forward the best of our traditions, those put forward by small communities and families that are really the renewing social force that will help turn our country around.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I am very grateful to my friend from Nebraska. Mr. FORTENBERRY and I came in together, and I am so glad we did. We have been friends ever since. What a noteworthy tribute he had to pay. I am grateful for that tribute.

Madam Speaker, we have had so many Americans who have given, as Lincoln said, the last full measure of devotion for freedom, for liberty, for people who were not even Americans, because that is who Americans have been.

I know our current President is fond of saying that is who we are, and then he provides access to \$100 billion for Iran—the largest supporter of terrorism. It says it is going to keep supporting terrorism, just with a lot more money now that the President has made all of this available. The President says that is not who we are, and then he shows us that we open our arms to terrorists from all over the world.

So many Americans gave their lives and gave their limbs for liberty in Iraq, for liberty in Afghanistan. In fact, in Afghanistan, if I recall my figures correctly, in the 7¼ years under Commander in Chief Bush, from October of 2001 until January of 2009, there were just over 500 precious American lives given for the cost of freedom in Afghanistan. Supposedly, we were told by this President, the war was pretty much over. He sent more troops for a while to Afghanistan; but even after, supposedly, the war has been over and troops have been left over there, we keep getting Americans killed.

It is because of the rules of engagement that so needlessly tie their

hands. It is because this administration would rather punish Green Beret Sergeant First Class Martland for stopping a serial child rapist. It would rather punish him—throw him out, end his military career—because this administration, at least here in this country, does not want to offend the serial child rapist in Afghanistan.

No wonder people around the world have lost so much respect for the United States in the last 7 years. They know that stuff is going on. They knew that Sergeant Martland stood up for the child and for the woman. They knew what he did. They spread the word. Then the word spreads when Sergeant Martland makes international news because this administration wants to punish him for dragging him out of the compound—not killing, not beheading, not disemboweling—in an act of defense of many third persons. They find out this administration punished the military hero, the Green Beret who protected the victims.

It is incredible. I mean, any administration that would do that would probably turn around and, if it heard about some entity that was allowing unborn babies to be killed and was selling body parts, might be tempted to punish the people who exposed it instead of punishing those who did such a heinous act.

□ 1900

Those who have read Scripture know there will come a time when right is wrong, wrong is right, the good are punished, and the evil are rewarded. But we also know the day will come when the ultimate judge of the world will set things straight.

So this is a story from Martha Mendoza, Maya Alleruzzo, and Bram Janssen from the Associated Press: "Oldest Christian monastery in Iraq is razed." This is heartbreaking.

This is a monastery Americans were devoted to restoring. It is a monastery where people came to know Jesus of Nazareth for the last 1400 years. It is a place where God did miracles in people's lives. It is a place where our military were very, very careful to protect because they knew the Christian significance.

As this administration miscalculated—apparently, our intelligence agencies did not miscalculate. Apparently, our intelligence agencies made very clear to this administration that ISIS is not a JV team, that these are dangerous people and they have to be stopped and you have to ramp it up.

So it wasn't our intelligence. We didn't have bad intelligence. The reports are out there. The administration, thinking it knew better than those on the ground in the area, did not take ISIS seriously.

Now, this Christian monastery over 1400 years old has been razed. The story from Iraq:

"The oldest Christian monastery in Iraq has been reduced to a field of rubble, yet another victim of the Islamic

State group's relentless destruction of ancient cultural sites.

"For 1,400 years the compound survived assaults by nature and man, standing as a place of worship recently for U.S. troops. In earlier centuries, generations of monks tucked candles in the niches and prayed in the cool chapel. The Greek letters chi and rho, representing the first two letters of Christ's name, were carved near the entrance.

"Now satellite photos obtained exclusively by The Associated Press confirm the worst fears of church authorities and preservationists—St. Elijah's Monastery of Mosul has been completely wiped out.

"In his office in exile in Irbil, Iraq, the Rev. Paul Thabit Habib, 39, stared quietly at before- and after-images of the monastery that once perched on a hillside above his hometown of Mosul. Shaken, he flipped back to his own photos for comparison.

"'I can't describe my sadness,' he said in Arabic. 'Our Christian history in Mosul is being barbarically leveled. We see it as an attempt to expel us from Iraq, eliminating and finishing our existence in this land.'

"The Islamic State group, which broke from al-Qaeda and now controls large parts of Iraq and Syria, has killed thousands of civilians and forced out hundreds of thousands of Christians, threatening a religion that has endured in the region for 2,000 years. Along the way, its fighters have destroyed buildings and ruined historical and culturally significant structures they consider contrary to their interpretation of Islam."

Madam Speaker, I find it interesting that these writers know what leaders in this administration still, after all these years, have not figured out. It is Martha Mendoza, Maya Alleruzzo, and Bram Janssen.

They point out in this article that these people believe that these sites are contrary to their interpretation of Islam. Yet, this administration says, no, it has nothing to do with Islam.

The article continues:

"Those who knew the monastery wondered about its fate after the extremists swept through in June 2014 and largely cut communications to the area.

"Now, St. Elijah's has joined a growing list of more than 100 demolished religious and historic sites, including mosques, tombs, shrines and churches in Syria and Iraq. The extremists have defaced or ruined ancient monuments in Nineveh, Palmyra and Hatra. Museums and libraries have been looted, books burned, artwork crushed—or trafficked.

"'A big part of tangible history has been destroyed,' said Rev. Manuel Yousif Boji. A Chaldean Catholic pastor in Southfield, Michigan, he remembers attending Mass at St. Elijah's almost 60 years ago while a seminarian in Mosul.'

"These persecutions have happened to our church more than once, but we

believe in the power of truth, the power of God,' said Boji. He is part of the Detroit area's Chaldean community, which became the largest outside Iraq after the sectarian bloodshed that followed the U.S. invasion in 2003. Iraq's Christian population has dropped from 1.3 million then to 300,000 now, church authorities say."

Christians are under persecution, being killed in greater numbers than any time in our history. Yet, it is not the Christians being persecuted in greater numbers than any time in history. It is not the group that many in the world recognize are the most persecuted religion in the world.

This administration wants to welcome those of the religion of persecution rather than the most persecuted group in the world, that being Christians, although just recently this article from CNS News, "550 Syrian Refugees Admitted to U.S. Since the Paris Attacks"—and, of the most persecuted highest number killed in the history of the world, Christians, this administration admitted two.

An article from the Texas Tribune points out that Governor Greg Abbott and my friend, Democrat U.S. Rep. HENRY CUELLAR, "pressed the U.S. Department of Homeland Security on Monday to explain why the agency plans to reduce its aerial surveillance on the Texas-Mexico border."

"Monday's request comes as CBP is reporting a new surge in the number of undocumented immigrants crossing the Rio Grande. From October to December of 2015, about 10,560 unaccompanied minors entered Texas illegally through the Rio Grande Valley sector of the U.S. Border Patrol. That marks a 115 percent increase over the same time frame in 2014."

Madam Speaker, what is clear is that, as this administration says, oh, we are arresting fewer people coming into the country illegally, these kind of reports make clear, well, yeah, if you close your eyes, you will keep arresting even fewer. That is what they are doing. They are closing our eyes to our ability to see people that are violating our law.

At the same time, we get this report from the Washington Examiner that sanctuary cities now cross the 300 mark, with Dallas and Philadelphia added to it.

Madam Speaker, with so much to be depressed about, I want to commend the people of the State of Iowa, where I spent a couple of days last week and where I have spent other times many days in the past. When I am among the Iowans, I feel like I am back home in East Texas. The people are wonderful.

I had somebody ask earlier today about: What do you think about your party?

I said: What do you mean?

He said: Well, you look at the people that won the Iowa caucuses.

So?

The comment was made: Well, in the Democratic caucus or primary, you had

two White Socialists—this was the comment from this person—and in the Republican primary, the first and third vote-getters were Cuban, Hispanic Americans, and the fourth was African American. Isn't that interesting the way things have turned?

Well, I have enjoyed coming to love the people of Iowa, and I look forward to the days ahead because of them.

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

WATER SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I want to pick up on some issues of security. We have heard for the last hour discussions of security, and there are many different aspects to the question of security.

Are we secure in this world in which we live? Well, there are a lot of problems. To be sure, we can worry about China and the South China Sea, and we do. Certainly, in the Middle East, where I recently visited the Gulf States and Iran, there are a lot of concerns there.

As you move into Iraq, there are the issues of ISIL, al Qaeda and, of course, the great tragedy that is occurring in Syria where, basically, cities are simply being destroyed, obviously, the churches, the monasteries, the mosques—boom—housing.

There are well over 270,000 people—Christians, Muslims, and others—killed in the Syrian civil war and the resultant desire by people to get out of there. Immigration issues are abounding. Certainly, they affect us here in the United States.

There are many other security issues beyond those that make the headlines. There are security issues in our homes. For example, do we have a job? Well, that is a big issue.

Often here on the floor, in days gone by, I would stand with my colleagues and we would talk about creating jobs in the United States. We would talk about strategies of Make It In America, strategies to use our tax dollars to buy American-made products and services so that our money could be used to employ our own people and to support our own businesses.

These are all very, very important strategies. They do happen to do with individual security, community security, and family security. So security has many, many pieces.

Tonight I want to talk about one type of security. This is something that affects every human being, every animal, large or small, from an elephant to the smallest mouse. This security issue is one that affects every form of life. It is called water. It is called water.

This is the most basic of security issues. You don't go but a day or 2,

maybe 3, days, if you are not doing much and it is really not very hot, without water. It is essential. This is a bottom-line security issue.

If you don't have water, you are insecure. If you don't have water, you will very soon be dead. If you have poisonous water, you may not die immediately, but it will certainly affect you.

Let's take a look at this. This is water from Flint, Michigan, United States of America. There are roughly 100,000 human beings in Flint, Michigan.

Well, among the most essential of all of the things we need for life, for security, is water. That is Flint, Michigan, water, a city of 100,000 people in the United States.

□ 1915

Oh, we would like to think of ourselves as being the most advanced place in the world. That is Flint, Michigan, water. Nine thousand children under the age of 4 or 5 have been drinking that water contaminated with lead for about 14 months.

I am not going to go into the reasons why that tragedy is occurring. There are many. There is an FBI investigation and there are questions about the Governor of Michigan and the way in which it was done, but I am not going to go there today.

I want to go to something else that we are responsible for here in the House of Representatives and our colleagues across the Capitol in the U.S. Senate. I want to talk about our responsibility here because this is our business.

If we are concerned about security—and we are—we should—and we do—talk about al Qaeda. We should—and we do—talk about ISIS. We should—and we do—talk about refugees and whether they are safe or not. We talk about San Bernardino and the great tragedy there. We should talk about it, and we should do something about it.

There is another side of security that we have specific responsibility to deal with. In 1974, we set out to clean up the waters of the United States with the Clean Water Act. Over the years, it has been amended. In 1996, we set standards for clean water and we provided some funding.

If someone were to grade us on our success in addressing one of the fundamental security issues, that is, the ability to have clean, drinkable water, here is the scorecard. Let's take a look at it. Let's see.

We can run down through aviation, bridges. Oh, by the way, this is from the American Society of Civil Engineers. They produce a scorecard on how well this great Nation, the United States of America, is doing on providing fundamental security.

Aviation, bridges, dams, drinking water: D. Today, at a hearing on water, the Society of Civil Engineers said we have got a D on drinking water.

Somebody asked them: Is that the bottom grade?

They said: Well, pretty much because if you go to an F, it is too much paperwork. So they just stop at D. D.

We fancy ourselves to be the greatest place in the world, the most advanced economy. All the way down this list are D's, a couple of C's. Our infrastructure doesn't rank among the best in the world. In fact, we rank about where developing countries are.

So what is the result of all of this? Well, Flint, Michigan, water, would you drink it? For 100,000 people in Flint, Michigan, that is their water supply. Without water, you don't live.

Closer to my home in Porterville, California, a city of a few tens of thousands of people, no water. So they truck it in. I have got one of those on my ranch. It is called a livestock water trough. That is where the kids get their water in the United States of America.

Oh, we think we are good. Security comes in many forms. Drinking water. So why does this happen? Why is it that, in this great Nation, all of us, 435 here, and another 100 across the Capitol—why is it Flint Michigan, Porterville, California, a half a dozen other cities in California, no water or contaminated water?

Just in December it was reported that, in about a half a dozen communities in the San Joaquin Valley of California, the uranium in the water has reached a level beyond that which is allowed. That is okay. It is only going to be cancer.

Uranium, fine. Flint, Michigan, Porterville, communities throughout this Nation. Oh, Toledo, Ohio. I remember Toledo, Ohio, last year shut down its water system because of contamination from algae in the lake. America. Why? Why?

Here is why. A sharp drop in government infrastructure spending. Oh, government infrastructure spending. Federal Government infrastructure spending. For 435 of us; this is our job.

Oh, let's see. This is 2002. Somewhere—oh, these are real dollars, disinflated, \$325 billion. In 2014—that is 12 years later—\$210 billion. That is what happens. That is what happens when you don't have water in Porterville. That is what happens when you have uranium and the inability to take it out because you can't afford the systems. That is what happens in Flint, Michigan.

Let's take another look at those numbers, another way to look at it. Spending on clean water and drinking water infrastructure. In 2014 dollars—these are constant dollars across the way—1973, is that Ronald Reagan? I think so. No. Actually, it was a little later.

That wasn't Reagan. It is the end of—what did we spend in 1973 in consistent 2014 dollars? We spent about \$10 billion. Okay. In 1990, we spent about \$6 billion. Again, these are dollars all consistent for 2016 dollars. In 1999, we are down to about just under \$4 billion. In 2005, we get down to about \$3.5 billion. In 2016, bingo, \$2 billion.

You wonder why we have a D? You wonder why the water systems break. 240,000 water mains broke last year in the United States. You see the pictures of the sinkholes. That is not a geological issue. That is a water main issue. A water main is broken, washed out the street, washed out the community, and the houses fall into it. Not all of them, but that is basically it. 240,000 of those last year.

What are we doing? Are we building new, high-quality water systems for our community? No, we are not. I will tell you what we are doing. Over the next few years, we are going to spend a trillion dollars in the next 20 years on rebuilding—that is a trillion dollars, not a billion—a trillion dollars—on rebuilding our entire nuclear warfare system. Every bomb, new airplanes, new missiles, new intercontinental ballistic missiles, new submarines, a trillion dollars. And this number competes with that trillion dollars.

We make choices around here, folks. We make choices on how we are going to spend your tax money. We are going to spend it on nuclear bombs that go big in a big way, on new stealth bombers, new intercontinental ballistic missiles, new submarines, new dial-a-bomb—dial it up, it goes big; dial it down, it goes small—so that we can use it as a tactical nuclear weapon. Whoa. We are making choices here.

I can go on for some time about this. I get pretty excited about it. I get pretty dismayed. When I am in Brussels, as I was last week, returning from the Gulf States—Oman, Dubai, Abu Dhabi, Qatar, Bahrain—looking at what is going on there, this is what I saw: I saw enormous problems. But I also saw a modern infrastructure. Go to Brussels. Look at their airport. Then go to an American airport.

Water. Water. Flint, Michigan, water. State of Michigan, United States of America, that is the water that 100,000 Americans are forced to drink. We have got a Clean Water Act. We have got the laws in place to build our water systems.

So what do we do? Well, I guess we would rather rebuild the B61 nuclear bomb rather than building a water system for Americans for the security of 100,000 people.

I live a long way from Flint, Michigan, but the guy I am going to call on, that is his home. That is where he was raised. Those are the people he represents.

DAN KILDEE, you have been on this issue for weeks and months. You have been sounding the alarm. You have been calling us out. You have been calling us out, all 435 of us and the Senate and the administration. You have been calling us out, and you are doing the work of securing the safety of the people in your community. Please join me, DAN KILDEE, from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Well, first of all, let me thank my friend, Mr. GARAMENDI, not just for that introduction and for his comments about my hometown, but for his leadership on this issue.

This is the critical issue that really determines whether we are competitive as a Nation. But it goes beyond competitiveness. It is the issue that will determine whether we have true national security. But it goes beyond national security. Sometimes it is a matter of life and death. Sometimes it is really a matter of health.

In my hometown, the issue of failed infrastructure, particularly of the State of Michigan and their failure to manage infrastructure, let alone reinvest in it potentially, will affect not just 100,000 people, all of the citizens there, but, most importantly, will affect the trajectory of the lives of 9,000 children under the age of 6 who, for the last year and a half, have been drinking water that has elevated lead levels well beyond what normally would be required in order to take drastic action to correct the problem.

And it was largely overlooked because of a failed philosophy of government in the State of Michigan that put short-term interest, short-term dollars-and-cents measures of success, ahead of not just long-term investment, but ahead of the lives of children that has resulted in this terrible tragedy.

□ 1930

I will just take a moment to tell you what happened and to support the efforts of my friend Mr. GARAMENDI in continuing to raise this question.

The letter grade graph he showed regarding clean drinking water showed in the aggregate a grade of D. In Flint, it was an F. It was a failing grade.

So, the failure to invest in infrastructure, and particularly urban infrastructure—roads, bridges, and water—led to significant economic difficulty in my hometown of Flint. The failure of the State to support cities—and, in fact, they cut direct support in cities—resulted in my hometown going into financial stress. The State then appointed a receiver to take over the city.

Rather than provide support, rather than rebuild, it appointed a receiver, a financial manager, to go in with one tool, and one tool only, and that was a scalpel, to cut the budget of a city that was really begging for investment. Instead of investment, more cuts.

One of the cuts was, for a temporary period of time until a regional pipeline to Lake Huron was completed, to draw drinking water from the Flint River, which for decades functioned as an open industrial sewer.

In the State of Michigan, where we have the world's greatest source of surface water, freshwater, there was a decision to use the Flint River. But because of our aging infrastructure, old infrastructure, and lots of lead pipes, including thousands and thousands of lead service lines to homes, and the failure of the State to manage this process and treat the water effectively, highly corrosive water leached lead into the drinking water, and 100,000

people have been subjected to elevated lead levels. Thousands of children have potentially been affected.

The sad story here is that it all could have easily been prevented with just a little bit of investment and better management of the infrastructure. But we take water infrastructure for granted, as if all we have to do is turn on the faucet and the water will appear. No, it takes investment; it takes money; it takes resources. In this case, the State's failure has resulted in something that we hope is not repeated across this country; but without investment, there will be more Flint, Michigans.

So what we need now is to call upon the State particularly to make the kind of investment in Flint to make it right. As I said, 9,000 children in the city of Flint under the age of 6 have substantially elevated lead levels from the water that showed up in their blood in tests done by a courageous pediatrician, Dr. Mona Hanna-Attisha, who was one of the people who blew the whistle on this.

So now we have a crisis in Flint. We have a loss of faith in government. But it is a crisis because this city is really at risk. We need significant investment to make it right. That investment would come in the form of a long overdue replacement of those lead service lines, that lead piping that is outdated, obsolete, and dangerous. Because of the failure to deal with this when it was a less expensive investment, we now have, I think, a very important moral responsibility on the State of Michigan to take care of the unique needs that these children will face as they go through their developmental stages. We need early childhood education for all of them. We need good nutritional programming—and not just to make it available, but to ensure sure they have good nutrition. We need additional help in the schools. We need behavioral support.

There are consequences. There are human consequences to this failure. It is not just that the water looks bad, smells bad, tastes bad. It is unhealthy.

Again, I hope Flint's experience can be an experience for the rest of the country, because the way our State treated the people of Flint was as if they didn't matter. They allowed this infrastructure to atrophy, allowed the city to atrophy, didn't support redevelopment, didn't support even the basic need of \$140 a day to provide corrosion control treatment in this aging water system. All of that could have prevented this terrible tragedy, but they didn't do it.

So now the State of Michigan bears the principal responsibility. I am doing everything I can to get Federal help for this, but the State of Michigan bears the principal responsibility. As far as I am concerned, it is up to them to make it right.

The message that my friend has been bringing to this Congress when it comes to this question of infrastruc-

ture is that Flint proves that it matters what we do here. It matters what we do in this House. The fact is we have known as a Nation for a long time that, if we are going to be safe, if we are going to be competitive, if we are going to be healthy, we have to invest in that which we take for granted.

Think about it, water, drinkable water. Most people in this room, most people in America never give it a second thought. You just turn on the faucet and it is there. It is literally what we depend upon for our very lives. In Flint, Michigan, because of this terrible failure, not only was it not safe, but we poisoned 9,000 children as a result.

There are consequences to what we do here, and there are consequences to what we don't do here. So for those Members who have expressed their sympathy, I appreciate that, I sincerely do. But the children of Flint, the people of Flint, and, frankly, the people of Porterville and everywhere else need more than sympathy. We need investment. We need this Congress and this country to step up and do what it is right and invest in our own future, because if we don't, as you can tell, there are consequences.

Thank you for your leadership on this.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. KILDEE, thank you so very much for the work that you are doing sounding the alarm and driving all of us. I know you did this morning in our Caucus. You alerted us to it. You motivated us. And, in fact, I am talking about it tonight because of your motivation that you gave to me and to our colleagues this morning.

You spoke here a little bit about the human consequences. I would like you to take another run around this on how we bear—the community of America, and more specifically, Michigan—the responsibility of caring for addressing the human problem that now exists.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank you for that question, because that is really the core of what we are dealing with right now.

We need a lot of help in Flint. This could have been avoided. But now that this has occurred, there is some work we need to do to fix the pipes. There is some work we need to do to make sure the emergency needs are met—temporary water. But the real need is this human need.

Lead is a neurotoxin. It affects development of the brain. The citizens who are most at risk are those children who are still in those early developmental stages, particularly children age 6 and under. Literally, children feeding, drinking formula made with this water will have the trajectory of their lives potentially affected.

The thing that I think is important to keep in mind is, first of all, Flint is a tough town. We can live through this; we can get through this; we can succeed; but we are going to need resources. We need resources, really, to come from the people who did this to

us, which is the State government with, I think, a completely bankrupt philosophy that basically says you are on your own.

Well, you are not on your own when it comes to drinking water. We all expect drinking water to be clean. We have every right to expect that. It is a human right.

But what we need now and what I think is morally required is to wrap our arms around these kids. We know that when it comes to brain development and challenges the kids might face, whether it is from a developmental question from some other source or derived from lead exposure, the more we do to help those children develop as early as possible, the better they will do in the long term.

So, I will have legislation that I will introduce this week that puts Federal support in—and requires the State of Michigan to come up with its share, because they did this—so that we expand Head Start, Early Head Start, and that we give those kids the early opportunity to expand their minds; also, that we get them nutritional support, because we know that good, nutritious food—milk, for example—is very helpful in getting kids through lead exposure with minimal impact.

Now, it is only to mitigate the damages and help these kids overcome, but what we need to do now as a community is what we would do for any child facing a developmental challenge. It is early childhood education. It is nutritional support. It is a school nurse, for example. We have gone so far in this country that we don't even fund the basics that we all grew up with. We all had a school nurse. You go to Flint, Michigan, a city of 100,000 people, and we have one school nurse.

Also, it is after-school programming, enrichment opportunities. Most of the kids in my hometown, sadly, already have hurdles in front of them because of the misfortune of being born into poverty. They don't have the kind of opportunities that many kids take for granted: piano lessons, dance, art, after-school activities, gym time, a summer program. Maybe for the older kids, a summer job.

That is the kind of help that will be required in order to move these kids from where they were headed before this crisis occurred and what the trajectory of their lives looks like right now.

So the point is there are human consequences for the failure to do this right in the first place. And when we have a State government that failed these kids, they now have a moral obligation to step up and actually take care of their needs going forward.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might interrupt you for a moment, this morning you spoke of a young child that was interviewed. Would you please share that?

Mr. KILDEE. I will. I read this. It came from a writer from Detroit, a guy named Mitch Albom, who most people

know for having written a bestseller, “Tuesdays with Morrie.” He came to Flint to interview children and to talk about what this whole experience meant to them.

One young man said something which, in a very poignant way, in a really eloquent way, describes what exactly happened in Flint. The little boy said that he was afraid that he wouldn’t be smart now, that he wouldn’t be smart.

It just occurred to me what a terrible crime this is, the failure of adults to manage the government in a way that takes the concerns of the life of a child into account and looks only at a balance sheet, only at a quarterly earnings statement—maybe the longest term that they look at it is an annual financial report—and wouldn’t consider the fact that the result would be to

have a young 8- or 9-year-old boy say to himself, “I am afraid I won’t be smart.”

What does that do to that kid’s hopes for himself, whether the cognitive, behavioral, or developmental impact of lead would have any substantial effect on him or her, kids that are in Flint? The fact that the lack of action by the government gives them doubt about their own future, doubt about their own capacity is just heartbreaking.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. KILDEE, thank you very, very much.

“I am afraid I won’t be smart enough.” I wonder if we should ask ourselves if we are smart enough. Are we smart enough? There are 435 of us facing a myriad of questions around this world and some of them in our own hometowns. Are we smart enough?

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KAPTUR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for February 1 on account of travel delay.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. TOM PRICE, Chairman, Jan. 5, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHARLES W. DENT, Chairman, Jan. 11, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	10/9	10/19	Vietnam, Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines		644.00		(3)		1,269.00		1,913.00
Hon. Hank Johnson	10/9	10/19	Vietnam, Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines		644.00		(3)		1,269.00		1,913.00
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	10/9	10/19	Vietnam, Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines		644.00		(3)		1,269.00		1,913.00
Shelley Husband	10/9	10/19	Vietnam, Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines		644.00		(3)		1,269.00		1,913.00
Joe Keeley	10/9	10/19	Vietnam, Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines		644.00		(3)		1,269.00		1,913.00
Stephanie Gadsbois	10/9	10/19	Vietnam, Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines		644.00		(3)		1,269.00		1,913.00
Peter Larkin	10/9	10/19	Vietnam, Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines		644.00		(3)		1,269.00		1,913.00
John Manning	10/9	10/19	Vietnam, Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines		644.00		(3)		1,269.00		1,913.00
James Park	10/9	10/19	Vietnam, Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines		644.00		(3)		1,269.00		1,913.00
Hon. Steve King	11/5	11/13	Serbia, Iraq, Turkey, Sweden, Hungary		696.00		15,485.60		1,177.45		17,359.05
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	10/24	10/25	Haiti		111.00		938.43		150.00		1,199.43
Hon. John Conyers	10/24	10/26	Haiti		222.00		770.10		300.00		1,292.10
Tracy Short	10/24	10/26	Haiti		222.00		770.10		300.00		1,292.10
Lindsay Yates	10/24	10/26	Haiti		222.00		735.10		300.00		1,257.10
Keenan Keller	10/24	10/26	Haiti		222.00		770.10		300.00		1,292.10

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Cynthia Martin	10/24	10/26	Haiti		222.00		770.10		300.00		1,292.10
Committee total					7,713.00		20,239.53		14,248.45		42,200.98

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Jan. 22, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES
 Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ROB BISHOP, Chairman, Jan. 7, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES
 Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, Jan. 6, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES
 Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

SEN. ORRIN G. HATCH, Chairman, Jan. 12, 2016.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
 ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4164. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Black Stem Rust; Additions of Rust-Resistant Species and Varieties [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0079] received January 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4165. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of interim final rule — Lacey Act Implementation Plan; Definitions for Exempt and Regulated Articles [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0018] (RIN: 0579-AD11) received January 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4166. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, ORMS, D & R, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Stew-

ardship End Result Contracting Projects (RIN: 0596-AD25) received January 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4167. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Army's report on gifts made for the benefit of U.S. Military Academy Army Band for FY 2015, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 974(d)(3); 113-66, Sec. 351; (127 Stat. 741); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4168. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Office's 2015 Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5344(d); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 154(d); (124 Stat. 1418); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4169. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Deputy Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Removal of 24 CFR 280--Nehemiah Housing Opportunity Grants Program [Docket No.: FR-5878-F-01] (RIN: 2502-AJ31) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4170. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Review of Major Changes in Program Design and Management Evaluation Systems [FNS-2011-0035] (RIN: 0584-AD86) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4171. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4172. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Partitions of Eligible Multiemployer Plans (RIN: 1212-AB29) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4173. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Pumps [Docket No.: EERE-2013-BT-TP-0055] (RIN: 1905-AD50) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4174. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Examination of Aliens — Revisions to Medical Screening Process [Docket No.: CDC-2015-0045] (RIN: 0920-AA28) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4175. A letter from the Chief Counsel, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to 47 CFR Part 301 to Implement Certain Provisions of the Spectrum Pipeline Act [Docket No.: 160108022-6022-01] (RIN: 0660-AA31) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4176. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed items to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778 note; Public Law 105-261, Sec. 1512 (as amended by Public Law 105-277, Sec. 146); (112 Stat. 2174); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4177. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4178. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's 2016 Report to Congress on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 4605(f)(2); Public Law 96-72, Sec. 6(f)(2) (as amended by Public Law 99-64, Sec. 108(e)); (99 Stat. 133); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4179. A letter from the Executive Director, Mississippi River Commission, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Annual Report for the Mississippi River Commission for calendar year 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); Public Law 94-409, Sec. 3(a); (90 Stat. 1241); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4180. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Establish a Single Small Business Size Standard for Commercial Fishing Businesses [Docket No.: 150227193-5999-02] (RIN: 0648-BE92) received January 29, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4181. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Vessel Register Required Informa-

tion, International Maritime Organization Numbering Scheme [Docket No.: 150902807-5999-02] (RIN: 0648-BE99) received January 29, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4182. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Seabird Avoidance Measures [Docket No.: 140214140-5999-01] (RIN: 0648-BD92) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4183. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Report to Congress on the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act's usage of the Act's Antitrust Laws Exemption, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d-6a note; Public Law 109-417, Sec. 405(a)(8); (120 Stat. 2877); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4184. A letter from the Chair, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the Commission's amendment to the federal sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary, together with the reason for amendment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(o); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4185. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights in Specified Areas of the Sanaa (OYSC) Flight Information Region (FIR) [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8672; Amdt. No.: 91-340] (RIN: 2120-AK72) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4186. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Territory and Airspace of Somalia [Docket No.: FAA-2007-27602; Amdt. No.: 91-339] (RIN: 2120-AK75) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4187. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Los Angeles, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1139; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-4] received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4188. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0335; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-021-AD; Amendment 39-18358; AD 2015-26-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4189. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0648; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-136-AD; Amendment 39-18344; AD 2015-25-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4190. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Alpha Aviation Concept Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3956; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-032-AD; Amendment 39-18345; AD 2015-25-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4191. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2714; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-052-AD; Amendment 39-18349; AD 2015-26-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4192. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1199; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-008-AD; Amendment 39-18351; AD 2015-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4193. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0076; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-246-AD; Amendment 39-18350; AD 2015-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4194. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0083; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-131-AD; Amendment 39-18347; AD 2015-25-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4195. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, MC-PRR, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Electronic Logging Devices and Hours of Service Supporting Documents [Docket No.: FMCSA-2010-0167] (RIN: 2126-AB20) received January 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4196. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program, State Reporting On Policies and Practices To Prevent Use of TANF Funds in Electronic Benefit Transfer Transactions in Specified Locations (RIN: 0970-AC56) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4197. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue

Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure: Update of CC: International No-Rule Revenue Procedure 2015-7 (Rev. Proc. 2016-7) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4198. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2016-6 (Rev. Proc. 2016-6) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4199. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2016-4 (Rev. Proc. 2016-4) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4200. A letter from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's certification that the level of screening services and protection services at the Punta Gorda Airport in Florida will be equal to or greater than the level that would be provided at the airport by TSA Transportation Security Officers, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44920(d)(1); Public Law 107-71, Sec. 108(a); (115 Stat. 613); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

4201. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicaid Program; Covered Outpatient Drugs [CMS-2345-FC] (RIN: 0938-AQ41) received January 27, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

4202. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicaid Program; Face-to-Face Requirements for Home Health Services; Policy Changes and Clarifications Related to Home Health [CMS-2348-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ36) received January 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 3293. A bill to provide for greater accountability in Federal funding for scientific research, to promote the progress of science in the United States that serves that national interest (Rept. 114-412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2017. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A; with an amendment (Rept. 114-413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STIVERS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 595. Resolution providing for con-

sideration of the bill (H.R. 1675) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise its rules so as to increase the threshold amount for requiring issuers to provide certain disclosures relating to compensatory benefit plans, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 766) to provide requirements for the appropriate Federal banking agencies when requesting or ordering a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, to provide for additional requirements related to subpoenas issued under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-414). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 4425. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 110 East Powerhouse Road in Collegeville, Minnesota, as the "Eugene J. McCarthy Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 4426. A bill to expand school choice in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 4427. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HILL, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PALMER, Mr. VELA, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 4428. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure fairness in Medicare hospital payments by establishing a floor for the area wage index applied with respect to certain hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. KNIGHT:

H.R. 4429. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue minimum uniform safety standards for underground natural gas storage facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. TITUS (for herself, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 4430. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to include training for certain

employees of air carriers to combat human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4431. A bill to direct the Attorney General to reimburse State and local law enforcement agencies for costs incurred in carrying out law enforcement activities associated with the armed occupation of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4432. A bill to establish an interim rule for the operation of small unmanned aircraft for commercial purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. BERA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 4433. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the income protection allowances; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 4434. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 4435. A bill to improve access to mental health and substance use disorder prevention, treatment, crisis, and recovery services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and 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 Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 4436. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 to provide for expedited project implementation relating to the comprehensive Everglades restoration plan; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 4437. A bill to extend the deadline for the submittal of the final report required by the Commission on Care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 4438. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations to the Environmental Protection Agency to assist the State of Michigan and its residents impacted by the contaminated water crisis; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. NORTON:

H.R. 4439. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to require that certain public buildings contain a lactation room for public use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 4440. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes" to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the Equus Beds Division of the Wichita Project; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 107th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEHAN for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. DEUTCH:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 596. A resolution recognizing the 146th anniversary of the ratification of the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 597. A resolution recognizing the significance of Black History Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H. Res. 598. A resolution congratulating the University of Mount Union football team for winning the 2015 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Football Championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 599. A resolution recognizing January 2016 as "National Mentoring Month", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 4425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and post roads."

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 4426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 4427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 4428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article I Section 8

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 4429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 4430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIII

Section 1, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

Section 2, "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution (the "Commerce Clause")

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 4433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 4434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 4436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 4438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 and Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 4440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. GOHMENT.

H.R. 188: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GRAYSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 267: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 317: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 546: Mr. HIMES, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 556: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 592: Mr. COOK and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 624: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 711: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 775: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 812: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 814: Mr. DENT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 842: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 846: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 868: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 911: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 921: Mr. SIRES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 939: Ms. MOORE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 973: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 997: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1062: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1086: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1209: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1218: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1221: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1233: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1258: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1343: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1397: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1399: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1459: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1475: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. NEAL, and Mrs. CAPP.

H.R. 1486: Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 1492: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1550: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1552: Mr. ISRAEL.

- H.R. 1572: Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 1594: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1769: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. SIREs.
H.R. 1781: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1784: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 1887: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 1977: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2090: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 2125: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2144: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 2150: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2170: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2191: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2197: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 2215: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2224: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2237: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2264: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2293: Ms. HAHN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2342: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2404: Mr. COSTA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. LEE, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2411: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2430: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2450: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2460: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2509: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 2515: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 2520: Mr. JOLLY and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2521: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2590: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2597: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2622: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2635: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2651: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 2663: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2737: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2752: Mr. KLINE, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2775: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2799: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2802: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2805: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2894: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2911: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 3053: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 3099: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 3159: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3209: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3229: Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 3289: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3299: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 3339: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 3381: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 3399: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3434: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3484: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3514: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3516: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 3528: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3539: Mr. GRJALVA.
H.R. 3648: Ms. PINGREE and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3684: Mr. TAKAI and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 3739: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 3741: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3779: Mr. LATTa.
H.R. 3797: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3808: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 3880: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3917: Mr. WALZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3936: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3952: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 3957: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 3965: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 3982: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4013: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4063: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4069: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4116: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 4146: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4147: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4153: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4164: Mr. LATTa.
H.R. 4167: Mr. OLSON and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 4177: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 4207: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4216: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4223: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4230: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4235: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 4247: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 4249: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4251: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 4279: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 4281: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HILL, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 4285: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 4293: Mr. HOLDING and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 4294: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. RENACCI, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 4300: Mr. SANFORD.
H.R. 4313: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 4336: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 4362: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 4365: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4371: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 4376: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4380: Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4389: Mr. POCAN and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4399: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4400: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 4405: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.J. Res. 55: Mr. ZELDIN.
H. Res. 112: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 207: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. BLUM.
H. Res. 393: Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 451: Mr. SESSIONS.
H. Res. 540: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. KEATING.
H. Res. 541: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H. Res. 548: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 551: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H. Res. 561: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 569: Ms. HAHN and Mr. LEWIS.
H. Res. 571: Mr. COOK, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. RENACCI.
H. Res. 575: Mr. POLIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 584: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 585: Mr. BRAT, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HUDSON.
H. Res. 589: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. MEEKS.
H. Res. 590: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 592: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. LAHOOD.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative SHERMAN (CA) or a designee to H.R. 766, the Financial Institution Customer Protection Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.