

passenger rail infrastructure, and I strongly support the provision that permits funds to be used for crossing safety improvements because we all know these investments benefit not only safety, but also our regional and national economies.

In 2014, we invested \$220 million in the Railway-Highway Crossings Program at the Federal level; yet, under title 49, only 10 States are required by Federal law to have action plans prioritizing rail-highway safety improvements.

It is critically important for Congress to ensure that Federal dollars for passenger rail infrastructure improvements are used wisely. We must also ensure that Federal funds are prioritized to address safety improvements at the most dangerous crossings first.

My amendment would get at the heart of this issue by requiring every State to have a specific plan in place that will ensure both the wise use of tax dollars and address rail-highway grade crossing safety in a systematic way.

I ask my colleagues to vote for my commonsense amendment.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for offering this amendment.

While grade crossing incidents have dropped 40 percent since 2000, the tragic events in Ms. BROWNLEY's district last week remind us how important it is to be aware of grade crossings.

This amendment requiring States to develop and implement plans to improve safety at grade crossings within their borders, I think, adds strength to the bill. I would also note there are similar grade crossing reporting requirements in the Federal highway program, and we should work with the Senate during conference to reauthorize the surface transportation programs, ensuring that there is consistency among the requirements at those grade crossings.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I thank the chairman for your extraordinary work on this bill—and a bipartisan bill as well—and I thank you for accepting the amendment.

Rail-highway crossing safety problems are not unique to my district. Sadly, my colleagues have also experienced recent tragedies. On Monday, a Long Island Rail Road train struck a car stopped on the tracks in East Rockaway. In February, a Metro-North train struck a sport utility vehicle, tragically killing the driver and five train passengers in Valhalla.

I strongly believe that Congress, along with State and local governments, must address this safety issue as a matter of urgency, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. POSEY. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I would like to speak in support of her amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentlewoman ask unanimous consent to reclaim her time?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Yes.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Yes, I yield.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I would like to support this amendment and urge my colleagues to do so.

They are putting in a high-speed rail in my State now, running over 100 miles through my district, something that will go 120-plus miles an hour through the middle of small towns and communities which are ill-prepared and ill-equipped to safely facilitate that high rate of traffic.

I wish I had thought ahead to bring some illustrations, photographs, or diagrams of some of the intersections that this train will go blazing through without much thought to the pedestrians, the vehicles, the men, women, and children in the community that will be put in danger by it.

I think this is a great amendment. If you are going to use Federal money—I see that the gentlelady said it is for projects that use Federal money, not an unfunded mandate—but if you are going to use the Federal money, you are going to use these RIF loans, some of which appear to be in the process of being granted in direct conflict of the requirements of granting the RIF loans, the very least we could do is insist that the money is used safely in our districts.

□ 1345

The very least we could do is insist that the money is used safely in our districts.

So I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I urge my colleagues to support this great amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate has passed a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

PASSENGER RAIL REFORM AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 2015

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. PERLMUTTER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-36.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 503. QUIET ZONE REPORT.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to Congress a report evaluating the rule issued by the Federal Railroad Administration on the use of locomotive horn at rail crossings. Such report shall—

- (1) evaluate the effectiveness of the rule in reducing accidents and fatalities at rail crossings;
- (2) evaluate the effectiveness of the rule in establishing quiet zones;
- (3) identify any barriers to the establishment of quiet zones; and
- (4) estimate the costs associated with their establishment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 134, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 749 requires the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, to conduct a study and submit a report to Congress evaluating the effectiveness of the Federal Railroad Administration's 2005 rule on the use of locomotive horns at rail crossings. We were just talking about rail crossings.

After 10 years of being in effect, I believe it is fair we ask the FRA to update and modernize the train horn regulation, allowing flexibility for new technologies and innovations that may become available.

The basic premise behind the rule has not changed: to promote public safety by requiring train operators to sound horns at certain decibel levels while passing through railway crossings to alert motorists and pedestrians.

While the rule currently allows municipalities to apply for "quiet zone" status, I am concerned the current requirements for obtaining a quiet zone

waiver are far too rigid, cost prohibitive, and time consuming. Achieving quiet zone status can take years of work and cost millions of dollars.

By requiring the GAO to study the train horn rule, I am confident the FRA can craft an updated rule striking a balance between public safety and providing communities flexibility to establish quiet zones.

I hope the GAO study will provide insight on how the FRA can update train horn requirements when communities invest in certain safety enhancements and measures installed at crossings, including barriers, warning signals, and other features to keep the public safe.

Last year, I attended an event for the unveiling of a new quiet zone in one of the cities in my district, Commerce City, Colorado, which was established after significant investment from the city. I want to thank the FRA and State officials for working with Commerce City. But we need to review how long and how costly these quiet zone applications can be.

Just last week, another city in my district, Arvada, announced four planned railway crossing improvements to establish crossing zones. According to a story published in The Denver Post last week, the city has been in discussions with the FRA for more than 5 years on getting the quiet zones approved. I include the text of The Denver Post article for the RECORD.

RAILROAD QUIET ZONES WILL SILENCE TRAIN HORNS AT FOUR ARVADA CROSSINGS

Arvada residents living along the Union Pacific Railroad tracks could sleep a little easier next year with the establishment of "quiet zones" at four crossings.

City Council recently approved a \$1.8 million agreement with Union Pacific that will see barriers and gates added where the tracks intersect at Lamar and Carr Streets, Olde Wadsworth Boulevard and West 66th Avenue.

Arvada communications manager Maria Vanderkolk said the city has been in discussions for more than five years with the Federal Railroad Administration, the Public Utilities Commission and Union Pacific on getting the quiet zones approved.

"It's expensive—we got a couple approved elsewhere about 10 years ago, then we had issues with these four and they're right in the heart of the city," Vanderkolk said. "We told the neighborhood this would be done last year. . . various and sundry delays means this has literally taken years to get approved."

Train horns are sounded in compliance with federal rules and regulations, which require a train to blast its horn for 15 to 20 seconds at any public crossing. Under terms of the agreement, the city will install four-quadrant gate systems—or gates with four arms, in addition to flashing lights and ringing bells, at the four crossings. These type of gates make it difficult for motorists to drive around.

Once they're built, the trains will no longer have to blast their horns and the Union Pacific train will run quietly through the entire length of Arvada.

"Without a quiet zone, people see a train coming and think they may be able to beat it and skirt around the gate," Vanderkolk said. "With a quiet zone, you construct a bar-

rier so the car physically can't get around it."

Michael Smith has lived blocks from the railroad tracks in his home near 64th Avenue and Field Street for almost 35 years. He said over the years, the trains have become more frequent and the horns so prevalent that at times they have kept him and family members from getting a good night's sleep.

Things got so bad they considered moving, but decided to stay once it became clear the city was working to address the problem.

"We really appreciate the work city staff has done on getting this completed," Smith said. "It's a lot of money, but it will be great for the community."

The city is coordinating with the railroad on getting the crossings built by the end of 2015, said Chris Sveum, a city civil engineer.

She added: "There's no guarantee the trains still won't have to sound their horns from time to time, but this should cut down the rate by 95 percent."

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, it is time for Congress to analyze the effectiveness of the train horn rule and work with FRA to improve the ability of our communities all across the country to continue investing in railway crossing safety.

A more flexible rule could enable these communities to craft solutions reducing noise, promoting long-term economic growth, and, at the same time, ensuring the safety of residents.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask for an "aye" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, the past couple of weeks have seen some startling accidents at grade crossings. Having an independent entity review the train horn rule would be a good start to helping ensure such accidents don't occur in the future.

The train horn and quiet zone rule was one that took the Federal Railroad Administration almost 10 years to complete. It was finalized 10 years ago in 2005. So this would be a good time to revisit the effectiveness.

Furthermore, with the rise in freight traffic on previously lower capacity routes, some communities are seeing more trains travel through their towns, which are used to lower traffic.

Looking at crossings, the creation of quiet zones, and their costs will be a helpful tool for small communities across the country. I recommend support for the gentleman from Colorado's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Transportation Committee and all of the Members for working with me on this amendment. I would ask for an "aye" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114-36.

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 2, line 3, through page 3, line 10, strike section 101.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 134, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment removes the taxpayer subsidies and requires Amtrak to operate as a business, as we were promised it would when it was established back in 1971.

Every year, as Amtrak's operating losses have mounted, Congress has dutifully shoveled more money at it to keep it afloat. Every year, its congressional supporters have promised reforms to bring these losses under control. And every year, these promises have fallen flat.

This year, we are told, well, look at all the new reforms that we are building into this. In 5 years, they will have their act together. Well, how many times have we heard this promise? Let me cite just a few.

Back in 1997, facing mounting criticism, the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act required Amtrak to operate without any Federal operating assistance after 2002.

When that didn't happen, in 2008, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) attempted to eliminate only its most expensive route from reauthorization. That year, the gentleman from Minnesota, Jim Oberstar, called any reduction in subsidies a "preemptive strike" and promised that the bill was chock-full of reforms that would soon solve Amtrak's problems.

Well, when that didn't happen, in 2014, the gentleman from Georgia, Paul Broun, proposed eliminating subsidies, just as my amendment does. At the time, the gentleman from Iowa, Tom Latham, said: "I concede that Amtrak could be more efficient. However, it has made significant improvements in this area recently and is moving in the right direction."

"Moving in the right direction."

This year, taxpayers will subsidize Amtrak in the amount of about \$1.4 billion. The bill before us authorizes \$1.4 billion for next year. Put another way, we will shell out \$45 every time a passenger steps aboard an Amtrak train. That is \$45 per passenger, per trip, and direct losses billed to taxpayers. That is up from \$32 of loss per passenger 6 years ago.

Despite endless promises, things are not getting better. Amtrak's apologists

claim this is a 40 percent reduction in authorized funding. In fact, Amtrak received \$1.4 billion in 2015, the same as this bill authorizes in 2016.

Outside experts have reported that over the next 10 years, subsidizing Amtrak will cost taxpayers \$49 billion. Let me put that in family-sized numbers. The average American family will have to cough up \$392 from its taxes over the next 10 years just to cover Amtrak's losses.

What does that \$392 out of a family's taxes pay for? Well, among other things, Amtrak's food and beverage employees, who are paid an average of \$106,000 a year to provide a service that lost over \$800 million over the past decade just selling snacks on Amtrak trains.

Are we at least seeing any improvements in service? Not hardly. Amtrak's monthly on-time performance has significantly declined.

Bigger losses, declining service—that is not moving in the right direction. That was a false promise then, just like all of the other false promises we have heard since 1971.

In last year's appropriations debate, Amtrak apologists warned that cutting off the subsidies would "eliminate an entire transportation option." It does no such thing.

Amtrak claims that it is running a profit on a heavily traveled Northeast corridor. Nothing in my amendment would change this. Anything Amtrak makes on these profitable routes, Amtrak keeps.

With this amendment, Amtrak would be perfectly free to continue to operate and expand its Northeast corridor from its own profits and to subsidize its other money-losing operations to the extent that its profits would cover them.

However, this amendment would end the practice of forcing American taxpayers to underwrite another 5 years of broken promises.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as I stand up here today, I know that if the gentleman from Minnesota, Jim Oberstar, was here, the transportation guru, he would be standing up for Amtrak. So I am going to stand up in place of Mr. Oberstar.

And let's start out with, this amendment would kill Amtrak. It would shut it down. It would strand millions of passengers, disrupt commuter operations, add to our already congested roads and airports, eliminate over 20,000 jobs nationwide, and jeopardize local economies and business that depend on Amtrak's service.

Amtrak provides the majority of all intercity passenger rail service in the United States, with more States and localities across America turning to

passenger rail to meet the transportation needs of our citizens.

Amtrak reduces congestion and improves our energy independence. One full passenger train can take up to 250 to 350 cars off the road. Passenger rail also consumes less energy than both automobiles and commercial airlines.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

I certainly appreciate the gentleman's concern. He has been a true deficit hawk. One of the great challenges we face in America is reducing the deficit.

There has been a longstanding debate in this Congress about passenger rail in this country. I, for one, believe it is necessary. I think that what we have in this bill—and I have watched for the past 40 years also some of these broken promises.

I am committed to, and I think we committed in this bill to putting forth reforms, streamlining, empowering the States, which I think is a huge step in the right direction, giving States the ability to be at the table, to invest their dollars to force Amtrak to do things differently.

So, again, throughout the bill, there are these reforms. I feel confident that, in the way the country is going, with population growth and with these corridors expanding, we have to have passenger rail to move people around some of the most densely populated corridors.

So I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would simply respond to the ridership claims that it has no impact on congestion because the ridership is infinitesimal. You have to compare Amtrak's 31 million trips to the 650 million airline trips per year. According to Cato, the average American logs about 15,000 miles per year by car, 1,800 miles by plane, and just 20 miles on Amtrak.

If Amtrak is making a profit, it can use those profits any way it wants—to continue its operations, to subsidize its losing routes. But it should not be tapping further into taxpayers' pockets.

□ 1400

Voters have elected the biggest Republican majority in the House since 1928, with a resounding mandate to stop wasting money. Today this government is spending and taxing record amounts of families' earnings, and well above the 40-year average as a percentage of our economy. If we can't bring ourselves to cut this, one of the most outrageous subsidies in the entire budget, voters will have every right to ask what good are we?

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, let's just back up for a minute. What the gentleman would do, he says, well, they could keep operating the Northeast corridor. Well, that is good, because three-quarters of the people going from Washington, D.C., to New York are choosing rail over air, and I don't know where we would fit that many more airplanes in the already congested skies. But that is actually, unfortunately, not true because of the other routes, particularly across-country and Western routes, the obligations under their contracts to their existing employees who would lose their jobs, other obligations they would have for abandoned lines and stations, and all that would total billions of dollars.

So even if they theoretically—and you would have to do further changes in the law rather than just taking away the money—could operate the Northeast corridor, they couldn't because of these other obligations. Any money would have to go there, and they would be immediately bankrupt because it would exceed their revenues.

So that is one, perhaps, unintended effect of the gentleman's amendment, because he does seem very sympathetic to the fact that three-quarters of the people going between Washington, D.C., and New York are choosing rail over air, and it is a growing percentage. He doesn't seem to be cognizant of the fact that ridership is up 14 percent—that is actually 4 million people in 1 year—that revenue is up, and the operating losses have been cut in half. They are down 48 percent.

Mr. Chairman, there is no passenger rail system that operates like Amtrak across a continent as large as ours without assistance from the government. Now, if you want to disconnect the country—as I recounted earlier, on 9/11, I had a Federal official who had to get back for meetings in the Northwest. He took the train. We have an aging society. I tell you, when I don't have to get on an airplane every week and I can take a little more time to get somewhere—and I think a lot of other people, as they are aging, would like to avoid the hassles of air travel. I believe ridership will continue to grow.

In the Northwest we are in a cooperative arrangement—and I pointed that out earlier—with Amtrak, where they operate our train, an Acela train which was purchased, and the ridership is up to about 1 million people a year. And it is growing quickly to avoid the already overly congested I-5 between Eugene and Seattle and avoid the hour and a half you are going to spend somewhere 60, 70 miles south of Seattle sitting in your car. So he would deprive Americans of all this for ideology—not for good reasons, but for ideology.

We should be going the other way. We should be investing more and building out a robust, 21st century rail system like every other industrial country in the world. Why do we have to be Third World?

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 114-36.

Mr. LIPINSKI. 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 48, line 14, after "procedures" insert "for passengers, including passengers using or transporting nonmotorized transportation such as wheelchairs and bicycles".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 134, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss my amendment, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman DENHAM, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, Ranking Member CAPUANO, and former Subcommittee Ranking Member BROWN for all their hard work and for bringing this bipartisan legislation to the floor so early this year.

Mr. Chairman, this bill shows us what Congress can do when we work together to build consensus, and yes, compromise—compromise—to get things done to improve our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

This bill makes much-needed reforms to Amtrak's business model and the RRIF loan program, which I hope will unlock a potential financing source for the CREATE rail modernization program in northeastern Illinois and help commuter rail agencies make important improvements, such as installing positive train control.

I am pleased the bill contains provisions extending Buy America requirements to RRIF projects. I have been mentioning this need since 2009, and I am glad to see that we are codifying these requirements to ensure that this \$35 billion loan program is investing our dollars in American materials and American jobs.

My amendment today is a small but important addition to this bill. It sharpens the directive in section 211 that requires Amtrak's inspector general to conduct a review of Amtrak's boarding procedures. Section 211 is a good step towards improving the experience of Amtrak riders and the efficiency of Amtrak's operations.

This amendment builds on this provision by clarifying that the Amtrak IG should consider the boarding needs of passengers that use mobility devices, including all forms of wheelchairs, as well as passengers with items such as bicycles. This will make sure that the IG's report considers the needs of all its riders, guarantees that Amtrak will focus on complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and harnesses a potential revenue stream from bicyclists and other users of non-motorized transport.

Right now, Amtrak uses patchwork procedures that can make it difficult for an individual using a wheelchair or traveling with a bike to get on and off a train. The Amtrak inspector general issued a report in August of last year that found that only 10 percent of Amtrak stations are fully ADA compliant, which demonstrates the need to not only look at each station's infrastructure, but how each station gets passengers from station to platform to train. We need to make sure that Amtrak is serving all of its customers to the best of its abilities and in accordance with the law.

Mr. Chairman, similar difficulties exist for other forms of transportation, such as bicycles. Only 38 percent of Amtrak lines provide baggage service for bicycles, while only 18 percent of lines even allow for roll-on bicycle service that are complemented by ad hoc policies at many of the stations on these lines. Mobility is important to reducing congestion, and if we improve the boarding process, we improve quality of service and help encourage ridership.

This amendment is supported by Easter Seals, People for Bikes, the United Spinal Association, the League of American Bicyclists, AARP, the Rails to Trails Conservancy, the National Disabilities Rights Network, Transportation for America, and the Adventure Cycling Association.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment even though I do not oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. This amendment simply clarifies that when the Amtrak inspector general looks at ways to improve Amtrak's boarding procedures at major stations that it consider passengers using wheelchairs and other nonmotorized transportation. I know

this is near and dear to the hearts of Mr. LIPINSKI's constituents, so, again, I rise in support.

At this time, I would also like to take the opportunity, which I neglected to do, to thank the staff for their work over the past year. We rely on them to make a lot of this come together. Their hard work and dedication deserves recognition and appreciation.

Specifically, I would like to thank on the rail subcommittee Mike Friedberg, Fred Miller, David Connolly, and Kristin Alcalde; on the Democratic side, Jennifer Homendy and Rachel Carr for their hard work; our communications team Jim Billimoria, Justin Harclerode, Michael Marinaccio—I think I finally got it right, and he has left the committee—Keith Hall; from our front office Jennifer Hall, Beth Spivey, Collin McCune, Clare Doherty, Isabelle Beegle-Levin, Denny Wirtz, and Mary Mitchell Todd. To all of them, I thank them for their very, very hard work on helping to put this bill together.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this, and I would like to express my appreciation to the chair, ranking member, ranking members of the subcommittee and chair. This is, I think, an example of Congress doing what it should do. I appreciate it. As an alumni member of the T and I Committee, I am proud to see this move forward.

Rail corridors are absolutely critical in terms of being able to promote mobility. As the chair of the Bike Caucus, I am particularly interested in this amendment.

The committee ended last Congress on a high note with WRRDA, and being able to start this Congress on a high note with a really thoughtful approach to Amtrak, moving this forward, I think, is a signal that there is no other committee that has more potential to do more this Congress to help rebuild and renew the economy and get America moving. This is a tremendous signal about what is possible.

I lend my congratulations to the committee, Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, Ranking Member BROWN, and look forward to working with you on more excitement as we move forward.

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank, again, Chairman SHUSTER for his work and Ranking

Member DEFAZIO. This is what we need to be doing is coming together and working these things out. There is so much that America needs done, especially when it comes to transportation infrastructure.

I want to thank the chairman for his great work in leading this committee. We have a lot of other issues to work on, other forms of transportation, but this is a good example of what we can do by working together.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment and support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on the amendment printed in House Report 114-36 on which further proceedings were postponed:

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 147, noes 272, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

AYES—147

Abraham	Forbes	King (IA)
Aderholt	Foxx	Knight
Allen	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Amash	Garrett	Lamborn
Babin	Gohmert	Latta
Barr	Goodlatte	Loudermilk
Barton	Gosar	Love
Benishkek	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Lummis
Bishop (UT)	Graves (LA)	Marchant
Blum	Graves (MO)	Massie
Brady (TX)	Grothman	McCaul
Brat	Guinta	McClintock
Bridenstine	Guthrie	McHenry
Brooks (AL)	Harper	McMorris
Buck	Harris	Rodgers
Burgess	Hartzler	McSally
Byrne	Heck (NV)	Meadows
Carter (GA)	Hensarling	Messer
Carter (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Mica
Chabot	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (FL)
Chaffetz	Hill	Mooney (WV)
Clawson (FL)	Holding	Mulvaney
Coffman	Hudson	Neugebauer
Collins (GA)	Huelskamp	Noem
Conaway	Huizenga (MI)	Nugent
Culberson	Hultgren	Nunes
DeSantis	Hunter	Olson
DesJarlais	Hurd (TX)	Palazzo
Duffy	Hurt (VA)	Palmer
Duncan (SC)	Issa	Pearce
Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam	Pittenger
Fleischmann	Jolly	Poe (TX)
Fleming	Jones	Poliquin
Flores	Jordan	Pompeo

Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)

Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thornberry
Valadao
Walker

NOES—272

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Elmiers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel

Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Amodei	Hinojosa	Speier
Black	Long	Waters, Maxine
Blackburn	Roe (TN)	Yoho
Crawford	Rush	
Fincher	Smith (WA)	

□ 1440

Messrs. MCNERNEY, WALBERG, WITTMAN, TAKANO, GALLEGO, ZELDIN, FORTENBERRY, RICHMOND, and LYNCH changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. GUTHRIE, GOHMERT, RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. JOLLY, YOUNG of Indiana, MESSER, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART) having assumed the chair, Mr. BYRNE, 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. 749) to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 134, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1445

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Yes, I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 749 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 503. AMTRAK SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the use of the Amtrak Police Department \$150,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019 for acquisition of canines, explosive detection, surveillance and communication equipment, baggage screening, counter-terrorism and critical infrastructure protection, and other security needs determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) VETERANS PROTECT PASSENGERS HIRING INITIATIVE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall implement a veterans hiring initiative in the Amtrak Police Department, which shall include veterans with experience working with military working dogs.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion in the interest of time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer this amendment today as the final amendment to the bill.

I am proud of the bipartisan work that the committee has done, and I want to commend the chairman, Mr. SHUSTER, also Messrs. DEFAZIO, DENHAM, and CAPUANO, and all the staff for the work that went into this legislation. This is a good bill, and it makes key investments in our rail infrastructure and in rail safety. I want to personally thank the chairman for all of his hard work on this bill and for, in particular, including the provisions that I authored on positive train control and grade crossings, the need for which has been so dramatically demonstrated by the terrible accidents in places like Valhalla and Spuyten Duyvil, New York, and recently in Oxnard, California.

However, we can make this bill better. My amendment will not kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If adopted, it would proceed immediately to final passage.

My amendment simply provides \$150 million annually to Amtrak's police department to address critical security needs. Amtrak's security force is not large, but its task is monumental, protecting nearly 32 million passengers who use Amtrak every year. My amendment gives those security officials the resources they need to prevent and defend against terrorist attacks. From additional canine units to explosive detection equipment, we need to make sure that Amtrak's police officers, nationwide, have the capability to protect passengers.

The amendment also requires Amtrak to implement a veterans hiring

initiative specifically designed to hire veterans with experience working with military dogs, canine units. Amtrak has a long history of providing career opportunities to veterans, as well as Active Duty military members, but under current law is not required to do so. It is not required to seek out veterans for open positions. With more than 200,000 Active Duty servicemembers transitioning to civilian life, we can, today, guarantee that Amtrak will seek out veterans for new hires.

In the last 10 years, more than 800 attacks have occurred worldwide against passenger and commuter rail systems, killing thousands. Many of us remember the terrifying images of the terrorist attacks in Madrid and London. In Mumbai, three separate attacks in the last 15 years have killed hundreds of people.

All of us here in both parties understand the real dangers our country is facing. I have no doubt that one of the greatest threats we face is to our U.S. rail system. Subways and commuter systems, in particular, remain a top threat. Information taken from Osama bin Laden's very compound in Pakistan indicated that al Qaeda was considering attacks on a number of U.S. rail systems.

Our intelligence and law enforcement officials have foiled several threats in just recent years. In 2009, an Afghan-born jihadist plotted to bomb New York subways with devices very similar to those used in the 2005 London attacks. And in 2011, two al Qaeda-supported terrorists were arrested after plotting to bomb and derail a train between Toronto and New York's Penn Station.

At a time with heightened security and growing threats like ISIL, we are asking Amtrak's police force to do more with less. Amtrak reports that security funding overall has decreased by more than 50 percent since 2011. We need to reverse this trend to protect the security of our national passenger rail system.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense amendment to provide the necessary funding to ensure the safety and security of Amtrak passengers and rail commuters.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment will do nothing more than kill the bill. H.R. 749 is a bipartisan bill with heavy, heavy reforms that will improve and advance passenger rail in this country, including security. We have taken that into consideration. I agree that security is important, but we cover the cost of security activities in this bill.

Both sides of the aisle have worked very hard over the past 2 years to craft a bill that I believe is exactly the kind

of legislation that the American people want. It is a reform bill. It is commonsense reforms. There has never been an Amtrak bill with these kinds of reforms in it empowering the States.

This bill empowers the States, those 19 States that have 21 supported Amtrak lines. They will have a seat at the table to make investments to improve passenger rail in those 19 States. It is going to give the commission on the Northeast corridor more say, more teeth to be able to force Amtrak to do things. It is going to keep the profits of the Northeast corridor in the Northeast corridor for that heavily congested area of the country that needs to have passenger rail and, along the way, learn the lessons of when we make those investments, how we can go out to the other corridors around this country that are going to need passenger rail.

This bill is not perfect; Amtrak is not perfect. But I truly believe this bill sets Amtrak on the course to reform itself and to improve itself so in the future they can move towards going away from the subsidy by the Federal Government. That is my goal: to get an Amtrak that doesn't have any Federal subsidies.

So these reforms were put in place. They are strong reforms. As I said, we have never had an Amtrak bill like this before, and it was done on a bipartisan basis. I think we can be proud of it. The Congress can be proud of this bill, and the American people can be proud that we are doing something.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 232, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

AYES—184

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Carson (IN)
Aguilar	F.	Cartwright
Ashford	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Bass	Brown (FL)	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Becerra	Bustos	Cicilline
Bera	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Beyer	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Clay
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Cleaver
Bonamici	Carney	Clyburn

Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Perlmuter	McSally	Ribble	Stivers	Davis, Danny	Kinzing (IL)	Rice (NY)
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Peters	Meadows	Rice (SC)	Stutzman	Davis, Rodney	Kirkpatrick	Richmond
Conyers	Jones	Peterson	Meehan	Rigell	Thompson (PA)	DeFazio	Kline	Rigell
Cooper	Kaptur	Pingree	Messer	Roby	Thornberry	DeGette	Kuster	Roby
Costa	Keating	Pocan	Mica	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi	Delaney	LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Polis	Miller (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Tipton	DeLauro	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Crowley	Kennedy	Price (NC)	Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Trott	DelBene	Langevin	Roskam
Cuellar	Kildee	Quigley	Moolenaar	Rokita	Turner	Denham	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Cummings	Kilmer	Rangel	Mooney (WV)	Rooney (FL)	Upton	Dent	Larson (CT)	Rouzer
Davis (CA)	Kind	Rice (NY)	Mullin	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao	DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Royal-Allard
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Richmond	Mulvaney	Roskam	Wagner	Deutch	Lee	Ruiz
DeFazio	Kuster	Roybal-Allard	Murphy (PA)	Ross	Walberg	Diaz-Balart	Levin	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Langevin	Ruiz	Neugebauer	Rothfus	Walden	Dingell	Lewis	Russell
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger	Newhouse	Rouzer	Walker	Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ruiz	Noem	Royce	Walorski	Dold	Lipinski	Ryan (WI)
DelBene	Lawrence	Sánchez, Linda	Nugent	Russell	Walters, Mimi	Doyle, Michael	LoBiondo	Sánchez, Linda
DeSaulnier	Lee	T.	Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Weber (TX)	F.	Loeb sack	T.
Deutch	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta	Olson	Salmon	Webster (FL)	Duckworth	Lofgren	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Lewis	Sarbanes	Palazzo	Sanford	Wenstrup	Duncan (TN)	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky	Palmer	Scalise	Edwards	Edwards	Lowey	Scalise
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Schiff	Paulsen	Schock	Ellison	Ellison	Lucas	Schakowsky
F.	Loeb sack	Schrader	Pearce	Schweikert	Westmoreland	Ellmers (NC)	Luetkemeyer	Schiff
Duckworth	Lofgren	Scott (VA)	Perry	Scott, Austin	Whitfield	Emmer (MN)	Lujan Grisham	Schock
Edwards	Lowenthal	Scott, David	Pittenger	Sensenbrenner	Williams	Engel	(NM)	Schrader
Ellison	Lowey	Serrano	Pitts	Sessions	Wilson (SC)	Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray	Scott (VA)
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)	Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Wittman	Esty	(NM)	Scott, David
Eshoo	(NM)	Sherman	Poliquin	Shuster	Womack	Farenthold	Lummis	Serrano
Esty	Luján, Ben Ray	Sinema	Pompeo	Simpson	Woodall	Farr	Lynch	Sewell (AL)
Farr	(NM)	Sires	Posey	Smith (MO)	Yoder	Fattah	MacArthur	Sherman
Fattah	Lynch	Slaughter	Price, Tom	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)	Fitzpatrick	Maloney,	Shimkus
Foster	Maloney,	Carolyn	Ratcliffe	Smith (NJ)	Young (IA)	Forbes	Carolyn	Shuster
Frankel (FL)	Carolyn	Swalwell (CA)	Reed	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)	Fortenberry	Maloney, Sean	Simpson
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Takai	Reichert	Stefanik	Zeldin	Foster	Marino	Sinema
Gabbard	Matsui	Takano	Renacci	Stewart	Zinke	Frankel (FL)	Matsui	Sires
Gallego	McCollum	Thompson (CA)	Amodei	Fincher	Smith (WA)	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy	Slaughter
Garamendi	McDermott	Thompson (MS)	Barton	Guthrie	Speier	Fudge	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Graham	McGovern	Titus	Black	Hinojosa	Waters, Maxine	Gabbard	McCollum	Smith (TX)
Grayson	McNerney	Tonko	Blackburn	Long	Yoho	Gallego	McDermott	Stefanik
Green, Al	Meeks	Torres	Costello (PA)	Roe (TN)		Garamendi	McGovern	Stivers
Green, Gene	Meng	Tsongas	Crawford	Rush		Garrett	McKinley	Swalwell (CA)
Grijalva	Moore	Van Hollen				Gibbs	McMorris	Takai
Gutiérrez	Moulton	Vargas				Gibson	Rodgers	Takano
Hahn	Murphy (FL)	Veasey				Goodlatte	McNerney	Thompson (CA)
Hastings	Nadler	Vela				Graham	Meadows	Thompson (MS)
Heck (WA)	Napolitano	Velázquez				Graves (LA)	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Higgins	Neal	Visclosky				Graves (MO)	Meeks	Thornberry
Himes	Nolan	Walz				Grayson	Meng	Tiberi
Honda	Norcross	Wasserman				Green, Al	Mica	Tipton
Hoyer	O'Rourke	Schultz				Green, Gene	Miller (MI)	Titus
Huffman	Pallone	Watson Coleman				Griffith	Moolenaar	Tonko
Israel	Pascrell	Welch				Grijalva	Moore	Torres
Jackson Lee	Payne	Wilson (FL)				Guinta	Moulton	Trott
Jeffries	Pelosi	Yarmuth				Gutiérrez	Mullin	Tsongas

NOES—232

Abraham	DeSantis	Hudson
Aderholt	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Allen	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)
Amash	Dold	Hultgren
Babin	Duffy	Hunter
Barletta	Duncan (SC)	Hurd (TX)
Barr	Duncan (TN)	Hurt (VA)
Benishek	Ellmers (NC)	Issa
Bilirakis	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (KS)
Bishop (MI)	Farenthold	Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Blum	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Bost	Fleming	Jolly
Boustany	Flores	Jordan
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Joyce
Brat	Fortenberry	Katko
Bridenstine	Fox	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Buchanan	Garrett	Kinzing (IL)
Buck	Gibbs	Kline
Bucshon	Gibson	Knight
Burgess	Gohmert	Labrador
Byrne	Goodlatte	LaMalfa
Calvert	Gosar	Lamborn
Carter (GA)	Gowdy	Lance
Carter (TX)	Granger	Latta
Chabot	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Chaffetz	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Clawson (FL)	Graves (MO)	Love
Coffman	Griffith	Lucas
Cole	Grothman	Luetkemeyer
Collins (GA)	Guinta	Lummis
Collins (NY)	Hanna	MacArthur
Comstock	Hardy	Marchant
Conaway	Harper	Marino
Cook	Harris	Massie
Cramer	Hartzler	McCarthy
Crenshaw	Heck (NV)	McCaul
Culberson	Hensarling	McClintock
Curbelo (FL)	Herrera Beutler	McHenry
Davis, Rodney	Hice, Jody B.	McKinley
Denham	Hill	McMorris
Dent	Holding	Rodgers

NOT VOTING—16

□ 1457

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 111, meeting with constituents in office on matters involving Ukraine. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 316, nays 101, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—316

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Clay
Adams	Brooks (IN)	Cleaver
Aderholt	Brown (FL)	Clyburn
Aguilar	Brownley (CA)	Coffman
Ashford	Buchanan	Cohen
Babin	Bucshon	Cole
Barletta	Bustos	Collins (NY)
Bass	Butterfield	Comstock
Beatty	Calvert	Connolly
Becerra	Capps	Conyers
Bera	Capuano	Cook
Beyer	Cardenas	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Costa
Bishop (MI)	Carson (IN)	Costello (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Cartwright	Courtney
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Cramer
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Crenshaw
Bost	Chaffetz	Crowley
Boustany	Chu, Judy	Cuellar
Boyle, Brendan	Cioccilino	Cummings
F.	Clark (MA)	Curbelo (FL)
Brady (PA)	Clarke (NY)	Davis (CA)

NAYS—101

Allen	Byrne	Duncan (SC)
Amash	Carter (GA)	Fleischmann
Barr	Carter (TX)	Fleming
Benishek	Chabot	Flores
Bilirakis	Clawson (FL)	Fox
Blum	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Brat	Conaway	Gohmert
Bridenstine	Culberson	Gosar
Brooks (AL)	DeSantis	Gowdy
Buck	DesJarlais	Granger
Burgess	Duffy	Graves (GA)

Grothman	Love	Rohrabacher
Harris	Marchant	Rokita
Hartzler	Massie	Rooney (FL)
Heck (NV)	McCaul	Rothfus
Hensarling	McHenry	Royce
Herrera Beutler	McSally	Salmon
Hice, Jody B.	Messer	Sanford
Holding	Miller (FL)	Schweikert
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin
Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Sensenbrenner
Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer	Sessions
Hultgren	Noem	Smith (MO)
Hunter	Nugent	Smith (NE)
Hurd (TX)	Olson	Stewart
Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo	Stutzman
Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Walorski
Jones	Poe (TX)	Weber (TX)
Jordan	Pompeo	Wenstrup
King (IA)	Posey	Westmoreland
Knight	Price, Tom	Wilson (SC)
Labrador	Ratcliffe	Yoder
Latta	Rice (SC)	Young (IA)
Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	

NOT VOTING—15

Amodei	Fincher	Roe (TN)
Barton	Guthrie	Rush
Black	Hinojosa	Smith (WA)
Blackburn	Lamborn	Speier
Crawford	Long	Yoho

□ 1505

Messrs. STEWART, SMITH of Nebraska, and RICE of South Carolina changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 110 for passage of McClintock Amendment No. 6, rollcall No. 111 for passage of the Democrat Motion to Recommit, and rollcall No. 112 for final passage of H.R. 749, which took place Wednesday, March 4, 2015, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 110, the McClintock Amendment No. 6, and voted “nay” on rollcall Nos. 111 and 112, against the Motion to Recommit and final passage of H.R. 749.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1213) to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1213

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 “Office of Compliance Administrative and Technical Corrections Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. PROCEDURES FOR MEDIATION AND HEARINGS UNDER CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995.

(a) REQUIRING MEDIATORS TO BE APPOINTED FROM MASTER LIST.—Section 403 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1403) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “after considering recommendations by organizations composed primarily of individuals experienced in adjudicating or arbitrating personnel matters” and inserting “from the master list developed and maintained under subsection (e)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) MASTER LIST OF MEDIATORS.—

“(1) DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF MASTER LIST.—The Executive Director shall develop and maintain a master list of individuals who are experienced in adjudicating, arbitrating, or mediating the kinds of personnel and other matters for which mediation may be held under this section. Such list may include, but not be limited to, members of the bar of a State or the District of Columbia and retired judges of the United States courts.

“(2) CONSIDERATION OF CANDIDATES.—In developing the master list under this subsection, the Executive Director shall consider candidates recommended by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service or the Administrative Conference of the United States.”.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF DEADLINE TO ELECT PROCEEDINGS AFTER END OF PERIOD OF MEDIATION.—Section 404 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1404) is amended by striking “Not later than 90 days after a covered employee receives notice of the end of the period of mediation, but no sooner than 30 days after receipt of such notification, such covered employee” and inserting “Not later than 90 days, but not sooner than 30 days, after the end of the period of mediation, a covered employee”.

(c) NOTIFICATION OF CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) MEDIATIONS.—Section 416(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1416(b)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, and the Executive Director shall notify each person participating in the mediation of the confidentiality requirement and of the sanctions applicable to any person who violates the confidentiality requirement.”.

(2) HEARINGS AND DELIBERATIONS.—Section 416(c) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1416(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The Executive Director shall notify each person participating in a proceeding or deliberation to which this subsection applies of the requirements of this subsection and of the sanctions applicable to any person who violates the requirements of this subsection.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to mediations and other proceedings which are first initiated after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL TERM FOR MEMBERS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE.

Notwithstanding section 301(e)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381(e)(1)), any individual serving as a member of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance as of February 28, 2015, may be appointed to serve for one additional term of 2 years.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, March 6, 2015.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mrs. MILLER, Michigan, Chairman

Mr. LATTA, Ohio

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS, Illinois

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

FEBRUARY 18, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, This letter serves as my official resignation from the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. It has been my pleasure serving on this Committee since being elected to Congress.

Best Regards,

FREDERICA S. WILSON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

HONORING AGENT BRIAN TERRY

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, Border Patrol unveiled a new statue honoring slain Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry at the Naco, Arizona, border station in my district named in Agent Terry's honor.

The statue, depicted here, shows Agent Terry carrying a member of his Border Patrol tactical unit on his shoulders and is a fitting tribute to a man who loved his job and his fellow agents.

Agent Terry entered the service with the Border Patrol on July 23, 2007. Before that, he served in the U.S. Marine Corps and as a police officer in Michigan.

On December 14, 2010, Agent Terry was on patrol with three of his fellow agents in Peck Canyon near Nogales, Arizona, when they came across five