

this country by strengthening Medicare for future generations. I am very glad that we have done things like starting to close the Medicare doughnut hole so that seniors are starting to save money on their prescriptions. In the first 6 months of 2013, more than a million seniors with Medicare have received at least one free preventative service—and our seniors have earned this through a lifetime of work.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1504

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOLF) at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2610.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 312 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. 2610.

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

□ 1505

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. 2610)

making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. MESSER 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 Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today I present H.R. 2610, a bill providing fiscal year 2014 appropriations for the Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies.

The T-HUD bill conforms with the 302(b) allocation of \$44.1 billion in budget authority, and is in line with the House budget of \$967 billion. Under such an allocation, we prioritized programs and spending and were able to achieve three very important funding goals: first, meet the "ob lim" funding levels for the MAP-21, the highway authorization bill; keep the commercial airspace running smoothly; and preserve and renew the housing option for all HUD-assisted families under lease in fiscal year 2014.

Mr. Chairman, I imagine today we're going to hear a lot about the budget and the sequester, and I'll tell you, I agree. We need a deal. We need a deal that resolves the irresponsible meat-ax approach to the sequester and provides a top-line budget number that addresses concerns about taxes and spending.

But the Budget Control Act is the law, and no matter what number we'd like to write this to, the law gives us \$967 billion to fund the government. You get there either by across-the-board cuts or by prioritizing the funds available. I think we all agree that continuing across-the-board cuts is not the answer. We've seen examples why.

Earlier this year, across-the-board cuts caused air traffic controllers to be furloughed, consumer convenience to be sacrificed, and air safety to be endangered. In April, the House voted on a strongly bipartisan basis 361-41 to tap unspent FAA funds and put these air traffic controllers back to work.

Mr. Chairman, we know that across-the-board cutting is no way to run a government. Considering there still isn't an agreement on the sequester or a top-line budget number, it's imperative that we realign the funds we have available to ensure DOT and HUD have the resources they need to care for the population and infrastructure of this Nation. This is a chance to make sure the "must-do" priorities are addressed.

I assume we're going to hear a lot about infrastructure investment, and I will tell you we fund the authorized programs at the authorized program levels.

I assume we're going to hear a lot about housing needs, and I will tell you, we retain the housing option for HUD families currently receiving assistance, protecting the most vulnerable.

We are operating under an open rule, and I hope we can keep the debate and amendment process moving along today. We will be taking points of order against amendments that would increase our allocations or authorize on an appropriations act. Let me reemphasize to people who are going to be offering amendments that we will enforce points of order.

I'd like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), the T-HUD ranking member, for his comity and willingness to discuss what would be possible under a \$44.1 billion allocation.

I'd also like to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, plus the members of the committee, and especially the subcommittee, for their hard work and commitment to this bill.

And speaking of subcommittee members, I'd like to give a special word of congratulations to a new and valued member of the Appropriations Committee. The gentlewoman from Washington, Ms. JAMIE HERRERA BEUTLER, and her husband, Daniel, recently welcomed their first child, a beautiful baby girl, into their family. This sweet girl is a miracle and a testament to the faith and hope that her parents have carried over recent months. We offer our continued praise for their strength, the wisdom of their doctors, and the joy of this new family.

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

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses.....	102,481	113,108	102,481	---	-10,627
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	(2,618)	---	(2,618)	---	(+2,618)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	(984)	---	(984)	---	(+984)
Office of the General Counsel.....	(19,515)	---	(19,867)	(+352)	(+19,867)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.....	(10,107)	---	(10,107)	---	(+10,107)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.....	(10,538)	---	(11,572)	(+1,034)	(+11,572)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.....	(2,500)	---	(2,500)	---	(+2,500)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	(25,469)	---	(23,376)	(-2,093)	(+23,376)
Office of Public Affairs.....	(2,020)	---	(2,020)	---	(+2,020)
Office of the Executive Secretariat.....	(1,595)	---	(1,595)	---	(+1,595)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.....	(1,369)	---	(1,369)	---	(+1,369)
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response.....	(10,778)	---	(10,778)	---	(+10,778)
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	(14,988)	---	(15,695)	(+707)	(+15,695)
Research and Development.....	---	14,765	14,220	+14,220	-545
National Infrastructure Investments.....	500,000	500,000	---	-500,000	-500,000
Rescission.....	---	---	-237,000	-237,000	-237,000
Aviation Consumer Call Center (legislative proposal)..	---	7,500	---	---	-7,500
Financial Management Capital.....	4,990	10,000	4,990	---	-5,010
Cyber Security Initiatives.....	10,000	6,000	2,000	-8,000	-4,000
Office of Civil Rights.....	9,384	9,551	9,384	---	-167
Transportation Planning, Research, and Development....	9,000	9,750	6,000	-3,000	-3,750
Rescission of unobligated balances.....	---	-2,750	-2,750	-2,750	---
Subtotal.....	9,000	7,000	3,250	-5,750	-3,750
Working Capital Fund.....	(172,000)	---	(172,000)	---	(+172,000)
Minority Business Resource Center Program.....	922	925	922	---	-3
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(18,367)	(18,367)	(18,367)	---	---
Minority Business Outreach.....	3,068	3,088	3,068	---	-20
Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	143,000	146,000	100,000	-43,000	-46,000
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	782,845	817,937	3,315	-779,530	-814,622
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations.....	9,653,395	9,707,000	9,521,784	-131,611	-185,216
Air traffic organization.....	(7,442,738)	(7,311,790)	(7,182,664)	(-260,074)	(-129,126)
Aviation safety.....	(1,252,991)	(1,204,777)	(1,199,777)	(-53,214)	(-5,000)
Commercial space transportation.....	(16,271)	(16,011)	(14,160)	(-2,111)	(-1,851)
Finance and management.....	(582,117)	(807,646)	(777,198)	(+195,081)	(-30,448)
Human resources programs.....	(98,858)	---	---	(-98,858)	---
Staff offices.....	(200,286)	(306,994)	(291,348)	(+91,062)	(-15,646)
NextGen.....	(60,134)	(59,782)	(56,637)	(-3,497)	(-3,145)
Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,730,731	2,777,798	2,155,000	-575,731	-622,798
Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund).....	167,556	166,000	145,000	-22,556	-21,000
Rescission of unobligated balances.....	---	---	-26,184	-26,184	-26,184
Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(3,435,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(-235,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(3,350,000)	(2,900,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+450,000)
Administration.....	(101,000)	(106,600)	(106,600)	(+5,600)	---
Airport cooperative research program.....	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	---	---
Airport technology research.....	(29,250)	(29,500)	(29,500)	(+250)	---
Small community air service development program...	(6,000)	---	---	(-6,000)	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rescission of contract authority.....	---	-450,000	---	---	+450,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	12,551,682	12,200,798	11,795,600	-756,082	-405,198
Limitations on obligations.....	(3,350,000)	(2,900,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+450,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(15,901,682)	(15,100,798)	(15,145,600)	(-756,082)	(+44,802)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on Administrative Expenses.....	(412,000)	(429,855)	(417,000)	(+5,000)	(-12,855)
Federal-Aid Highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(39,699,000)	(40,995,000)	(40,995,000)	(+1,296,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(39,699,000)	(40,256,000)	(40,256,000)	(+557,000)	---
(Exempt contract authority).....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	---	---	---	---	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(39,699,000)	(40,256,000)	(40,256,000)	(+557,000)	---
Exempt contract authority.....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(40,438,000)	(40,995,000)	(40,995,000)	(+557,000)	---
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)...	(251,000)	(259,000)	(259,000)	(+8,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(251,000)	(259,000)	(259,000)	(+8,000)	---
Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(310,000)	(313,000)	(313,000)	(+3,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(310,000)	(313,000)	(313,000)	(+3,000)	---
Rescission of contract authority.....	---	---	-95,957	-95,957	-95,957
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.....	---	---	-95,957	-95,957	-95,957
Limitations on obligations.....	(561,000)	(572,000)	(572,000)	(+11,000)	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(561,000)	(572,000)	(476,043)	(-84,957)	(-95,957)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and Research (general fund).....	140,146	148,343	117,000	-23,146	-31,343
Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(115,500)	(118,500)	(139,175)	(+23,675)	(+20,675)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(115,500)	(118,500)	(139,175)	(+23,675)	(+20,675)
Subtotal, Operations and Research.....	255,646	266,843	256,175	+529	-10,668
Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(554,500)	(561,500)	(561,500)	(+7,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(554,500)	(561,500)	(561,500)	(+7,000)	---
Highway safety programs (23 USC 402).....	(235,000)	(235,000)	(235,000)	---	---
National priority safety programs (23 USC 405)...	(265,000)	(272,000)	(272,000)	(+7,000)	---
High visibility enforcement.....	(29,000)	(29,000)	(29,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	(25,500)	(25,500)	(25,500)	---	---
Rescission of contract authority	---	---	-152,281	-152,281	-152,281
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.....	140,146	148,343	-35,281	-175,427	-183,624
Limitations on obligations.....	(670,000)	(680,000)	(700,675)	(+30,675)	(+20,675)
Total budgetary resources.....	(810,146)	(828,343)	(665,394)	(-144,752)	(-162,949)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and Operations.....	178,596	184,500	184,500	+5,904	---
Railroad Research and Development.....	35,000	35,250	35,250	+250	---
Research Development and Technology.....	---	54,750	---	---	-54,750
Rail Service Improvement Program.....	---	3,660,000	---	---	-3,660,000
Northeast Corridor Improvement Program (rescission)...	---	---	-4,419	-4,419	-4,419
Next Generation High-Speed Rail (rescission).....	---	---	-1,973	-1,973	-1,973
National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	466,000	---	350,000	-116,000	+350,000
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	952,000	---	600,000	-352,000	+600,000
Current Rail Passenger Service.....	---	2,700,000	---	---	-2,700,000
Subtotal.....	1,418,000	2,700,000	950,000	-468,000	-1,750,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	1,631,596	6,634,500	1,163,358	-468,238	-5,471,142
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative Expenses.....	102,713	109,888	102,713	---	-7,175
Formula and Bus Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(9,400,000)	---	---	(-9,400,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(8,478,000)	---	---	(-8,478,000)	---
Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program.....	---	25,000	---	---	-25,000
Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(9,500,000)	(9,500,000)	(+9,500,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(8,595,000)	(8,595,000)	(+8,595,000)	---
Research and University Research Centers.....	44,000	---	---	-44,000	---
Research, Development, Demonstration, and Deployment Program.....	---	30,000	20,000	+20,000	-10,000
Transit Cooperative Research.....	---	7,000	4,000	+4,000	-3,000
Technical Assistance and Standards Development.....	---	7,000	4,000	+4,000	-3,000
Human Resources and Training.....	---	5,000	2,000	+2,000	-3,000
Capital Investment Grants.....	1,955,000	1,981,472	1,815,655	-139,345	-165,817
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Capital and Preventive Maintenance.....	150,000	150,000	125,000	-25,000	-25,000
Rescission (H. Sec. 163)(S. Sec. 167).....	---	---	-81,338	-81,338	-81,338
Rescission of contract authority (H. Sec. 163).....	---	---	-70,000	-70,000	-70,000
Total, Federal Transit Administration.....	2,251,713	2,315,360	1,922,030	-329,683	-393,330
Limitations on obligations.....	(8,478,000)	(8,595,000)	(8,595,000)	(+117,000)	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(10,729,713)	(10,910,360)	(10,517,030)	(-212,683)	(-393,330)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and Maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund).....	32,259	32,855	30,582	-1,677	-2,273
Maritime Administration					
Maritime Security Program.....	174,000	208,000	174,000	---	-34,000
Operations and Training.....	156,258	152,168	143,768	-12,490	-8,400
Ship Disposal.....	5,500	2,000	4,000	-1,500	+2,000
Assistance to Small Shipyards.....	9,980	---	---	-9,980	---
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account: Administrative expenses.....	3,740	2,655	2,655	-1,085	---
Total, Maritime Administration.....	349,478	364,823	324,423	-25,055	-40,400

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Operational Expenses:					
General Fund.....	20,721	21,015	20,528	-193	-487
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	639	639	639	---	---
Pipeline Safety information grants to communities.....	(1,000)	(1,500)	(1,000)	---	(-500)
Subtotal.....	21,360	21,654	21,167	-193	-487
Hazardous Materials Safety:					
General Fund.....	42,338	45,801	42,762	+424	-3,039
Special Permit and Approval Fees.....	---	-6,000	---	---	+6,000
Subtotal.....	42,338	39,801	42,762	+424	+2,961
Pipeline Safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	90,679	133,000	90,679	---	-42,321
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.....	18,573	18,573	18,573	---	---
Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund.....	---	2,000	2,000	+2,000	---
Subtotal.....	109,252	153,573	111,252	+2,000	-42,321
Subtotal, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....	172,950	215,028	175,181	+2,231	-39,847
Pipeline safety user fees.....	-91,318	-133,639	-91,318	---	+42,321
Pipeline Safety Design Review fee.....	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	---
Emergency Preparedness Grants:					
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund.....	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	---	---
(Emergency preparedness fund).....	(188)	(188)	(188)	---	---
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....	81,632	79,389	81,863	+231	+2,474
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and Development.....	15,981	---	---	-15,981	---
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and Expenses.....	79,624	85,605	79,624	---	-5,981
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and Expenses.....	29,310	30,775	29,310	---	-1,465
Offsetting collections.....	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	---	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board.....	28,060	29,525	28,060	---	-1,465
General Provisions, this Title					
Section 193:					
(a) Deployment of MagLev Projects (rescission)....	---	---	-80,000	-80,000	-80,000
(b) Rail crossing safety and planning programs....	---	---	80,000	+80,000	+80,000
Total, title I, Department of Transportation..	17,945,016	22,709,135	15,297,617	-2,647,399	-7,411,518
Appropriations.....	(17,946,266)	(23,169,135)	(16,050,769)	(-1,895,497)	(-7,118,366)
Rescissions.....	---	(-2,750)	(-433,664)	(-433,664)	(-430,914)
Rescissions of contract authority.....	---	(-450,000)	(-318,238)	(-318,238)	(+131,762)
Offsetting collections.....	(-1,250)	(-7,250)	(-1,250)	---	(+6,000)
Limitations on obligations.....	(52,758,000)	(53,003,000)	(53,473,675)	(+715,675)	(+470,675)
Total budgetary resources.....	(70,703,016)	(75,712,135)	(68,771,292)	(-1,931,724)	(-6,940,843)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Management and Administration					
Executive Offices.....	---	14,540	12,000	+12,000	-2,540
Administration, Operations and Management.....	537,789	---	---	-537,789	---
Administration Support Offices.....	---	505,313	479,000	+479,000	-26,313
Program Office Salaries and Expenses:					
Public and Indian Housing.....	200,000	220,299	197,000	-3,000	-23,299
Community Planning and Development.....	100,000	109,740	99,000	-1,000	-10,740
Housing.....	391,500	383,375	377,000	-14,500	-6,375
Policy Development and Research.....	22,211	21,687	21,000	-1,211	-687
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.....	72,600	76,504	71,000	-1,600	-5,504
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control...	7,400	7,642	7,000	-400	-642
Subtotal.....	793,711	819,247	772,000	-21,711	-47,247
Total, Management and Administration.....	1,331,500	1,339,100	1,263,000	-68,500	-76,100
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	17,242,351	17,968,278	17,000,000	-242,351	-968,278
Tenant protection vouchers.....	75,000	150,000	75,000	---	-75,000
Administrative fees.....	1,375,000	1,685,374	1,350,000	-25,000	-335,374
Family self-sufficiency coordinators.....	60,000	---	---	-60,000	---
Veterans affairs supportive housing.....	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---
Sec. 811 mainstream voucher renewals.....	112,018	110,564	110,564	-1,454	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....	18,939,369	19,989,216	18,610,564	-328,805	-1,378,652
Advance appropriations.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill.....	18,939,369	19,989,216	18,610,564	-328,805	-1,378,652
Rental Assistance Demonstration.....	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Public Housing Capital Fund.....	1,875,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	-375,000	-500,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-10,000)	---	---	(+10,000)
Public Housing Operating Fund.....	4,262,010	4,600,000	4,262,010	---	-337,990
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-8,000)	---	---	(+8,000)
Choice neighborhoods.....	120,000	400,000	---	-120,000	-400,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-2,000)	---	---	(+2,000)
Rescission.....	---	---	-120,000	-120,000	-120,000
Family Self-Sufficiency.....	---	75,000	60,000	+60,000	-15,000
Native American Housing Block Grants.....	650,000	650,000	600,000	-50,000	-50,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-3,000)	---	---	(+3,000)
Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant.....	13,000	13,000	---	-13,000	-13,000
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account....	12,200	6,000	6,000	-6,200	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(976,000)	(1,818,000)	(1,818,000)	(+842,000)	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account... (Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	386 (41,504)	--- ---	--- ---	-386 (-41,504)	--- ---
Total, Public and Indian Housing.....	25,871,965	27,743,216	24,918,574	-953,391	-2,824,642
<hr/>					
Community Planning and Development					
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS..... Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	332,000 ---	332,000 (-2,000)	303,000 ---	-29,000 ---	-29,000 (+2,000)
Community Development Fund:					
CDBG formula.....	2,948,090	2,798,100	1,636,813	-1,311,277	-1,161,287
Indian CDBG.....	60,000	70,000	60,000	---	-10,000
Integrated planning and investment grants.....	---	75,000	---	---	-75,000
Neighborhood stabilization program.....	---	200,000	---	---	-200,000
Disaster relief.....	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
Subtotal.....	3,308,090	3,143,100	1,696,813	-1,611,277	-1,446,287
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)
Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108): (Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(240,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(+260,000)	---
Credit subsidy.....	5,952	---	---	-5,952	---
Rescission.....	---	---	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000
HOME Investment Partnerships Program..... Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	1,000,000 ---	950,000 (-5,000)	700,000 ---	-300,000 ---	-250,000 (+5,000)
Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program.....	53,500	---	30,000	-23,500	+30,000
Capacity Building.....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Homeless Assistance Grants.....	2,033,000	2,381,000	2,088,000	+55,000	-293,000
Total, Community Planning and Development.....	6,732,542	6,826,100	4,814,813	-1,917,729	-2,011,287
<hr/>					
Housing Programs					
Project-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	9,050,672	10,007,000	9,050,672	---	-956,328
Contract administrators.....	289,000	265,000	---	-289,000	-265,000
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....	9,339,672	10,272,000	9,050,672	-289,000	-1,221,328
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)
Advance appropriations.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000	---	---
Total, Project-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill.....	9,339,672	10,272,000	9,050,672	-289,000	-1,221,328
Housing for the Elderly..... Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	374,627 ---	400,000 (-2,000)	374,627 ---	---	-25,373 (+2,000)
Housing for Persons with Disabilities..... Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	165,000 ---	126,000 (-1,000)	126,000 ---	-39,000 ---	---
Housing Counseling Assistance.....	45,000	55,000	35,000	-10,000	-20,000
Rental Housing Assistance.....	1,300	21,000	21,000	+19,700	---
Rent Supplement (rescission).....	---	-3,500	-3,500	-3,500	---
Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund.....	6,500	7,530	6,530	+30	-1,000
Offsetting collections.....	-4,000	-6,530	-6,530	-2,530	---
Total, Housing Programs.....	9,928,099	10,871,500	9,603,799	-324,300	-1,267,701
<hr/>					
Federal Housing Administration					
Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account: (Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	---	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(50,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(-30,000)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-9,676,000	-10,841,000	-10,841,000	-1,165,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM).....	-170,000	-57,000	-57,000	+113,000	---
Administrative contract expenses.....	207,000	127,000	127,000	-80,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
General and Special Risk Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(25,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-588,000	-926,000	-926,000	-338,000	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration.....	-10,227,000	-11,697,000	-11,697,000	-1,470,000	---
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of Mortgage-backed Securities Loan					
Guarantee Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	19,500	21,200	19,000	-500	-2,200
Offsetting receipts.....	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-647,000	-707,000	-707,000	-60,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM) (Sec. 210)....	-23,000	-12,000	-12,000	+11,000	---
Additional contract expenses.....	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000	---
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association....	-750,500	-796,800	-799,000	-48,500	-2,200
Policy Development and Research					
Research and Technology.....	46,000	50,000	21,000	-25,000	-29,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair Housing Activities.....	70,847	71,000	55,847	-15,000	-15,153
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control					
Lead Hazard Reduction.....	120,000	120,000	50,000	-70,000	-70,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Management and Administration					
Information Technology Portfolio.....	---	285,100	100,000	+100,000	-185,100
Working Capital Fund.....	199,035	---	---	-199,035	---
Office of Inspector General.....	124,000	127,672	124,000	---	-3,672
Transformation Initiative.....	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
(By transfer).....	---	(80,000)	---	---	(-80,000)
Total, Management and Administration.....	373,035	412,772	224,000	-149,035	-188,772
(Grand total, Management and Administration)..	(1,704,535)	(1,751,872)	(1,487,000)	(-217,535)	(-264,872)
=====					
Total, title II, Department of Housing and					
Urban Development.....	33,496,488	34,939,888	28,455,033	-5,041,455	-6,484,855
Appropriations.....	(40,304,488)	(43,192,918)	(36,831,063)	(-3,473,425)	(-6,361,855)
Rescissions.....	---	(-3,500)	(-126,500)	(-126,500)	(-123,000)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-11,204,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-1,439,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-4,000)	(-6,530)	(-6,530)	(-2,530)	---
(by transfer).....	---	80,000	---	---	-80,000
(transfer out).....	---	-80,000	---	---	+80,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(70,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(-30,000)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(926,257,504)	(932,318,000)	(932,318,000)	(+6,060,496)	---
=====					

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Access Board.....	7,400	7,448	7,400	---	-48
Federal Housing Finance Agency, Office of Inspector General (legislative proposal).....	---	48,000	38,000	+38,000	-10,000
Offsetting collections (legislative proposal).....	---	-48,000	-38,000	-38,000	+10,000
Federal Maritime Commission.....	24,100	25,000	24,200	+100	-800
National Passenger Rail Corporation Inspector General.	20,500	25,300	25,300	+4,800	---
National Transportation Safety Board.....	102,400	103,027	102,400	---	-627
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.....	215,300	204,100	185,100	-30,200	-19,000
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness.....	3,300	3,595	3,000	-300	-595
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies....	373,000	368,470	347,400	-25,600	-21,070
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2)					
Department of Transportation					
Federal Aviation Administration					
Facilities and Equipment (emergency).....	29,600	---	---	-29,600	---
Federal Highway Administration					
Emergency Relief Program (emergency).....	2,022,000	---	---	-2,022,000	---
Federal Railroad Administration					
Operating Subsidy Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (emergency).....	32,000	---	---	-32,000	---
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (emergency).....	86,000	---	---	-86,000	---
Federal Transit Administration					
Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program (emerg)	10,900,000	---	---	-10,900,000	---
Total, Department of Transportation.....	13,069,600	---	---	-13,069,600	---
Department of Housing and Urban Development					
Community Planning and Development					
Community Development Fund (emergency).....	16,000,000	---	---	-16,000,000	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Other Appropriations.....	29,069,600	---	---	-29,069,600	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)
 (Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grand total.....	80,884,104	58,017,493	44,100,050	-36,784,054	-13,917,443
Appropriations.....	(58,623,754)	(66,778,523)	(53,267,232)	(-5,356,522)	(-13,511,291)
Rescissions.....	---	(-6,250)	(-560,164)	(-560,164)	(-553,914)
Rescissions of contract authority.....	---	(-450,000)	(-318,238)	(-318,238)	(+131,762)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(29,069,600)	---	---	(-29,069,600)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-11,204,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-1,439,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-5,250)	(-61,780)	(-45,780)	(-40,530)	(+16,000)
(by transfer).....	---	80,000	---	---	-80,000
(transfer out).....	---	-80,000	---	---	+80,000
(Limitation on obligations).....	(52,758,000)	(53,003,000)	(53,473,675)	(+715,675)	(+470,675)
Total budgetary resources.....	(133,642,104)	(111,020,493)	(97,573,725)	(-36,068,379)	(-13,446,768)

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. PASTOR of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. The devastating impacts of the Ryan budget are on full display in the fiscal year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies bill.

My good friend, Chairman TOM LATHAM, was given an impossible allocation of \$44.1 billion. This is \$4.4 billion below the fiscal year 2013 sequestration level and \$10 billion below the level included in the Senate bill. As a result, the FY 2014 bill makes deep cuts to a number of critical transportation and housing programs.

Within the Department of Transportation, the bill cuts the programs and activities of the Federal Aviation Administration by \$756 million below the FY 2013 CR level. While the bill provides enough funds to avoid additional furloughs, it is unclear whether FAA will be able to completely lift the hiring freeze that has been in place during this fiscal year.

The FAA's NextGen program will also be impacted by delaying the important developmental work on many of the program's emerging technologies.

Amtrak's capital program is cut by more than \$350 million, which will jeopardize long distance service and some short haul routes. At these funding levels, Amtrak will have to suspend mechanical overhauls on equipment, which will result in slow orders and furloughs of hundreds of mechanical employees and engineers.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development sustained even deeper cuts. The bill reduces funding for the CDBG, the Community Development Block Grant, program to \$1.6 billion, which is the lowest level since the program was created in 1975. The HOME program is funded at \$700 million, which is the lowest level since the program began in 1992.

The bill funds the Public Housing Capital Fund at its lowest level since 1987, adding more than \$1 billion in deferred capital maintenance to an existing \$26 billion maintenance backlog.

In closing, I do want to commend the chairman, TOM LATHAM, for funding the critical safety missions of the Department of Transportation and for honoring the obligation limitations in the surface and aviation bills. The chairman has also included sufficient funding to move 10,000 more homeless veterans off the street and into housing.

Despite the chairman's efforts, I have great concerns with the bill as it is currently written. I remain hopeful that we can achieve a more realistic allocation as the appropriations process moves forward this year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a great member of the committee.

Mr. COLE. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fiscal Year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act. I want to commend my good friend, Chairman LATHAM, for making some tough choices, but making those choices in a manner that was fair, transparent, and rational. I also want to thank my good friend, Mr. PASTOR, the ranking member on the other side of the aisle. He's always a pleasure to work with. He's always a delightful Member and he always contributes. I know while this bill may not be everything that he would like, he certainly added a great deal in the course of our deliberations.

The reality is that because of sequestration, the allocation this subcommittee was given is meager. The bill provides \$44.1 billion in discretionary spending—a reduction of many billions below the fiscal year 2013 enacted level. But let's be clear: that reduction is due to the Budget Control Act and the mechanism of sequestration, not the Ryan budget, which simply recognizes the realities that have been agreed upon and passed into law. It's worth noting that our friend, the President of the United States, recommended the sequester, which we're trying to enact in this budget.

At the same time, even with these cuts, the bill has maintained funding for the FAA Contract Tower Program, a program which is vitally important to maintaining safe national airspace.

The bill also provides funding to continue assistance to all families anticipated to hold section 8 and public housing vouchers at the beginning of fiscal year 2014. I know that was a tough mark to make, Mr. Chairman, and one that I appreciate that you did make because you put people first.

Additionally, this bill fully funds the President's request for veterans housing vouchers at \$75 million, a point that my friend, Mr. PASTOR, made.

Mr. Chairman, I know Mr. LATHAM and every member of this committee would like to spend more money on infrastructure; but because of our \$17 trillion crushing debt and because of unrestrained growth and entitlement spending, this is where we are and this is where we will be until we confront out-of-control entitlement spending.

Many of my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to reject this hard reality. Some believe we will never have to balance our budget. Some believe that trillions of dollars in additional tax increases are the solution. And some think that we don't need to make any changes in our entitlement programs. That approach, in my view, simply won't work.

The deficit we have is far too high, but it is less than half of what it was

when Republicans retook the House in 2010. That's progress. But more progress will need to be made until America actually balances its books. And that, I believe, will set the stage for faster, more robust economic growth.

I pledge to work with my friends on both sides of the aisle to find a compromise that will allow us to make vitally important investments while still lowering the deficit, but that compromise must involve entitlement reform. Until then, we frequently will continue to see important programs, such as the ones in this bill, starved for investments that they need.

So we need to get on to that bigger deal that my friend, Mr. LATHAM, talked about. I think the product of that deal will be much more robust appropriations for this particular subcommittee.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I want to commend both the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work on this bill. But no amount of hard work could redeem this bill, and I am rising in strong opposition. We call it the THUD bill. Well, the bill makes about the same sound as it spells—thud.

The majority's bill says of our transportation and infrastructure commitments, We don't care if the wheels fall off. It says of our housing and development commitments, We don't care if the roof caves in. Thud.

While I appreciate the hard work of the members of this subcommittee and of the dedicated staff on both sides of the aisle, the funding levels included in this bill are just unacceptable. They're impossible. The 302(b) allocation received by this subcommittee is 15 percent lower than it was last year. And that was already low. It's 19 percent below the Budget Control Act. It's nearly \$10 billion below the level that the Senate is considering in the same bill.

This funding level reflects the reckless discretionary spending caps adopted by the House majority in the Ryan budget resolution, which not only locked in sequestration; it doubled down on sequestration in order to shelter defense and homeland security bills from some of the cuts. This made allocations for our domestic investments even worse—far, far beyond the usual zone of political disagreement. The Transportation and Housing bill we're considering today is a prime example of this impossible tradeoff.

On the transportation side, the bill makes deep cuts to the capital programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, Amtrak, and the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts program. It zeroes out funding for the TIGER program, which has been enormously successful at advancing critical

surface transportation projects in communities across the country, and yet has had to leave thousands of meritorious proposals unfunded. Once again, the bill includes no funding for the development of high speed rail.

Funding for our housing needs is even worse. The bill reduces funding for the Community Development Block Grant program, a program that over the years has been known for its bipartisan support, to \$1.6 billion. That's the lowest level since this program was created in 1975. The HOME program is funded at \$700 million, the lowest level since that program began in 1992. And the bill rescinds funding for the Choice Neighborhoods program, the successor program of Hope VI. That means the bill lacks funding for any comprehensive revitalization program whatsoever.

During the Appropriations Committee markup of this bill, Democrats offered a series of amendments to restore these damaging cuts and produce a bill that more adequately meets our Nation's critical housing and infrastructure needs. All of those amendments were rejected on party-line votes.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the most tragic and disappointing fact about this bill is that the cuts it imposes could be avoided if the Republican leadership would only appoint budget conferees to go negotiate, with their Senate counterparts, a long-term deficit reduction deal that would lift sequestration and preserve vital investments in our future.

Alternatively, Republican leaders could reconsider their refusal to talk with the President. That offer from December still stands. They should work with him to address the real drivers of the deficit—tax expenditures and entitlements—thus, lifting sequestration, along with the drag it represents on our economy and the mockery it makes of the appropriations process.

The bill before us is exhibit A of this travesty. I urge my colleagues to raise their voices and their votes against it.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished friend from Chicago (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I became a member of the Appropriations Committee this Congress to make the tough funding choices that determine our national priorities, but this year's budget allocations have taken those choices away from us.

This bill is being touted as a budgetary tradeoff, but there are no tradeoffs in this bill. There are only cuts. Investments in our infrastructure are needed more than ever. Yet this bill makes some of the most significant cuts to vital transportation programs in decades.

We all remember the Recovery Act. An interesting fact about the Recovery Act is about 6 or 7 percent of that bill

dealt with infrastructure, but that 6 or 7 percent of that bill created about two-thirds of the jobs that the act created.

Unfortunately, in this bill there's no funding for TIGER grants, which fund infrastructure projects like the Elgin-O'Hare Western Access Project in my district, and no funding for Core Capacity Grants to fund desperately needed improvements to transit systems like the Chicago Transit Authority. Instead of increasing safety and capacity in air travel, we're slashing funding to the FAA's air traffic control modernization program. Instead of expanding rail service, we're cutting Amtrak's capital program by 37 percent.

The housing numbers are even worse. This bill cuts funding to housing programs that not only work but have a proven track record of saving the taxpayer money. There's no funding for the Choice Neighborhoods program, which helps communities revitalize distressed neighborhoods. There are significant cuts to the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, which is used to house some of the most vulnerable among us, and also another program which saves money. Community Development Block Grants, used by communities across the country, have been cut in half and are at their lowest levels since the Ford administration.

We're cutting investments in our future and essential services to those in need to pay for bloated defense spending the Pentagon often itself says it doesn't need. In the final analysis, countries that succeed invest in research, education, and infrastructure. Mr. Chairman, we're cutting all three.

I joined this committee to make the smart funding choices that will propel our Nation forward, but this bill does just the opposite. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. LATHAM. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I, first of all, want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking member, and all of the members of the subcommittee for their very good work. Given the allocation they have, they have done their very best.

I would follow up on a number of remarks by my colleagues, including the chairman, and that is we need a deal. And my plea to the membership is we cannot continue to go on like this.

This process no longer is on time. Our year starts October 1. In 2007, we finished in February. In 2008, we finished in December. In 2009, we finished in March. In 2010, we finished in December. In fiscal year 2011, we finished in April. In 2012, we finished in December. This year, we finished on March 26.

Since 2007, we should have enacted 84 individual appropriation bills. We have

enacted nine individually—about 10 percent of our work. Unfortunately, the body has made the work of this subcommittee, the full committee, and the other 11 subcommittees very difficult.

For fiscal year 2013, our committee was given a target in the summer of 2011, under the Budget Control Act. The target was changed under a resolution passed by the House for the budget in the spring of 2012. The target was changed again on January 1, 2013. Subsequently, we have sequestration. My plea to the general membership is, please, just give this exceptional committee one target and let us do our work.

I also am fearful because we are operating most agencies, including the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, under a continuing resolution that, for the vast majority of my colleagues, makes no difference. You wouldn't run your house or your business exactly the way you did last year.

□ 1530

We made these agencies wait 7 months to tell them they can keep doing the same thing for another 5 months, and on October 1 of this year we're going to do it again.

Some people say we're spending too much money. I agree, which is why I have actually brought a chart to the floor. We balanced a budget under President Nixon in 1969 for 1 year. We balanced a budget for 4 years under President Clinton. During those years, Federal spending was about 18.9 percent of GDP. For fiscal years 2011, 2012 and 2013, it was about 22.7. The response of this body is: we will do the Budget Control Act, and we will have mindless sequestration and treat all discretionary accounts the same.

Some people say we don't have enough revenue. They're absolutely right. When President Nixon and President Clinton balanced a budget for those 5 years, revenue was 20.1 percent of GDP. Today, it is 16.2.

We had a bill passed on January 1 that effectively now has limited us as far as any future revenue. I would point out 204 Members of this body voted for that bill in a bipartisan fashion, and 219 Members of this body today, in a bipartisan fashion, voted for the Budget Control Act, even though most of them complain about sequestration.

Today, we have the allocations this great subcommittee is faced with, and we are pounding our discretionary accounts. The fact is, in 1963 over 67 percent of what we spent as a national government was an investment in the future, in our children's future. In fiscal year 2012, that was down to 26 percent.

For those who want to continue this madness of going after discretionary spending, and particularly domestic discretionary spending—Department of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development—I would point out that

year, if we had eliminated the Government of the United States, eliminated the Congress and the Presidency and every agency except the Department of Defense and the entitlement programs, and did nothing on taxes, our deficit last year was \$472 billion. It is estimated this year, if we got rid of the Department of Transportation—which I think some people are trying to do with this allocation—if we got rid of HUD, if we got rid of the government, except for defense, except for entitlements, and did nothing on taxes, this year's deficit would be \$153 billion.

The American Society of Civil Engineers this year gave our country—the United States of America, the greatest country on Earth—a D-plus for our infrastructure. I have a bridge that was blown up in my district next to ArcelorMittal and BP. That's not helping create jobs.

They claim we are about \$1.6 trillion short between now and 2020 investing in infrastructure. That's what this bill is about, investing in the future.

We do need a deal; and the chairman mentioned it, the ranking member mentioned it. We do have to talk about entitlements for the sake of our children. What about our children when Social Security is insolvent in 2033? What about our children when Medicare is insolvent in 2024? We need to address those issues; and we need to address the issue of revenue to make sure we have enough to invest in those highways, in those classrooms, in those research institutes so that we can have a full and vibrant economy going forward.

For those who want to balance the budget and are about this madness of sequestration and crushing domestic discretionary spending, hurting defense discretionary spending, I would also point out that the Congressional Budget Office indicated in October of 2011 that for fiscal year 2012, one-third of the deficit would have gone away if we simply were at full employment.

So it is time to talk to each other. It is time to put everything on the table. It is time to invest in this country. And I would hope we do that sooner rather than later.

I appreciate very much the gentleman yielding me time.

Mr. LATHAM. I would inquire of the gentleman from Arizona if he has any more speakers.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, we're waiting for the ranking member of the full committee. She is on her way. So I will fill in the best I can.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. First of all, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, who is the ranking member on the Defense Appropriations, for his excellent presentation. Also, I join him in making that request to our leadership, both the majority and the minority, that we begin the conversation. We only have a few days before September

30 rolls around. So I would hope that we take his comments seriously and get to work and continue the process of the appropriation and lift the sequestration.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, what a difference a year makes. Last year, Chairman LATHAM put forward a responsible bill that invested in our Nation's infrastructure and the housing needs of our most vulnerable citizens. The bill we consider today, which is \$7.7 billion below the FY 2013 CR level and \$13.9 billion below the President's request, is a stark contrast. For example, last year's bill funded Amtrak's capital program at the highest level ever. This year's bill funds Amtrak at the lowest level in a decade, which will likely cause furloughs of mechanical employees and slower service.

Last year, the chairman spoke out against an amendment offered by Mr. CHAFFETZ to cut the CDBG program to \$2.95 billion—still \$1.3 billion higher than the level in this bill. Member after Member on the majority side spoke out against the cut, noting how important CDBG was to economic development in cities and States across the country. In fact, 17 Republican appropriators, including Chairman ROGERS and Chairman LATHAM, helped to defeat this wrong-headed cut by a vote of 157–267.

What changed? Have these programs become ineffective? Have local infrastructure needs and homelessness disappeared? Or do House Republicans simply support raising local taxes to fund affordable housing and infrastructure investments? Because that will be the result.

Unfortunately, what has changed is that the reckless Republican Ryan budget guts investments in domestic priorities that increase American prosperity. In fact, this bill alone would mean the loss of between 125,000 and 140,000 Tenant-Based Rental Vouchers, cause 146,000 people who are now housed to become homeless, and result in 7,110 fewer jobs created, and \$1.4 billion in lost economic output due to the \$237 million rescission to the TIGER program.

Instead of investing in affordable housing to help people make the transition from dependency to independence and investing in infrastructure to fix deficient transportation systems and create jobs, Republicans would rather defund the Affordable Care Act, block-grant Medicaid, privatize Medicare, while protecting subsidies for Big Oil and tax breaks for the very wealthiest Americans.

The Senate is currently marking up bills at the level to which Democrats and Republicans agreed in the bipartisan Budget Control Act. The Senate T-HUD bill provides a more responsible path that invests in job creation and

assistance to families suffering in this economy. For example, the Senate provides nearly \$10 billion more than the bill we consider today for infrastructure investments that have received strong bipartisan support and would create jobs, including \$1.45 billion to fund Amtrak, more than \$3 billion for the Community Development Block Grant program, \$550 million for the TIGER grant program, and \$1 billion for the HOME program.

If we are to avert a developing crisis and make progress on long-term fiscal challenges, Senate Democrats need a partner in the House majority to conference the budget. The American people, local governments, and small business owners want this budget standoff to end so that we can avoid shutting down the government in October and help them build a stronger economy.

When will Republicans stop holding their livelihoods hostage to the Ryan budget? House Democrats are ready to work with our Republican colleagues to responsibly address our fiscal challenges. However, if they continue to move farther away from consensus by turning once bipartisan bills like this one, T-HUD, into red meat messaging bills for their base, Congress will have a difficult time reaching a balanced agreement before the CR expires in 2 months.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, before I yield back my time, as we start this amendment process, I want to thank and commend the staff of the subcommittee. These are the individuals who worked very hard to bring this bill forward. They worked many hours and put in a lot of time and effort, so before we start the amendment process I want to recognize their hard work.

So I'd like to thank, from the minority staff, Kate Hallahan and Joe Carlile; from the majority staff, Dena Baron, Doug Disrud, Carl Barrick, Cheryle Tucker, and Brian Bernard because they spent countless hours bringing this bill to us.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman LATHAM for doing what he could with this bad allocation, and I look forward to the amendment process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I intend to yield back here, but let me associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) about commending the staff. He named everyone. I just wanted to, again, associate myself with that and thank him for being such a great partner through all this. It has been difficult, but the product we have is, I think, as good as we could possibly have with our allocation this year.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, the base bill contains divisive policy riders that would pointlessly prohibit federal investment in high-speed rail in California.

Rail has a long history in CA going back to 1869. Prior to “the last spike” joining Central Pacific and Union Pacific railroads, CA was isolated from the rest of the country.

Once the transcontinental railroad was completed, CA started to develop into the urbanized, industrialized economic and political powerhouse that it is today—the 12th largest economy in the world.

What we’re talking about here is jobs. Connecting LA and San Francisco will generate 66,000 jobs annually for 15 years and 2,900 permanent operations jobs for Phase 1. In the Central Valley, initial construction will produce 20,000 jobs annually for five years.

If you want to talk about Return on Investment, the initial state investment of \$2.6 billion from state bond funds will produce a net economic impact of \$8.3 to \$8.8 billion—a 3 to 1 return.

Every year, auto congestion drains \$18.7 billion in lost time and wasteful fuel from the state’s economy.

Our auto congestion is not something we can build ourselves out of . . . travel on CA’s interstate system is increasing at a rate 5 times faster than capacity is added.

Now is the time to invest in High Speed Rail in CA. This bill prohibits federal investment in high-speed rail in California, and fails to make other critically needed investments in our nation’s failing infrastructure: a 37% cut in Amtrak capital funds which will result in deferred maintenance; and a \$139 million cut to Federal Trust Transit Administration capital investment grants that will cancel scheduled projects in California and other states.

American’s sense of itself as an exceptional nation was true when we were investing in our national infrastructure, whether it was: electrification of our rural communities, building our interstate highway system, or connecting the East Coast to the West Coast by rail.

We need to dream big again and not be afraid to make those same kinds of investments in our national infrastructure, like high speed rail, and NextGen for a 21st century air traffic control system.

The American Society of Civil Engineers recently issued their report card for our nation’s infrastructure and the United States got a grade of D+.

This bill should be increasing our grade from a D+ to an A+.

We just need the political will.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, to build a vibrant economy, we must invest in building our nation’s infrastructure in a strategic and cost-effective way. Our businesses and communities need efficient transportation and goods movement; our aging neighborhoods need help to eliminate blight and to encourage additional private investment and business growth; and, our country needs to invest in job creation.

H.R. 2610 does not meet any of these needs. The uncompromising austerity of this bill strips our economy of its footing and imparts damage that will be felt for generations.

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) programs—critical investments in our infrastructure—will be cut in half by H.R. 2610. These grants are used to stabilize low income neighborhoods with tools that support and stimulate economic vitality. For every federal dollar spent in CDBG funds another \$3 in private and public investment is leveraged.

In Long Beach, CA last year, these grants provided services for 384 new and existing

small businesses, creating many new jobs; provided comprehensive services to 18,000 Long Beach community members, promoting progress towards permanent housing and self-sufficiency—lifting people out of poverty and off government assistance; and, completed exterior repairs and upgrades at 115 business sites revitalizing Long Beach neighborhoods.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2610 eliminates TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery Program) grants and it eliminates all funding for the Sustainable Communities Initiative—both are models of collaborative and efficient government. These two models support sustainable regional transportation systems and land use planning to promote economic health and workable communities, respectively.

America cannot afford to divest in its infrastructure. I ask for a “no” vote on H.R. 2610.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the Fiscal Year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, THUD, appropriations bill being considered before the House. This bill fails in almost every regard to prioritize our Nation’s crumbling infrastructure, expand affordable housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income Americans, and strengthen local economies through direct investment and job creation.

The House bill cuts \$7.7 billion from the enacted level for FY2013, slashing funds for vital community development programs, TIGER grants and high-speed rail projects, and even key assistance grants for our most vulnerable segment of the population: homeless individuals and families. This bill already cuts more than \$4 billion below the post-sequester amounts for FY2013, consistent with the terrible assumptions included in the Ryan Budget that the Defense Department will be spared from this shared sacrifice. Simply put, this bill will place the burden of these cuts squarely on the backs of low- and moderate-income Americans.

The FY2014 THUD appropriations bill is just another example of House Republicans’ refusal to work across the aisle to develop a sensible and bipartisan budget agreement that does not threaten our economic growth and competitiveness. Instead, my Republican colleagues have deliberately chosen to ignore the demands of the American people by developing a budget that makes drastic cuts to public programs without any deliberation on the basis of need or the public good.

Mr. Chair, the FY2014 THUD appropriations bill is simply unworkable in its current form. The drastic and indiscriminate cuts found in this bill will undermine critical investments in our Nation’s infrastructure, hollow out vital housing programs, and destroy jobs.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2610

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

Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, \$102,481,000, of which not to exceed \$2,618,000 shall be available for the Immediate Office of the Secretary; not to exceed \$984,000 shall be available for the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary; not to exceed \$19,867,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; not to exceed \$10,107,000 shall be available for the Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy; not to exceed \$11,572,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs; not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs; not to exceed \$23,376,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration; not to exceed \$2,020,000 shall be available for the Office of Public Affairs; not to exceed \$1,595,000 shall be available for the Office of the Executive Secretariat; not to exceed \$1,369,000 shall be available for the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization; not to exceed \$10,778,000 for the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response; and not to exceed \$15,695,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any office of the Office of the Secretary to any other office of the Office of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no appropriation for any office shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent by all such transfers: *Provided further*, That notice of any change in funding greater than 5 percent shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$60,000 shall be for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, excluding fees authorized in Public Law 107-71, there may be credited to this appropriation up to \$2,500,000 in funds received in user fees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for the position of Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Today’s bill is part of the House majority’s irresponsible charade of a budget process. The sequester cuts affecting 2013 spending levels are having a tangible impact on American families and hurting our economy: 70,000 children losing access to Head Start; 4 million fewer Meals on Wheels delivered; \$1.5 billion in cuts to the National Institutes of Health’s lifesaving medical research and jobs; degraded military readiness; furloughs and reduced paychecks for hundreds of thousands of Federal employees; and delayed safety modernization at airports.

□ 1545

My friends on the other side of the aisle want it both ways. They adopted

a budget resolution that endorses the sequester levels for next year, locking in a top-line figure \$92 billion below the Senate's and the President's budget levels, while they pretend they fixed the sequester for defense. They cut more than required on the domestic side and did nothing to shield defense programs from legally mandated cuts under sequestration. If the House bills are enacted, defense will be cut \$48 billion in January as a result of the sequester because the majority has not enacted legislation to stop it—\$48 billion when General Dempsey has made it very clear to those of us who have had recent talks with him that our readiness is at stake.

The Republicans allocated more adequate funding to the initial bills to fund military construction, veterans affairs, defense, and homeland security. The remaining bills have quickly revealed the Republicans' thoroughly inadequate investments to sustain job creation and invest in America's future prosperity.

Perhaps no other bill's programs mean as much to the communities in our districts as the bill we are considering today, yet it guts affordable housing and community development and underfunds rail, air, and road transportation networks.

The same majority wrote a very different bill last year that reflected an understanding of the impact these programs have on our economy and Americans' livelihoods.

Compare the House bill to the Senate version, which is almost \$10 billion higher. Seventy-three Senators, including 19 Republicans, voted to proceed to floor debate. The House bill, on the other hand, was reported from committee on a straight party-line vote.

I would be hard-pressed to find a better example of fiddling while Rome burns than the House majority's budget and appropriations process this year. They continue to trot out bills despite White House veto threats and despite even worse sequestration cuts right around the corner.

I have asked at our committee to suspend our markup until we conference a budget resolution with the Senate so that we can negotiate a reasonable top line for the appropriations process. There is no sense in the House proceeding alone with levels totally unacceptable to the White House and the Senate, yet we will be here late into the evening again considering amendments to a bill that is going nowhere.

When the House returns after the August recess, we will have only 9 legislative days until the end of the fiscal year: 9 days to negotiate a path forward, 9 days to avert a government shutdown, 9 days to do the jobs we were sent here to do—work together to invest in America and build up our economy.

I genuinely hope our majority will be prepared in the fall for the necessary compromise these negotiations require,

because this bill shows they are not prepared for responsible governance today.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the report for this year's Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill, the "THUD" bill, as I noted earlier, states:

The Nation is in desperate need for infrastructure and investment.

I am glad we can agree on that. We are indeed in desperate need, yet the bill before us hardly reflects that. It chooses to prioritize spending cuts over putting Americans back to work. It is part of a budget process that places antitax ideology above all and refuses to address the main drivers of the deficit. Instead, it simply doubles down on sequestration, making sequestration even worse with respect to the domestic bills so as to give some measure of protection to defense. It is an atrocious process, and this bill is Exhibit A for this travesty.

We all know America's surface transportation network is essential for moving goods and services, as well as people, in an efficient manner. Unfortunately, that transportation system is becoming increasingly outdated and ineffective. The American Society of Civil Engineers recently gave America's infrastructure a cumulative grade of "D."

Congestion, aging trains and roads, and thousands of structurally deficient bridges are imposing real costs on the American people and on the American economy. It is estimated that Americans spend 4.2 billion hours a year stuck in traffic. I can testify to sharing that experience last Sunday. This costs the economy \$78.2 billion annually. The poor condition of our roads costs motorists another \$67 billion a year in repairs and operating expenses.

The civil engineers stated that "current spending amounts to only about half of the needed investment." Instead, similar to the proposed Ryan budget, this Republican fiscal year 2014 THUD bill would underfund programs that provide critical investments in transportation alternatives and smart growth, providing about \$2 billion in total for transit programs, which is about a 17 percent cut from last year.

The bill would completely eliminate funding for the overwhelmingly popular and successful TIGER grant program, which invests in multimodal projects, including roads and bridges, transit, high-speed and intercity passenger rail, freight rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and ports—these things that promise to achieve critical national objectives and make our communities more livable and sustainable. On top of that, the bill would even rescind funding for the fiscal year 2013 TIGER grant process that is already under way.

The bill also decreases funding for the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts and Small Starts program, which is the primary source of Federal support for major transit capital projects that are locally planned, implemented, and operated. They are critical for leveraging local investment to implement transit alternatives.

And then for yet another year, the bill provides zero dollars for development of high-speed rail corridor development. I speak as a representative of a State where high-speed rail development between Raleigh and Charlotte is well under way and holds great promise. Yet this bill denies further resources, denies that kind of support for other parts of the country. Our Nation has a major competitiveness gap in this area. These investments make sense. Sometimes you have to spend some money to make some money, and high-speed rail investments have a synergistic impact. They upgrade our rail infrastructure, they improve the mobility of goods and people, and they create jobs.

Finally, Amtrak. This bill is pathetic with respect to Amtrak—only \$950 million total. Of this, only \$600 million goes to the capital account. That is a 37 percent reduction from last year and more than \$1 billion less than the administration's request for capital.

You can figure out how this is going to work. You subtract from that amount Amtrak's required mandatory debt service, that is \$200 million; safety-critical work and inspections and maintenance mandated by Federal law, that is another \$200 million; and new equipment expected to be delivered this year that will add capacity and improve returns on long-distance trains, that is \$100 million. So you see where that money is going. It leaves almost nothing for capital investment in the national system, including improving accessibility for passengers with disabilities.

When you are cutting things this closely, it means the work you are going to do is going to be done less efficiently. Amtrak will have to fix problems only as they occur. It will defer major work. That is bad policy. It is bad economics. If Amtrak deteriorates, service will suffer, revenue will suffer, Amtrak's costs will go up, and that will eventually be reflected in higher appropriations needs in the future.

Mr. Chairman, transportation investments help improve the mobility of millions of Americans and provide alternatives to congested roadways. They foster the development of more livable communities and are proven job-creators. It is absolutely penny wise and pound foolish to shortchange these investments. I urge defeat of this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, by gutting investments in transportation

and housing, the majority is proposing to bring our Nation backward at a time when we must be building the infrastructure needed to compete and win in a competitive global economy.

For example, with today's legislation, the majority is proposing to slash the Community Development Block Grant program by almost half. These cuts would be devastating to the working poor in communities like Rochester, New York, which I represent, where block grants provide housing assistance and investments in neighborhoods that are woefully underserved.

Furthermore, the majority is proposing to gut investments in infrastructure projects, and particularly passenger rail. They do so at a time when rail ridership continues to grow across the country.

In Rochester, the Amtrak ridership has been increased by 89 percent since 2008, despite the fact that decades of underinvestment have resulted in aging rails, delayed trains we have to sidetrack to let the freight go by, and a crumbling train station.

I want to say something about this train station. It was built over 45 years ago as a temporary train station. It has not, in all these years, been ADA compliant. You cannot imagine what it is like to get somebody in a wheelchair from the station up onto the train, or to watch a mother with a stroller struggle to get up there because it is impossible to do. 144,000 people went through that railroad station last year, and they deserve something more like the 21st century.

I have fought years to improve train travel; and we are finally getting to build, with a TIGER grant, a new intermodal station in the heart of the city. Like countless other cities and towns, our work has been supported by Federal TIGER grants, which have provided vital support in modernizing our city's infrastructure. The funding is allowing Rochester and countless other communities to build the roads, rails, and runways we need to compete for the jobs of the future. But we cannot allow that to happen if we cut out the very means by which we fund them.

Ridership, as I have said, on Amtrak's high-speed Acela, which I wish we had—we only have one sort-of-high-speed rail in New York—continues to reach record highs, and States like California and Illinois and North Carolina are already building high-speed rail lines. That is terribly important.

As cochair of the bicameral Congressional High-Speed Passenger Rail Caucus, I will soon be joined today by fellow members who realize the incredible value of Amtrak and nationwide passenger rail to our country.

The truth is that our rail system reaches throughout our economy and supports tens of thousands of jobs. The bill before us today endangers these jobs, including the jobs of 20,000 Amtrak employees and the private businesses who sold \$1.3 billion worth of domestic goods and services to Amtrak last year.

As my colleagues will tell you, endangering jobs today and our economy is a recipe for failure, especially at a time when our infrastructure really needs to be upgraded. As we rebuild places like Afghanistan, it always makes me so angry. If they are going to be building high-speed rail there, I want to build it in New York, in America somewhere.

Let me tell you this story, which I think will bring it home to all of you.

In 1893, the president of New York Central Railroad, for reasons I'm not really clear, lived way out in upstate New York. He had to commute to New York City every day during the week and spent the weekends at home. In 1893, they decided they would have a race with steam engines, so they raced the few miles between Buffalo and Rochester to see which one of those engines were the fastest. Mr. Chair, they set a world record by traveling at 112½ miles an hour between Rochester and Buffalo.

Today, we are on the same track. It hasn't been improved any, but we can't go anywhere near like that. There is no way we can get even close to 80 miles an hour. We can't do that. Mostly it is about 40. It takes a lot longer now to travel from Rochester to Buffalo than it did in 1893.

□ 1600

Crumbling infrastructure like this is not only harmful to our economy but is an embarrassment to a Nation that has never been scared to dream big, and while it is true that our Nation has faced challenges over the past few years, we need big answers.

The proposed bill fails our country now and into the future. Now is not the moment to stop investing in our country nor is it the time to resign ourselves to a future of diminished success. Instead, it is a time to roll up our sleeves and to put our country back to work.

We can answer the call of a generation by investing in the future, and we can build a better, more prosperous America one road, one runway, and one rail line at a time. So I urge my colleagues to reject the cynical and backwards-looking legislation that is before us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1893]

GREAT SPEED ON THE CENTRAL

EMPIRE STATE EXPRESS ENGINE TRAVELS AT THE RATE OF 112½ MILES AN HOUR

BUFFALO, NY, May 11.—If the New York Central officials wanted a record for their new engine, No. 999, preparatory to exhibiting her at the World's Fair, they have got one now that beats the world. It is 112½ miles an hour.

On Tuesday the Empire State Express, drawn by this marvelous machine, made 102 miles an hour, a great record in itself, but Engineer Charles Hogan said she was not feeling well that day and could do better. She was given a night's rest here, and yesterday morning was brought out, looking ponderous, trim, and stately, and sent down to Syracuse for another trial.

The Empire State Express arrived in Syracuse on time, and Hogan and No. 999 were ready to take her. The engine was coupled on and the train left Syracuse on time. Hogan let her out a few times on the way to Rochester, just to see if she was feeling good, and finding that she responded to every touch of the throttle he contentedly bided his time. He did not want to get ahead of his schedule and he brought her into the Rochester depot at just the right moment. The test of speed was to come between Rochester and this city. Soon after leaving Rochester Hogan slowed her down a little, for he intended to make up the time at the western end of the trip. Passing Batavia, the train was rushing along at an easy gait of a mile a minute. Then Hogan let her out. The speed increased as the engine flew along, and just before reaching Crittenden the record of Tuesday of a mile in thirty-five seconds was equaled. But this was exceeded just this side of that station, when the new world's record of a mile in thirty-two seconds was made.

This is equivalent to 112½ miles an hour. A speed nearly as great was kept up until Forks Station was reached, and then Hogan slowed her down and allowed her to enter Buffalo at her customary speed, arriving on time.

The passengers on board said that the train flew along with the same steadiness that would have accompanied a slower rate of speed. There was no unusual swaying or jolting, and only persons who were looking out for manifestations of extraordinary speed would have noticed that the clickety-click of the rails sounded like the roar of musketry, and the telegraph poles along the track seemed like pickets in a fence.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the New York Central Railroad yesterday the determination was reached to begin the running of the twenty-hour train to Chicago on the 28th inst. The train will be known as the "Exposition Flier." The question of fare has not yet been definitely settled. Doubtless the action of the Trunk Line Presidents today will have some effect on the rate. An advance of from \$5 to \$10 on the regular fare will probably be charged. The speed of this fast train will be about fifty miles an hour.

Mr. NADLER. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the FY14 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill.

This bill is the perfect illustration of the majority's cruel and misguided priorities. We hear a lot from the other side about how we need to cut the budget, reduce the deficit and rein in spending, but, clearly, that's just rhetoric. Last week, the majority put a bill on the floor that increased defense spending substantially, including extra funding for programs the administration and the military didn't want and have no intention of using. The reality is that the majority in this House is perfectly willing to increase spending for things they care about, like military contracts, but not for ensuring adequate housing, investing in economic and community development or even in transportation infrastructure.

The bill before us today is so bad that it's hard to imagine how it can be fixed. The House bill is fully \$10 billion less than the Senate bill, and it's virtually impossible to find offsets for amendments to improve the bill, but

it's important for us to highlight some of the egregious cuts, such as the drastic cuts to the Amtrak capital and operating budget. Just a few years ago, Congress passed the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act, PRIIA, which authorized a total of \$9.8 billion for Amtrak for the fiscal years 2009 through 2013, but the actual appropriations for Amtrak over this time period was \$2.5 billion below the authorized amount.

There is no question we need to invest more in our railroads. A working group for the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission reported that the total capital cost estimate of establishing a national intercity passenger rail network between now and 2050 would be about \$357 billion, or a little over \$8 billion annually. We are nowhere near that, and the bill before us today takes us in exactly the wrong direction. This bill slashes Amtrak's capital program by 37 percent and Amtrak's operations by 25 percent from last year's enacted level.

These funding levels would have a drastic impact on Amtrak's ability to maintain service. Once you take into account Amtrak's financial obligations, such as contract payments and federally mandated safety work, Amtrak would have only \$100 million to cover the investment needs of the entire system. The Northeast corridor alone requires about \$780 million per year to address longstanding state of good repair needs, and Amtrak will have to defer maintenance, which will cause service delays and interruptions, and increased costs in the long run.

This is idiotic. I know some people are Amtrak haters no matter the facts, but here are a few more facts that are noteworthy.

Commuter lines on the Northeast corridor carry 235 million passengers every year. These are mostly business travelers who rely on the reliability of Amtrak's rail in order for them to get to work and foster economic growth. If Amtrak cannot maintain the rails adequately, all of these commuter rail systems around all of our major cities will stop being efficient, will stop being able to transport their people.

Amtrak employs nearly 20,000 people in 46 States. Amtrak employees paid more than \$64 million in State and local taxes last year. Amtrak did business for suppliers equaling about \$1.3 billion last year. Cutting funding for Amtrak jeopardizes all of this economic activity and all of the good-paying jobs associated with it. It will ultimately cost taxpayers a lot of money in the long run.

Amtrak provides a vital service for communities all around the country. We should be increasing investments in Amtrak and developing intercity and high-speed rail. This bill includes no funds whatsoever for the TIGER grant program. In fact, it rescinds \$237 million in previous TIGER funds. The bill also includes no funding for the

Projects of National and Regional Significance account, which is authorized under the MAP-21 bill that we passed last year but that is now subject to general fund appropriations. The New Starts program will fund some new transit programs, but that account is cut as well, and there is only enough funding to maintain commitments to projects currently in the pipeline. So there are, essentially, no programs to fund any new construction of major transportation projects.

The majority has offered no solutions for how to invest in future economic growth, to facilitate interstate commerce and to maintain our global competitiveness. I urge my colleagues to reject these disastrous cuts to Amtrak, these disastrous cuts to TIGER and to general infrastructure, and to support moving us back toward an intelligent transportation policy. I have to urge a "no" vote on the FY14 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill.

Later in this debate, I will discuss the equally disastrous cuts in Community Development Block Grants. It's just another example of how this bill is dismantling the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FATTAH. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I come to address the House, the Congress of the United States.

We are the wealthiest country in the world. We are the most powerful country in the world. We have one program that focuses on improving the lives and life chances of people in our lower-income communities across our country. It's called the Community Development Block Grant. It was created under Republican President Richard Nixon in 1974.

Since its inception, we have invested about \$132 billion in some 1,209 communities across our country. Over the life of this program, we have invested about the same amount as we took to build the International Space Station. In 1 year, we spent approximately the same amount in Afghanistan. This year, we are spending \$3.3 billion on the Community Development Block Grant, which is the lowest amount in the history of our Nation.

What the majority, my friends on the other side, are proposing in this appropriations bill is to spend the least amount ever on this effort. They want to slash it from \$3.3 billion to \$1.6 billion. Now, it's not that they are mean-spirited. It is because the allocation for this bill is fatally deficient. It is too low to meet the needs of the greatest country on Earth in so many respects that we could be here all day in pointing out the deficiencies, but I want to focus on just this one program.

Because it was created by a Republican President, it operates in the most, I think, approving way for those on the other team. That is to say that

these are grants for which all of the decisions are made at the local level by Republican and Democratic Governors, by Republican and Democratic local officials. They decide what the priorities are going to be to help uplift these communities. So it's unfortunate that they would single out this particular program—the only program that we have to help the neediest communities across our country. I've seen it. It has worked in local business districts, encouraging small business development. I've seen its work in helping seniors put in major systems repair and heating and windows or roofing so that they can be protected in the winter.

This is a great program, even though it was developed by a President of the other party. It operates through local decisionmaking. It's already at the lowest level ever, and if you added up what we've invested in it in all of these years, it wouldn't add up to what we've spent in building the International Space Station. If we added up all that we've spent on it in all of these years, it barely gets to the number we spend in 1 year in Afghanistan, but we still think somehow we should cut it in half.

It's a wrongheaded decision. I would ask that we reconsider it. I know the allocation is tough, but it's going to be a lot tougher on so many more Americans who live in communities, in being reminded of what Jay-Z said, that have their shades on and are just waiting on the Sun to shine their way. I would ask my colleagues to think about that as we go forward. Think about the wrongheadedness of this and how unworthy it is for the greatest country on Earth to say to its citizens who need our help that somehow we can spend money in Afghanistan—in some far off place—or that we can build a great International Space Station, which I support, but that we can't do anything about the challenges in these neighborhoods. I ask the entire House to live up to our responsibilities in a much different way than we are doing now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFIN OF ARKANSAS

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Page 56, line 25, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, on March 29, 2013, the ExxonMobil Pegasus pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas, spilled thousands of gallons of oil into the homes and onto the properties surrounding the ruptured pipelines. I am committed to making things right for the people of Mayflower by ensuring that another spill like this doesn't occur again in Arkansas.

The U.S. Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA, is responsible for regulating and ensuring the safe and secure movement of oil and petroleum products to industry and consumers through our Nation's interstate pipelines. As an interstate pipeline, the inspection of the Pegasus pipeline was PHMSA's responsibility.

Pipelines move nearly two-thirds of the oil and petroleum products transported annually. Interstate pipelines deliver over 11.3 billion barrels of petroleum each year. The cost to transport a barrel of petroleum products from Houston to the New York Harbor is about a dollar. American pipelines are indisputably the safest way to move oil, and I remain supportive of the pipeline infrastructure as it will provide important jobs and energy to Americans, but we've got to make sure these pipelines are safe. Every year, pipelines transport more than 11 billion barrels of oil, and last year, less than five ten-thousandths of 1 percent of it was lost to spills.

We've got to do what we can to make sure spills that did occur don't happen again. Although the number of spills is a minimal fraction of what we safely transport throughout the country, I know that we can still make more certain the safety of our Nation's pipelines. I continue to support the safe transport of our Nation's oil and petroleum products, and I have introduced my amendment to increase the budget for PHMSA's operational expenses by \$500,000 to further ensure the safety of our Nation's pipelines.

This appropriation finances the operational support costs for PHMSA, including agency-wide functions of administration, management, policy development, legal counsel, budget, financial management, civil rights, human resources, acquisition services, information technology, and governmental and public affairs.

I ask that the House support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. LATHAM. I think it is very well thought out. The gentleman does have it offset, so the committee position on this side would be to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), who talked about the underfunding of so many important

programs in this bill but, in particular, of the Community Development Block Grant program.

When we talk about our national security, it means more than the number of missiles that we possess, and it means more than the number of military bases we have overseas. It means as well—and just as importantly—many of the priorities that are contained in the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

That is why it pains me to come to the floor today to lament about how woefully underfunded key transportation, infrastructure and housing programs are in this bill—programs that revitalize our communities, help our neighbors secure affordable housing, and support smart economic development.

□ 1615

The bill, as it is before us today, simply put, is unfixable at its current allocation level. There are programs like the HOME program, which is at its lowest funding level in its history. Just so my colleagues understand, the HOME program is a critical Federal investment utilized by States and localities to provide affordable rental and homeownership opportunities for low-income households. As we recover from a damaging recession, these cuts in this program will put further strain on affordable housing opportunities.

This bill also severely underfunds tenant-based rental assistance, project-based rental assistance, and the Public Housing Capital Fund. I continue to hear from housing advocates in my home State of Massachusetts, and their message is consistent and clear: we need more funding in these accounts to ensure that all families have access to affordable, comfortable, and stable housing.

The families that we're talking about aren't losing sleep overnight wondering whether they're going to be attacked from some country overseas. They're losing sleep overnight because they don't know whether they're going to have shelter to protect their own families. They're worried about their own security in this country, and yet we are underfunding these programs so significantly.

I'm especially concerned, as my colleague from Pennsylvania stated, about the proposed reduction in Community Development Block Grant funding. This bill cuts CDBG formula grants by nearly 50 percent and funds this program at its lowest level since its creation in the 1970s.

In April, I joined with 143 bipartisan Members on a programmatic request letter to appropriators in support of \$3.3 billion for this program. In July, after the subcommittee's legislation was released, 101 bipartisan Members wrote to the Appropriations Committee again expressing support for effective funding levels. There is demonstrated bipartisan support for Com-

munity Development Block Grants, Mr. Chairman, because these dollars are at work in communities in each of our districts.

Last week, Governor Deval Patrick of Massachusetts announced that 38 communities in Massachusetts will receive over \$31 million in CDBG funding. These dollars will fund housing rehabilitation, child care centers, cityscape improvements, and social services, just to name a few. I also want to point out that every \$1 in Community Development Block Grants leverages an additional \$3.55 in funding to revitalize our communities. Investing these Federal dollars in our cities and in our towns spurs redevelopment efforts and provides a high return on our investment. These funds also create and save jobs. Since fiscal year 2005, these funds have created or retained over 300,000 jobs. If my friends on the other side of the aisle are serious about job creation, CDBG is not the place to cut.

Realizing the need for effective funding, the Senate appropriations bill funds the program at \$3.15 billion. So, should this bill go to conference, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject these cuts in the House bill and support robust funding for Community Development Block Grants, a program with a proven record of supporting community development efforts across our country.

Let's stop these reckless and harmful cuts to our communities. We ought to be on the floor today fixing sequestration. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle should be on the floor today appointing conferees on the budget so that we can negotiate more reasonable allocations on these appropriations bills.

I would remind my colleagues that this is not some abstract debate that we're having here today on the floor. These cuts will hurt real people. They will pave the way for more deterioration of our cities and towns. They will cost jobs and they will hurt our economy. Enough is enough. We're supposed to be helping people, not hurting people. It's time for Congress to get its priorities straight.

I urge my colleagues to support the CDBG program, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with my colleague, Mr. LATHAM, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I know that you know that our Nation suffers from a spending-driven debt crisis and the only real remedy is to quit spending money that we don't have. But because the President would not

work with us to enact meaningful, targeted spending discipline, his sequester has been enacted.

Mr. Chairman, we are stewards of the taxpayers' dollars; and with the President's sequester in place, I believe that it's more critical than ever that our Nation's transportation funding be spent wisely, including funding for the FAA's Contract Tower Program because, Mr. Chairman, in Washington, it's not always how much money you spend that counts; it's how you spend the money.

I would ask the distinguished chairman to work with me and other Members to ensure that this critical funding is allocated to the facilities that represent the greatest cost benefit to the taxpayer.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LATHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's attention to this issue. I look forward to working with him and the FAA to ensure that our limited Federal dollars go to towers that provide the greatest benefit to the taxpayer.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2610. This bill, which was crafted to conform to the strangling and senseless limits of the Ryan budget, would cut the total discretionary funding for the Transportation-HUD appropriations measure by \$7.7 billion below the enacted fiscal year 2013 appropriation and by more than \$4 billion below the level of funding provided after sequestration took effect.

These cuts would devastate programs like the Community Development Block Grant program and the HOME program, which are essential to supporting development in cities throughout our Nation and to providing housing and other services to our most vulnerable citizens.

This bill would also be devastating to our national passenger rail service, Amtrak; and that is the specific issue I will address today.

The bill before us would cut the capital grant provided to Amtrak by some \$352 million and cut the operating grant by \$119 million below the enacted fiscal year 2013 levels. Such cuts would likely force Amtrak to reduce its maintenance levels and furlough maintenance personnel. Such cuts may even lead to reduced service on the Northeast corridor, the critical link on the eastern seaboard among Washington, D.C., Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston.

In their views on the Transportation-HUD appropriations measure, the mi-

nority noted that this bill is out of touch with reality and that it is nowhere more evident than in the proposed funding level for Amtrak.

While the House majority has undertaken a relentless effort to destroy Amtrak, the traveling public has made it clear they consider Amtrak to be an essential part of our Nation's transportation network.

Amtrak finished fiscal year 2012 having carried more than 31 million passengers—the highest number of passengers in any year since Amtrak was created. This total included more than 11 million passengers who traveled on the Northeast corridor. Together, the long-distance routes had their highest passenger volumes in 19 years and Amtrak set 12 consecutive monthly ridership records in fiscal year 2012. To put this number in perspective, if Amtrak were an airline, it would be the sixth largest in the country.

Americans have voted with their ticket purchases, and they are choosing to ride Amtrak in greater numbers. In fact, record ridership growth is continuing in fiscal year 2013. Rather than seeking to destroy a service critical to our Nation's mobility, we should be investing in this system to ensure it can continue to meet increased passenger demand with increased speed and efficiency.

Significant infrastructure improvements are needed all along the Northeast corridor to create truly high-speed rail service. In Maryland, for example, the B&P tunnel, which carries every train traveling into Washington, D.C., from all points north of the city, must be replaced. This tunnel was opened in 1873 and its design limits train speeds to 30 miles per hour. We would not think of relying on technology from the 1870s in other aspects of our lives. We wouldn't want medical technology or communications technology from the 1870s. And we should not be content to rely on transportation infrastructure from the 1870s.

The President has rightly threatened to veto this bill; and rather than waste the House's time on legislation like this that threatens to degrade our transportation networks and delay passengers and commerce, we should be considering bills that will make long overdue investments to expand our mobility and support our economic growth. Rather than cutting investments in Amtrak, we should be investing in the development of truly high-speed rail on the Northeast corridor and throughout the northeastern United States.

And before we consider this or any other appropriations measures, the House and Senate should follow regular order by appointing conferees who can resolve a budget that can be adopted by both bodies and that can then guide the development of appropriations measures for fiscal year 2014.

I urge Members to oppose this misguided legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, this Transportation-Housing and Urban Development bill before us today is the latest in a long series of appropriations bills from the House majority that grossly underfunds the fundamental priorities of American families. Every time we see a new appropriations bill come from this majority, the vital national needs that are meant to be covered in that legislation have been cut to the bone.

In this case, this bill makes deep cuts in everything from the upkeep of the traffic control system to Amtrak to Community Development Block Grants and HOME grants. This bill endangers our infrastructure, our public safety, and our communities. It is yet another example of the problems created by the majority's obsessive fixation on slashing all nondefense spending programs to the detriment of the priorities we were elected to uphold.

Let's step back for a moment and look at the big picture. The Budget Control Act of 2011 placed strict limits on appropriations—defense as well as domestic—that are scheduled to remain in place through 2021. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that these caps will reduce spending by a total of \$840 billion over 10 years, compared to the policies previously in place.

Now, on top of these Budget Control Act caps, we also have the deep and indiscriminate across-the-board cuts caused by sequestration. Despite claims to the contrary by this majority, the effects of the sequester cuts are real. They're real and they are damaging. We are talking about children losing access to Head Start and the opportunities for their growth and development that early childhood education provides. Low-income women will lose access to the cancer screenings that could save their lives. Seniors will be hungry because Meals on Wheels distribution has been pared back.

When the new school year starts in September, school districts already struggling to make ends meet will face an additional across-the-board 5 percent cut in Federal aid. And in terms of medical research, the National Institutes of Health will be supporting the smallest number of research project grants this year in more than a decade.

These cuts will have profound and lasting consequences for families, for students, for the pace of scientific research. But despite that, the majority apparently thinks that the problem with sequestration, at least when it comes to domestic spending, is that the cuts were too small. They have been assembling a series of bills for 2014 that cut the resources for nondefense programs by a total of almost \$47 billion below the 2013 postsequester level.

That is not the right direction for this country. That's not what we ought to be doing.

In total, the majority's 2014 budget bills will bring funding for nondefense appropriations to their lowest level on record as a share of GDP, with records on this basis going back to 1976. In other words, the majority proposes to spend less, relative to the economy, on things like infrastructure, scientific research, education, environmental protection—the key investments that grow our economy—than at any time in nearly the last 40 years.

Within the total, some bills are targeted for larger cuts than others. Sequestration already cuts the transportation, housing, and infrastructure programs covered in today's bill by more than \$3 billion, and this legislation would slash another \$4.4 billion.

□ 1630

That's bad enough, but the largest cuts of all come in the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education bill, which the majority seems to consider the very lowest priority. The allocation to that bill starts with this year's \$7 billion in sequestration cuts, and then cuts \$28 billion more. Think about it for a moment. For programs like education, medical research, job training, public health, the majority does not just want to double down on sequestration; they want to quadruple down.

This is not about saving money or reducing the deficit. This is about ideology, pure and simple. The majority's approach is not required by the Budget Control Act. On the contrary, in total, their bills are \$47.7 billion below the Budget Control Act cap on non-defense spending, and that is the cap with sequestration in place.

Because this bill is already far leaner than even the BCA and sequestration require, there are no offsets to be had to ameliorate the deep and dangerous cuts to Community Development Block Grants, housing, Amtrak, or mass transit. The bottom line is the majority is very explicitly trying to underfund the priorities in this legislation. They have put forward a budget that sets our government and our Nation up to fail.

This is not the right choice for America, for our kids or our future. Responsible budgeting means making key investments that grow the economy and improve American families' quality of life. This is just not a responsible budget. I urge defeat of this grossly inadequate bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues in strong support of the Community Development Block Grant program and the tremendous benefits that this program has afforded millions

of low- and moderate-income Americans since its inception in 1974 under Republican leadership. The Community Development Block Grant is a vital tool that the Department of Housing and Urban Development uses to provide for new developments and affordable housing in local communities all across the country.

The fiscal year 2014 House Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill indiscriminately slashes the grants by almost half, or \$1.6 billion less than the current \$3.3 billion for fiscal year 2013. These cuts do not reflect a change in need or have any basis in reality, and they would do incredible harm to local communities across the entire Nation.

The House version of this bill is simply unworkable in its current form, and it plainly ignores many of the benefits that the CDBG program provides for the 1,209 State and local governments that receive these grants. Since 1974, CDBG has invested over \$135 billion in local economies. Every dollar that has been invested leverages an additional \$3.55 in non-CDBG funding, which can go toward improving existing infrastructure, new jobs, and housing repairs, as well as homeownership assistance. By slashing CDBG funding, the House majority will invariably bring harm to countless low- and moderate-income Americans. I'm not prepared to do that, and neither are many of us, even many Republican colleagues.

Cuts from years prior have already had devastating consequences. The city of Dallas, for example, is considering another round of cuts or eliminating certain programs entirely in light of projected budget reductions. For Dallas, this could mean eliminating grants for affordable housing developers, shrinking the Mortgage Assistance Program, and decimating new home construction in areas targeted by CDBG revitalization.

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 2014 Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill will bring considerable harm, and considering it this week is just another example of the misguided policies of the current Republican majority. As long as the current majority Republicans refuse to work together with House Democrats to develop a sensible budget framework, the American people will continue to suffer the consequences of draconian cuts to invaluable social programs.

When we shut down everything, it does not help us economically. It shuts us down. It moves us backwards. There is a right way and a wrong way, and we cannot continue to do it the way this current Republican majority is pushing.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to join my colleagues today in advocating for critical investments to rebuild our Nation's transportation infrastructure. The bill we are considering this week makes devastating cuts that will have serious consequences on our ability to compete in the global economy and ensure the stability and well-being of local communities.

The fact of the matter is that our infrastructure is crumbling, with the American Society of Civil Engineers grading the United States with a D-plus on their annual report card assessing the condition of America's infrastructure. In my home State of Rhode Island, 21 percent of our 757 bridges are structurally deficient and in need of repairs.

In the short-term, supporting our Nation's roads, rails, and airports will generate job growth in a construction sector that remains hard hit from the recession—employing the talented, capable men and women of the building trades to rebuild America.

In a rapidly changing global economy, the ability to quickly and safely transport goods, services, and information is a real advantage. To compete successfully, every American business, from energy companies and manufacturers to technology companies and farmers, must have access to a world-class connected transportation system.

But to maintain this edge, virtually every expert has said we must continue to invest in rebuilding America. If you don't believe me, look at the strategic decisions being made by competing nations. Just last week, China's Ministry of Rails announced plans to invest another \$32 billion to upgrade their rail system. In June, President Putin proposed investing \$43 billion to build a new superhighway in Moscow, modernize the Trans-Siberian Railway, and construct a brand-new 500-mile high-speed rail line.

While Russia and China are betting on their economic future, my friends on the other side of the aisle have offered a bill that would unquestionably set us back. This bill guts investments in our railroads, cutting more than \$468 million in funding for Amtrak compared to fiscal year 2013 enacted levels and eliminates all funding for high-speed rail.

This bill cuts intercity passenger rail despite recent reports demonstrating how rail has been an area of growth. According to a report from the Brookings Institution last year, Amtrak was our Nation's fastest growing mode of transportation in the last 15 years.

My local train station in Providence, Rhode Island, has seen ridership totals increase by more than 137 percent, and Amtrak is not just used by tourists.

So, demand for intercity passenger rail service has grown exponentially in the last decade and our competitors abroad have noticed, investing billions in their rail systems. But here, some of my colleagues have decided to slash

funding and put our rail system at risk. This is clearly the wrong approach.

Of course, this legislation does not only jeopardize our Nation's rail system; it also slashes funding for municipal and State governments hoping to invest in critical local projects.

This bill eliminates all funding for the TIGER grant program in fiscal year 2014, and it rescinds \$237 million of the \$500 million appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The TIGER program invests in innovative, multimodal transportation projects, providing for upgrades of bridges, roads, ports, and other transportation infrastructure that are critical to regional economies. But perhaps most importantly, this is a program that encourages local stakeholders to plan for their future and think about innovations to local transportation infrastructure that will spur growth and create jobs. This is exactly how Federal investments are supposed to work.

Unfortunately, this bill once again leaves our State and local partners without the resources needed to help strengthen local communities. Sadly, it gets worse. This bill also jeopardizes the still-fragile recovery of our housing market and communities at risk.

For example, this bill decimates funding for the Community Development Block Grant program, which was signed into law by a Republican President who recognized the importance of assisting communities by providing flexibility to invest in everything from wastewater treatment facilities to housing and economic development. This critical program is a lifeline for families facing difficult economic challenges and provides critical resources to promote economic development and improve quality of life.

Today, this bill cuts CDBG funding levels almost in half compared to current enacted levels, the lowest level of funding since it began, and a billion dollars less than President Ford requested for the program in 1975. Let that sink in. This bill cuts our investments in local projects so drastically that we have reduced programs to less than 60 percent of what they were nearly four decades ago.

Mr. Chairman, this bill clearly does not reflect our values and priorities as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to reject this reckless and shortsighted bill, and to work together on a plan to respond to our urgent transportation and infrastructure needs and a plan that dedicates resources to strengthening local communities. Our ability to promote growth, create jobs, and compete in a global economy depends on it.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, I am in strong opposition of the underlying bill, as it makes damaging cuts to

Community Development Block Grants. A cut of \$1.6 billion—a nearly 50 percent reduction from the previous year—is not smart policymaking. These draconian cuts will no doubt have lasting harmful effects on our communities throughout the country.

Since 1974, over 1,200 communities relied on CDBG funds to support development projects and make other important improvements. These funds are used in providing social services for the poor and senior citizens, improving dilapidated housing facilities, supporting local food banks, and maintaining local parks. CDBG funds are critical investments made by the Federal Government to bring important benefits to local communities.

My district, for example, stands to lose almost \$2.2 million next year if these cuts go into effect. That's nearly half of what they got last year. And it's on top of hundreds of thousands of cities in my district have already lost due to the poorly designed automatic cuts known as sequestration. The city of Pasadena will see their funding drop from \$1.7 million to under \$1 million. The city of Alhambra will see their funding drop from around \$800,000 down to only \$430,000.

These cuts are more than lines on a piece of paper. They will have real impacts on my neighbors and my community. Take People for People, a food bank run by the West San Gabriel Valley Church Council for the last 25 years. People for People provides the homeless and needy families with clothes and boxes of food. During the recession, they saw a 20 percent spike in the numbers of families who came to them for help. Last year, they were able to support hundreds of families that are suffering right now. Hundreds of families stay afloat with local donations and a \$27,000 grant through CDBG. But this year, because of Federal Government cuts, they will receive 75 percent less, merely \$7,000.

But People for People isn't the only program that will get hit. Countless other nonprofit service organizations around the San Gabriel Valley will be forced to serve fewer low-income residents at a time when they need it the most. CDBG funds have helped fund tutoring, health services, small business assistance, senior services, food assistance, and fair housing services. Cities will have to cut back on home rehabilitation programs that improve blighted neighborhoods and public facilities, improvements that make cities safer and more accessible. And fewer construction projects mean fewer construction jobs, too.

During this time of economic recovery, we cannot pull out the rug from programs that are vital to helping our constituents. Our cities, our communities, and our constituents cannot afford these drastic cuts to CDBG funding. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this terrible bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1645

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise today because our Transportation-HUD Appropriations Act is insufficient to maintain our national transportation infrastructure and invest properly in community development and safe, affordable housing.

This Transportation-HUD Appropriations Act really guts investments critical to strong, sustainable communities. And, in particular, it decimates the Community Development Block Grants program, slashing it in half to the lowest level since the program began in 1975.

This isn't just something that hurts Democrats. It hurts Republicans, it hurts everybody. It's across the board. And so, for the Community Development Block Grant program to work and ensure access to decent, affordable housing, to provide services to the most vulnerable in our communities, and to create jobs through the expansion and retention of businesses, we've got to reject this proposal before us.

Communities across the country rely on the Community Development Block Grant to provide critical services for low-income people and their families, as well as economic development assistance to small businesses and infrastructure improvements.

To this day, the Community Development Block Grant remains the principal source of revenue for localities to use in devising flexible solutions to prevent economic and social deterioration in lower-income neighborhoods and communities throughout the Nation.

These grants are an important tool for helping local governments tackle serious challenges facing their communities, making a difference in the lives of millions of people and their communities across the Nation.

Now, Detroit is a longstanding Community Development Block Grant grantee, receiving an average of \$33 million in annual funding, while Wayne County, which Detroit is in, receives an additional \$5.3 million. Yet, this proposal in the appropriations bill would drastically cut these funds.

The CDBG program in Detroit and Wayne County, includes preserving low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, offering a range of housing choices, constructing urban infrastructure, improving the appearance of urban and rural communities, increasing the quality of neighborhood-based living, and decreasing negative environmental impacts.

For my conservative friends to continue to focus solely on reducing the deficit, in particular doing so on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans, is unnecessary and not appreciated. Although deficit reduction is an important task, Congress can't balance

the budget on the backs of working families. And sharply reducing programs like the Community Development Block Grant and HOME is going the wrong direction.

I would say, this is the second major cut for the Community Development Block Grant funding since the Great Recession. The CDBG Coalition, consisting of national organizations representing local elected officials, State and local government practitioners, development organizations, and nonprofit organizations, all strongly oppose these cuts.

These are individuals working daily in their communities, with the most acute awareness of what their communities need. So, in support of them and our constituents, we must fund CDBG formula grants at no less than the \$3.3 billion in FY14.

So, Mr. Chairman, once again I ask the Congress to stop trying to balance the budget on the backs of working families.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, during the appropriation process, over 100 Members and I expressed our concern about the low funding level for Community Development Block Grants.

These grants are one of the most successful, cost-effective Federal programs that encourage economic growth in our cities and communities across the country. According to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, every \$1 of CDBG investment leads to an additional \$3.55 of investment from outside sources.

In California's 35th Congressional District, the cities of Pomona, Chino, Ontario, Fontana, and Rialto, where people of all parties reside, currently receive Community Development Block Grant funding. This funding is used to build affordable housing, construct sidewalks, and invest in energy efficiency, water conservation, gang prevention, and after-school programs.

These programs maintain strong neighborhoods and promote a higher quality of life for residents in the district. With the proposed cuts in this bill, it is estimated that they will lose 50 percent of funding for next year.

I strongly oppose these devastating cuts. I ask that other Members consider their communities and oppose these cuts too.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Let me start with the fact that I choose to believe that Mr. LATHAM does not like this bill. Mr. LATHAM's not listening to me. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that I start

my debate, that I choose to believe that you do not like this bill. I know you. I've worked with you over a long period of time.

This bill is insufficient to meet the obligations of this subcommittee. It is unworthy of the support of this House.

Mr. Chairman, there are many things wrong with the 2014 Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill, but perhaps none more egregious than its severely painful cuts to the Community Development Block Grants.

Now, let me start with this observation. This is not about a poor people's program. It helps some poor people, but it helps communities—rich, moderate, and poor.

This is not about the 47 percent. This is about the 100 percent.

The Community Development Block Grant program was enacted on a bipartisan basis in 1974 and signed into law by the President, Gerald Ford, former minority leader of this House, President of the United States. From its beginning, it has served as a model of how bipartisan compromise in Congress can help tackle important challenges on the local level.

For nearly 40 years, these grants have been awarded on a formula basis to State and local governments for infrastructure development, the creation and maintenance of affordable housing units, anti-poverty initiatives.

It makes communities better. It empowers Members of Congress to be able to help their local communities who elect them. These grants save lives in our largest cities and in our smallest towns, in Alaska, in Hawaii, and in Maryland.

The cuts in this bill would reduce Community Development Block Grants by more than half. America is not bankrupt. America need not claim defeat and retreat. America has the resources, if it has the will, to grow our economies, to grow our communities, and to make them better.

We appropriated around \$3.8 billion for these grants in fiscal year 2012, while this bill would cut that figure to just \$1.6 billion. To put this into perspective, in 2001 we spent \$4.7 billion under George Bush II on Community Development Block Grants.

After years of whittling away at those critical grants which empower our States, counties, and cities to help the most vulnerable have a chance at finding jobs and putting roofs over their heads, it would be devastating to communities whose budgets are already pushed to the limit and rely on these grants to serve all of their residents.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle talk a great deal about fiscal responsibility. But what about social responsibility?

Now I'm a strong proponent of fiscal responsibility. But if fiscal responsibility is not coupled with social responsibility, it is not worthy of this House or this country.

Community Development Block Grants are an instrument of our common citizenship and, yes, our common humanity. In this case, however, they are a poignant example of the Republican strategy of disinvestment in America and abandonment of our communities and their people. Surely we're better than that, Mr. Chairman.

When we considered the Veterans Affairs, military construction, and Defense appropriations bills that included robust funding, we knew those funds had to come from somewhere. Here it comes.

Like our Republican friends, we believe we must invest in a strong, national defense, as Chairwoman MIKULSKI has been doing on the Senate Appropriations Committee. But we do not share the Republican majority's view that we ought to abandon our domestic priorities in the process. We're better than that.

None of us are surprised that their strategy to deal with the sequester is to ignore its consequences and impose cuts even deeper, even deeper, even deeper than the sequester calls for. In fact, I know of a number of our colleagues on the Republican side who see the folly in such strategy but cannot or will not speak up, for fear of the political consequences from the radical right. This bill is proof that such a strategy is underway.

It's not only an abdication of responsible leadership, it is a recipe for gridlock, as Democrats in the House and Senate could never agree to it. Reject this bill. We can and must do better.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, this is a slash-and-burn budget. I don't know why we bother.

Whether you're looking at the community block grant or the section I'm going to say a few words about, the Amtrak section, you can see what we're about—we're supposed to reauthorize a highway bill this year and a railway bill this year. That certainly won't matter if the Transportation and HUD appropriations bill simply ignores authorized infrastructure spending and building.

The federal government has Amtrak because the private sector insisted that we take it. They showed, they proved that you can't run a railroad without public subsidy.

Amtrak has done an amazing job considering how little public subsidy it has gotten. The private sector gave it to us because they couldn't handle the operating expenses, and they couldn't handle the capital costs.

Now, Amtrak, by the ticket, is basically handling the operating expenses. Shame on us that we will not come forward to do our part with the capital expenses. With a 37 percent cut in capital expenses, that is the way, Mr. Chairman, to run a railroad into the ground

that otherwise is doing very well on its own dime.

There is a thirty-five percent difference between the House and Senate bills. The Republican bill is bipartisan. Yet, we're about to pass a bill here that nobody would consider in the Senate, and that the President would have to veto.

Why are we going through these appropriations exercises that amount to nothing?

□ 1700

Amtrak is more than sustaining itself. Virtually each month this year, it has had record ridership. Amtrak actually recovers almost 80 percent of its operating costs out of ticket revenue. That's amazing. It seems to me Amtrak ought to be rewarded rather than, as this bill does, be punished.

Amtrak carries 31 million passengers every year, and it keeps increasing. Travellers are preferring rail and 20,000 people across 47 States work for Amtrak. Yes, we know about it best here in the East, where Amtrak also has 1 million daily commuters.

This is our national railroad. It's unbelievable that we would be content to see every single nation in the world that considers itself an advanced nation be generations ahead of us on railroad development. We are two generations behind, for example, on high-speed rail. Yet there are zero dollars in this bill for high-speed rail.

Amtrak is very well managed. In the committee we have heard what they have done and how they have done it. But they can't manage without at least some recognition from the Congress that we, too, have a role to play in the railroad. No railroad in the world is unsubsidized. This one is subsidized very little. It is still able to run most of its trains over 100 miles an hour.

We ought to understand who we're talking about. We're not just talking about the Acela from the District of Columbia to New York. Among the 25 busiest Amtrak stations are Seattle, Harrisburg, and Bakersfield, California.

At a time when the airlines are in trouble and have reduced their operations, Amtrak keeps growing in ridership each month. I have a winning operation here. But this bill sends it back into losing for us. We don't need to do that. We have a railroad that offers middle class jobs to 20,000 people, 200 of them in the District of Columbia. Let's do what we need to do in the T-HUD bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGGO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 5, strike "not to exceed".

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

Mr. GALLEGGO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple amendment. It simply strikes three words,

"not to exceed," with respect to the budget of an office that I consider to be pretty important, and that is the Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response.

As you look through the bill, every single part of the Office of the Secretary has a separate line item, and in looking at the bill, I noticed, for example, that for emergency response and security we have budgeted a little over \$10 million. On the other hand, we have budgeted about twice as much for the lawyers for the Office of General Counsel. The lawyers somehow get twice as much as emergency response and security. Frankly, as I look at the list and how the money is divided, we spend \$24 million roughly, which is nearly more than two times as much for the Assistant Secretary for Policy—all of that being more important than security.

For me, as a Member of Congress who represents some 59,000 square miles, including five ports of entry and 800 miles of the Texas border with Mexico, an area, frankly, where we have seen emergencies and emergency response before, frankly, where the Congress is consistently and rightfully concerned about security, it seems to me that we would give the Department of Transportation some additional flexibility.

This doesn't raise per se the amount of money that's available to them. What it does is give them additional flexibility so that in the event they don't spend the line items from the other items like the Office of Public Affairs or the Office of General Counsel, it gives them the flexibility to spend more money for intelligence, security, and emergency response.

I think if you ask every single individual Member of Congress what is more important, the lawyers or the Department of Transportation Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response; what is more important, the lawyers at the Department of Transportation or the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response, all of these kinds of things, especially for a Member from the border, I think security is more important.

Again, it doesn't cost more money. It doesn't appropriate any more money, per se. What it does is gives the agency the ability to move money around and the flexibility to provide additional money, should it become necessary. Frankly, one never knows what kind of emergency is going to come up. One never knows what is going to happen, whether it's going to be a natural disaster or a terrorist attack. It always pays to have the emergency response folks have the level of flexibility that they need in order to understand that regardless of what happens, they have the opportunity to do their jobs and to do their jobs well.

Additional budget flexibility in times of limited dollars and limited budgets, I think, is very key. So what this amendment would propose to do is simply strike those three words, "not to exceed," so that there would poten-

tially be an opportunity for the Department of Transportation to spend more money on emergency response and security than the little over \$10 million that's allotted to them for the whole year.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that I am not opposed to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment. It ensures that the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response would receive no less than \$10.778 million. This office performs important security functions of the Department of Transportation.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGGO).

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

Mr. LATHAM. 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.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the draconian cuts to the Community Development Block Grant, or CDBG, program in this legislation.

The CDBG program has a proven record of success in stabilizing and revitalizing communities across the country by directly providing funds to local communities and giving them the flexibility to decide where the funding will have the greatest impact. In the last 7 years, CDBG has assisted over a million low- and moderate-income homeowners to rehabilitate their homes, keeping neighborhoods and communities safe and stable.

More than 30 million people have benefited from CDBG-funded public improvement programs, including senior and child care centers, homes for persons with disabilities, safe streets, and shelters for victims of domestic violence. Funds have also been used to provide public services to millions of low- and moderate-income households, including employment training, meals to seniors, and services for abused children.

But the real impact of CDBG is not seen on the national scale. It is seen on the streets and in the neighborhoods of

the communities that receive these funds. In my district, CDBG funds have established adult literacy programs, legal support for immigrant victims of domestic violence, and youth summer employment opportunities. It has preserved public housing and addressed vacant housing and lots in at-risk neighborhoods, providing support and guidance for small, locally owned businesses.

Because of the flexibility CDBG provides, the city government has been able to identify the most pressing needs and the most at-risk communities and allocate funds as they are needed. When we invest CDBG funds in our cities, we see an immediate impact in the neighborhoods as nonprofit and private entities follow, bringing new development and opportunities for residents.

Mr. Chairman, CDBG was a change from the old way in which specific programs were specifically funded. People in this House—mostly Republicans, I must say—said, Give more flexibility to local governments; instead of giving to 20 categorical-specific programs, fund them into one or two Community Development Block Grants so they can be used more efficiently. We have done that. We have combined a lot of categorical programs into CDBG, and now we want to tear it to pieces.

Despite the success that CDBG has had, the bill we are debating on the floor today would cut funding to \$1.6 billion, which is a 50 percent cut from this year, and the lowest funding level in the 40-year history of the program—lower than when President Ford supported it, even without inflation adjustments.

In New York, CDBG funding would fall from \$164 million to \$82 million. These funding levels will leave hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers and millions of Americans without access to the vital services and support that CDBG provides.

How did we get here? Why are we voting to gut this proven, efficient, flexible program? Why are we voting for a 50 percent cut in an already much too small allotment? The answer is simple: the slash-and-burn Republican budget. The same budget that provides tax breaks for the wealthy and large corporations and unneeded increases in defense spending while slashing funding for Medicaid, food stamps, and WIC has left appropriators with such small funding allocations that this bill was unworkable and unrealistic from the start.

So here we are, slashing programs that serve and protect the most vulnerable among us—programs that are proven to save us money in the long run and programs that support flexibility and accountability in our communities.

We may disagree, Mr. Chairman, on how to keep our economy strong, but we should all agree that we must stop piling these cuts on the backs of seniors and the working poor, women,

kids, and the middle class. Stop these cuts to our communities. We should reject this bill unless it's grossly increased in the aggregate, which it won't be, as we know. So we should reject this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague from New York. This bill has too many cuts, and I will oppose final passage. But it does have comparable funding levels between the House and Senate for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, which administers distracted driving prevention grants to the States. This is an area where we need to do more.

Every year thousands of accidents, many fatal, result from people texting or talking on their phones while driving. I'm not just talking about using a hands-free device. I'm talking about someone driving with one hand while talking on a cell phone or texting with the other hand.

In 2011, 3,331 people in the U.S. were killed in crashes involving a distracted driver—up from 3,267 in 2010. And in 2011, more than 387,000 people were injured in an accident involving a distracted driver, and 416,000 were injured in 2010. In 2012, the last year of updated data, 10 percent of injury crashes resulted from distracted driving. It's clear that we must use every opportunity available to push for strong distracted driving laws, much the same as we did for drunk driving, which worked.

So I encourage my colleagues to renew their commitment to address the deadly issue of distracted driving. My Districted Driving Prevention Act, H.R. 1664, withholds funding from States that do not make both texting and talking on a phone while driving a primary offense, and goes further than the U.S. Department of Transportation's efforts to raise awareness and provide grants. These are important efforts, and they should be funded adequately; but they don't go far enough.

To date, only nine States make both texting and talking on a phone while driving a primary offense: my home State of New York, followed by California, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Nevada, New Jersey, Washington, and West Virginia. That's a start, but it falls short of establishing a national highway safety baseline that saves lives.

□ 1715

In conclusion, let me say, when study after study shows us that distracted driving is just as dangerous as drunk driving, Congress cannot continue to ignore the problem when only nine States have taken action that meets a reasonable standard of safety. Anything less leaves our roads unsafe, our

constituents in danger, and more unnecessary deaths as a result.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses related to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, \$14,220,000, of which \$8,218,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the powers and duties, functions, authorities and personnel of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration are hereby transferred to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology in the Office of the Secretary, including the authority to accept funding from modal administrations for support of Global Positioning System activities pursuant to reimbursable agreements with the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology in the Office of the Secretary; *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 102 and 5 U.S.C. 5315, there shall be an Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology within the Office of the Secretary, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, to lead such office; *Provided further*, That any reference in law, regulation, judicial proceedings, or elsewhere to the Research and Innovative Technology Administration shall be deemed to be a reference to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology of the Department of Transportation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 19.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, beginning on line 4, strike all through page 5, line 6 and insert the following:

For necessary expenses of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration, \$14,220,000, of which \$8,218,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment that provides the existing \$14.7 million in DOT funding to the Research and Innovative Technology Administration, rather than a new Assistant Secretary.

This amendment is noncontroversial and addresses concerns of the Science and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committees. It does not affect the scoring of the bill.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in division F of Public Law 113-6, \$237,000,000 are permanently rescinded.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CAPITAL

For necessary expenses for upgrading and enhancing the Department of Transportation's financial systems and re-engineering business processes, \$4,990,000, to remain available through September 30, 2015.

CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVES

For necessary expenses for cyber security initiatives, including necessary upgrades to wide area network and information technology infrastructure, improvement of network perimeter controls and identity management, testing and assessment of information technology against business, security, and other requirements, implementation of Federal cyber security initiatives and information infrastructure enhancements, implementation of enhanced security controls on network devices, and enhancement of cyber security workforce training tools, \$2,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2015.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, \$9,384,000.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND
DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning and research, \$6,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the unobligated balances made available by Public Law 111-117 and designated for a single project in the accompanying conference report, \$750,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances made available by Section 195 of Public Law 111-117, \$2,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Working Capital Fund, not to exceed \$172,000,000 shall be paid from appropriations made available to the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That such services shall be provided on a competitive basis to entities within the Department of Transportation: *Provided further*, That the above limitation on operating expenses shall not apply to non-DOT entities: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated in this Act to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without majority approval of the Working Capital Fund Steering Committee and approval of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER
PROGRAM

For the cost of guaranteed loans, \$333,000, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 332: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$18,367,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$589,000.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

For necessary expenses of Minority Business Resource Center outreach activities, \$3,068,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 332, these funds may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

In addition to funds made available from any other source to carry out the essential air service program under 49 U.S.C. 41731 through 41742, \$100,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That in determining between or among carriers competing to provide service to a community, the Secretary may consider the relative subsidy requirements of the carriers: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under section 41742 of title 49, United States Code, and no funds made available in this Act or any other Act in any fiscal year, shall be available to carry out the essential air service program under sections 41731 through 41742 of such title 49 in communities in the 48 contiguous States unless the community received subsidized essential air service or received a 90-day notice of intent to terminate service and the Secretary required the air carrier to continue to provide service to the community at any time between September 30, 2010, and September 30, 2011, inclusive: *Provided further*, That basic essential air service minimum requirements shall not include the 15-passenger capacity requirement under subsection 41732(b)(3) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act or any other Act shall be used to provide essential air service to communities that require a rate of subsidy per passenger in excess of \$500.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF
ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after "communities" insert "in the 48 contiguous States".

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I want to thank Chairman LATHAM for his leadership on this bill. It's difficult times.

This is a very simple amendment. In 1978, when Congress deregulated the airline industry, it also provided a means to protect rural communities. The Essential Air Service program ensures the continuation of service to communities that would have lost all air service through deregulation. While this is a vital program, I respect the efforts of the chairman to find cost sav-

The bill excludes communities from participating in the program if they receive a per-passenger subsidy of greater than \$500. Current law excludes communities if they receive over \$1,000 per passenger, with the exception of communities in Alaska and Hawaii. This recognizes that communities in Alaska and Hawaii are completely dependent on air travel.

Alaska has limited road infrastructure. Eighty-two percent of Alaskan communities do not have a road system. In many of these communities, everything has to come in by air. My amendment clarifies that the proposed reforms will not alter the longstanding recognition of the realities in Alaska and Hawaii—no roads, no alternatives, complete dependence on aviation.

My amendment has no score per CBO and does not impact funding levels of the program. My amendment provides a no-cost solution to ensure the most remote areas of our Nation are not excluded from participating in this program. I'd just like to remind my colleagues if you take all the land east of the Mississippi River to the Atlantic Ocean, from Maine to Florida, that's Alaska. And you think about it, in that area, there's 253 Congressmen and 52 Senators. That's really different. Hawaii has the same problem—not quite as large, but we have only one way to communicate, and that's with air service.

I urge the passage of this amendment. It is a very simple amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I just will stand up in favor of the amendment and I will be calling a recorded vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Young amendment. This amendment will continue the administration of the Essential Air Service program, recognizing the unique characteristics of both Hawaii and Alaska.

The Essential Air Service program was put into place to guarantee that small communities, like the communities in our States, will continue to maintain a minimal level of scheduled air service with access to the national air transportation system. Especially in times of medical emergencies or natural disasters, this literally is the difference between life and death for the people in our communities.

In a State like Hawaii, where I'm from, where island communities are separated by the Pacific Ocean, access to air service is oftentimes the only transportation option available if service needs to be provided with any regularity or within specific time constraints.

One example is Kalaupapa, a community on an isolated peninsula on the north shore of Molokai. When Hansen's disease was first introduced to the Hawaiian Islands, all people afflicted with this disease were sent to this rural community, Kalaupapa. Today, it is a refuge for the remaining residents and patients who, now cured, would still like to live there. If not for the assistance of the Essential Air Service program, the only way to get in and out of that community is a 3.5 mile trail down a 1,700-foot sea cliff used by mule riders and hikers. This trail is extremely steep and challenging and has been made impassable in the past because of heavy rains. This is just one example of why this continued air service is critical to the people who continue to live in this community.

Hawaii and Alaska, as illustrated, have unique geographical limitations and challenges. Whereas other communities are generally accessible by vehicle, that's not always the case in the noncontiguous States; 3½ miles doesn't sound very far until you're looking up the side of a steep cliff from the back of a mule.

The amendment being offered by Representative YOUNG would continue this program's recognition of our exceptional geographic challenges. This amendment maintains the current practice of Alaska and Hawaii being exempt from restrictions on what communities are eligible for the Essential Air Service program.

Currently, only two communities in Hawaii qualify—Kalaupapa and Kamuela—but maintaining this air service is critically important for all people who live in these areas.

I would also just like to take a moment to recognize my colleague from Hawaii, Congresswoman COLLEEN HANABUSA. She has worked very closely with Congressman YOUNG on this amendment and would have liked to have been here to speak in strong support of it today were it not for Tropical Storm Flossie, where she is stuck in Hawaii, across the Pacific Ocean away.

I would like to thank Representative YOUNG for offering this amendment and for his leadership, and strongly urge my colleagues to support the Young amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I want to make sure that my friends who live far, far away from where I live do understand that many of us understand the dynamics that they've presented. Arguably, their argument is unassailable, and I rise in support of their amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. 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 Alaska will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$250)".

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, the Essential Air Service program is an expensive government handout. It is, in effect, welfare for airplanes.

Page 9 of the bill expressly states that the per passenger subsidy extended to rural communities—and by the way, we're not talking about Hawaii and Alaska here; we're talking about places like Muscle Shoals—for a flight that would not otherwise exist is capped at \$500. I think that's too high. I don't know why we should be, in effect, paying people \$500 to fly to Muscle Shoals. I don't see the sense of that at a time when we're cutting food stamps and cutting block grants to communities. I think it's a poor way to spend taxpayer funds. My amendment would reduce this subsidy to a still-very-high \$250 per passenger because \$500 per passenger is simply outrageous.

If passengers don't want to pay for aviation routes, then they simply shouldn't exist. For 500 bucks per passenger, we could literally rent a limousine for every single person aboard each flight and drive them to the single nearest commercial airport.

I understand the need for rural services in necessary aspects of life, like Postal Services, telephones, and even the Internet; but I cannot understand the need to subsidize regular airline flights that would otherwise not exist to the tune of \$500 per passenger.

The bill before us today would cut community development funds in half—to the lowest level since the program began in 1975. It would cut HOME Investment Partnerships to the lowest level since that program began in 1992. And it would drastically reduce the amount of section 8 rental assistance and increase homelessness. Under these circumstances, I cannot stand by in good conscience and allow a subsidy like this to continue.

I offer this amendment today because it's more important to put a roof over the heads of the poor than it is to hand out corporate welfare to United Airlines and to support aviation routes that simply should not exist.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

We have, in the bill, restrained the growth of this program, keeping the total amount at \$216 million—\$116 million of which is from fees and \$100 million provided in discretionary appropriation for the fiscal year 2012 program level. So it's at the same level as it was before; we don't have any increase.

Mr. Chairman, I really urge the administration, the authorizers, if they want to reform this program, to actually get to work, do it—not on an appropriation bill where we have had no discussion, no debate. It is an issue that should be handled by the authorizers rather than on this appropriation bill.

We need the comprehensive reform so that isolated communities can be served while restraining growth in this program. But I do urge a "no" vote, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would agree with Chairman LATHAM that this reform needs to come about, and it shouldn't be in an appropriation bill. Hopefully, the T&I authorizing committee will look at this issue and come to a decision.

It was interesting that the amendment before this amendment, we basically waived Hawaii and Alaska. And here we are now limiting the Essential Air Service to \$250. I would tell you, as we tried to explain to my colleague from Florida, that this would probably cause 100—maybe a little more—smaller communities not to be able to link to the national air service. So this is not the time to do it.

So I would rise in opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. 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 8, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

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

□ 1730

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply continues the

good work started by the amendment of the gentleman from Florida and pulls the plug on this tired old program.

Recently, the much-maligned sequester required a 4 percent cut in the FAA budget, which its leadership then immediately translated into a 40 percent flight delay until the public rebelled.

The total sequester cut to the FAA was roughly \$636 million, and they took that out on the traveling public; yet they had \$243 million to pay for empty and near-empty flights from selected airports in tiny communities under this program that is laughingly called "Essential Air Service." It is, in fact, the least essential air service imaginable.

Since we last visited this issue, the FAA reauthorization bill made some minor reforms to the program. For example, we are no longer subsidizing air travel from communities that are within a 90-mile radius of a major airport, and the per passenger subsidy has been capped at \$1,000 per passenger.

These minor reforms mean that one airport in Ely, Nevada, has been dropped from the program and two more are about to be. That's a start. But still, it is no excuse for shoveling, as this appropriation does, a total of \$216 million at this program between direct taxpayer subsidies and fees into next year.

In other words, in this austere age of sequestration, when the White House is shuttered to the public and soldiers are being told to pay for their own Internet access, the House of Representatives proposes at best a token reduction in this wasteful, unfair, and outdated program while cutting real essential air services like air traffic control. With all due respect, what in the world are we thinking?

Remember, this was supposed to be a temporary program when we deregulated commercial aviation. It was supposed to last for just a few years to give rural communities a chance to adjust. That was 35 years ago.

It is true there are over a few tiny communities in Alaska—like Kake's 700 hearty souls—who have no highway connections to hub airports, but they have plenty of alternatives. In the case of Kake, they enjoy year-round ferry service to Juneau. In addition, Alaska is well served by a thriving general aviation market and the ubiquitous bush pilot. Rural life has great advantages and great disadvantages, and it is not the job of hardworking taxpayers who choose to live elsewhere to level out these differences.

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

Last year, one Member rushed to the microphones to suggest this was essential for emergency medical evacuations. We heard an echo of that a moment ago. It has nothing to do with medical evacuations. This program subsidizes regular, scheduled, commercial service that practically nobody uses. If it actually had a passenger base, we wouldn't need, in effect, to hand out \$1,000 bills to the few passengers who use it, would we? An airline so reckless with its funds would quickly bankrupt itself. The same principle holds true for governments.

The Washington Post is not known as a bastion of fiscal conservatism, but I cannot improve upon the Post's recent editorial when it said:

Ideally, Essential Air Service would be zeroed out, and the \$200 million we waste on it devoted to a truly national purpose: perhaps deficit reduction, military readiness, or the social safety net. Alas, if Congress and the White House were capable of making such choices, we probably never would have had sequestration in the first place.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

The Essential Air Service program ensures that small and rural communities have access to the national air transportation system. The program plays a key role in the economic development of many rural communities by ensuring that air service continues.

Does the program need reform? Absolutely, it does, yes. That is why we cap the per passenger subsidy at \$500, which is down from the current \$1,000 cap per passenger.

We have also cut the discretionary funding in this bill by \$46 million, leaving a total program level of \$216 million—\$100 million in discretionary funding and \$116 million from fees. This is an 18 percent reduction. We already have imposed a significant cut to this program.

We will continue to push the administration to reform the program and work with the Transportation Infrastructure Committee, but an outright elimination of the funding in this bill is a hit to rural communities that I cannot support.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to speak in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. The Essential Air Service program was designed to continue air service for small communities that had scheduled air service prior to airline deregulation. It is funded through annual appropriations and overflight fees that are collected when foreign air carriers traverse through U.S. airspace.

This amendment cuts the overall program in half. Many small communities would lose their air service, including, we believe, four communities in the State of California: Crescent City, El Centro, Merced, and Visalia.

This is not the way to reform this program. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, as a co-sponsor of this amendment, I rise to speak in support of eliminating the Essential Air Service program.

I thank my colleague from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for his work on this amendment.

Another Californian once said, "There's nothing more permanent than a temporary government program." Mr. Chairman, I'm sure all my colleagues recognize that famous line from former President Ronald Reagan. His statement was accurate then, just as it is accurate now, regarding the Essential Air Service program.

This program was intended to be temporary. It was created as a transition program in the seventies after airline deregulation to help rural airports adjust to a free market system. We are now more than 25 years after the intended end date of 1988, and the taxpayers are still footing the bill.

This is yet another example of Washington's spending problem, Mr. Chairman. It has to stop.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I certainly understand all Federal programs should be prepared and subjected to cost-saving measures, and Essential Air Service is actually no different. That is why we passed reforms during the FAA reauthorization last year to improve efficiency and save taxpayer dollars.

Additionally, the underlying bill today already includes a reduction in funding for the EAS program. While there is room for savings in all programs, totally eliminating EAS outright would be counterproductive.

The Essential Air Service program serves an important purpose in rural and remote areas. Businesses in rural America actually compete more effectively with even the limited air service that might be available.

Last year, the House rejected this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do so once again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

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

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

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

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

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, administrative expenses for research and development, establishment of air navigation facilities, the operation (including leasing) and maintenance of aircraft, subsidizing the cost of aeronautical charts and maps sold to the public, lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, in addition to amounts made available by Public Law 108-176, \$9,521,784,000, of which \$6,484,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which not to exceed \$7,182,664,000 shall be available for air traffic organization activities; not to exceed \$1,199,777,000 shall be available for aviation safety activities; not to exceed \$14,160,000 shall be available for commercial space transportation activities;

not to exceed \$777,198,000 shall be available for finance and management activities; not to exceed \$56,637,000 shall be available for NextGen and operations planning activities; and not to exceed \$291,348,000 shall be available for staff offices: *Provided*, That not to exceed 2 percent of any budget activity, except for aviation safety budget activity, may be transferred to any budget activity under this heading: *Provided further*, That no transfer may increase or decrease any appropriation by more than 2 percent: *Provided further*, That any transfer in excess of 2 percent shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 404 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall transmit to Congress an annual update to the report submitted to Congress in December 2004 pursuant to section 221 of Public Law 108-176: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by \$100,000 for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to the Congress: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress a companion report that describes a comprehensive strategy for staffing, hiring, and training flight standards and aircraft certification staff in a format similar to the one utilized for the controller staffing plan, including stated attrition estimates and numerical hiring goals by fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to Congress: *Provided further*, That funds may be used to enter into a grant agreement with a non-profit standard-setting organization to assist in the development of aviation safety standards: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for new applicants for the second career training program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Federal Aviation Administration to finalize or implement any regulation that would promulgate new aviation user fees not specifically authorized by law after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections funds received from States, counties, municipalities, foreign authorities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred in the provision of agency services, including receipts for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities, and for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station certificates, or for tests related thereto, or for processing major repair or alteration forms: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$140,000,000 shall be for the contract tower program, of which \$10,350,000 is for the contract tower cost share program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act for aeronautical charting and cartography are available for activities conducted by, or coordinated through, the Working Capital Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

Page 11, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Ms. SPEIER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, on July 6 of this year, Asiana Airlines Flight 214 from Incheon, South Korea, crashed on its final approach to San Francisco International Airport, which is in my district. Initial reports made clear that low airspeed was a crucial factor in that crash. It was a horrible accident. Three Chinese 16-year-old girls on their way to a summer camp in southern California lost their lives. It could have been an absolute catastrophe, because there were over 300 people, including crew, that survived that horrific day.

Low airspeed has been a concern for air safety for almost 20 years. In 1996, the FAA's Human Factors Team concluded that flight crews needed better warnings that the aircraft was reaching low airspeeds. In 2003, following the crash that killed our congressional colleague Senator Paul Wellstone, the National Transportation Safety Board recommended the FAA study whether to require installation of low airspeed audible and visual alert systems. Following the Colgan Air crash in Buffalo, New York, a recommendation was reissued in 2010 on installation of redundant audible and visual warnings of impending hazardous low speed conditions.

Now, after almost two decades since the initial recommendation and over 3 years since the recommendation after Colgan, the FAA has not addressed this question of whether existing commercial aircraft should be required to install low airspeed warning systems. I fear that without direction from Congress, the FAA could take years to complete this study. That is why I am offering this amendment, which provides the FAA \$500,000 to conduct and complete a study on this important question within 1 year.

Low airspeed alert systems that cry out "airspeed low" are available and require a simple software change. These differ from the tonal alerts that sound similar to other pilot alerts. The FAA should investigate whether existing low airspeed tonal warnings, such as those in a Boeing 777, provide a sufficient level of pilot warning or if, instead, a verbal warning, such as those in the newer 737s, provides a higher level of safety.

When the alert signals to a pilot that they are traveling at too low of an airspeed, they have at best a few seconds to react. It is vital that planes have alerts that are instantly recognizable, clear, and unambiguous.

Airline safety advocates argue that verbal alerts are more effective at

alerting a pilot that they are flying at too low of an airspeed because they are instantly recognizable to a pilot. If a verbal warning is found to be more effective, the FAA should take expedient action to require both new aircraft and existing aircraft to incorporate a verbal warning.

Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure just last week to talk to Sully Sullenberger, the pilot of the “Miracle of Hudson River,” and he said something very compelling to me. He said that when a pilot is in a position of reacting during a crash, they need every one of their senses being alert; the senses when you are holding the throttle, the senses when you hear low speed alert, and the senses when you see “stall.” I thought that was very compelling.

We have a number of cases that suggest now that low airspeed alerts that are verbal should be incorporated. The FAA has dragged its feet. I believe that this particular amendment would be very helpful and save many lives in the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment. It is a good amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, we believe that these moneys would expedite the study to see if better warnings could be given at low speeds, so we approve the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. SPEIER). The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1745

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 9, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$3,497,000)”.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, to echo the words of my colleagues, Ranking Members NITA LOWEY and ED PASTOR, my good friend, the allocation provided for T-HUD appropriations under the Ryan budget, which was “deemed passed” by my Republican colleagues, is simply unworkable.

From funding for the Federal Aviation Administration, TIGER grants, public transit programs, Amtrak, high-speed rail, Community Development Block Grants, and the HOME affordable housing program, House Republicans are offering a bill that not only makes devastating cuts to our Nation’s transportation infrastructure but to vital programs in housing, health care,

education, labor, and other services that millions of Americans rely on, in order to spare defense spending from sequestration.

In particular, this bill makes detrimental cuts to aviation programs and investments in our national air system. It cuts FAA operations by \$185 million below the President’s budget request. It slashes \$575 million, 21 percent, from the FAA’s Facilities and Equipment account, and it casts doubt on the future hiring of air traffic controllers and inspectors.

NextGen is a full, multiyear effort to modernize our Nation’s air traffic control system by transitioning from a ground-based navigation system to a satellite-based navigation system. As it is implemented, NextGen will help reduce delays, expand air traffic system capacity, and mitigate aviation’s impact on the environment while ensuring the highest levels of safety. Currently, the FAA is moving from NextGen program development into baseline and operational programs, and passengers and operators are beginning to experience the benefits of these investments. However, while the bill preserves funding for the NextGen programs currently under deployment, it forces the FAA to greatly slow down its NextGen modernization of the air traffic control system.

My amendment restores funding for NextGen programs to the fiscal year 2013 level within the Operations Planning account. It really does represent a small amount, approximately \$3.5 million, over the FY 2014 House funding level of \$56.6 million for a total of \$60.1 million. The increased funding would help ensure that the FAA remains on schedule with regard to NextGen implementation while giving it the flexibility to decide how best to move forward in this challenging budget environment.

I do recognize that the chairman and ranking member were given a difficult task, and I respect that, but we cannot fail to recognize the future of our NextGen implementation, so I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The committee shares the gentleman’s support of NextGen programs. However, this amendment increases one activity in the operations account and makes no other further adjustments. The result is individual program levels that exceed the account level, which one cannot do.

To meet our allocation, the subcommittee looked closely at all accounts and at all programs. The subcommittee placed a high priority on FAA operations with just a 2 percent cut below the budget request. Within the operations account, the sub-

committee balanced the number of high priority areas, including NextGen, aviation safety and air traffic control. This amendment throws this account off balance. The programs within the account would no longer add up to the top line, and the FAA could simply ignore the subcommittee’s direction on other program levels in the account. So, therefore, we urge a “no” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. The amendment increases funding for the FAA’s NextGen office by \$3.5 million. As stated by my colleague from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), it is for future development. I would agree with him that it is something that we need to invest in and that this would accelerate the implementation of NextGen, which is greatly needed. Our air traffic control system is aging and needs modernization. Yet, as Mr. WOLF has pointed out, the allocation is so tight that moving money in the account will cause some problems.

My hope would be that if there is a reconciliation with the Senate that this would be given a higher priority in the funding levels as we work in conference with the Senate.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, technical support services, improvement by contract or purchase, and hire of national airspace systems and experimental facilities and equipment, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; engineering and service testing, including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available; and the purchase, lease, or transfer of aircraft from funds available under this heading, including aircraft for aviation regulation and certification; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, \$2,155,000,000, of which \$458,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014; \$1,697,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources,

for expenses incurred in the establishment, improvement, and modernization of national air space systems: *Provided further*, That upon initial submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2015 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a comprehensive capital investment plan for the Federal Aviation Administration which includes funding for each budget line item for fiscal years 2015 through 2019, with total funding for each year of the plan constrained to the funding targets for those years as estimated and approved by the Office of Management and Budget.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$870,031,000) (increased by \$870,031,000)".

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do wish to point out that the bill before us today makes deep cuts to FAA facilities and equipment. Make no mistake that these reductions will directly impact and delay the implementation of NextGen. I've spoken to this issue. This particular amendment makes available approximately \$870 million for NextGen capital programs, which is at the FY 2013 enacted level. This increased funding would help ensure that the FAA remains on schedule with regard to NextGen implementation.

Let me make it very clear. I fought very hard, along with my colleagues, both current and former—Republican and Democrat—to bring the NextGen facilities to the West Palm Beach airport. We were very successful in that regard, but I am troubled that we might not get to full implementation if we continue the reductions that I see that are set forth.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise once again to offer an additional amendment to H.R. 2610, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies (T—HUD) Appropriations Act for FY 2014.

According to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), by the end of the NextGen mid-term in 2020, NextGen improvements will:

Reduce delays by 41 percent;

Cumulatively save 1.6 billion gallons of fuel and reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 16 million metric tons; and

Provide \$38 billion in cumulative benefits to aircraft operators, the traveling public, and the FAA through delay reduction, fuel savings, and other efficiency improvements.

However, the bill before us today makes deep cuts to the FAA's Facilities and Equipment account in the amount of \$575 million, or 21 percent.

Make no mistake. These reductions will directly impact and delay the implementation of NextGen.

Certain NextGen activities currently underway face significant reductions in this bill.

One example is the Optimization of Airspace and Procedures in the Metroplex

(OAPM) program, which is the FAA's fast-track initiative to implement new navigation procedures and airspace improvements to reduce fuel consumption and aircraft emissions in some of the United States' busiest airspace.

This could delay the completion of their designs and the beginning of the implementation phase.

My amendment makes available approximately \$870 million for NextGen capital programs, which is the FY 2013 enacted level.

This increased funding would help ensure that the FAA remains on schedule with regard to NextGen implementation, while giving it the flexibility to decide how best to move forward in this challenging budget environment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for research, engineering, and development, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, \$145,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, which shall be available for expenses incurred for research, engineering, and development: *Provided further*, That, of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations available under this heading, \$26,183,998 are rescinded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 16, strike "That," and insert "That \$61,960,000 shall be available for NextGen research and development, as authorized by section 48102(a) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*,".

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in Switzerland yesterday, there was a collision of trains—one moving north and the other moving south. A good friend of Mr. WOLF's and of Mr. PASTOR's and mine served as chairman and ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, James Oberstar. In addition to the many things that Jim suggested during his tenure here, I think back to some

of the things that would have put us in a better position than we are today, particularly with regard to overall infrastructure, roads and rail.

I can't understand—and I was saying to the young staffer working with me—what it is that causes the rail industry, both abroad and here, to not have the necessary equipment that would allow one train on the same track to let the other train coming from the opposite direction, and vice versa, know that they are both on the same track. There just seems to be something wrong with that when we have the kind of sophisticated equipment that we do.

NextGen, in the air area of the world, allows for us to avoid those kinds of problems and to increase efficiency and safety. It ultimately reduces delays and saves fuel, particularly if we get on with what I'm asking for, which is \$62 million for NextGen research and development activities from the FAA's Research, Engineering and Development account.

Again, I am not asking for anything that I think would do anything less than help all of us. We don't just live in these places. We fly there. The aviation industry contributes nearly \$1.3 trillion to the United States economy. Furthermore, the FAA's air traffic controllers manage nearly 70,000 flights per day, which, on an annual basis, carry more than 730 million passengers.

With such a vital role in our economy, now is not the time to underfund our Nation's air traffic control system. I urge my colleagues to make a real investment in our Nation's transportation infrastructure by supporting this NextGen amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we share the gentleman's support of the NextGen programs. However, fencing off this amount for NextGen could have the unintended consequences of forcing cuts to other priorities, such as to aviation safety research and programs to improve air traffic control in the near term, including programs to reduce noise and carbon emissions.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

For liquidation of obligations incurred for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and noise compatibility planning and programs as authorized under subchapter I of chapter 471 and subchapter I of chapter 475 of title 49, United States Code, and under other law authorizing such obligations; for procurement, installation, and commissioning of runway incursion prevention devices and systems at airports of such title; for grants authorized under section 41743 of title 49, United States Code; and for inspection activities and administration of airport safety programs, including those related to airport operating certificates under section 44706 of title 49, United States Code, \$3,200,000,000 to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$3,350,000,000 in fiscal year 2014, notwithstanding section 47117(g) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the replacement of baggage conveyor systems, reconfiguration of terminal baggage areas, or other airport improvements that are necessary to install bulk explosive detection systems: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of funds limited under this heading, not more than \$106,600,000 shall be obligated for administration, not less than \$15,000,000 shall be available for the Airport Cooperative Research Program, and not less than \$29,500,000 shall be available for Airport Technology Research.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL
AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 110. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate in excess of 600 technical staff-years under the federally funded research and development center contract between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Center for Advanced Aviation Systems Development during fiscal year 2014.

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

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

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

SEC. 114. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for paying premium pay under subsection 5546(a) of title 5, United States

Code, to any Federal Aviation Administration employee unless such employee actually performed work during the time corresponding to such premium pay.

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

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

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

SEC. 118. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than 7 political and Presidential appointees in the Federal Aviation Administration.

SEC. 119. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to increase fees pursuant to section 44721 of title 49, United States Code, until the FAA conducts a public outreach that is designed to elicit feedback from aviation stakeholders, and until the FAA has reported the justification of its fees on paper and digital products to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

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

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

Not to exceed \$417,000,000, together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Highway Administration, shall be paid in accordance with law from appropriations made available by this Act to the Federal Highway Administration for necessary expenses for administration and operation. In addition, not to exceed \$3,248,000 shall be paid from appropriations made available by this Act and transferred to the Appalachian Regional Commission in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 104.

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

Funds available for the implementation or execution of programs of Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs authorized under titles 23 and 49, United States Code, and the provisions of Public Law 112-141 shall not exceed total obligations of \$40,256,000,000 for fiscal year 2014: *Provided*, That the Secretary may collect and spend fees, as authorized by title 23, United States Code, to cover the costs of services of expert firms, including counsel, in the field of municipal and project finance to assist in the underwriting and servicing of Federal credit instruments and all or a portion of the

costs to the Federal Government of servicing such credit instruments: *Provided further*, That such fees are available until expended to pay for such costs: *Provided further*, That such amounts are in addition to administrative expenses that are also available for such purpose, and are not subject to any obligation limitation or the limitation on administrative expenses under 23 U.S.C. 608.

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL
HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 120. (a) For fiscal year 2014, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) determine the proportion that—

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

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

(4) distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2), for each of the programs (other than programs to which paragraph (1) applies) that are allocated by the Secretary under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act and title 23, United States Code, or apportioned by the Secretary under sections 202 or 204 of that title, by multiplying—

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

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

(5) distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) and the amounts distributed under paragraph (4), for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs that are apportioned by the Secretary under title 23, United States Code (other than the amounts apportioned for the national highway performance program in section 119 of

title 23, United States Code, that are exempt from the limitation under subsection (b)(12) and the amounts apportioned under sections 202 and 204 of that title) in the proportion that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(12) section 119 of title 23, United States Code (but, for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years).

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

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

(2) redistribute sufficient amounts to those States able to obligate amounts in addition to those previously distributed during that fiscal year, giving priority to those States having large unobligated balances of funds apportioned under sections 144 (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act) and 104 of title 23, United States Code.

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

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

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

(B) division E of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act.

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

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

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

(e) REDISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 123. From the unobligated balances of funds apportioned among the States prior to October 1, 2012, under sections 104(b) and 144 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 112-141), the amount of \$13,248,000 shall be made available in fiscal year 2014 for the administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to funds distributed in accordance with section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 112-141); section 133(d)(1) of such title (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 109-59); and the first sentence of section 133(d)(3)(A) of such title (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 112-141): *Provided further*, That such amount shall be derived on a proportional basis from the unobligated balances of apportioned funds to which this provision applies: *Provided further*, That the amount made available by this provision in fiscal year 2014 for the administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration shall be in addition to the amount made

available in fiscal year 2014 for such purposes under section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the amount made available by this provision in fiscal year 2014 for the administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration shall have the same period of availability and characteristics of the contract authority made available under section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code.

□ 1800

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, beginning on line 23, strike section 123.

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

Mr. WOLF. Per an agreement with the authorizing committee, this amendment strikes section 123 under the administrative provision of the Federal Highway Administration. This section made certain unobligated balances of contract authority available in 2014.

This amendment is noncontroversial and will have no budgetary scoring effect.

I respectfully ask for a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. The amendment strikes \$13.25 million in additional funds for the administrative expenses for the Federal Highway Administration.

While I will not object to my friend's amendment, I do have concerns that the more we cut on the administrative expenses, the agency's ability to do proper oversight will suffer.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 124. (a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available, limited, or otherwise affected by this Act shall be used to approve or otherwise authorize the imposition of any toll on any segment of highway located on the Federal-aid system in the State of Texas that—(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act, is not tolled; (2) is constructed with Federal assistance provided under title 23, United States Code; and (3) is in actual operation as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) NUMBER OF TOLL LANES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any segment of highway on the Federal-aid system described in that subsection that, as of the date on which a toll is imposed on the segment, will have the same number of nontoll lanes as were in existence prior to that date.

(2) HIGH-OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANES.—A high-occupancy vehicle lane that is converted to a toll lane shall not be subject to

this section, and shall not be considered to be a nontoll lane for purposes of determining whether a highway will have fewer nontoll lanes than prior to the date of imposition of the toll, if—(A) high-occupancy vehicles occupied by the number of passengers specified by the entity operating the toll lane may use the toll lane without paying a toll, unless otherwise specified by the appropriate county, town, municipal or other local government entity, or public toll road or transit authority; or (B) each high-occupancy vehicle lane that was converted to a toll lane was constructed as a temporary lane to be replaced by a toll lane under a plan approved by the appropriate county, town, municipal or other local government entity, or public toll road or transit authority.

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

For payment of obligations incurred in the implementation, execution and administration of motor carrier safety operations and programs pursuant to section 31104(i) of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4127 and 4134 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, \$259,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the sum of which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for implementation, execution, or administration of motor carrier safety operations and programs authorized under title 49, United States Code, shall not exceed total obligations of \$259,000,000 for “Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs” for fiscal year 2014, of which \$9,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016, is for the Research and Technology program, and of which \$1,000,000 shall be available for commercial motor vehicle operator’s grants to carry out section 4134 of Public Law 109-59: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 4127(e) of Public Law 109-59, none of the funds under this heading for outreach and education shall be available for transfer.

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

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out sections 31102, 31104(a), 31106, 31107, 31109, 31309, 31313 of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4126 and 4128 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-41, \$313,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or execution of motor carrier safety programs shall not exceed total obligations of \$313,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 for “Motor Carrier Safety Grants”; of which \$218,000,000 shall be available for the motor carrier safety assistance program, \$30,000,000 shall be available for the commercial driver’s license improvements program, \$32,000,000 shall be available for border enforcement grants, \$5,000,000 shall be available for the performance and registration information system management program, \$25,000,000 shall be available for the commercial vehicle information systems and networks deployment program, and \$3,000,000 shall be available for the safety data improvement program: *Provided further*, That,

of the funds made available herein for the motor carrier safety assistance program, \$32,000,000 shall be available for audits of new entrant motor carriers: *Provided further*, That \$95,956,883 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—FEDERAL MOTOR
CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

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

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary, with respect to traffic and highway safety authorized under chapter 301 and part C of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, \$117,000,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

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

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, \$139,175,088, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2014, are in excess of \$139,175,088, of which \$133,801,093 shall be for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 403, and of which \$5,373,995 shall be for the National Driver Register authorized under chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That within the \$133,801,093 obligation limitation for operations and research, \$20,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015 and shall be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for future years: *Provided further*, That \$20,675,088 of the total obligation limitation for operations and research in fiscal year 2014 shall be applied toward unobligated balances of contract authority provided in prior Acts for carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code.

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

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141, to remain available until expended, \$561,500,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account): *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2014, are in excess of \$561,500,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141, of which \$235,000,000 shall be for “Highway Safety Programs” under 23 U.S.C. 402; \$272,000,000 shall be for “National Priority Safety Programs” under 23 U.S.C. 405; \$29,000,000 shall be for “High Visibility Enforcement Program” under section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141; \$25,500,000 shall be for “Administrative Expenses”

under section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for construction, rehabilitation, or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local or private buildings or structures: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the funds made available for “National Priority Safety Programs” under 23 U.S.C. 405 for “Impaired Driving Countermeasures” (as described in subsection (d) of that section) shall be available for technical assistance to the States: *Provided further*, That with respect to the “Transfers” provision under 23 U.S.C. 405(a)(1)(G), any amounts remaining available to carry out any activities described in subsection (b) through (g) to increase the amount made available under section 402, shall include the obligational authority for such amounts: *Provided further*, That of the prior year unobligated balances of contract authority for “Highway Traffic Safety Grants”, \$152,281,282 is rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—NATIONAL
HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

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

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

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

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
SAFETY AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, \$184,500,000, of which \$12,400,000 shall remain available until expended.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, \$35,250,000, to remain available until expended.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT
FINANCING PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue direct loans and loan guarantees pursuant to sections 502 through 504 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-210), as amended, such authority to exist as long as any such direct loan or loan guarantee is outstanding: *Provided*, That, pursuant to section 502 of such Act, as amended, no new direct loans or loan guarantee commitments shall be made using Federal funds for the credit risk premium during fiscal year 2014.

OPERATING GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL
RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make quarterly grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for the operation of intercity passenger rail, as authorized by section 101 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-432), \$350,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amounts available under this paragraph shall be available for the Secretary to approve funding to cover operating losses for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific train route: *Provided further*, That each such

grant request shall be accompanied by a detailed financial analysis, revenue projection, and capital expenditure projection justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Corporation shall transmit, in electronic format, to the Secretary, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation the annual budget and business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan for fiscal year 2014 required under section 204 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan, monthly performance reports, and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall also include a separate accounting of ridership, revenues, and capital and operating expenses for the Northeast Corridor; commuter service; long-distance Amtrak service; State-supported service; each intercity train route, including Autotrain; and commercial activities including contract operations: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall include a description of work to be funded, along with cost estimates and an estimated timetable for completion of the projects covered by these plans: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall include annual information on the maintenance, refurbishment, replacement, and expansion for all Amtrak rolling stock consistent with the comprehensive fleet plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall provide semiannual reports in electronic format regarding the pending business plan, which shall describe the work completed to date, any changes to the business plan, and the reasons for such changes, and shall identify all sole-source contract awards which shall be accompanied by a justification as to why said contract was awarded on a sole-source basis, as well as progress against the milestones and target dates of the 2012 performance improvement plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation's budget, business plan, 5-Year Financial Plan, semiannual reports, and all subsequent supplemental plans shall be displayed on the Corporation's Web site within a reasonable timeframe following their submission to the appropriate entities: *Provided further*, That these plans shall be accompanied by a comprehensive fleet plan for all Amtrak rolling stock which shall address the Corporation's detailed plans and timeframes for the maintenance, refurbishment, replacement, and expansion of the Amtrak fleet: *Provided further*, That said fleet plan shall establish year-specific goals and milestones and discuss potential, current, and preferred financing options for all such activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be obligated or expended until the Corporation agrees to continue abiding by the provisions of paragraphs 1, 2, 5, 9, and 11 of the summary of conditions for the direct loan agreement of June 28, 2002, in the same manner as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to support any route on which Amtrak offers a discounted fare of more than 50 percent off the normal peak fare: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso does not apply to routes where the operating loss as a result of the discount is covered by a State and the State participates in the setting of fares: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2015 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

CAPITAL AND DEBT SERVICE GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for capital investments as authorized by section 101(c), 102, and 219(b) of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-432), \$600,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That after an initial distribution of up to \$50,000,000, which shall be used by the Corporation as a working capital account, all remaining funds shall be provided to the Corporation only on a reimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may retain up to one-half of 1 percent of the funds provided under this heading to fund the costs of project management oversight of capital projects funded by grants provided under this heading, as authorized by subsection 101(d) of division B of Public Law 110-432: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall approve funding for capital expenditures, including advance purchase orders of materials, for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific capital project justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That except as otherwise provided herein, none of the funds under this heading may be used to subsidize operating losses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be used for capital projects not approved by the Secretary of Transportation or on the Corporation's fiscal year 2014 business plan: *Provided further*, That in addition to the project management oversight funds authorized under section 101(d) of division B of Public Law 110-432, the Secretary may retain up to an additional \$3,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading to fund expenses associated with implementing section 212 of division B of Public Law 110-432, including the amendments made by section 212 to section 24905 of title 49, United States Code.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$600,000,000)".

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$600,000,000)".

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase the appropriations for Amtrak's capital and debt service grants by \$600 million and increase the spending reduction amount by the same amount. It would have the effect of entirely defunding this account.

Amtrak was created by Congress in 1970 to provide nationwide passenger rail service. It currently operates more than 40 routes across the United States. Unfortunately, the majority of these routes operate at a huge loss to taxpayers. The committee report for the underlying bill details just how big that loss is. In fiscal year 2011, Amtrak's long-distance routes ran a deficit of \$554 million. By next year, that amount is projected to grow to \$610 million in losses.

Mr. Chairman, the committee also takes note of Amtrak's troubled food

and beverage service, which has lost a total of \$313 million just over the last 3 years. This year alone, Amtrak is projected to lose nearly \$75 million on its food and beverage service, reflecting just a return of only 64 percent on its expenses. Despite these losses, Amtrak pays the attendants who serve on board food and beverages between \$24 and \$27 per hour. The committee itself points out that this wage is more than 20 percent higher than that of flight attendants, and these employees' current labor agreement calls for another 3 percent increase each year for the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, this isn't the first time I've come to the floor to talk about Amtrak, and I can say with some confidence that this probably won't be the last.

We as a country are broke; yet we continue to offer hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars each year to a passenger rail line which refuses to make meaningful reforms. The waste here is rampant, and we just cannot afford it anywhere. Our Nation is broke. We've got to stop spending money we don't have. We have to live within our means.

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

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment as it would shut down Amtrak.

I can see that Amtrak could be more efficient. There is no doubt about that. However, it has made significant improvements in this area recently, and it is moving in the right direction.

The bill does not include arbitrary funding decisions. We held hearings and scrubbed each. This committee worked very hard to achieve a balanced bill within our limited funding.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. This amendment is just another example of how the Republican majority is limiting transportation options for the American people.

Last year, more than 31 million Americans chose Amtrak as the means of transportation to get to business meetings, family gatherings, and vacations. They chose Amtrak to avoid crowded airplanes, congested highways, and for the opportunity to view the wonderful and majestic scenery of this great Nation. Americans deserve a passenger rail system that is safe and reliable.

This amendment also demonstrates how many Members on the other side of the aisle will blindly cut funding without any idea of the real ramifications. For instance, I sincerely doubt

that the gentlelady from Tennessee understands that in addition to handing out 20,000 pink slips, her amendment would cost the government \$4.5 billion over the next 5 years due to the violation of labor agreements.

This is a shortsighted amendment. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEXT GENERATION HIGH-SPEED RAIL
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available for Next Generation High Speed Rail, as authorized by sections 1103 and 7201 of Public Law 105-178, \$1,973,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be cancelled from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program, as authorized by Public Law 94-210, \$4,419,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be cancelled from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL
RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 150. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds provided in this Act for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation shall immediately cease to be available to said Corporation in the event that the Corporation contracts to have services provided at or from any location outside the United States. For purposes of this section, the word "services" shall mean any service that was, as of July 1, 2006, performed by a full-time or part-time Amtrak employee whose base of employment is located within the United States.

SEC. 151. The Secretary of Transportation may receive and expend cash, or receive and utilize spare parts and similar items, from non-United States Government sources to repair damages to or replace United States Government owned automated track inspection cars and equipment as a result of third-party liability for such damages, and any amounts collected under this section shall be credited directly to the Safety and Operations account of the Federal Railroad Administration, and shall remain available until expended for the repair, operation and maintenance of automated track inspection cars and equipment in connection with the automated track inspection program.

SEC. 152. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, rule or regulation, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to allow the issuer of any preferred stock heretofore sold to the Department to redeem or repurchase such stock upon the payment to the Department of an amount determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 153. None of the funds provided to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation may be used to fund any overtime costs in

excess of \$35,000 for any individual employee: *Provided*, That the president of Amtrak may waive the cap set in the previous proviso for specific employees when the president of Amtrak determines such a cap poses a risk to the safety and operational efficiency of the system: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall notify House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 30 days of granting waivers and delineate the reasons for granting such waiver in the Corporation's monthly report: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on November 1, 2013, a summary of the total number of employees that received such waivers, the total overtime payments the Corporation paid to employees receiving waivers, the total the Corporation paid in overtime payments in the prior three fiscal years, and a description of the factors that contributed to an increase or decrease from the prior year.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal Transit Administration's programs authorized by chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, \$102,713,000, of which up to \$3,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5329 and not less than \$1,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5326: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided or limited in this Act may be used to create a permanent office of transit security under this heading: *Provided further*, That upon submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2015 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to Congress the annual report on New Starts, including proposed allocations for fiscal year 2015.

TRANSIT FORMULA GRANTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in the Federal Public Transportation Assistance Program in this account, and for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112-141; and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112-141, \$9,500,000,000, to be derived from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or execution of programs authorized under 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112-141, shall not exceed total obligations of \$8,595,000,000 in fiscal year 2014.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION,
AND DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5312, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5313, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND STANDARDS
DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5314, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

HUMAN RESOURCES AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5322(a), (b), and (e), \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5309, \$1,815,655,000, to remain available until expended.

□ 1815

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$127,283,000)".

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to increase transit funding for Capital Investment Grants, also known as the New Starts program, by \$127 million, which would bring it to the same level as the bill currently being considered in the Senate.

Earlier this year, almost 100 Members joined me in sending a letter to the Appropriations Committee requesting funding for transit, at a minimum, at the levels authorized in MAP-21 and in the President's request. In one of the few bright spots in this bill, transit formula grants are funded at the MAP-21 authorized level, in large part because the formula grants are funded out of the mass transit account of the highway trust fund. Unfortunately, the New Starts and Small Starts program, which comes out of general revenue and funds the construction of new fixed guideway systems, such as new subway lines, bus rapid transit, and light rail is cut 7 percent below the enacted level and 8 percent below the President's request. This shows how important it is that the provision in last year's Republican bill that would have cut regular mass transit funds out of the highway trust fund and subject it to appropriations was defeated because otherwise we would have a drastic cut there, too.

This bill is out of step with the demands of the American people. According to the American Public Transportation Association, a record 10.5 billion trips were taken last year, the second highest annual ridership since 1957. This increase in ridership is occurring all over the country, in places like Michigan, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, Tennessee, Florida, Arizona, and Utah, to name just a few. Despite the increase in ridership, Federal transportation funding is not keeping up with demand. Public transportation agencies all across the country are facing possible job cuts, maintenance backlogs, service reductions, and fare hikes.

The funding levels in this bill provide barely enough to meet our existing commitments to projects currently under construction, and there is a small amount of money for only a few new Small Starts. The funding level is too low to adequately finance planning and development of additional transit projects. The policy framework in this bill is one of attrition and contraction:

to provide just enough money to close out the old projects, with no plans to invest in major new transit systems in any meaningful way in the future. We are not adequately investing in building new capacity and expanding transit service around this country, but I suppose that is the point—to slowly starve these programs to the point that they cease to be effective and then argue that they are not necessary.

But I am optimistic that we will ultimately provide greater funding for transit. This is an issue that historically has had bipartisan support. Many of my Republican friends joined me in protecting the transit funding guarantees during consideration of surface transportation legislation last year and in defeating the leadership's attempt to eliminate it. The business community and the real estate industry support funding for public transportation, along with a wide range of labor, civil rights, environmental, and civic organizations. Public transportation has broad support all over the country because people understand that investing in transit is one of the smartest things we can do to create jobs right here in America, reduce congestion and dependence on foreign oil, and spur economic growth.

My amendment would increase the New Starts program by \$127 million, which is a modest amount considering how much we should be investing in our infrastructure, but at least it would put the House bill on equal footing with the Senate. Unfortunately, there is no account to use as an offset that wouldn't cause significant harm to other important programs, and, therefore, I have offered none. I understand the chairman may insist upon raising a point of order, and this just shows the limitations under which we are working in this impossible bill in which there is grossly inadequate funding all around so that you can't responsibly ask for an offset without destroying mass transit or something else that is of great import in order to support adequate expenditures.

I urge my colleagues to support increasing transit funding in whatever final product for FY14 appropriations becomes law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 113th Congress, which states:

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

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill

in violation of such section. It would increase budget authority by \$127,383,000.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

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

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Iowa, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS TO THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

For grants to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority as authorized under section 601 of division B of Public Law 110-432, \$125,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall approve grants for capital and preventive maintenance expenditures for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority only after receiving and reviewing a request for each specific project: *Provided further*, That prior to approving such grants, the Secretary shall determine that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority has placed the highest priority on those investments that will improve the safety of the system: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, in order to ensure safety throughout the rail system, may waive the requirements of section 601(e)(1) of title VI of Public Law 110-432 (112 Stat. 4968).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert (reduced by \$125,000,000).

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert (increased by \$125,000,000).

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, it was my impression that this House had put an end to earmarks, and yet the Transportation-HUD appropriations bill contains \$125 million solely for the benefit of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, also known as WMATA.

This is just a fraction, mind you, of the \$1.5 billion that Congress intends to give the D.C. Metro system over a 10-year period. This is not just your everyday average earmark. The Heritage Foundation has dubbed this subsidy "the largest earmark in American history."

So I have an amendment here at the desk, and it is very simple. It simply eliminates this earmark that has received subsidies since 2008.

At a time of record budget deficits and debt, the American people cannot afford to provide yet again another earmark, another special subsidy, especially when you take into consideration the fact that the D.C. Metro already receives funds from a variety of other Federal sources, from other Federal Transit Administration grants and programs.

Also, you add to that, given the performance of this agency, I find it absolutely astounding that the American people should want to give even more of their hard-earned cash to this agency. In addition to daily service interruptions, lax management, and poor general performance, Metro has a significant record of wasting money. Right here in The Washington Post, it was reported that Metro spent \$382 million to rebuild cars, only to have them break down even more often than the cars that they didn't overhaul. The Post also pointed out that when senior agency attorneys wanted new offices for themselves, they spent over a quarter of a million dollars to accommodate them. And why not? It's simply our money, taxpayer money being used.

Last year, it was reported that the Office of Inspector General uncovered several personal and unwarranted expenses on Metro's credit cards, such as \$2,000 worth of gift cards, things like camcorders valued at \$730, and even \$180 for headphones. So even when they spend this money on things it should be spending on, the facts are really disturbing. The Federal Government pays, mind you, over half—specifically, 56 percent—of their capital costs already.

Now, I understand that we'll hear others who say, D.C., the Nation's Capital, it's a tourist destination and it has a large population that utilizes it as transportation to get to work, but this is nothing unique. The same can be said for cities back in my neck of the woods like New York City or over in Chicago or Philadelphia, Boston, and Los Angeles. Should they get the same earmarks as well? What is it that is unique about Washington, D.C., that they are the only ones that get this type of earmark?

Congress should not be forced to make the taxpayers use their hard-earned money to subsidize a transportation system that has failed over the years to get its fiscal house in order. We owe it to the American people to be better than that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I understand our friend from New Jersey

apparently doesn't like Metro or the clientele it serves. So much of what he said I think is, in fact, distorted.

The Metro system in metropolitan Washington is one of the great success stories of regional cooperation in the United States of America. In less than 40 years, this system has created the second highest transit utilization in the United States. New York's is well over 120 years old; we're less than 40.

In addition, my friend talked about taxpayer money. Not a dime of Federal money sustains or subsidizes Metro's operating costs. That's a problem because 40 percent of the Federal workforce uses Metro every day; and it is subsidized not by the Federal Government, I say to my friend from New Jersey, but by local governments in the metropolitan area. And I know because I was chairman of one of them, and I had to write that check every year for the subsidy for Metro—not the Federal Government, the government of Fairfax County. And we were happy to write the check because we saw the value in Metro.

Metro also has the highest fare box recovery rate in the United States of any transit system. Subsidies, we recover 80 percent through the fare box. It's the most efficient recovery in the United States. It lacks a dedicated source of revenue. It's the only major transit system in the United States that lacks a dedicated source of revenue.

That's why I say to my friend from New Jersey, my Republican predecessor introduced this legislation you want to cut. Tom Davis was the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. He was a Republican Congressman from Virginia, from the 11th District of Virginia I now am privileged to represent, and he and I saw eye to eye on this subject. We needed Federal help, and the Federal Government has a special responsibility because this is the Nation's Capital.

Twelve million visitors use that Metro system at some point or another during the course of a year, unsubsidized by the Federal Government. In fact, the only subsidy we ever get is every 4 years when there's an inauguration, there's some consideration made. Other than that, we're kind of on our own.

And so Tom Davis, my Republican predecessor felt, as did all of us in the region, that there was a special obligation to at least help on capital improvements because it's an aging system. And with that aging system, elevators need to be replaced, escalators need to be improved, canopies need to be replaced.

□ 1830

And so we came up with a capital improvement idea. The deal was this: in a Republican Congress, that if the local governments would come up with a match, dollar for dollar, we, the Federal Government, would provide \$150

million a year for that capital improvement, to get new cars that are safer so we can avoid the kind of tragedy that occurred a few years ago in the system, because we have original cars still in the system from almost 40 years ago.

So the local governments came up with that match, \$150 million, 50 for Maryland, 50 for D.C., 50 for Virginia, and we amended the compact, the contract that created Metro, to put Federal representatives on the board for the first time with voting privileges.

If we adopt this amendment today, we turn our back on that Republican idea, that Republican legislation, and we turn our back on the faith that the local jurisdictions have expressed in keeping their commitment as part of this bargain.

Metro is a very important part of our Nation's Capital, and it is wrong to disinvest in it, and it's even wrong to break a contract, a commitment we made several years ago when my Republican predecessor introduced this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman first begins his comments by attacking my motives in this matter, saying that—what did he say? I do not care about lines such as Metro or the people it serves.

I would ask the gentleman, who's not paying any attention to me, exactly what is it in my statement would say that I do not care about the people that it serves? Because I do care about them, as much as I care about the subway system or the metro system in my metro area, such as New York City or in my metro area, such as down in Newark, New Jersey. I care about them as well.

But you know, when I go back and I talk to those people who use those services, whether they be residents of New Jersey or residents of New York, or maybe they're residents from Virginia, from your neck of the woods up here, who come to visit the financial capital of the world, New York City, or the Garden State of New Jersey, who want to use our metro systems, they ask me why it is that D.C. gets a special deal, why D.C. gets \$1.5 billion over 10 years for their system.

Let's get the facts straight as far as the subsidy for the capital cost of 65 percent, and why our cities in our area, what is it that's so unique and special about this area and not about Chicago or Philadelphia or the other areas.

So I go to my first question. What is it in my statement that you said, you could slander me, sir, by saying that I do not care about the people who ride on these systems?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I would say to my friend from New Jersey, I do not question his motivation; I question his action. His action suggests, just as he just said, we're no different than any other transit system.

Well, we are different. This is the Nation's Capital, and we bear the full responsibility of moving the Federal workforce, the bulk of the Federal workforce to work every single day. That is not a responsibility the New York subway system bears. It's not the responsibility Boston bears, or the BART system in San Francisco bears. It is unique.

And we bear the responsibility in this region of welcoming 10 to 12 million fellow Americans every year to visit the Nation's Capital, many of whom use that Metro system, again, something that is subsidized on an operating basis, by the local taxpayer. That is unique to this area.

Mr. GARRETT. If I had some of the charts showing where some of the wealthiest districts are in the Nation, where, despite the turmoil of '08 and the financial crisis, where prices of real estate continue to rise, where revenues continue to go up, it would be in this section of the country, not in Boston, not in Philly, not in New York or Newark. But this is one of the wealthiest portions of the country.

And you're right, sir. If this is an area that should look for subsidies, it should look for subsidies from some of the wealthiest people in America that live right here, not under the underlying bill.

It's not asking for people from your district to pay their fair share, or the people from Maryland or Virginia to pay their fair share. It's asking for people from all across the country to chip in to pay for here, when you're not allowing the people from New York, Newark, Philadelphia, Chicago, out in California—those other areas have subway systems and metro systems. You're not willing to help them out.

But, Mr. Speaker, you want everyone else in America to help the residents who live here and subsidize their costs, but you're not willing to help out the people who live in my neck of the woods.

And that, sir, is unfair to my constituents. That's unfair to all the constituents in all those cities that are looking for a fair deal and for efficiency and economy from our government, and not for special deals.

I'll end where I began. I thought Washington had done away with earmarks but, obviously, with this legislation and the special interests that are being catered to here, we have not done so.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on

which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. GALLEGO of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 317, noes 92, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—317

Aderholt	Cleaver	Frankel (FL)
Alexander	Clyburn	Fudge
Amodei	Cohen	Gabbard
Andrews	Collins (GA)	Gallego
Bachus	Collins (NY)	Garamendi
Barber	Connolly	Garcia
Barletta	Conyers	Gerlach
Barrow (GA)	Cook	Gibbs
Barton	Cooper	Gibson
Bass	Costa	Gohmert
Beatty	Cotton	Gowdy
Becerra	Courtney	Grayson
Benishek	Crawford	Green, Al
Bentivolio	Crenshaw	Green, Gene
Bera (CA)	Crowley	Griffin (AR)
Bilirakis	Cuellar	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Culberson	Grimm
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Guthrie
Blumenauer	Daines	Hahn
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Hanna
Bonner	Davis, Danny	Hartzler
Boustany	Davis, Rodney	Hastings (WA)
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Heck (NV)
Braley (IA)	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Brooks (AL)	Delaney	Higgins
Brooks (IN)	DeLauro	Himes
Brown (FL)	DelBene	Honda
Brownley (CA)	Denham	Hoyer
Buchanan	Dent	Huffman
Bustos	DeSantis	Hunter
Butterfield	Deuth	Israel
Calvert	Diaz-Balart	Jackson Lee
Camp	Doggett	Jeffries
Capito	Doyle	Johnson (GA)
Capps	Duckworth	Johnson (OH)
Capuano	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Cárdenas	Ellison	Jordan
Carney	Engel	Joyce
Carson (IN)	Enyart	Kaptur
Carter	Eshoo	Keating
Cartwright	Esty	Kelly (IL)
Cassidy	Farenthold	Kelly (PA)
Castor (FL)	Fattah	Kennedy
Castro (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Kildee
Chaffetz	Forbes	Kilmer
Chu	Fortenberry	Kind
Cicilline	Foster	King (IA)
Clay	Fox	King (NY)

Kinzinger (IL)	Nunes	Sewell (AL)
Kirkpatrick	Nunnelee	Shea-Porter
Kline	O'Rourke	Sherman
Kuster	Owens	Shimkus
Lamborn	Pascrell	Shuster
Lance	Pastor (AZ)	Simpson
Langevin	Paulsen	Sinema
Lankford	Payne	Sires
Larsen (WA)	Pearce	Slaughter
Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Smith (NE)
Latham	Perlmutter	Smith (NJ)
Lee (CA)	Peters (CA)	Smith (TX)
Levin	Peters (MI)	Smith (WA)
Lewis	Peterson	Speier
Lipinski	Petri	Stewart
LoBiondo	Pocan	Stivers
Loeb	Poe (TX)	Swalwell (CA)
Loeb	Polis	Takano
Lofgren	Pompeo	Terry
Lowenthal	Posey	Thompson (CA)
Lowey	Price (GA)	Thompson (MS)
Luetkemeyer	Price (NC)	Thompson (PA)
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Quigley	Thornberry
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Rahall	Tiberi
Lynch	Reed	Tierney
Maffei	Reichert	Tipton
Maloney	Renacci	Titus
Maloney, Carolyn	Rice (SC)	Tonko
Maloney, Sean	Richmond	Tsongas
Marino	Rigell	Turner
Matheson	Roby	Upton
Matsui	Roe (TN)	Valadao
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
McCullum	Rogers (MI)	Veasey
McDermott	Rooney	Vela
McGovern	Ros-Lehtinen	Velázquez
McHenry	Roskam	Visclosky
McIntyre	Ross	Walberg
McKeon	Rothfus	Walden
McKinley	Roybal-Allard	Walorski
McMorris	Ruiz	Walz
Rodgers	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
McNerney	Rush	Schultz
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Waters
Meeks	Ryan (WI)	Watt
Meng	Sánchez, Linda T.	Waxman
Messer	Sanchez, Loretta	Webster (FL)
Michaud	Sarbanes	Welch
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wenstrup
Moore	Schiff	Williams
Moran	Schneider	Wittman
Mullin	Schock	Wolf
Murphy (FL)	Schwartz	Womack
Nadler	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth
Napolitano	Scott, David	Yoder
Neal	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Negrete McLeod	Serrano	Young (AK)
Nolan	Sessions	Young (IN)

NOES—92

Amash	Goodlatte	Mulvaney
Bachmann	Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Barr	Granger	Neugebauer
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Noem
Black	Griffith (VA)	Nugent
Blackburn	Hall	Olson
Brady (TX)	Harper	Palazzo
Bridenstine	Harris	Perry
Broun (GA)	Hensarling	Pittenger
Bucshon	Holding	Radel
Burgess	Hudson	Ribble
Cantor	Huelskamp	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Huizenga (MI)	Rokita
Coble	Hultgren	Royce
Coffman	Hurt	Runyan
Cole	Issa	Salmon
Conaway	Jenkins	Sanford
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Scalise
Duffy	Jones	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Kingston	Scott, Austin
Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Ellmers	Latta	Southerland
Fincher	Long	Stockman
Fleischmann	Lucas	Stutzman
Fleming	Lummis	Wagner
Flores	Marchant	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Massie	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Whitfield
Gardner	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)	

NOT VOTING—24

Campbell	Farr	Hastings (FL)
Clarke	Graves (MO)	Herrera Beutler
Cramer	Gutiérrez	Hinojosa
Dingell	Hanabusa	Holt

Horsford	Miller, Gary	Rangel
Labrador	Pallone	Schrader
McCarthy (NY)	Pingree (ME)	Wilson (FL)
Meadows	Pitts	Young (FL)

□ 1901

Messrs. COFFMAN, AMASH, ROKITA, SMITH of Missouri, STOCKMAN, FRANKS of Arizona, BURGESS, and HALL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CICILLINE, MCKINLEY, RYAN of Wisconsin, BENTIVOLIO, LEVIN, SHUSTER, RICE of South Carolina, VALADAO, TERRY, MAF-FEI, RUSH and RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mrs. ROBY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 175, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—239

Aderholt	Cohen	Gibson
Amodei	Cole	Goodlatte
Andrews	Conyers	Green, Al
Bachus	Cook	Green, Gene
Barletta	Cooper	Grijalva
Bass	Costa	Guthrie
Beatty	Courtney	Hahn
Becerra	Cramer	Hall
Benishek	Crenshaw	Hanna
Bera (CA)	Crowley	Harper
Bishop (GA)	Culberson	Hartzler
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Danny	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	Davis, Rodney	Heck (WA)
Bonamici	DeFazio	Higgins
Bonner	DeGette	Honda
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Huffman
Braley (IA)	DelBene	Hultgren
Brown (FL)	Denham	Jackson Lee
Brownley (CA)	Dent	Johnson (GA)
Bustos	Deuth	Johnson (OH)
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E. B.
Calvert	Doyle	Jones
Capito	Duckworth	Jordan
Capps	Edwards	Joyce
Capuano	Ellison	Kaptur
Cárdenas	Ellmers	Keating
Carney	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Carson (IN)	Enyart	Kelly (PA)
Carter	Eshoo	Kennedy
Cartwright	Castor (FL)	Kildee
Cassidy	Castro (TX)	Kilmer
Castor (FL)	Chu	Kind
Castro (TX)	Cicilline	King (IA)
Chaffetz	Clarke	King (NY)
Chu	Clay	Kinzinger (IL)
Cicilline	Cleaver	Kirkpatrick
Clay	Clyburn	Kline
	Coble	Langewiesche

Larsen (WA) Neal
 Latham Negrete McLeod
 Lee (CA) Owens
 Levin Pascrell
 Lewis Pastor (AZ)
 Lipinski Payne
 LoBiondo Pearce
 Loeb sack Pelosi
 Lowenthal Perlmutter
 Lowey Perry
 Luetkemeyer Peters (CA)
 Lujan Grisham Peters (MI)
 (NM) Peterson
 Luján, Ben Ray Poca
 (NM) Price (NC)
 Lummis Quigley
 Lynch Rahall
 Maloney, Reed
 Carolyn Richmond
 Maloney, Sean Roby
 Marino Rogers (KY)
 Matsui Rogers (MI)
 McCollum Rooney
 McDermott Rothfus
 McGovern Roybal-Allard
 McIntyre Runyan
 McKeon Ruppertsberger
 McMorris Rush
 Rodgers Ryan (OH)
 Mc Nerney Ryan (WI)
 Meeks Sánchez, Linda
 Meng T.
 Mica Sanchez, Loretta
 Michaud Sarbanes
 Miller (FL) Schakowsky
 Miller (MI) Schiff
 Miller, George Schneider
 Moore Schock
 Moran Schrader
 Mullin Schwartz
 Murphy (FL) Scott (VA)
 Nadler Scott, David

NOES—175

Alexander Gardner
 Amash Garrett
 Bachmann Gingrey (GA)
 Barber Gosar
 Barr Gowdy
 Barrow (GA) Granger
 Barton Graves (GA)
 Bentivolio Grayson
 Bilirakis Griffin (AR)
 Black Griffith (VA)
 Blackburn Grimm
 Boustany Harris
 Bridenstine Heck (NV)
 Brooks (AL) Hensarling
 Brooks (IN) Himes
 Broun (GA) Holding
 Buchanan Hudson
 Bueshon Huelskamp
 Burgess Huizenga (MI)
 Camp Hunter
 Cantor Hurt
 Carter Israel
 Cassidy Issa
 Chabot Jeffries
 Chaffetz Jenkins
 Coffman Johnson, Sam
 Collins (GA) Kingston
 Collins (NY) Kuster
 Conaway LaMalfa
 Connolly Lamborn
 Cotton Lance
 Crawford Lankford
 Cuellar Larson (CT)
 Cummings Latta
 Daines Lofgren
 DeSantis Long
 DesJarlais Lucas
 Doggett Maffei
 Duffy Marchant
 Duncan (SC) Massie
 Duncan (TN) Matheson
 Farenthold McCarthy (CA)
 Fincher McCaul
 Fitzpatrick McClintock
 Fleischmann McHenry
 Fleming McKinley
 Flores Meehan
 Forbes Messer
 Fortenberry Mulvaney
 Foster Murphy (PA)
 Foxx Napolitano
 Franks (AZ) Neugebauer
 Frelinghuysen Noem
 Gallego Nolan
 Garcia Nugent

Webster (FL) Wittman
 Wenstrup Womack
 Westmoreland Woodall
 Williams Yoder

NOT VOTING—19

Campbell Hinojosa
 Dingell Holt
 Gohmert Horsford
 Graves (MO) Labrador
 Gutiérrez McCarthy (NY)
 Hanabusa Meadows
 Herrera Beutler Miller, Gary

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1905

Mr. COLE changed his vote from
 “no” to “aye.”
 So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.
 The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.
 The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.
 A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 191, noes 224,
 not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 421]
 AYES—191

Amash Ellison
 Bachmann Engel
 Barber Farenthold
 Barr Fincher
 Barrow (GA) Fitzpatrick
 Barton Fleischmann
 Bilirakis Fleming
 Black Flores
 Blackburn Fortenberry
 Brady (TX) Foster
 Bridenstine Foxx
 Brooks (IN) Franks (AZ)
 Broun (GA) Frelinghuysen
 Brown (FL) Garcia
 Buchanan Gardner
 Bueshon Garrett
 Burgess Gibbs
 Camp Gingrey (GA)
 Cantor Gohmert
 Carson (IN) Goodlatte
 Carter Gosar
 Cassidy Gowdy
 Castor (FL) Granger
 Chaffetz Graves (GA)
 Chu Grayson
 Cleaver Green, Gene
 Coffman Griffin (AR)
 Collins (GA) Griffith (VA)
 Collins (NY) Grijalva
 Conaway Hall
 Connolly Hanna
 Cooper Harris
 Cotton Hartzler
 Crawford Heck (NV)
 Cummings Hensarling
 DeGette Himes
 DeSantis Holding
 Doggett Hudson
 Duffy Huizenga (MI)
 Duncan (SC) Hultgren
 Duncan (TN) Hunter
 Edwards Hurt

Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Peters (CA)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pittenger
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Radel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Rogers (AL)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita

Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schiff
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (TX)
 Speier
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman

Thompson (CA)
 Thornberry
 Titus
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walorski
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Wilson (SC)
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoho
 Young (IN)

NOES—224

Aderholt Gallego
 Alexander Garamendi
 Amodei Gerlach
 Andrews Gibson
 Bachus Green, Al
 Grimm Barletta
 Bass Guthrie
 Beatty Hahn
 Becerra Harper
 Benishek Hastings (FL)
 Bentivolio Hastings (WA)
 Bera (CA) Heck (WA)
 Bishop (GA) Higgins
 Bishop (NY) Honda
 Bishop (UT) Hoyer
 Blumenauer Huelskamp
 Bonamici Huffman
 Bonner Issa
 Boustany Jackson Lee
 Brady (PA) Jenkins
 Braley (IA) Johnson (GA)
 Brooks (AL) Johnson (OH)
 Brownley (CA) Joyce
 Bustos Kaptur
 Butterfield Keating
 Calvert Kelly (IL)
 Capito Kelly (PA)
 Capps Kennedy
 Capuano Kildee
 Cárdenas Kilmer
 Carney King (IA)
 Cartwright King (NY)
 Castro (TX) Kirkpatrick
 Chabot Kuster
 Cicilline Langevin
 Clarke Larsen (WA)
 Clay Larson (CT)
 Clyburn Latham
 Coble Latta
 Cohen Levin
 Cole Lewis
 Conyers Lipinski
 Cook LoBiondo
 Costa Loeb sack
 Courtney Lowenthal
 Cramer Lowey
 Crenshaw Lucas
 Crowley Lujan Grisham
 Cuellar (NM)
 Culberson Luján, Ben Ray
 Daines (NM)
 Davis (CA) Lummis
 Davis, Danny Maloney, Sean
 Davis, Rodney Marino
 DeFazio McCaul
 Delaney McCollum
 DeLauro McDermott
 DelBene McGovern
 Denham McIntyre
 Dent McKeon
 DesJarlais McKinley
 Deutch McHenry
 Diaz-Balart Messer
 Doyle Mica
 Duckworth Miller (FL)
 Ellums Miller, George
 Enyart Moran
 Eshoo Mulvaney
 Esty Murphy (FL)
 Farr Napolitano
 Fattah Neugebauer
 Forbes Nugent
 Frankel (FL) Nunnelee
 Fudge O'Rourke
 Gabbard Olson

Noem
 Nolan
 Nunes
 Owens
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (MI)
 Poca
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Richmond
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rooney
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Runyan
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David

Wilson (FL) Wolf Yoder
Wittman Yarmuth Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—18

Campbell Hinojosa Miller, Gary
Dingell Holt Pallone
Graves (MO) Horsford Pingree (ME)
Gutiérrez Labrador Pitts
Hanabusa McCarthy (NY) Rangel
Herrera Beutler Meadows Young (FL)

□ 1910

Messrs. ROKITA and CRAWFORD changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 248, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

AYES—166

Amash Gardner Miller (MI)
Bachmann Garrett Mulvaney
Bachus Gibbs Murphy (PA)
Barber Gingrey (GA) Neugebauer
Barr Gohmert Nugent
Barrow (GA) Goodlatte Nunes
Barton Gowdy Nunnelee
Bentivolio Graves (GA) O'Rourke
Bilirakis Grayson Olson
Bishop (UT) Green, Gene Palazzo
Black Griffith (VA) Paulsen
Blackburn Grimm Payne
Boustany Hall Perry
Brady (TX) Hanna Petri
Bridenstine Harris Pittenger
Brooks (IN) Hastings (WA) Poe (TX)
Broun (GA) Heck (NV) Polis
Buchanan Hensarling Pompeo
Bucshon Himes Posey
Burgess Holding Price (GA)
Camp Hudson Radel
Cantor Huizenga (MI) Reed
Cassidy Hultgren Reichert
Castor (FL) Hunter Renacci
Chabot Hurt Rice (SC)
Chaffetz Issa Rigell
Coffman Jenkins Roe (TN)
Collins (GA) Johnson, Sam Rogers (AL)
Collins (NY) Jordan Rohrabacher
Conaway Kingston Roskam
Connolly Kinzinger (IL) Ross
Cook Klime Royce
Cotton LaMalfa Ruiz
Culberson Lamborn Ryan (WI)
Denham Lance Salmon
DeSantis Lankford Sanford
DesJarlais Latta Scalise
Doggett Long Schweikert
Duncan (SC) Maffei Scott, Austin
Duncan (TN) Marchant Sensenbrenner
Ellmers Massie Smith (MO)
Fincher McCarthy (CA) Smith (NJ)
Fleischmann McCaul Smith (TX)
Fleming McClintock Southerland
Flores McHenry Speier
Fortenberry Meehan Stewart
Foxy Messer Stivers
Franks (AZ) Mica Stockman
Frelinghuysen Miller (FL) Stutzman

Terry Walden
Thornberry Walorski
Tiberi Weber (TX)
Upton Webster (FL)
Velazquez Wenstrup
Wagner Westmoreland
Walberg Williams

NOES—248

Aderholt Gibson
Alexander Gosar
Amodei Granger
Andrews Green, Al
Barletta Griffin (AR)
Bass Grijalva
Beatty Guthrie
Becerra Hahn
Benishek Harper
Bera (CA) Hartzler
Bishop (GA) Hastings (FL)
Bishop (NY) Heck (WA)
Blumenauer Higgins
Bonamici Honda
Bonner Hoyer
Brady (PA) Huelskamp
Braley (IA) Huffman
Brooks (AL) Israel
Brown (FL) Jackson Lee
Brownley (CA) Jeffries
Bustos Johnson (GA)
Butterfield Johnson (OH)
Calvert Johnson, E. B.
Capito Jones
Capps Joyce
Capuano Kaptur
Cárdenas Keating
Carney Kelly (IL)
Carson (IN) Kelly (PA)
Carter Kennedy
Cartwright Kildee
Castro (TX) Kilmer
Chu Kind
Cicilline King (IA)
Clarke King (NY)
Clay Kirkpatrick
Cleaver Kuster
Clyburn Langevin
Coble Larsen (WA)
Cohen Larson (CT)
Cole Latham
Conyers Lee (CA)
Cooper Levin
Costa Lewis
Courtney Lipinski
Cramer LoBiondo
Crawford Loeb sack
Crenshaw Lofgren
Crowley Lowenthal
Cuellar Lowey
Cummings Lucas
Daines Luetkemeyer
Davis (CA) Lujan Grisham
Davis, Danny (NM)
Davis, Rodney Luján, Ben Ray
DeFazio (NM)
DeGette Lummis
Delaney Lynch
DeLauro Maloney,
DelBene Carolyn
Dent Maloney, Sean
Deutch Marino
Diaz-Balart Matheson
Doyle Matsui
Duckworth McCollum
Duffy McDermott
Edwards McGovern
Ellison McIntyre
Engel McKeon
Enyart McKinley
Eshoo McMorris
Eshoo McMorris
Esty Rodgers
Farenthold McNerney
Farr Meeks
Fattah Meng
Fitzpatrick Michaud
Forbes Miller, George
Foster Moore
Frankel (FL) Moran
Fudge Mullin
Gabbard Murphy (FL)
Gallego Nadler
Garamendi Napolitano
Garcia Neal
Gerlach Negrete McLeod

NOT VOTING—19

Campbell Gutiérrez
Dingell Hanabusa
Graves (MO) Herrera Beutler

Wilson (SC) Labrador
Wittman McCarthy (NY)
Woodall Meadows
Yoho Miller, Gary

Pallone Rokita
Pingree (ME) Young (FL)
Pitts
Rangel

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1913

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF

FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) 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 154, noes 258, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

AYES—154

Andrews Frankel (FL) Moran
Barrow (GA) Fudge Murphy (FL)
Barton Garamendi Nadler
Bass Garcia Napolitano
Beatty Gibson Neal
Becerra Grayson Nolan
Bera (CA) Green, Al Owens
Bishop (GA) Grijalva Payne
Bishop (NY) Hahn Perlmutter
Blumenauer Hastings (FL) Peters (CA)
Bonamici Heck (WA) Peters (MI)
Brady (PA) Higgins Peterson
Braley (IA) Himes Pocan
Brown (FL) Honda Polis
Buchanan Huffman Posey
Bustos Jackson Lee Quigley
Butterfield Jeffries Richmond
Cartwright Johnson (GA) Royal-Allard
Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B. Ruiz
Castro (TX) Keating
Chu Kelly (IL) Runyan
Clarke Kennedy Ruppersberger
Clay Kilmer Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver King (NY) Schakowsky
Clyburn Kuster Schwartz
Cohen Larsen (WA) Scott (VA)
Connolly Larson (CT) Scott, David
Cooper Lee (CA) Serrano
Courtney Lewis Sewell (AL)
Crowley Lipinski Shea-Porter
Cummings LoBiondo Sherman
Davis (CA) Loeb sack Sires
Davis, Danny Lofgren Slaughter
Davis, Rodney Lowenthal Smith (WA)
DeFazio Lujan Grisham Speier
DeGette (NM) Swallowell (CA)
Delaney Luján, Ben Ray Takano
DeLauro (NM) Thompson (CA)
Dent Lynch Thompson (MS)
Deutch Maffei Tierney
Doggett Maloney, Titus
Doyle Carolyn Tonko
Duckworth Maloney, Sean Tsongas
Edwards Matheson Veasey
Ellison Matsui Vela
Engel McDermott Velázquez
Enyart McGovern Visclosky
Eshoo McNerney Wasserman
Esty Meeks Schultz
Farr Meng Waters
Fattah Michaud Watt
Fitzpatrick Miller, George Welch
Foster Moore Wilson (FL)

NOES—258

Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallo
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)

Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
HuiZENGA (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Levin
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Petri
Pittenger

Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—21

Aderholt
Campbell
Cramer
Dingell
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa

Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Labrador
McCarthy (NY)
Meadows

Miller, Gary
Pallone
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Rangel
Simpson
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1917

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF
FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 109, noes 300,
not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

AYES—109

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bustos
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castro (TX)
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Galleo
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Grimm
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lowenthal
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Moore

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Payne
Pocan
Posey
Quigley
Richmond
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—300

Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Costa

Capuano
Cárdenas
Carter
Cartwright
Castro (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Costa

Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garcia
Gardner
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
HuiZENGA (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)

Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Maloney,
Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Garrett
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)

Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)

NOT VOTING—24

Campbell
Cole
Cramer
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Hall

Hanabusa
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Graves (MO)
Labrador
McCarthy (NY)
Meadows

Meadows
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Rangel
Waters
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1920

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

THE CONGRESSIONAL CHALLENGE CUP

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think most Members of this body know that every year for the past 12 years there has been a golf match between the House Republicans and the House Democrats. It has become known as The First Tee Challenge, because the money that is raised from this event goes to help The First Tee, as they reach nearly hundreds of thousands of young people across this country using the game of golf to talk about honesty, integrity, hard work, and discipline. It is patterned after the Ryder Cup.

This year's competition took place last Monday. After the matches were over, the score was tied—10 points for the Republicans and 10 points for the Democrats. That is the ultimate in bipartisanship.

But the rules of The First Tee Challenge Cup provide, just like the Ryder Cup, that the team that is in possession of the coveted Roll Call Cup, which I have right here in my hand, the team that is in possession of the cup must be defeated for the cup to change hands. So, therefore, the fact that the match was a tie this year, the coveted Roll Call Cup will stay in possession of the Republican team for 1 more year.

I just want to thank all the members of the team for their hard work, their dedication, their fine play, and congratulate The First Tee for all the work that they do. And a special word of thanks to the sponsors, who have raised over \$2 million over these years to help support The First Tee.

I would like to yield to my Democratic counterpart, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend from Florida for his kind remarks.

It was a wonderful competition. I would like to blame redistricting on the reversal of fortune that we've had over the last 2 years; but I can say in all honesty that it was a phenomenal competition and, more importantly, it was a very civil and friendly competition with a great deal of mutual respect and a great deal of humor and fun in a day that was documented last night on Golf Central on the Golf Channel. As my friend said, the most important thing is that we are raising money for a very important charity that has done phenomenal work throughout the country.

I want to congratulate the Republicans for retaining the cup and congratulate my own team for a valiant effort. I must remind everyone that we didn't lose, we tied, and that we will get back at it next year and try to steal that cup from the Republicans where it rightfully belongs.

Once again, thank you very much to the Republican team. Thanks also to the sponsors, and primarily to The First Tee for the great work that they do.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) 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 116, noes 295, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

AYES—116

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kilmer
King (NY)
Kuster
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks

Michaud
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Payne
Pocan
Posey
Quigley
Richmond
Runyan
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—295

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barnett
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek

Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas

Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones

Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci

Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothenfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci

NOT VOTING—22

Campbell
Carney
Cramer
Dingell
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa

Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Labrador
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Meadows

Miller, Gary
Pallone
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Rangel
Young (FL)

□ 1929

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONTINUATION OF AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank my close friend from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who not only called the House to order but who has been an extraordinary champion of transit systems for years, especially of Washington's metropolitan transit system, because he gets it. He understands how important this transit system is.

There was a previous discussion, a dialogue, between Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. GARRETT. The outcome of it was a suggestion that Washington's Metro system is somehow extraordinarily subsidized. The fact is that it's subsidized but that it's subsidized primarily by local governments. We have been trying on our side to provide subsidies to transit systems all over the country, including in the New York-New Jersey area—apparently, given the results of some of the votes, without much success on this bill.

The point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that Metro is our Nation's transit system. It was created largely to serve the needs of the Federal Government. Forty percent of Metro's peak ridership are Federal employees, so a Federal role is both necessary and appropriate. WMATA is also the primary means of transportation for visitors to our Nation's Capital. Whether they come to experience our historical legacy, to participate in rallies on The Mall or to meet with their Members of Congress, they use our Nation's Metro system.

Now, in recognition of this special relationship and of WMATA's urgent need for additional capital funds, the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 authorized \$1.5 billion over 10 years for WMATA's capital and preventative maintenance projects. It was bipartisan. As Mr. CONNOLLY suggested, his predecessor, Mr. DAVIS, largely led much of the effort, and it was to be matched dollar for dollar by the jurisdictions that WMATA serves—the District of Columbia, the State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

That bill represented a compact between WMATA and the Federal Government, which was granted representation on the WMATA board. That was part of the legislation, that you've got to put Federal representation on the board in return for the funding. Up to this point, the Federal Government has upheld its end of this compact. That's why we object so strongly to the Garrett amendment. Currently, this appropriations bill on the floor today provides \$125 million, which is consistent

with this compact in its funding for the Metro system. It's a 16 percent cut already below the authorized level, which, in fact, has been fully funded in previous fiscal years, but Mr. GARRETT's amendment would eliminate even that reduced funding level.

The elimination of WMATA funding would be deeply detrimental to the system and would diminish the ability of thousands of employees to get to work—two-fifths of them Federal employees. Critically, the further cuts mandated by Mr. GARRETT's amendment would limit WMATA's ability to continue improving the safety of the system and fully implement the recommendations of the National Transportation Safety Board that resulted from the 2009 Red Line crash. That's what we need to implement. We wouldn't be able to do it with this amendment. Eliminating Federal funding would also jeopardize State capital funding for the Metro system by breaking the matching compact that has been agreed to by all the parties.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this unnecessary amendment, which would irreparably harm America's most critical transit system.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I just want to speak briefly in support of what Mr. MORAN said.

Mr. Chairman, this law that we are drastically changing was really the result of a bipartisan agreement with regard to the Congress, and it was authored by former Congressman Tom Davis from northern Virginia. We voted on this one other time. A similar amendment was offered by Mr. GARRETT last year. It failed by a vote of 160–243.

In 2008, the Congress made a 10-year commitment as the Federal partner to provide capital funds for the needs of the Metro system. It was a commitment. It's in the law. We voted on it. We worked on it. It was bipartisan. Now we come up with the Garrett amendment. These funds are matched, as said by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), by WMATA's regional partners—Virginia, Maryland and Washington, D.C. Again, it was voted on before, in the last Congress, and it failed overwhelmingly by a vote of 160–243.

Eliminating this funding means that Congress would be choosing to go back on its commitment to provide the money needed to maintain a safe and reliable system used by many of your constituents—the people who visit. Metro is currently using Federal funds to improve a 30-year-old system to address the critical safety recommenda-

tions made by the National Transportation Safety Board. People died on the Metro. This money is being used to make the Metro safe. As the other Member said, many Members have constituents who come from all over the country to use it. More than half of the Metro rail system serves Federal facilities like the Pentagon, the Department of Homeland Security and many others.

I would ask Members to keep the commitment that was made in a bipartisan way and to vote down the Garrett amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

He and I spent literally a decade working together, shoulder to shoulder, in a bipartisan way because this is America's subway. This is a subway that is used by almost all of the visitors who come to visit their capital. It is for that reason that the Federal Government has participated in building this extraordinary system.

The gentleman is correct. We have an agreement. There is a compact that has been signed by Republican Governors and Democratic Governors, by Republican Members of the House and Democratic Members of the House, by Republican members of the Senate and Democratic members of the Senate. I would hope that the House would reject this amendment.

I adopt the remarks of the gentlemen from Virginia. My colleagues Mr. MORAN and Mr. WOLF, I think, speak for all of us, and, of course, Mr. CONNOLLY has spoken very strongly for himself, but I would hope that the House would continue to keep the faith with the agreement that has been made for what is America's subway, used by all of our people when they come here to their Nation's Capital.

I want to thank the chairman, and I want to thank the ranking member for their efforts on behalf of the Metro as well as for keeping the faith of the agreement that we have reached. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and his remarks.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

I also want to thank Mr. LATHAM and Mr. PASTOR for their opposition to this amendment.

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

THUD APPROPRIATIONS

In 2008, the Congress made a 10-year commitment, as the federal partner, to provide capital funds for the needs of the Metro system.

These funds are matched by WMATA's regional partners, Virginia, Maryland and Washington, D.C.

This amendment would eliminate \$125 million in capital funds for Metro, which has already been cut from \$150 million last year.

A similar amendment offered to last year's THUD bill failed by a vote of 160–243.

Eliminating this funding means Congress is choosing to go back on its commitment to provide money needed to maintain a safe and reliable system used by many of your constituents.

Metro is currently using federal funds to improve its 30-year-old system to address the critical safety recommendations made by the National Transportation Safety Board, which Metro has made its highest priority.

WMATA operates the second largest rail system and sixth largest bus system in the U.S.

It provides 1.3 million trips a day—many of these trips carry employees to and from work every day.

More than half of the Metrorail stations serve federal facilities, like the Pentagon and the Department of Homeland Security.

Metro is critical to the economic growth of this region.

It has spurred \$37 billion in economic development at or near to Metro's property.

I represent the Dulles airport and Loudoun County and since 1999, I have supported extending metro rail to Dulles.

The funding provided in this bill for Metro is critical to the success and safety of the rail project along the Dulles Corridor, which is the single greatest economic engine for Northern Virginia.

Congress must continue to uphold its commitment to provide a safe and reliable metro experience for the American people that we serve.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we may take advantage of revisiting this yet again to have a teachable moment here.

My good friend from New Jersey talked about some of the problems of the Metro system. As a practical matter, many of those problems are the result of 40 years of an accumulated maintenance deficit and a lack of a long-term, reliable partnership with the Federal Government, exemplified by the irresponsibility of this amendment that is being proposed.

The Federal Government is the primary beneficiary of Metro. Bear in mind these 68 square miles that represent the District of Columbia: 21 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government, and a much larger percentage of the valuable land is tax-exempt; 30 percent of the jobs are Federal jobs even in these difficult times, and they're not paying taxes to the District of Columbia or to Metro; 40 percent of the rush-hour traffic is of Federal employees, and we suffer some of the worst traffic congestion in the United States in this region.

We have a serious accumulated deficit for maintenance, and this was part of a bipartisan, long-term agreement to solve this problem and improve service and meet the Federal responsibilities. I appreciate the advocacy and the eloquence of my friends from Virginia and Maryland who have come to the floor and pointed out this responsibility. I

speak as somebody who represents a district 2,300 miles away, but I, too, have an interest in the Federal Government's being a responsible partner in helping Metro function properly.

Many of us were on the floor of the House during 9/11. That was a horrible week in our Nation's Capital. But for the Metro system, the area would have been paralyzed.

□ 1945

I suggest that this is, I hope, well intentioned; but I think it's shortsighted, and it underscores the problems we have had in the district to deal with long-term capital investments. As has been pointed out, the local governments surrounding are part of the partnership and are contributing money.

I would hope that the Federal Government understands its responsibility and not only do we reject this misguided amendment, but hopefully we can use this as an opportunity to reaffirm the partnership, the role that the Federal Government plays, the benefit that the Federal Government obtains for our employees, for our visitors, for the land that is located here that occupies Federal activities.

Mr. Chairman, these are tea leaves that people read. I am sad that this bill underfunds infrastructure across the country on the very day that the American Society of Civil Engineers puts out their report that gives us a D-plus rating for infrastructure in this country, that we need increased private investment, local government funding. We have \$2.2 trillion over the next 10 years. It will be necessary just to bring our infrastructure up to standard. And this will be the quickest way to put Americans to work at family-wage jobs from coast to coast. I would hope at some point we get back to our responsibilities overall for infrastructure, but in the meantime we should reject this effort to undermine the partnership and the Federal responsibility.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, when we're in session, I have the opportunity—and I take it—to ride the metro. That's the way I get around in this great city. I have to tell you that in the late sixties, early seventies when I first came to Washington on other business, I saw where Connecticut Avenue was being dug up, the beginning of the Red Line. So I can attest, Mr. Chairman, that every morning at the South Capitol stop, people who work in this complex on Capitol Hill, that there are lines of workers that are coming into work.

So when the proposition came before the House, the compact that the Federal Government agreed with Maryland, Virginia, and the District, to maintain the metro and the particular States and District had the matching

funds, I was very supportive because I knew of the benefit that Metro brought to our employees here on Capitol Hill, as well as to the Federal employees throughout this metro area. So I have to tell you that I support the Metro system, and I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriations measure fails at every level to meet our Nation's transportation infrastructure needs, support our States' housing initiatives, or further our community development goals.

I would like to take a moment to highlight a few of the most egregious cuts in the Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill before us today because it's important for my constituents in Rhode Island to hear exactly what's being proposed here today.

We all recognize clearly that some cuts in Federal spending are unavoidable. In certain cases, they're even desirable in the current budgetary environment. But this bill goes far beyond what's reasonable by reneging on the spirit of the agreed-to spending levels in the Budget Control Act. The cuts in this bill to the Community Development Block Grant program, the HOME grant, and transportation investments endanger the well-being of America's cities and towns, as well as our residents.

Expanding economic opportunities and creating jobs continue to be my top priorities in Congress. It's exactly what this Nation needs right now. It's certainly what we need in Rhode Island, given the fact we have the fourth highest unemployment rate in the Nation. Regrettably, this bill achieves neither of these goals. The Congressional Budget Office estimated just last week the sequestration would result in 1.6 million fewer American jobs by the end of September 2014. Yet my Republican colleagues have decided to double down on this reckless policy by crafting the T-HUD bill with the assumption that sequestration remains in effect.

These cuts translate into real jobs and real benefits to our communities. Just 2 weeks ago, I celebrated a \$10

million Federal TIGER grant award that will be used to help Rhode Island replace the aging Providence Viaduct. It's part of the I-95 corridor that goes right through the center of Providence. This bill eliminates the TIGER grant program.

In April, our State Department of Transportation unveiled plans to improve the Providence Amtrak station. The station serves over 1 million Amtrak and commuter rail passengers each year, benefiting our entire State, as well as neighboring ones with multimodal connections from Providence to the Boston metropolitan area. This bill cuts Amtrak funding by 33 percent, endangering further improvements to important interstate transportation infrastructure.

In June, Rhode Islanders celebrated the 100th anniversary of the Amalgamated Transit Union Local 618. Their 1,000 members take us to school, work, to the doctor, and to the grocery store quickly and safely every day. Public transportation decreases congestion, pollution, and individual fuel costs; it connects us to recreation, family, and community; and it creates jobs in the short term, while supporting careers over the long term. This bill cuts transit funding by 17 percent from last year.

It also delivers a 25 percent cut to the Housing Counseling Assistance Fund, which helped over 2,000 Rhode Island families last year stay in their homes, avoid foreclosure, or refinance their mortgage. This bill would cut the HOME program by \$300 million, a 30 percent reduction from pre-sequestration levels. HOME is a critical resource that's used to develop affordable housing for those who need it most. It has resulted in over 4,200 units in Rhode Island alone being created.

Meanwhile, homeless families, the most vulnerable among us, once again will feel the full brunt of the majority's misplaced priorities. In 2012, over 4,800 Rhode Islanders found themselves homeless, one-quarter of them children. The State homeless assistance programs depend on Federal support to operate shelters to help move people to a permanent housing solution; yet H.R. 2610 does not come close to adequately funding these programs, placing thousands of Rhode Island families in even further jeopardy.

By cutting the administrative fund for section 8, this bill seeks to undermine the very integrity of that program. Those seeking housing assistance vouchers will find agencies understaffed, underfunded, and unable to serve the millions who depend on section 8 to stay in affordable housing. This is outrageous.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill cuts the CDBG program by almost 50 percent, an unacceptable and draconian move that will cripple the neighborhoods that need the most help. These grants are the cornerstone of local investment opportunities. For every dollar spent on CDBG grants, \$3 is lever-

aged from private, nonprofit, and other non-Federal funding sources. The organizations working with CDBG funds use them for employment services, homeless assistance, child care, senior care, mental health outreach, and countless other services. I'm sad to see that the committee has decided that this is not worth the investment.

This bill is misguided, and I hope we will rethink this. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WOODALL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 2855, STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Ms. GRANGER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-185) on the bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 693

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 693.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

SCHOOL ACCESS TO EMERGENCY EPINEPHRINE ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2094) to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2094

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL PREFERENCE TO CERTAIN STATES THAT ALLOW TRAINED SCHOOL PERSONNEL TO ADMINISTER EPINEPHRINE.

Section 399L(d) of part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

"(F) SCHOOL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION OF EPINEPHRINE.—In determining the preference (if any) to be given to a State under this subsection, the Secretary shall give additional preference to a State that provides to the Secretary the certification described in subparagraph (G) and that requires that each public elementary school and secondary school in the State—

"(i) permits trained personnel of the school to administer epinephrine to any student of the school reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction;

"(ii) maintains a supply of epinephrine in a secure location that is easily accessible to trained personnel of the school for the purpose of administration to any student of the school reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction; and

"(iii) has in place a plan for having on the premises of the school during all operating hours of the school one or more individuals who are trained personnel of the school.

"(G) CIVIL LIABILITY PROTECTION LAW.—The certification required in subparagraph (F) shall be a certification made by the State attorney general that the State has reviewed any applicable civil liability protection law to determine the application of such law with regard to elementary and secondary school trained personnel who may administer epinephrine to a student reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction and has concluded that such law provides adequate civil liability protection applicable to such trained personnel. For purposes of the previous sentence, the term 'civil liability protection law' means a State law offering legal protection to individuals who give aid on a voluntary basis in an emergency to an individual who is ill, in peril, or otherwise incapacitated."; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

"(E) The term 'trained personnel' means, with respect to an elementary or secondary school, an individual—

"(i) who has been designated by the principal (or other appropriate administrative staff) of the school to administer epinephrine on a voluntary basis outside their scope of employment;

"(ii) who has received training in the administration of epinephrine; and

"(iii) whose training in the administration of epinephrine meets appropriate medical