

Rock Wilderness Act, a bill to designate as wilderness southern Utah's incredible public lands, such as Desolation Canyon, the Dirty Devil, and the Greater Cedar Mesa.

These wild and precious lands are our birthright as Americans, and they are essential to who we are as a Nation. My bill safeguards these special lands and the waters, the flora, and the fauna within them. It furthers the great American conservation ethic of John Muir, of Theodore Roosevelt, and of the many others who helped to preserve the great wild places we cannot imagine today living without.

As we advance toward a cleaner economy, we must protect the \$646 billion outdoor recreation economy, which employs more than 6 million people nationwide. None of that is possible without protecting our public lands.

America's Red Rock Wilderness Act would do just that.

NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS DAY

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the first annual National Gun Violence Awareness Day.

In just the past year, gun violence has killed 372 people in Los Angeles County, including 43 in my own congressional district and 20 in the city of Compton alone.

My communities continue to mourn these victims: victims like 16-year-old Lontrell Lee Turner, who was gunned down walking home from church in Compton last December; 65-year-old Jose Padilla, the father who was shot and killed while closing up his restaurant in Lynwood; and 72-year-old Mary Motsumoto, who was shot to death by her husband in their home in San Pedro.

I have mourned with too many parents and comforted too many children who have lost loved ones through gun violence. My communities have suffered through the scourge of gun violence for too long. The children of my community can no longer be targets.

Today, I am proud to stand for gun violence awareness and wear an orange ribbon, representing the value of human life and the efforts we must take to protect it.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, according to a report I read recently, serious mental health problems are declining among our children, and that is very good news. But the same report found that over half of severely troubled youth get absolutely no help at all. That is a glaring gap in our system that must be addressed today.

Far too often, the only thing standing in the way of treatment is the negative stigma associated with this disease. The stigma of treatment and medication, the stigma of anger and instability, the stigma of fear of the disease itself.

At a time when there are 10 times more people with mental illness in jail than in State-funded psychiatric beds, we are not doing our job to help our loved ones wage this silent battle alone.

Last month during Mental Health Awareness Month, we recognized and thanked organizations like the Massachusetts Association for Behavioral Health for their critical work to fill the gaps in our system and wipe away the stigmas that deter so many from pursuing treatment.

NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS DAY

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the first National Gun Violence Awareness Day.

Gun violence is an increasingly growing problem in our country, claiming the lives of hundreds of thousands nationwide each year. This must be addressed now.

Gun violence has taken the lives of America's men, women, and children. In 2010, nearly 3,000 infants, children, and teens died as a result of gun violence. This is unacceptable.

In my State of North Carolina, gun violence is rampant. According to a 2013 Center for American Progress report, North Carolina ranked 15th in the Nation for gun violence. From 2001 through 2010, more than 11,000 North Carolinians died as a result of gun violence. These senseless crimes instill fear, pain, and insecurity in our communities.

My colleagues, we must band together to repair our communities and help stop gun violence.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2577, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2578, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by the direction on Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 287 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 287

Resolved, That (a) at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for

consideration of any bill specified in section 2 of this resolution. The first reading of each such bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. General debate on each such bill shall be confined to that bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate each such bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in each such bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) During consideration of each such bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment except as provided in paragraph (2);

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports any such bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on that bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The bills referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

(b) The bill (H.R. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 287 provides for a modified open rule for separate consideration of H.R. 2578 and H.R. 2577. Under this rule, any Member may offer any amendments to the bills in question that comply with the rules of the House. It

also provides for 10 minutes of debate on each amendment considered. This approach has been what we call a standard rule for appropriations bills and was established and has been followed for this last year and the year before, and I believe it has been effective and, really, a good way for this body to be able to effectively operate, allowing each and every Member of this body the chance to offer their amendments.

This rule also accomplishes two important goals:

First, it reflects the majority's commitment to an open and transparent appropriations process. This rule will also allow for all Members to bring to this body their ideas that they have that they bring from back home, perhaps ideas from their own individual constituents about how we can make this appropriations process even better. I think it is important that Members of Congress be given an opportunity to do this in the appropriations process, and that is exactly what we are trying to do today for a robust opportunity for discussion. If an amendment complies with the rules of the House, it certainly will be given an up-or-down vote, if that Member chooses to do so.

Secondly, this rule provides for reasonable time constraints. It is my belief that if Members' ideas are heard and the process by which we consider appropriations bills is done on a timely basis, then the House will benefit, and so will the American people, so that we work effectively and efficiently at the same time. This rule, I believe, strikes a good balance, allowing all Members an opportunity to offer necessary amendments but also allowing the House to get its work done.

□ 1230

I estimate that we will spend about 18 hours in the process to get these bills done. Throughout this open process, the House will be able to make two great bills, I think, even better.

Mr. Speaker, the open process by which these two bills will be considered, if the rule is adopted, is not only a good thing, but I think it says something about the work that the Rules Committee is doing. I am proud to support these two underlying bills because they make tough decisions, and they prioritize the responsibilities of the Federal Government. We simply do not have enough money to spread around to not have to make tough decisions. These are tough decisions that are made.

Yesterday, at the Rules Committee, both of these bills were equally addressed on a bipartisan basis, and both the ranking member and the chairman of the subcommittee said they worked well together.

Obviously, not everybody was happy with how much money they had to spend, but both of the ranking members—the Democrats who were present—addressed our committee and said that they were treated fairly, that

they were treated respectfully, and that it was an open and transparent process to achieve good things for the bills.

That is the hope that I have as we come to the floor today in that you will see groups of Members who will come to the floor with an open opportunity as a result of what we did in the Rules Committee, knowing that the process that took place back in the Appropriations Committee was well done.

Alarming, however, yesterday, we learned that President Obama has threatened to veto both of these bills because, as I quote him, they “drastically underfund critical investments.”

Let me see if I can break this down for you. It is our job to determine what those appropriations levels would be. We heard from the President of the United States when he presented his budget, and year after year after year, the President of the United States has failed to receive more than only several votes on his budget.

I believe that what we have done by working carefully and meticulously through the budget process and through the appropriations process gives us a better angle on the needs and the priorities of these agencies from a congressional and, I believe, a “back home” experience.

The people of this country elected their Representatives, and their Representatives have come to Washington and have had a fair and open process, notwithstanding that we are not spending as much as people want us to spend.

I believe that the President is saying that he will veto these bills because he does not believe that we simply continue to spend more and more and more. This President has an insatiable appetite that we saw and have seen year after year after year.

Based upon his words, I would say back to him: Mr. President, please look at the merits of the work that the House of Representatives is doing on a bipartisan basis. We are trying to live within the parameters of a budget that has been established and that was voted on by Members of this body, that has the vast majority of the Members of this body to say, when compared to the President's budget, this is the budget that I believe best represents not only what we can accomplish but what will work in the best interests of the American people, our constituents. Mr. President, they are the same ones that you have across this great Nation. Mr. President, we are asking you to take a second look at how you will listen to us and to watch the process that is going on here. I think it will develop itself into a better way for us to do business, and I would encourage the White House to look at that.

Mr. Speaker, a great nation simply cannot spend money that it does not have and be a great nation for very long. This last month, we crossed over the terrible, terrible threshold of going

from \$17 trillion to \$18 trillion in debt, and we continue to add up this debt and live off that debt and add to the debt with the spending that we do. We believe that what we have got to do is become more responsible with the taxpayers' dollars and the future of this great Nation.

The law of the land and the law that the President has signed requires Congress to act within the requirements of the Budget Control Act. These were agreements that were made with the President. That is what we are sticking to, and that is what these bills do; yet the President, once again, is telling us: Please set aside the agreement that was made. I don't now like the thing that I agreed to, that I signed into law.

In some instances, they were some of the President's own ideas.

We need to understand that the American people want and expect us to see problems and to solve them and to stick to it. That is what this budget process is about, and that is exactly what this appropriations process is about.

Look, I disagree with the President. I believe that what we need to do is to live within the agreement of the Budget Control Act. My party, the Republicans, have worked to lower discretionary spending from nearly \$1.5 trillion in 2009, where we were, to today in 2015, \$1.014 trillion.

That is the difference between 2009 and 2015, years in which excessive and out-of-control spending could have taken place but for the discipline of the Republican Party and the discipline of our Members and, might I say, of the American people, who have heard our call for having a plan, a plan which carefully moves America into the future, that lessens the amount of debt the American people have to take on, and that makes better opportunities for our children and grandchildren not to have to pay back our excessive spending just because we are a group of people who thinks it is smarter than the people back home. We aren't.

They get also, Mr. Speaker, that we have to have a defined goal. We have to do exactly what they do back home, and that is to be responsible about a family budget, about a State budget, about a Federal Government budget.

That means disciplined accountability and a plan that you are willing to stick to. That is exactly what we have done. We have worked hard to lower discretionary spending over these years, and the effort has saved more than \$2 trillion over this period of time and, I believe, over what would have been spent.

I think this is a big win for the American people, and I think it is a big win for people who want, need, and expect Members of Congress to come to Washington and stick not only to a plan, but to a disciplined approach in trying to balance together the needs of this great Nation and its people and the need for us to look over the horizon at what our future would be.

I think that we have lowered spending and that we have had a chance to shrink the size of government. Certainly, what we are trying to do is to work at lowering the deficit or the amount of money that would have been added to that deficit. These are the discussions that people back home have with their Members of Congress: What lies ahead? And how are you going to be able to make tough decisions?

I hope that the President of the United States is listening to this because we are, on a bipartisan basis, having these same discussions in the House of Representatives and in the committees on which our Members serve. Now is the time not to go back to liberal, reckless spending opportunities. They will always abound.

It is always easier to spend somebody else's money. I just don't think it is right, so the Republican Party is here on the floor today with two more appropriations bills, and it is going to sell to the American people the confidence that we have that we can make this government work more effectively and more efficiently—yes, with fewer dollars but with greater opportunities for efficiency.

I believe that both of these bills strike what is a balance, a balance between funding critical projects while making smart financial decisions. These two can be accomplished, and that is why we are trying to work together to prioritize it.

H.R. 2578, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2016, focuses on the true governmental interest: fighting crime; making decisions about how we keep terrorists at bay; keeping the American people safe; and supporting the U.S. economy at the same time by making critical investments in science, space, exports, and manufacturing. Certainly, in tough economic times, tough decisions are required, and that is exactly where we are.

Yesterday, we had a chance to hear from two Members of Congress—Republicans—one of them, the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the subcommittee chairman. He talked about the bill reflecting smart but fair decisions. The decisions that he spoke about were that the legislation provided \$51.4 billion in total discretionary, which was \$661 million below the President's request.

H.R. 2578 also prioritizes vital programs that are, essentially, built around law enforcement—Federal law enforcement—and their ability to aim at the problems that our citizens see and that, certainly, our law enforcement sees and to put a priority on national security and public safety and initiatives that also aim for job creation and economic growth. These are part of the priorities that have to be taken up, and, in fact, they were.

The second bill, H.R. 2577, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2016, I believe, similarly had many of the same characteristics.

First of all, they are going to stick to exactly what we talked about in the budget, and they are going to have to strike a balance—a tough balance—but one which is based on the priorities of essential programs and on making responsible reductions to low-priority activities.

This bill provides \$55.3 billion in discretionary funding, which is \$9.7 billion below what the President wanted. Once again, the President does not want to stick to the budget agreement—an agreement which he signed into law—but that is what this body is going to do.

We are going to live within the law, and living within the law is what the American people expect as part of the plan. This bill allows for important investments in national transportation infrastructure, including investments in our national highways, railways, and airports. It also provides help to people who are in dire need of affordable housing options.

Mr. Speaker, I learned a long time ago, when I became a scoutmaster for the Boy Scouts of America, that needs always outpace resources. Needs are always out there, and they are something that you just simply want to continue to be a part of, but money is not always the answer.

Sometimes, a prioritization of the needs that you have to meet will then define you to a better process, one which people can then better understand. That is what we are doing here today.

Like most Members, who will have an opportunity as a result of the work that we did last night in the Rules Committee, I have ideas that, I think, can help improve H.R. 2577. One of those ideas, I have brought to the floor many, many times in a bill; and during the debate on funding, I think I will have good ideas that will help make our country stronger—in this case, make transportation stronger.

It became clear to me a number of years ago that government subsidized rail service on Amtrak does not make economic sense. What we have looked at is that Amtrak takes money. Years and years and years ago, they agreed that they would quit taking government subsidies and would run the railroad as an east and west operation.

Instead, what did they do? They became a cross-country hauler. Every single long-distance route that Amtrak provides—those of more than 400 miles in length—operate at a loss every single month. There are 11 routes that cost double the amount of revenue that they create. That is why I have offered two important opportunities, which were amendments, to eliminate this.

The first would eliminate the funding for Amtrak's long-distance routes, which have a total direct cost of more than twice the revenue. That means, if the cost is twice the revenue, then it would be eliminated.

The second would eliminate the funding for Amtrak's worst performing

line, the Sunset Limited. The Sunset Limited, which is an east-west and west-east operation is subsidized for every single ticket and for every single train by over \$400 in government subsidies, a loss totalling \$41.9 million last year alone.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the ideas. Mr. Speaker, you will be hearing about lots of them over the next 18-some hours of debate that will take place. This is a good thing about this rule. Members just like myself will have a chance to come and put their ideas as opportunities on the floor for other Members to consider. I think that is why we are here today, to work together on a process that will make our country even stronger.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, the chair of the Committee on Rules and my friend, for yielding the customary 30 minutes for debate.

I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today in opposition to the rule and underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of both H.R. 2578, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, as well as H.R. 2577, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. Both, in my opinion, are woefully inadequate and underfunded pieces of legislation that serve as a slap in the face to hard-working Americans and a reminder of my Republican colleagues' shortsighted and irresponsible attempt at achieving a balanced budget.

Last night, in his testimony before the Committee on Rules on H.R. 2577, Ranking Member DAVID PRICE made a statement that was not only profound but incredibly accurate. He responded to Republican sentiments that slashing domestic appropriations in isolation is a necessary evil by stating that "a great nation must invest in its future."

Indeed, the importance of this investment cannot be overstated. For too long, we have forced austerity measures upon appropriators that prevent the funding of programs that create jobs; bolster our economy; repair and improve our Nation's decrepit highways, transit systems, and infrastructure; that fund medical research; and provide safe, decent, and affordable housing for poor and vulnerable families, the elderly, and disabled.

It both saddens and frustrates me that my Republican friends continue to go after domestic programs that would unequivocally improve the lives of so many Americans while at the same time refusing to address the real drivers of the fiscal crisis, which are tax expenditures and mandatory spending.

It is unconscionable to me that we, as a nation, cannot come up with the

money to fund projects that repair and improve our country's transportation infrastructure. I pointed out yesterday in the Committee on Rules that aside from all of the bridges that I talked about from Florida that are in need of repair, right here in Washington, the Memorial Bridge that leads from Virginia into this city is in need of repair.

The initiative that provides grants to local law enforcement and first responders would also improve in our country. But we provide ourselves with an unlimited budget to fight foreign wars without a mechanism to pay for those costs. Enough already, Congress. How about an authorization for the use of force rather than the methods that are employed now for ongoing, undetermined, indefinite—it appears—wars?

The solution to our current fiscal circumstances lies not in withholding of necessary funding for essential domestic programs, but in comprehensive reform that considers—yes, considers—tax increases in addition to entitlement and appropriations cuts. That is how we balanced the budget in 1994 and to a relative degree in 1997, and we had, at that time, 4 years of balanced budgets. Adherence to these Republican budget limits self-imposed by sequestration is ineffective, detrimental to our national progress, and just plain wrong.

The Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations measure before us today is the instrument used to provide funding for many vital programs and agencies, such as the Department of Justice, Commerce, NASA, and the National Science Foundation. Despite the importance of fully funding these agencies, this bill is a prime example of the mindless austerity of sequestration and the misguided priorities of my Republican colleagues.

Time won't permit to add context to how we got to sequestration, and my friend from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, is absolutely correct. The President did sign this measure, but that was at the instance of an awful lot of negotiations and the government being shut down.

I don't stand here and point fingers at either side in this regard. I said yesterday in the Committee on Rules, and I repeat here, it is the fault of 435 voting Members of Congress that we allow for this measure to put us in the position that we are in on these two measures as well as others to come.

For example, this bill fails to adequately fund several Department of Justice grant programs and outright eliminates others, programs and funding that are critical to many State and local law enforcement activities. Specifically, the bill cuts \$180 million from the Community Oriented Policing Services hiring program. This effectively eliminates a program that would put an additional 1,300 police officers on the streets. At a time when the relationship between many of our communities and law enforcement is strained, why are we decimating a program dedi-

cated to building trust and mutual respect between the police and the communities they serve?

In another startling policy decision by the majority, this bill eliminates, in its entirety, several other important programs, including the substance abuse program.

I come to the floor today from a meeting this morning dealing with institutions for mental disease in which the community of persons who work in substance abuse, addiction, and mental health are pleading for the changes necessary for them to be able to address the significant problem that our population faces from veterans, to civilians, to children, and to the elderly, and yet what we did in this measure is eliminate the Substance Abuse Treatment program.

We eliminate the Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction initiative at a time when we are witnessing, in our Nation, serious gun violence, and many of us today are about the business of trying to highlight, at least on this one day, the epidemic of gun violence in our society and how it has cost lives and treasure.

This program, as offered, eliminates the National Center for Campus Public Safety.

Perhaps the most indicative of the misplaced funding priorities by the majority is the gun policy rider—yep, yep, a rider, not part of this bill, just kind of tacked on like we tacked on something having to do with Cuba. We just tack these riders on, and this has been attached to this legislation.

Not only has the majority completely eviscerated important violence and gun crime reduction programs, they have attached a policy rider that cancels out a narrow, targeted reporting requirement on the sale of certain long guns sold in four border States. The purpose of this requirement is to discourage straw purchasers from buying weapons for Mexican drug cartels. This reporting requirement has been proven to be effective. Courts agreed that it does not restrict Second Amendment rights, so why is the majority including this irresponsible gun rider in a bill that largely funds public safety? The irony of this provision should not be lost on any of us.

Finally, in addition to cutting funding to important public safety programs, this bill showcases my Republican colleagues' remarkable ability to bury their heads in the sand when it comes to climate change, employing their ill-conceived strategy of defunding any program that might help us understand and address this important issue. This legislation intentionally underfunds the Geosciences directorate at the National Science Foundation and the Earth Science Office at NASA, where scientists are studying the most effective ways to respond to climate change.

The second bill, H.R. 2577, provides \$55.3 billion in discretionary funding for transportation and housing pro-

grams for fiscal year 2016. While this allocation appears to be an increase from fiscal year 2015, after inflationary adjustments, including declining Federal Housing Administration receipts and increasing Section 8 renewal costs, this bill actually designates \$1.5 billion less than last year's enacted level.

The shortcomings of this piece of legislation are so numerous that I would far exceed the time allotted to me if I were to attempt to discuss them all. Instead, I will just graze the surface by addressing just a few of the most egregious provisions.

This bill reduces funding for Amtrak by 18 percent from last year's level and \$1.3 billion below the President's request. This reduction eliminates funding for positive train control, a technology that the Transportation Safety Board has stated publicly may have prevented last month's tragic Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia, and provides no funding for intercity passenger rail or the installation of additional safety mechanisms.

It also slashes funding for the Federal Transit Administration's Capital Investment Grant program, cuts TIGER funding by \$400 million—it does have a placeholder for something that may take place in the future—and it reduces the Federal Aviation Administration's capital program, which impedes the FAA's ability to implement its NextGen program as well as maintain and improve aging facilities.

In addition to its funding inadequacies, as has become custom under Republican leadership, this bill offers up legislative handouts to the trucking industry and other powerful interests at the expense of the safety of our constituents. Specifically, it is going to allow trucks to carry longer trailers across the country, make it harder for the Department of Transportation to mandate that drivers get more rest before they hit the road, and forbid the Department from raising the minimum insurance it requires trucks and buses to carry.

I wonder if we ever really talk to truckers and really ask them do they want to carry trains on roads—that is what it amounts to—and do they need the rest that they have requested for years. None of us are against the trucking industry, but these measures allow for something that should not occur. The latest data which is available shows that nearly 4,000 people died in accidents involving large trucks.

□ 1300

Last week, there were no less than three in the constituency I serve, including a 17-year-old extremely bright young girl who lost her life at the instance of a trucking incident.

Most of these 4,000 people were riding in another vehicle or were pedestrians. That is a 17 percent increase from the year 2009.

These provisions will make our highways less safe and do not belong in an appropriations bill. Trucking regulations should be openly debated as part

of a comprehensive surface transportation bill, which, incidentally, we have been assured is on the horizon.

Currently, one out of every nine bridges in our country is structurally deficient, and congestion has never been worse. At the same time, our population is expected to grow by 70 million over the next 30 years. Knowing this, we must not continue to wait for our bridges to collapse, our public transit systems to malfunction, and our highways to deteriorate before we agree to provide adequate funding.

Just as it does for transportation and infrastructure initiatives, H.R. 2577 makes dramatic cuts to funding for housing support programs for poor and vulnerable individuals and families. One of the most striking of these reductions is the one levied against the public housing capital fund, making it only slightly higher than the monetary amount allocated in 1989, without accounting for inflation.

I held a housing forum on Saturday in the congressional district that I am privileged to serve, and I saw the pain that was expressed by the people in long waiting lines for section 8 housing and in the deteriorating public housing that is in that 30-year at-risk period. It just pains me even to talk about it and then to come up here and in this very week do more, if we follow our Republican friends, to cut these programs.

This bill also reduces funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Choice Neighborhoods initiative. It slashes funding for Healthy Homes and lead hazard control grants, exposing the most underprivileged children to toxic lead poisoning.

It transfers money from the housing trust fund to fund the HOME program, taking funding away from a program which is reserved for the most economically disadvantaged and in the most need of assistance, and does nothing to increase access to safe and affordable housing for the elderly or disabled.

In short, this legislation undermines the continued viability of our Nation's infrastructure and threatens our country's economic competitiveness.

I fear that without these necessary investments in transportation, housing, science, commerce, and justice programs, the negative implication of Representative PRICE's statement will become a reality. We will fail to remain a great Nation because we will fail to accommodate the demands of the future.

For these very important reasons, and many more that I could express, I oppose both the rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I know that I see one of our colleagues from the Rules Committee who wants to come speak, but I want to take just a second and respond in kind for my party, and that is that my party does recognize that there is much that

does get accomplished because of the efforts of this government and the efforts of this Congress that fund good ideas and do things.

A number of years ago, we became faced with, however, a circumstance where what lies in our immediate future is too much spending, which means that this country has to borrow money. It is money that needs to be paid back.

But in the process of taking money, setting priorities, and spending money, there also is something called interest on the debt. And that is, if money were free and you could just borrow money but not pay interest for it, I am sure we would not mind how much we borrowed.

But the bottom line is that is not the reality. The reality is that we have to pay for money that we borrow. And that debt which we have to pay money back for means that every single year the amount of money that we pay and that comes out of the pot of money gets larger and larger and larger. And paying back debt competes against money that we can spend on behalf of people.

And so, at some point, if you just buy off on that we have got to spend more and more and more, that means that we have to take more as debt and pay more of interest. And that competes in a marketplace, in a budget, against projects that we would like to do and that do actually help people and that do focus on the most needy and the most vulnerable in our society.

But we are spending, Mr. Speaker, an incredible amount of money. And we are trying to learn over time how to become more efficient, how to make our cities even better, how to create jobs, and how to educate people and to bring them forth in a mature way. That is what every great nation really will be ultimately charged with: how can you make your country better not just today, but for the future.

And so Republicans do stand for not spending more than what we make so that we have more that we can make in a balanced budget today and spend in a way that creates a better future for our children and grandchildren.

The bottom line is, over the last 6 years, we have gone from a debt of \$9 trillion to \$18 trillion. Some could say that was while we slept, but that is not true. It happened while we were trying to offer better opportunities and resolve.

So, for the last 5 years, Republicans have said we are going to quit this runaway spending, we are going to make tough decisions, and we are going to protect this great Nation at the same time. But we are asking for the American people to also recognize what we are doing, Mr. Speaker. And just as I speak to you today, I speak to people back home, as other Members of Congress do to their constituents, and say we are trying to balance what we do over time with the efficiencies that keep this great Nation great.

I will be honest with you. We live in the greatest Nation in the world. And thank God we are Americans. We trust in God, but we also trust in discipline to make this great Nation even better. And that is what appropriations bills are about: priority, making this great Nation still great tomorrow with discipline. And discipline has a lot to do with our ability to be a great Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

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

Before making my remarks, I just want to say in a challenging way to the chairman of the Rules Committee that if we were to fix a bridge, it takes people to fix that bridge. And the people who fix that bridge spend their money in the local areas and pay taxes, which brings revenue back in. And that is why we need to fix bridges, in my judgment.

I am pleased at this time to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend with whom it is a pleasure to serve with on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, and I want to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule, which provides for consideration of the Transportation-HUD and CJS appropriations bills.

First, let me express my astonishment at the big giveaways to the trucking industry in this Transportation-HUD bill. This bill is loaded up with pet projects of the trucking industry that threaten the health and safety of the traveling public.

The lack of regard for the safety and well-being of those on the roads and bridges is stunning. It is hard to believe that some of the provisions that are contained as policy riders in these appropriations bills are actually there.

This bill should focus on strengthening America's infrastructure, repairing crumbling bridges, investing in public transportation, and making our roads safer, but instead puts the trucking industry in the driving seat, leaving the average American left behind.

The bill would, one, increase truck weights in Idaho and Kansas; two, allow twin 33-foot trailers on interstates; three, delay full implementation of DOT's hours of service rule, which requires minimum rest periods for truckers; and, four, prohibit the Department of Transportation from increasing minimum insurance requirements for big trucks and motor coaches.

Mr. Speaker, with all that we know, it is simply outrageous that we would allow bigger and heavier trucks on our highways.

Today's bill is intended specifically to appropriate funds, not authorize new policy. Yet this is exactly what these policy riders are doing. They don't belong on this bill.

Furthermore, there was not a single hearing on these trucking riders: not one subcommittee hearing, not one full committee hearing. These issues are important enough where they should be openly debated as part of a comprehensive surface transportation authorization bill, not tacked on to an appropriations bill. They don't belong here. But this process has become so corrupted that anything goes. Committees of jurisdiction are routinely disregarded and disrespected.

Making these controversial policy changes before the Department of Transportation finishes their comprehensive truck size and weight study that was required by MAP-21 would be irresponsible. We should allow the Department of Transportation the time it needs to get their study right.

Simply put, these trucking industry riders will make our highways less safe at a time when our infrastructure funding is woefully inadequate and our roads and bridges are crumbling.

In just the past 4 years, we have seen a dramatic 17 percent increase in the number of truck crash deaths and an alarming 28 percent increase in injuries. Instead of advancing safety measures to make our roads safer, Congress is about to roll back significant safety laws and regulations that will result in more deaths and more injuries on our roads and highways. In fatal truck and car crashes, 96 percent of the fatalities are occupants of the passenger car.

Mr. Speaker, public opinion is clear: Americans do not want bigger trucks or tired truck drivers on the road. Seventy-six percent of Americans opposed longer and heavier trucks, and 80 percent were opposed to increasing truck driver working and driving hours.

Yet here we are with authorizing language on an appropriations bill to make our roads less safe. Why are my friends doing this? It might be good policy for fundraising purposes, but it is lousy policy for the American people.

These dangerous riders don't belong here. They threaten the safety of everyday Americans on the road, and we ought to insist that they be removed.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to express my concern about the dangerous and backward-thinking riders that are included in both the CJS and Transportation-HUD Appropriations bills regarding Cuba.

Obviously, there are several Members here in this House who are nostalgic for the cold war, who are still living in the past. I just want to say, thanks to the leadership of President Obama and this administration, we are making real progress in normalizing relations with Cuba and connecting them with a 21st century economy. We are ending an embarrassing, dumb, and counter-productive policy that by all accounts

has been a miserable failure for the last five decades.

In 2011, after President Obama reinstated the rules allowing Cuban Americans to visit their relatives on the island and permitting all Americans to send remittances to Cuba, hard-liners used the appropriations process to prevent the policies from being implemented. Thankfully, Senate Democrats kept the hard-liners' provisions out of the omnibus bill, and legislation reversing the modest but hopeful travel and remittance reforms never reached the President's desk.

□ 1315

As a result, hundreds of thousands of trips between the U.S. and Cuba have taken place every year since, reuniting families and increasing the number of Cubans receiving the economic support they need to run their own businesses and lead more independent lives.

Instead of celebrating the progress, hard-liners are once again trying to shut down the new openings for greater citizen diplomacy created by this administration. This is the wrong thing to do for America; this is the wrong thing to do for American companies, and it is the wrong thing to do for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in six decades, the United States Government is encouraging citizen diplomacy, greater travel and trade, and telecommunications and other industries to build relationships and stronger ties with counterparts among the Cuban people and new entrepreneurs.

American businesses are already seeing the potential for economic growth. That is why JetBlue and other airlines are expanding charter services and planning commercial routes, why ferry companies are planning to set sail for Havana, why Airbnb and Netflix are hoping to build real businesses in the Cuban market, why Governors in red and blue States alike are trying to position companies in their States to succeed.

The provisions in these bills are antibusiness. Airlines and maritime businesses have already taken steps to initiate travel service to and from Cuba based on the administration's December 17, 2014, announcement, and these provisions in these bills will block them.

Even the United States Chamber of Commerce strongly opposes these provisions, and they have sent a letter to Congress basically making the case why we ought to have better and more open travel and trade with Cuba.

It is why Americans across the country and Cuban Americans in communities where they live are so deeply committed to a policy that puts the cold war behind us and puts our country on a path to creating a new and brighter future with Cuba.

Simply put, these provisions in these appropriations bills are trying to pull the plug on new efforts by U.S. citizens and U.S. companies to expand their

presence in Cuba. As the policy moves forward, they keep trying to pull us back into the cold war and a policy that has failed for over 50 years.

Let's be clear. The Transportation-HUD Appropriations bill would ground new commercial or charter flights that came into being after March 15, 2015. JetBlue and Tampa International Airport are just two beneficiaries of the President's new policy who would be adversely affected.

With new ferries leaving port, as much as \$340 million would be pumped into Florida's economy. These provisions would hold back that economic growth, hurting American businesses in Fort Lauderdale, Tampa, Orlando, and Miami.

Mr. Speaker, the CJS bill would shut down U.S. exports to Cuba in ways that will affect telecommunications firms now in negotiations to open up phone and Internet connections on the island.

Do we want Cubans to be better connected to the outside world? I thought the answer was a huge bipartisan yes, but apparently not. The ugly truth is that these provisions in these bills are hiding their real intent, and that is to shut down the growing connections between Cuba and the United States and our citizens and U.S. companies.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleagues that these provisions, first of all, do not belong in appropriations bills. They are authorizing language. They don't belong even in this debate.

I would suggest to them that these appropriations bills aren't going to see the light of day as long as these provisions are in this bill. I would urge my colleagues to put the cold war behind them and to get rid of these provisions, and let's move on to a better and more productive relationship.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful part about these last two speakers is that the rule allows them to come to the floor and to present an amendment to strike or to add anything that they would like to add into this bill. That is the beauty of what we are trying to do here today, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would just respond to the chairman by saying the thing about this rule that is so frustrating is that important amendments are only given 10 minutes of debate, 5 minutes on each side. Some of these issues are important and deserve more than 5 minutes of debate.

We are not going to have debates. We are going to offer amendments and then, essentially, vote. I am not so excited about the way this rule has been constructed, especially given the fact that very little time is being allotted to discuss some of these important issues.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you ask my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, if he

is ready to close. I have no additional speakers at this time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman asking. I have no further speakers and, in fact, would, as we have done many times, allow the gentleman to offer his close, and then I would also.

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

These bills exemplify the recklessness and the foolishness of the majority's almost exclusive focus on domestic appropriations for deficit reduction, while leaving the main drivers of the deficit unaddressed. We cannot continue on this path if we intend to maintain our country's economic competitiveness.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and underlying bills, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my two colleagues who serve on the Rules Committee, the gentleman Mr. MCGOVERN and the gentleman Mr. HASTINGS.

They are both not only extremely committed men to their constituency, but also to bettering this House of Representatives. Their voice and their words and their opportunities of which they stand up for, I have great respect for, and want to thank them for the character in which they have come after today's not only debate, but yesterday's debate that took a number of hours as we heard from four Members of this body about their ideas about how we should pursue these two appropriations bills today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to confine my comments to a perspective, and that is satisfaction that I have for the way in which this process is working today. I understand, as acknowledged in the very beginning, we have an issue with how much money we are going to spend.

I recognize we are back at 2008 levels in 2015 in most of these bills. I do acknowledge that. I do acknowledge that we are asking—requiring—on government a chance to run their agencies—spend money back at 2008 spending levels.

I think that the process that we are going through will also be an advantage ultimately, sure, in the short-term, but ultimately, where we will look at this as a prioritization basis, where we will empower the government, if they work with us and if we work with them, to understand how we can keep this country great—even spending less money—how we can continue to prioritize the decisionmaking to where we can pick and choose what needs to be done.

Look, it doesn't make me happy. It makes no Member of this body happy. Certainly, the Speaker, the gentleman from Florida, would recognize—you have needs in your district. I do, from Dallas, Texas, have needs in my immediate district and districts that are around.

The overwhelming need is all of us—and that is not to spend more than we

can say and justify for our future because the dollars that we spend are borrowed. The dollars that we borrow and spend show up on our bottom-line debt, and it impacts everybody.

The bottom line is we have to pay back interest on that money, just like any family that takes out money on a home loan or a credit card or something else. They have to be able to understand that takes away because they are paying for that, their ability to spend money in a different way.

Our Republican majority is well aware of the demand that is placed on us, that we cannot go and do all the things that we would wish to do, but we have accepted and taken a pledge that we have given to the American people that they do get an understanding—that is we are not going to keep in the circumstance of spending money based upon taking out a loan because it is not good for our children, our grandchildren. It is not good for our future.

Mr. Speaker, today, we have had a chance to debate these two bills in this one rule. I think, once again, as I stated earlier, it is a commitment to transparency and openness that this body has and every Member retains here on the floor. You saw part of it today.

Through this open modified rule, each Member will have the opportunity to submit their ideas to two underlying bills, H.R. 2578 and H.R. 2577. Through this rule, the House will be able to work its way through majority rule floor votes and to make sure that the vital appropriations process is vigorous, is timely, and reflects the will of this body.

When this rule is adopted, a robust debate will take place in a way that will allow us to fund these important measures, over \$100 billion.

I think that, as we talk about this, you can see, Mr. Speaker, that this body is getting its work done. It is getting its work done. We passed a budget. We will pass the appropriations bills.

We go home every weekend; we look our constituents in the eye, and we have to justify what we are doing. We are following a process that we said we would do. It is for the betterment of this country, to keep this country strong.

I am proud of the Members of this body; and, as a Republican member of our leadership team, I can tell you that we intend to follow through with the process, the promise that we make to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the underlying bills, for this rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of this resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 180, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

YEAS—242

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

NAYS—180

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

NOT VOTING—10

Adams Hudson Neugebauer
 Clyburn Jackson Lee Roe (TN)
 Delaney Lujan Grisham Yoho
 Fitzpatrick (NM)

□ 1353

Mr. BILIRAKIS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 170, answered “present” 2, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—240

Abraham Frelinghuysen Noem
 Allen Gabbard Nugent
 Gallego Nunes
 Goodlatte O'Rourke
 Gosar Olson
 Gowdy Palmer
 Graham Pelosi
 Granger Perlmutter
 Grayson Pocan
 Green, Al Green, Al
 Grothman Guthrie
 Hahn Hahn
 Hardy Hardy
 Harper Harper
 Harris Harris
 Heck (WA) Heck (WA)
 Hensarling Hensarling
 Higgins Higgins
 Himes Himes
 Hinojosa Hinojosa
 Huelskamp Huelskamp
 Huffman Huffman
 Hultgren Hultgren
 Hunter Hunter
 Hurt (VA) Hurt (VA)
 Issa Issa
 Johnson (GA) Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, Sam Johnson, Sam
 Jolly Jolly
 Kaptur Kaptur
 Katko Katko
 Keating Keating
 Kennedy Kennedy
 King (IA) King (IA)
 King (NY) King (NY)
 Kline Kline
 Knight Knight
 Kuster Kuster
 Labrador Labrador
 LaMalfa LaMalfa
 Langevin Langevin
 Larsen (WA) Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT) Larson (CT)
 Latta Latta
 Lipinski Lipinski
 Loeb sack Loeb sack
 Lofgren Lofgren
 Long Long
 Loudermilk Loudermilk
 Lowey Lowey
 Lucas Lucas
 Luetkemeyer Luetkemeyer
 Luján, Ben Ray Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM) (NM)
 Lummis Lummis
 Lynch Lynch
 Dent Dent
 Marino Marino
 Massie Massie
 Matsui Matsui
 McCarthy McCarthy
 McCaul McCaul
 McClintock McClintock
 McCollum McCollum
 McHenry McHenry
 McMorris McMorris
 Rodgers Rodgers
 McNeerney McNeerney
 Meadows Meadows
 Meeks Meeks
 Meng Meng
 Mica Mica
 Miller (MI) Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV) Mooney (WV)
 Moulton Moulton
 Mullin Mullin
 Murphy (PA) Murphy (PA)
 Nadler Nadler
 Napolitano Napolitano
 Newhouse Newhouse

NAYS—170

Aderholt Brown (FL)
 Aguilar Brownley (CA)
 Amash Buchanan
 Bass Buck
 Benishek Burchon
 Bera Burgess
 Beyer Capuano
 Bost Cardenas
 Boyle, Brendan Carson (IN)
 F. Castor (FL)
 Brady (PA) Chabot
 Brooks (IN) Chaffetz

Denham Kind
 DeSantis Kinzinger (IL)
 Dingell Kirkpatrick
 Dold Lance
 Duffy Lawrence
 Ellison Lee
 Ellmers (NC) Levin
 Farenthold Lewis
 Fleming Lieu, Ted
 Flores Lie, Ted
 Foxx LoBiondo
 Fudge Love
 Garamendi Lowenthal
 Garrett MacArthur
 Gibbs Maloney,
 Gibson Carolyn
 Graves (GA) Maloney, Sean
 Graves (LA) McDermott
 Graves (MO) McGovern
 Green, Gene McKinley
 Griffith McSally
 Guinta Meehan
 Hanna Miller (FL)
 Hartzler Moore
 Hastings Mulvaney
 Heck (NV) Murphy (FL)
 Herrera Beutler Neal
 Hice, Jody B. Nolan
 Hill Norcross
 Holding Palazzio
 Honda Pallone
 Hoyer Paulsen
 Huizenga (MI) Payne
 Hurd (TX) Pearce
 Israel Perry
 Jeffries Peters
 Jenkins (KS) Peterson
 Jenkins (WV) Pittenger
 Johnson (OH) Poe (TX)
 Johnson, E. B. Poliquin
 Jones Price, Tom
 Jordan Ratcliffe
 Joyce Reed
 Kelly (IL) Reichert
 Kelly (PA) Renacci
 Kilmer Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Gohmert Tonko

NOT VOTING—20

Adams Hudson
 Amodei Jackson Lee
 Clyburn Kildee
 Delaney Lamborn
 DesJarlais Lujan Grisham
 Fitzpatrick (NM)
 Grijalva Messer
 Gutiérrez Neugebauer

□ 1401

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of the death of a close friend. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 268—“yea,” rollcall No. 269—“yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on rollcalls Nos. 265 through 269.

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 265, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 266, I would have voted “yea.”

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 267, I would have voted “no.”

On this bill, H.R. 1335, I want to emphasize that I oppose this legislation because it would roll back the progress we've made in protecting fisheries, damaging our environment and economy, especially in the Chesapeake Bay.

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 268, I would have voted “nay.”

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 269, I would have voted “nay.”