

## Union Calendar No. 68

114TH CONGRESS }  
*1st Session*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

{ REPORT  
114-97

R E P O R T  
ON THE  
SUBALLOCATION OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

SUBMITTED BY MR. ROGERS, CHAIRMAN,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

together with  
MINORITY VIEWS



APRIL 29, 2015.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on  
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

49-006

WASHINGTON : 2015

SBDV 2016-1

## COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HAROLD ROGERS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey	NITA M. LOWEY, New York
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama	MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
KAY GRANGER, Texas	PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, Idaho	JOSÉ E. SERRANO, New York
JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON, Texas	ROSA L. DELAURO, Connecticut
ANDER CRENSHAW, Florida	DAVID E. PRICE, North Carolina
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas	LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California
KEN CALVERT, California	SAM FARR, California
TOM COLE, Oklahoma	CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Florida	SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr., Georgia
CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania	BARBARA LEE, California
TOM GRAVES, Georgia	MICHAEL M. HONDA, California
KEVIN YODER, Kansas	BETTY McCOLLUM, Minnesota
STEVE WOMACK, Arkansas	STEVE ISRAEL, New York
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska	TIM RYAN, Ohio
THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida	C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN, Tennessee	DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida
JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, Washington	HENRY CUELLAR, Texas
DAVID P. JOYCE, Ohio	CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine
DAVID G. VALADAO, California	MIKE QUIGLEY, Illinois
ANDY HARRIS, Maryland	DEREK KILMER, Washington
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama	
MARK E. AMODEI, Nevada	
CHRIS STEWART, Utah	
E. SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia	
DAVID W. JOLLY, Florida	
DAVID YOUNG, Iowa	
EVAN H. JENKINS, West Virginia	
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi	

WILLIAM E. SMITH, *Clerk and Staff Director*

**LETTER OF SUBMITTAL**

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
*Washington, DC, April 29, 2015.*

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I submit herewith the Committee's report on the suballocation of budget allocations for fiscal year 2016.

This report follows the requirements of section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 by providing a subdivision of fiscal year 2016 spending authority consistent with the levels of discretionary budget authority assumed in the House-passed concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016 (H. Con. Res. 27) and its accompanying report (House Report 114-047) as well as the current law levels for discretionary spending required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (P.L. 112-25).

Sincerely,

HAROLD ROGERS,  
*Chairman.*

(III)



## Union Calendar No. 68

114TH CONGRESS }  
*1st Session* } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
114-97

---

---

### REPORT ON THE SUBALLOCATION OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

---

APRIL 29, 2015.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of  
the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. ROGERS, from the Committee on Appropriations,  
submitted the following

### REPORT

#### SUBALLOCATION OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report on the suballocation of budget allocations for fiscal year 2016 based on the requirements of section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

At the time the Committee drafted this report a conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016 had not been adopted. However, this report follows the requirements of section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 by providing a subdivision of fiscal year 2016 spending authority consistent with the levels of discretionary budget authority assumed in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016 (H. Con. Res. 27) and its accompanying report (House Report 114-047) as passed by the House on March 25, 2015 as well as the current law levels for discretionary spending required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (P.L. 112-25) and enforced through sequestration.

The Committee, in distributing the allocation among the 12 regular appropriations bills, has remained within the allocation's totals.

## SUBALLOCATIONS TO SUBCOMMITTEES FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS

[In millions of dollars]

Subcommittee	Discretionary		Mandatory	Total
	General Purpose	Global War on Terror		
<b>Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration:</b>				
Budget authority .....	20,650		120,076	140,726
Outlays .....	20,513		108,703	129,216
<b>Commerce, Justice, Science:</b>				
Budget authority .....	51,378		343	51,721
Outlays .....	62,400		343	62,743
<b>Defense:</b>				
Budget authority .....	490,235	88,421	514	579,170
Outlays .....	519,579	43,780	514	563,873
<b>Energy and Water Development:</b>				
Budget authority .....	35,403			35,403
Outlays .....	36,186			36,186
<b>Financial Services and General Government:</b>				
Budget authority .....	20,249		21,527	41,776
Outlays .....	21,092		21,520	42,612
<b>Homeland Security:</b>				
Budget authority .....	39,320		1,517	40,837
Outlays .....	43,661		1,514	45,175
<b>Interior, Environment:</b>				
Budget authority .....	30,170		62	30,232
Outlays .....	30,882		62	30,944
<b>Labor, Health and Human Services, Education:</b>				
Budget authority .....	153,050		713,481	866,531
Outlays .....	156,193		713,523	869,716
<b>Legislative Branch:</b>				
All except Senate:				
Budget authority .....	3,341		109	3,450
Outlays .....	3,540		108	3,648
Senate items:				
Budget authority .....	959		26	985
Outlays .....	728		26	754
Total Legislative:				
Budget authority .....	4,300		135	4,435
Outlays .....	4,268		134	4,402
<b>Military Construction, Veterans Affairs:</b>				
Budget authority .....	76,057	532	94,766	171,355
Outlays .....	78,244	2	94,521	172,767
<b>State, Foreign Operations:</b>				
Budget authority .....	40,500	7,047	159	47,706
Outlays .....	47,055	1,660	159	48,874
<b>Transportation, HUD:</b>				
Budget authority .....	55,270			55,270
Outlays .....	119,818			119,818
<b>Grand total:</b>				
Budget authority .....	1,016,582	96,000	952,580	2,065,162
Outlays .....	1,139,891	45,442	940,993	2,126,326

## FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 1

Date: April 22, 2015

Measure: Report on the Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY16

Motion by: Mrs. Lowey

Description of Motion: To amend the Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY16.

Results: Defeated 20 yeas to 29 nays.

*Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Bishop  
 Mr. Cuellar  
 Ms. DeLauro  
 Mr. Farr  
 Mr. Fattah  
 Mr. Honda  
 Mr. Israel  
 Ms. Kaptur  
 Mr. Kilmr  
 Ms. Lee  
 Mrs. Lowey  
 Ms. McCollum  
 Ms. Pingree  
 Mr. Price  
 Mr. Quigley  
 Ms. Roybal-Allard  
 Mr. Ruppertsberger  
 Mr. Ryan  
 Mr. Serrano  
 Mr. Visclosky

*Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Aderholt  
 Mr. Calvert  
 Mr. Carter  
 Mr. Cole  
 Mr. Crenshaw  
 Mr. Culberson  
 Mr. Dent  
 Mr. Diaz-Balart  
 Mr. Fleischmann  
 Mr. Fortenberry  
 Mr. Frelinghuysen  
 Ms. Granger  
 Mr. Graves  
 Dr. Harris  
 Ms. Herrera Beutler  
 Mr. Jenkins  
 Mr. Jolly  
 Mr. Joyce  
 Mr. Palazzo  
 Mr. Rigell  
 Mrs. Roby  
 Mr. Rogers  
 Mr. Rooney  
 Mr. Simpson  
 Mr. Stewart  
 Mr. Valadao  
 Mr. Womack  
 Mr. Yoder  
 Mr. Young

## MINORITY VIEWS

The Majority's budget allocations are based on the House budget resolution which passed on a party-line vote in the full House. No member of the Democratic side of the aisle supported it.

Our markup occurred against a backdrop of news articles about efforts to craft a new budget agreement, one that would replace the sequester and allow higher funding levels for our twelve spending bills. It seems many Members on both sides of the aisle agree in principle that the House budget resolution and subsequent 302(a) allocation given to this Committee are unworkable and hope that a new "Murray-Ryan" plan is possible.

Yet, our Committee voted along partisan lines to reject the Democratic alternative based largely on the approach taken by the President in his budget request and approved the Chairman's allocations that will fail to adequately invest in initiatives that will create jobs, train a 21st century workforce, and give hardworking Americans more economic security.

For example, the Republican allocation for programs in the Labor, HHS bill will cut more than \$3.7 billion from programs that fund critical areas such as biomedical research, public health, early childhood education, education for children with special needs, and job training programs.

Further, it will result in cuts to NIH research grants; fewer kids enrolled in high-quality early learning programs; reduced support for Pell Grants; and a public health system that is less prepared for the next infectious disease outbreak.

In contrast, the President's budget includes a number of increases in important investments that the majority's proposal won't be able to fund, including: \$1 billion for biomedical research at the NIH with \$200 million for a Precision Medicine Initiative; \$2.4 billion for early education programs that would benefit Head Start, Child Care and Development Block Grants, and Preschool Development Grants; \$1 billion for Title I to support our nation's highest-need schools; and more than \$600 million for advanced research and development of medical countermeasures to prepare the nation for public health threats such as Ebola or Pandemic Influenza.

The Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill would be equally hard hit under the Chairman's proposal. If the past is a guide, capital programs will be grossly underfunded at this allocation. Specifically, it is likely that CDBG and HOME will be reduced to the lowest levels in the history of the program, progress on transit programs funded through Capital Investment Grants will stall, and there will be nothing done to alleviate the shortage of affordable and appropriate housing for the elderly and disabled.

The President's budget request and the Democratic alternative for the THUD bill would fully fund Capital Improvement Grants at \$3.2 billion, expand housing opportunities for the elderly and dis-



abled, and increase affordable housing construction through the HOME program.

The Interior bill's allocation paints a similar picture with an allocation that is \$246 million below the FY 2015 enacted level. Interior will still have to meet expanded needs: new preparations for the Centennial anniversary of the National Park Service; rising costs of combatting deadly wild fires; increased contract support costs in the Indian Health Service and Bureau of Indian Affairs, and all from an allocation below last year. The Democratic alternative would provide for these predictable needs.

The President's budget blueprint calls for an end to the mindless austerity of sequestration, instead replacing it with more targeted spending cuts, program integrity measures, and the closure of some outdated tax loopholes.

I think my colleagues on the other side generally agree that sequestration was a failure, and a return to sequester-level caps threatens important defense and non-defense priorities alike. The responsible course of action would be to reach agreement now on allocations that are more similar to the President's, which would protect key investments and meet the needs of an economy that has just begun to bounce back, so that we can fulfill our duty to enact spending bills for FY2016 before the end of this fiscal year.

NITA M. LOWEY.