## STOP STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES FROM DOUBLING

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, today I rise to draw attention to the fact that there are only 4 days left until Federal student loan interest rates double. On July 1, the interest rate for 7 million students could rise to 6.8 percent. Failure to act and to act now would add $6.3 billion to students' debt burdens in 1 year alone.

Frankly, Madam Speaker, this rise in rates would happen at a time when our young people can least afford it. Our young people who are recent college graduates have the highest unemployment rate of any age group in the Nation, and more of them are graduating with debt than ever before. In fact, two-thirds of the class of 2010 graduated with student loan debt.

Madam Speaker, this is a real problem. It should be solved now, and it shouldn't be solved on the backs of the working class and the poor. I urge my colleagues to join me and do the right thing. Let's stop the interest rates from doubling before it's too late.

## PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS' BENEFITS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4018) to improve the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5972 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 697 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5972.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1228

### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 26, 2012, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 74, line 6.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I submit the following for the RECORD.

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 102,481 | 110,450 | 108,277 | +5,796 | -2,173 |
| Immediate Office of the Secretary | (2,618) | --- | (2,635) | (+17) | (+2,635) |
| Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary | (984) | --- | (992) | (+8) | (+992) |
| Office of the General Counsel | (19,515) | --- | (19,615) | (+100) | (+19,615) |
| Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy | (10,107) | --- | (11,248) | (+1,141) | (+11,248) |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs | (10,538) | --- | (12,825) | (+2,287) | (+12,825) |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs | (2,500) | --- | (2,601) | (+101) | (+2,601) |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration | (25,469) | --- | (27,095) | (+1,626) | (+27,095) |
| Office of Public Affairs | (2,020) | --- | (2,034) | (+14) | (+2,034) |
| Office of the Executive Secretariat | (1,595) | --- | (1,701) | (+106) | (+1,701) |
| Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization | (1,369) | --- | (1,539) | (+170) | (+1,539) |
| Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response | (10,778) | --- | (10,875) | (+97) | (+10,875) |
| Office of the Chief Information Officer | (14,988) | --- | (15,117) | (+129) | (+15,117) |
| Research and Development | --- | 13,670 | --- | --- | -13,670 |
| National Infrastructure Investments | 500,000 | 500,000 | --- | -500,000 | -500,000 |
| Livable Communities Initiative | --- | 5,000 | --- | --- | -5,000 |
| Financial Management Capital | 4,990 | 10,000 | 10,000 | +5,010 | --- |
| Cyber Security Initiatives | 10,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | -4,000 | --- |
| Office of Civil Rights | 9,384 | 9,773 | 9,773 | +389 | --- |
| Transportation Planning, Research, and Development | 9,000 | 10,000 | 8,000 | -1,000 | -2,000 |
| Working Capital Fund | (172,000) | --- | (174,128) | (+2,128) | (+174,128) |
| Minority Business Resource Center Program | 922 | 1,285 | 1,285 | +363 | --- |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (18,367) | (21,955) | (21,955) | (+3,588) | --- |
| Minority Business Outreach | 3,068 | 3,234 | 3,234 | +166 | --- |
| Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund) | 143,000 | 114,000 | 114,000 | -29,000 | --- |
| Rescission of excess compensation for general aviation operations | -3,254 | --- | --- | +3,254 | --- |
| Total, Office of the Secretary | 779,591 | 783,412 | 260,569 | -519,022 | -522,843 |
| Federal Aviation Administration | | | | | |
| Operations | 9,653,395 | 9,718,000 | 9,718,000 | +64,605 | --- |
| Air traffic organization | (7,442,738) | --- | (7,513,850) | (+71,112) | (+7,513,850) |
| Aviation safety | (1,252,991) | --- | (1,255,000) | (+2,009) | (+1,255,000) |
| Commercial space transportation | (16,271) | --- | (16,700) | (+429) | (+16,700) |
| Finance and management | (582,117) | --- | (573,591) | (-8,526) | (+573,591) |
| Human resources programs | (98,858) | --- | --- | (-98,858) | --- |
| Staff offices | (200,286) | --- | (298,795) | (+98,509) | (+298,795) |
| NextGen | (60,134) | --- | (60,064) | (-70) | (+60,064) |
| Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund) | 2,730,731 | 2,850,000 | 2,749,596 | +18,865 | -100,404 |
| Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund | 167,556 | 180,000 | 175,000 | +7,444 | -5,000 |
| Rescission | --- | -26,184 | -26,184 | -26,184 | --- |
| Subtotal | 167,556 | 153,816 | 148,816 | -18,740 | -5,000 |
| Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization) | (3,435,000) | (3,400,000) | (3,400,000) | (-35,000) | --- |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (3,350,000) | (3,350,000) | (3,350,000) | --- | --- |
| Administration | (101,000) | (103,000) | (105,000) | (+4,000) | (+2,000) |
| Airport Cooperative Research Program | (15,000) | (15,000) | (15,000) | --- | --- |
| Airport technology research | (29,250) | (29,300) | (29,300) | (+50) | --- |
| Small community air service development program | (6,000) | --- | --- | (-6,000) | --- |
| Chapter 471 reform obligation limitation reduction (legislative proposal) | --- | (-926,000) | --- | --- | (+926,000) |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aviation Insurance Revolving Fund (Sec. 117) | --- | -1,000 | --- | --- | +1,000 |
| Total, Federal Aviation Administration | 12,551,682 | 12,720,816 | 12,616,412 | +64,730 | -104,404 |
| Appropriations | (12,551,682) | (12,747,000) | (12,642,596) | (+90,914) | (-104,404) |
| Rescissions | --- | (-26,184) | (-26,184) | (-26,184) | --- |
| Limitations on obligations | (3,350,000) | (2,424,000) | (3,350,000) | --- | (+926,000) |
| Total budgetary resources | (15,901,682) | (15,144,816) | (15,966,412) | (+64,730) | (+821,596) |
| Federal Highway Administration | | | | | |
| Limitation on Administrative Expenses | (412,000) | (437,780) | (392,855) | (-19,145) | (-44,925) |
| Federal-Aid Highways (Highway Trust Fund): | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (39,882,583) | (42,569,000) | (39,882,583) | --- | (-2,686,417) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (39,143,583) | (41,830,000) | (39,143,583) | --- | (-2,686,417) |
| (Exempt contract authority) | (739,000) | (739,000) | (739,000) | --- | --- |
| Emergency Relief (disaster relief category) | 1,662,000 | --- | --- | -1,662,000 | --- |
| Total, Federal Highway Administration | 1,662,000 | --- | --- | -1,662,000 | --- |
| Disaster relief category | (1,662,000) | --- | --- | (-1,662,000) | --- |
| Limitations on obligations | (39,143,583) | (41,830,000) | (39,143,583) | --- | (-2,686,417) |
| Exempt contract authority | (739,000) | (739,000) | (739,000) | --- | --- |
| Total budgetary resources | (41,544,583) | (42,569,000) | (39,882,583) | (-1,662,000) | (-2,686,417) |
| Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration | | | | | |
| Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization) | (247,724) | (250,000) | (244,144) | (-3,580) | (-5,856) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (247,724) | (250,000) | (244,144) | (-3,580) | (-5,856) |
| Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund) | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (307,000) | (330,000) | (307,000) | --- | (-23,000) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (307,000) | (330,000) | (307,000) | --- | (-23,000) |
| CVISN contract authority (Sec. 131) | 1,000 | --- | --- | -1,000 | --- |
| Rescission of contract authority | -1,000 | --- | --- | +1,000 | --- |
| Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limitations on obligations | (554,724) | (580,000) | (551,144) | (-3,580) | (-28,856) |
| Total budgetary resources | (554,724) | (580,000) | (551,144) | (-3,580) | (-28,856) |
| National Highway Traffic Safety Administration | | | | | |
| Operations and Research (general fund) | 140,146 | --- | 152,000 | +11,854 | +152,000 |
| Vehicle Safety | --- | 188,000 | --- | --- | -188,000 |
| Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund) | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (109,500) | (150,000) | (122,360) | (+12,860) | (-27,640) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (109,500) | --- | (122,360) | (+12,860) | (+122,360) |
| Highway Safety Research and Development (Limitation on obligations) | --- | (150,000) | --- | --- | (-150,000) |
| Subtotal | 249,646 | 338,000 | 274,360 | +24,714 | -63,640 |
| Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund) | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (550,328) | (643,000) | (501,828) | (-48,500) | (-141,172) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (550,328) | (643,000) | (501,828) | (-48,500) | (-141,172) |
| Highway safety programs (23 USC 402) | (235,000) | (317,500) | (235,000) | --- | (-82,500) |
| Occupant protection incentive grants(23 USC 405) | (25,000) | (40,000) | (25,000) | --- | (-15,000) |
| Safety belt performance grants (23 USC 406) | (48,500) | --- | --- | (-48,500) | --- |
| Distracted driving prevention | --- | (50,000) | --- | --- | (-50,000) |
| State traffic safety information system improvement(23 USC 408) | (34,500) | (34,500) | (34,500) | --- | --- |
| Impaired driving countermeasures (23 USC 410) | (139,000) | (139,000) | (139,000) | --- | --- |
| Grant administration | (25,328) | (18,000) | (25,328) | --- | (+7,328) |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| High visibility enforcement | (29,000) | (37,000) | (29,000) | --- | (-8,000) |
| Child safety and booster seat grants | (7,000) | --- | (7,000) | --- | (+7,000) |
| Motorcyclist safety | (7,000) | (7,000) | (7,000) | --- | --- |
| Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration | 140,146 | 188,000 | 152,000 | +11,854 | -36,000 |
| Limitations on obligations | (659,828) | (793,000) | (624,188) | (-35,640) | (-168,812) |
| Total budgetary resources | (799,974) | (981,000) | (776,188) | (-23,786) | (-204,812) |
| Federal Railroad Administration | | | | | |
| Safety and Operations | 178,596 | 196,000 | 184,000 | +5,404 | -12,000 |
| Offsetting fee collections (legislative proposal) | --- | -40,000 | --- | --- | +40,000 |
| Direct appropriation | 178,596 | 156,000 | 184,000 | +5,404 | +28,000 |
| Railroad Research and Development | 35,000 | 35,500 | 35,500 | +500 | --- |
| System Preservation | --- | 1,546,000 | --- | --- | -1,546,000 |
| Network Development | --- | 1,000,000 | --- | --- | -1,000,000 |
| National Railroad Passenger Corporation: | | | | | |
| Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation | 466,000 | --- | 350,000 | -116,000 | +350,000 |
| Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation | 952,000 | --- | 1,452,000 | +500,000 | +1,452,000 |
| Subtotal | 1,418,000 | --- | 1,802,000 | +384,000 | +1,802,000 |
| Next Gen High Speed Rail Service (rescission) | --- | -1,973 | -1,973 | -1,973 | --- |
| Northeast Corridor Improvement Program (rescission) | --- | -4,419 | -4,419 | -4,419 | --- |
| Total, Federal Railroad Administration | 1,631,596 | 2,731,108 | 2,015,108 | +383,512 | -716,000 |
| Federal Transit Administration | | | | | |
| Administrative Expenses | 98,713 | --- | 100,000 | +1,287 | +100,000 |
| Formula and Bus Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (9,400,000) | --- | (9,400,000) | --- | (+9,400,000) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (8,360,565) | --- | (8,360,565) | --- | (+8,360,565) |
| Rescission of prior year contract authority | --- | -72,496 | -72,496 | -72,496 | --- |
| Research and Technology Deployment | --- | 120,957 | --- | --- | -120,957 |
| Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization) | --- | (9,500,000) | --- | --- | (-9,500,000) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | --- | (4,759,372) | --- | --- | (-4,759,372) |
| Transit Expansion and Livable Communities (liquidation of contract authorization) | --- | (1,500,000) | --- | --- | (-1,500,000) |
| (limitation on obligations) | --- | (212,185) | --- | --- | (-212,185) |
| Capital Investment Grants | --- | 2,235,486 | --- | --- | -2,235,486 |
| Operations and Safety | --- | 166,000 | --- | --- | -166,000 |
| Administrative programs | --- | (129,700) | --- | --- | (-129,700) |
| Rail transit safety programs | --- | (36,300) | --- | --- | (-36,300) |
| Research and University Research Centers | 44,000 | --- | 44,000 | --- | +44,000 |
| Bus and Rail State of Good Repair (liquidation of contract authorization) | --- | (1,500,000) | --- | --- | (-1,500,000) |
| (limitation on obligations) | --- | (3,207,000) | --- | --- | (-3,207,000) |
| Capital Investment Grants | 1,955,000 | --- | 1,816,993 | -138,007 | +1,816,993 |
| Rescission | -58,500 | -11,429 | -11,429 | +47,071 | --- |
| Subtotal | 1,896,500 | -11,429 | 1,805,564 | -90,936 | +1,816,993 |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority | | | | | |
| Capital and Preventive Maintenance | 150,000 | 135,000 | 150,000 | --- | +15,000 |
| Rescission | --- | -523 | -523 | -523 | --- |
| Subtotal | 150,000 | 134,477 | 149,477 | -523 | +15,000 |
| University Transportation Research (rescission) | --- | -293 | -293 | -293 | --- |
| Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants (rescission) | --- | -14,662 | -14,662 | -14,662 | --- |
| Research, Training and Human Resources (rescission) | --- | -248 | -248 | -248 | --- |
| Interstate Transfer Grants (rescission) | --- | -2,662 | -2,662 | -2,662 | --- |
| Urban discretionary accounts (rescission) | --- | -578 | -578 | -578 | --- |
| Total, Federal Transit Administration | 2,189,213 | 2,554,552 | 2,008,102 | -181,111 | -546,450 |
| Appropriations | (2,247,713) | (2,657,443) | (2,110,993) | (-136,720) | (-546,450) |
| Rescissions | (-58,500) | (-30,395) | (-30,395) | (+28,105) | --- |
| Limitations on obligations | (8,360,565) | (8,178,557) | (8,360,565) | --- | (+182,008) |
| Total budgetary resources | (10,549,778) | (10,733,109) | (10,368,667) | (-181,111) | (-364,442) |
| Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | | | | | |
| Operations and Maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund) | 32,259 | 33,000 | 33,000 | +741 | --- |
| Maritime Administration | | | | | |
| Maritime Security Program | 174,000 | 184,000 | 184,000 | +10,000 | --- |
| Operations and Training | 156,258 | 146,298 | 145,753 | -10,505 | -545 |
| Rescission | -980 | --- | --- | +980 | --- |
| Ship Disposal | 5,500 | 10,000 | 4,000 | -1,500 | -6,000 |
| Assistance to Small Shipyards | 9,980 | --- | --- | -9,980 | --- |
| Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account: | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses | 3,740 | 3,750 | 3,750 | +10 | --- |
| Rescission | -35,000 | --- | --- | +35,000 | --- |
| Subtotal | -31,260 | 3,750 | 3,750 | +35,010 | --- |
| Total, Maritime Administration | 313,498 | 344,048 | 337,503 | +24,005 | -6,545 |
| Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration | | | | | |
| Operational Expenses: | | | | | |
| General Fund | 20,721 | 20,408 | 22,391 | +1,670 | +1,983 |
| Pipeline Safety Fund | 639 | 639 | 639 | --- | --- |
| Pipeline Safety information grants to communities | (1,000) | (1,000) | (1,500) | (+500) | (+500) |
| Subtotal | 21,360 | 21,047 | 23,030 | +1,670 | +1,983 |
| Hazardous Materials Safety | 42,338 | 50,673 | 42,546 | +208 | -8,127 |
| Pipeline Safety: | | | | | |
| Pipeline Safety Fund | 90,679 | 150,500 | 90,679 | --- | -59,821 |
| Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund | 18,573 | 21,510 | 18,573 | --- | -2,937 |
| Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund (leg. proposal) | --- | 4,000 | 2,000 | +2,000 | -2,000 |
| Subtotal | 109,252 | 176,010 | 111,252 | +2,000 | -64,758 |
| Subtotal, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration | 172,950 | 247,730 | 176,828 | +3,878 | -70,902 |
| Pipeline safety user fees | -91,318 | -151,139 | -91,318 | --- | +59,821 |
| Special permit and approval fees (leg. proposal) | --- | -12,000 | --- | --- | +12,000 |
| Pipeline Safety Design Review fee (leg. proposal) | --- | -4,000 | -2,000 | -2,000 | +2,000 |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emergency Preparedness Grants: | | | | | |
| Limitation on emergency preparedness fund | (28,318) | (28,318) | (28,318) | --- | --- |
| (Emergency preparedness fund) | (188) | (188) | (188) | --- | --- |
| Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration | 81,632 | 80,591 | 83,510 | +1,878 | +2,919 |
| Research and Innovative Technology Administration | | | | | |
| Research and Development | 15,981 | --- | 13,500 | -2,481 | +13,500 |
| Office of Inspector General | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | 79,624 | 84,499 | 84,499 | +4,875 | --- |
| Surface Transportation Board | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | 29,310 | 31,250 | 31,250 | +1,940 | --- |
| Offsetting collections | -1,250 | -1,250 | -1,250 | --- | --- |
| Total, Surface Transportation Board | 28,060 | 30,000 | 30,000 | +1,940 | --- |
| Total, title I, Department of Transportation | 19,505,282 | 19,550,026 | 17,634,203 | -1,871,079 | -1,915,823 |
| Appropriations | (17,942,016) | (19,685,493) | (17,769,670) | (-172,346) | (-1,915,823) |
| Rescissions | (-97,734) | (-62,971) | (-62,971) | (+34,763) | --- |
| Disaster relief category | (1,662,000) | --- | --- | (-1,662,000) | --- |
| Rescissions of contract authority | (-1,000) | (-72,496) | (-72,496) | (-71,496) | --- |
| Limitations on obligations | (52,068,700) | (53,805,557) | (52,029,480) | (-39,220) | (-1,776,077) |
| Total budgetary resources | (71,573,982) | (73,355,583) | (69,663,683) | (-1,910,299) | (-3,691,900) |
| TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT | | | | | |
| Management and Administration | | | | | |
| Administration, Operations and Management | 537,789 | 532,546 | 518,068 | -19,721 | -14,478 |
| Program Office Salaries and Expenses: | | | | | |
| Public and Indian Housing | 200,000 | 211,634 | 206,500 | +6,500 | -5,134 |
| Community Planning and Development | 100,000 | 103,882 | 103,500 | +3,500 | -382 |
| Housing | 391,500 | 398,832 | 396,500 | +5,000 | -2,332 |
| Policy Development and Research | 22,211 | 21,394 | 22,326 | +115 | +932 |
| Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity | 72,600 | 74,296 | 72,904 | +304 | -1,392 |
| Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control | 7,400 | 6,816 | 6,816 | -584 | --- |
| Subtotal | 793,711 | 816,854 | 808,546 | +14,835 | -8,308 |
| Total, Management and Administration | 1,331,500 | 1,349,400 | 1,326,614 | -4,886 | -22,786 |
| Public and Indian Housing | | | | | |
| Tenant-based Rental Assistance: | | | | | |
| Renewals | 17,242,351 | 17,237,948 | 17,237,948 | -4,403 | --- |
| Tenant protection vouchers | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | --- | --- |
| Administrative fees | 1,350,000 | 1,575,000 | 1,575,000 | +225,000 | --- |
| Family self-sufficiency coordinators | 60,000 | --- | 60,000 | --- | +60,000 |
| Veterans affairs supportive housing | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | --- | --- |
| Sec. 811 mainstream voucher renewals | 112,018 | 111,335 | 111,335 | -683 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-25,000) | --- | --- | (+25,000) |
| Subtotal (available this fiscal year) | 18,914,369 | 19,074,283 | 19,134,283 | +219,914 | +60,000 |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Advance appropriations | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Less appropriations from prior year advances | -4,000,000 | -4,000,000 | -4,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Tenant-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill | 18,914,369 | 19,074,283 | 19,134,283 | +219,914 | +60,000 |
| Public Housing Capital Fund | 1,875,000 | 2,070,000 | 1,985,000 | +110,000 | -85,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-10,350) | --- | --- | (+10,350) |
| Public Housing Operating Fund | 3,961,850 | 4,524,000 | 4,524,000 | +562,150 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-22,620) | --- | --- | (+22,620) |
| Choice neighborhoods | 120,000 | 150,000 | --- | -120,000 | -150,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-750) | --- | --- | (+750) |
| Family Self-Sufficiency | --- | 60,000 | --- | --- | -60,000 |
| Native American Housing Block Grants | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | --- | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-3,250) | --- | --- | (+3,250) |
| Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant | 13,000 | 13,000 | --- | -13,000 | -13,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-65) | --- | --- | (+65) |
| Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account | 6,000 | 7,000 | 6,000 | --- | -1,000 |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (360,000) | (900,000) | --- | (-360,000) | (-900,000) |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-35) | --- | --- | (+35) |
| Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account | 386 | 1,000 | --- | -386 | -1,000 |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (41,504) | (107,000) | --- | (-41,504) | (-107,000) |
| Housing Certificate Fund (rescission) | -200,000 | --- | --- | +200,000 | --- |
| Total, Public and Indian Housing | 25,340,605 | 26,549,283 | 26,299,283 | +958,678 | -250,000 |
| Community Planning and Development | | | | | |
| Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS | 332,000 | 330,000 | 330,000 | -2,000 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-1,650) | --- | --- | (+1,650) |
| Community Development Fund | 2,948,090 | 2,948,090 | 3,404,000 | +455,910 | +455,910 |
| Indian CDBG | 60,000 | 60,000 | --- | -60,000 | -60,000 |
| Sustainable housing and communities | --- | 100,000 | --- | --- | -100,000 |
| Capacity building | --- | 35,000 | --- | --- | -35,000 |
| Disaster relief | 300,000 | --- | --- | -300,000 | --- |
| (Disaster relief category) | 100,000 | --- | --- | -100,000 | --- |
| Subtotal | 3,408,090 | 3,143,090 | 3,404,000 | -4,090 | +260,910 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-15,715) | --- | --- | (+15,715) |
| Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108): | | | | | |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (240,000) | (500,000) | --- | (-240,000) | (-500,000) |
| Credit subsidy | 5,952 | --- | 6,000 | +48 | +6,000 |
| HOME Investment Partnerships Program | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,200,000 | +200,000 | +200,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-5,000) | --- | --- | (+5,000) |
| Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program | 53,500 | --- | 60,000 | +6,500 | +60,000 |
| Homeless Assistance Grants | 1,901,190 | 2,231,000 | 2,000,000 | +98,810 | -231,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-11,155) | --- | --- | (+11,155) |
| Total, Community Planning and Development | 6,700,732 | 6,704,090 | 7,000,000 | +299,268 | +295,910 |
| Housing Programs | | | | | |
| Project-based Rental Assistance: | | | | | |
| Renewals | 9,050,672 | 8,440,400 | 8,440,400 | -610,272 | --- |
| Contract administrators | 289,000 | 260,000 | 260,000 | -29,000 | --- |
| Subtotal (available this fiscal year) | 9,339,672 | 8,700,400 | 8,700,400 | -639,272 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-19,000) | --- | --- | (+19,000) |
| Advance appropriations | 400,000 | 400,000 | 400,000 | --- | --- |
| Less appropriations from prior year advances | -400,000 | -400,000 | -400,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Project-based rental assistance appropriated in this bill | 9,339,672 | 8,700,400 | 8,700,400 | -639,272 | --- |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Housing for the Elderly | 374,627 | 475,000 | 425,000 | +50,373 | -50,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-2,375) | --- | --- | (+2,375) |
| Housing for Persons with Disabilities | 165,000 | 150,000 | 165,000 | --- | +15,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-750) | --- | --- | (+750) |
| Housing Counseling Assistance | 45,000 | 55,000 | 45,000 | --- | -10,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-275) | --- | --- | (+275) |
| Rental Housing Assistance | 1,300 | --- | --- | -1,300 | --- |
| Rent Supplement (rescission) | -231,600 | --- | --- | +231,600 | --- |
| Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund | 6,500 | 8,000 | 4,000 | -2,500 | -4,000 |
| Offsetting collections | -4,000 | -4,000 | -4,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal | 2,500 | 4,000 | --- | -2,500 | -4,000 |
| Total, Housing Programs | 9,696,499 | 9,384,400 | 9,335,400 | -361,099 | -49,000 |
| Appropriations | (9,932,099) | (9,388,400) | (9,339,400) | (-592,699) | (-49,000) |
| Rescissions | (-231,600) | --- | --- | (+231,600) | --- |
| Offsetting collections | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | --- | --- |
| Federal Housing Administration | | | | | |
| Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account: | | | | | |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (400,000,000) | (400,000,000) | (400,000,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on direct loans) | (50,000) | (50,000) | (50,000) | --- | --- |
| Offsetting receipts | -4,427,000 | -9,676,000 | -9,676,000 | -5,249,000 | --- |
| Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM)(Sec. 210) | -286,000 | -170,000 | -170,000 | +116,000 | --- |
| Additional offsetting receipts (Sec. 238) | -59,000 | --- | --- | +59,000 | --- |
| Administrative contract expenses | 207,000 | 215,000 | 215,000 | +8,000 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-1,075) | --- | --- | (+1,075) |
| Working capital fund (transfer out) | (-71,500) | (-71,500) | (-71,500) | --- | --- |
| General and Special Risk Program Account: | | | | | |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (25,000,000) | (25,000,000) | (25,000,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on direct loans) | (20,000) | (20,000) | (20,000) | --- | --- |
| Offsetting receipts | -400,000 | -588,000 | -588,000 | -188,000 | --- |
| Total, Federal Housing Administration | -4,965,000 | -10,219,000 | -10,219,000 | -5,254,000 | --- |
| Government National Mortgage Association | | | | | |
| Guarantees of Mortgage-backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account: | | | | | |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (500,000,000) | (500,000,000) | (500,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Administrative expenses (legislative proposal) | 19,500 | 21,000 | 20,500 | +1,000 | -500 |
| Offsetting receipts (legislative proposal) | -100,000 | -100,000 | -100,000 | --- | --- |
| Offsetting receipts | -521,000 | -647,000 | -647,000 | -126,000 | --- |
| Offsetting receipts (Sec. 238) | -5,000 | --- | --- | +5,000 | --- |
| Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM) (Sec. 210) | -24,000 | -23,000 | -23,000 | +1,000 | --- |
| Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association | -630,500 | -749,000 | -749,500 | -119,000 | -500 |
| Policy Development and Research | | | | | |
| Research and Technology | 46,000 | 52,000 | 52,000 | +6,000 | --- |
| Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity | | | | | |
| Fair Housing Activities | 70,847 | 68,000 | 68,000 | -2,847 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-205) | --- | --- | (+205) |
| Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes | | | | | |
| Lead Hazard Reduction | 120,000 | 120,000 | 120,000 | --- | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-600) | --- | --- | (+600) |
| Management and Administration | | | | | |
| Working Capital Fund | 199,035 | 170,000 | 175,000 | -24,035 | +5,000 |
| (By transfer) | (71,500) | (71,500) | (71,500) | --- | --- |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Office of Inspector General | 124,000 | 125,600 | 125,600 | +1,600 | --- |
| Transformation Initiative | 50,000 | --- | 50,000 | --- | +50,000 |
| (By transfer) | --- | (119,870) | --- | --- | (-119,870) |
| Total, Management and Administration | 373,035 | 295,600 | 350,600 | -22,435 | +55,000 |
| (Grand total, Management and Administration) | (1,704,535) | (1,645,000) | (1,677,214) | (-27,321) | (+32,214) |
| General Provisions | | | | | |
| Rescission of prior-year advance | -650,000 | --- | --- | +650,000 | --- |
| Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development | 37,433,718 | 33,554,773 | 33,583,397 | -3,850,321 | +28,624 |
| Appropriations | (39,841,318) | (40,362,773) | (40,391,397) | (+550,079) | (+28,624) |
| Rescissions | (-431,600) | --- | --- | (+431,600) | --- |
| Disaster relief category | (100,000) | --- | --- | (-100,000) | --- |
| Advance appropriations | (4,400,000) | (4,400,000) | (4,400,000) | --- | --- |
| Rescissions of prior year advances | (-650,000) | --- | --- | (+650,000) | --- |
| Offsetting receipts | (-5,822,000) | (-11,204,000) | (-11,204,000) | (-5,382,000) | --- |
| Offsetting collections | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | --- | --- |
| (by transfer) | 71,500 | 191,370 | 71,500 | --- | -119,870 |
| (transfer out) | -71,500 | -191,370 | -71,500 | --- | +119,870 |
| (Limitation on direct loans) | (70,000) | (70,000) | (70,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (925,641,504) | (926,507,000) | (925,000,000) | (-641,504) | (-1,507,000) |
| TITLE III - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES | | | | | |
| Access Board | 7,400 | 7,400 | 7,400 | --- | --- |
| Federal Maritime Commission | 24,100 | 26,000 | 25,000 | +900 | -1,000 |
| Amtrak Office of Inspector General | 20,500 | 22,000 | 25,000 | +4,500 | +3,000 |
| National Transportation Safety Board | 102,400 | 102,400 | 102,400 | --- | --- |
| Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation | 215,300 | 213,000 | 225,300 | +10,000 | +12,300 |
| United States Interagency Council on Homelessness | 3,300 | 3,600 | 3,300 | --- | -300 |
| Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies | 373,000 | 374,400 | 388,400 | +15,400 | +14,000 |
| Grand total (net) | 57,312,000 | 53,479,199 | 51,606,000 | -5,706,000 | -1,873,199 |
| Appropriations | (58,156,334) | (60,422,666) | (58,549,467) | (+393,133) | (-1,873,199) |
| Rescissions | (-529,334) | (-62,971) | (-62,971) | (+466,363) | --- |
| Disaster relief category | (1,762,000) | --- | --- | (-1,762,000) | --- |
| Rescissions of contract authority | (-1,000) | (-72,496) | (-72,496) | (-71,496) | --- |
| Advance appropriations | (4,400,000) | (4,400,000) | (4,400,000) | --- | --- |
| Rescissions of prior year advances | (-650,000) | --- | --- | (+650,000) | --- |
| Offsetting receipts | (-5,822,000) | (-11,204,000) | (-11,204,000) | (-5,382,000) | --- |
| Offsetting collections | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (52,068,700) | (53,805,557) | (52,029,480) | (-39,220) | (-1,776,077) |
| (by transfer) | 71,500 | 191,370 | 71,500 | --- | -119,870 |
| (transfer out) | -71,500 | -191,370 | -71,500 | --- | +119,870 |
| Total budgetary resources | (109,380,700) | (107,284,756) | (103,635,480) | (-5,745,220) | (-3,649,276) |
| Discretionary total | (55,550,000) | (53,479,199) | (51,606,000) | (-3,944,000) | (-1,873,199) |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 102,481 | 110,450 | 108,277 | +5,796 | -2,173 |
| Immediate Office of the Secretary | (2,618) | --- | (2,635) | (+17) | (+2,635) |
| Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary | (984) | --- | (992) | (+8) | (+992) |
| Office of the General Counsel | (19,515) | --- | (19,615) | (+100) | (+19,615) |
| Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy | (10,107) | --- | (11,248) | (+1,141) | (+11,248) |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs | (10,538) | --- | (12,825) | (+2,287) | (+12,825) |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs | (2,500) | --- | (2,601) | (+101) | (+2,601) |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration | (25,469) | --- | (27,095) | (+1,626) | (+27,095) |
| Office of Public Affairs | (2,020) | --- | (2,034) | (+14) | (+2,034) |
| Office of the Executive Secretariat | (1,595) | --- | (1,701) | (+106) | (+1,701) |
| Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization | (1,369) | --- | (1,539) | (+170) | (+1,539) |
| Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response | (10,778) | --- | (10,875) | (+97) | (+10,875) |
| Office of the Chief Information Officer | (14,988) | --- | (15,117) | (+129) | (+15,117) |
| Research and Development | --- | 13,670 | --- | --- | -13,670 |
| National Infrastructure Investments | 500,000 | 500,000 | --- | -500,000 | -500,000 |
| Livable Communities Initiative | --- | 5,000 | --- | --- | -5,000 |
| Financial Management Capital | 4,990 | 10,000 | 10,000 | +5,010 | --- |
| Cyber Security Initiatives | 10,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | -4,000 | --- |
| Office of Civil Rights | 9,384 | 9,773 | 9,773 | +389 | --- |
| Transportation Planning, Research, and Development | 9,000 | 10,000 | 8,000 | -1,000 | -2,000 |
| Working Capital Fund | (172,000) | --- | (174,128) | (+2,128) | (+174,128) |
| Minority Business Resource Center Program | 922 | 1,285 | 1,285 | +363 | --- |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (18,367) | (21,955) | (21,955) | (+3,588) | --- |
| Minority Business Outreach | 3,068 | 3,234 | 3,234 | +166 | --- |
| Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund) | 143,000 | 114,000 | 114,000 | -29,000 | --- |
| Rescission of excess compensation for general aviation operations | -3,254 | --- | --- | +3,254 | --- |
| Total, Office of the Secretary | 779,591 | 783,412 | 260,569 | -519,022 | -522,843 |
| Federal Aviation Administration | | | | | |
| Operations | 9,653,395 | 9,718,000 | 9,718,000 | +64,605 | --- |
| Air traffic organization | (7,442,738) | --- | (7,513,850) | (+71,112) | (+7,513,850) |
| Aviation safety | (1,252,991) | --- | (1,255,000) | (+2,009) | (+1,255,000) |
| Commercial space transportation | (16,271) | --- | (16,700) | (+429) | (+16,700) |
| Finance and management | (582,117) | --- | (573,591) | (-8,526) | (+573,591) |
| Human resources programs | (98,858) | --- | --- | (-98,858) | --- |
| Staff offices | (200,286) | --- | (298,795) | (+98,509) | (+298,795) |
| NextGen | (60,134) | --- | (60,064) | (-70) | (+60,064) |
| Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund) | 2,730,731 | 2,850,000 | 2,749,596 | +18,865 | -100,404 |
| Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund | 167,556 | 180,000 | 175,000 | +7,444 | -5,000 |
| Rescission | --- | -26,184 | -26,184 | -26,184 | --- |
| Subtotal | 167,556 | 153,816 | 148,816 | -18,740 | -5,000 |
| Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization) | (3,435,000) | (3,400,000) | (3,400,000) | (-35,000) | --- |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (3,350,000) | (3,350,000) | (3,350,000) | --- | --- |
| Administration | (101,000) | (103,000) | (105,000) | (+4,000) | (+2,000) |
| Airport Cooperative Research Program | (15,000) | (15,000) | (15,000) | --- | --- |
| Airport technology research | (29,250) | (29,300) | (29,300) | (+50) | --- |
| Small community air service development program | (6,000) | --- | --- | (-6,000) | --- |
| Chapter 471 reform obligation limitation reduction (legislative proposal) | --- | (-926,000) | --- | --- | (+926,000) |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aviation Insurance Revolving Fund (Sec. 117) | --- | -1,000 | --- | --- | +1,000 |
| Total, Federal Aviation Administration | 12,551,682 | 12,720,816 | 12,616,412 | +64,730 | -104,404 |
| Appropriations | (12,551,682) | (12,747,000) | (12,642,596) | (+90,914) | (-104,404) |
| Rescissions | --- | (-26,184) | (-26,184) | (-26,184) | --- |
| Limitations on obligations | (3,350,000) | (2,424,000) | (3,350,000) | --- | (+926,000) |
| Total budgetary resources | (15,901,682) | (15,144,816) | (15,966,412) | (+64,730) | (+821,596) |
| Federal Highway Administration | | | | | |
| Limitation on Administrative Expenses | (412,000) | (437,780) | (392,855) | (-19,145) | (-44,925) |
| Federal-Aid Highways (Highway Trust Fund): | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (39,882,583) | (42,569,000) | (39,882,583) | --- | (-2,686,417) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (39,143,583) | (41,830,000) | (39,143,583) | --- | (-2,686,417) |
| (Exempt contract authority) | (739,000) | (739,000) | (739,000) | --- | --- |
| Emergency Relief (disaster relief category) | 1,662,000 | --- | --- | -1,662,000 | --- |
| Total, Federal Highway Administration | 1,662,000 | --- | --- | -1,662,000 | --- |
| Disaster relief category | (1,662,000) | --- | --- | (-1,662,000) | --- |
| Limitations on obligations | (39,143,583) | (41,830,000) | (39,143,583) | --- | (-2,686,417) |
| Exempt contract authority | (739,000) | (739,000) | (739,000) | --- | --- |
| Total budgetary resources | (41,544,583) | (42,569,000) | (39,882,583) | (-1,662,000) | (-2,686,417) |
| Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration | | | | | |
| Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization) | (247,724) | (250,000) | (244,144) | (-3,580) | (-5,856) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (247,724) | (250,000) | (244,144) | (-3,580) | (-5,856) |
| Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund) | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (307,000) | (330,000) | (307,000) | --- | (-23,000) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (307,000) | (330,000) | (307,000) | --- | (-23,000) |
| CVISN contract authority (Sec. 131) | 1,000 | --- | --- | -1,000 | --- |
| Rescission of contract authority | -1,000 | --- | --- | +1,000 | --- |
| Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limitations on obligations | (554,724) | (580,000) | (551,144) | (-3,580) | (-28,856) |
| Total budgetary resources | (554,724) | (580,000) | (551,144) | (-3,580) | (-28,856) |
| National Highway Traffic Safety Administration | | | | | |
| Operations and Research (general fund) | 140,146 | --- | 152,000 | +11,854 | +152,000 |
| Vehicle Safety | --- | 188,000 | --- | --- | -188,000 |
| Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund) | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (109,500) | (150,000) | (122,360) | (+12,860) | (-27,640) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (109,500) | --- | (122,360) | (+12,860) | (+122,360) |
| Highway Safety Research and Development (Limitation on obligations) | --- | (150,000) | --- | --- | (-150,000) |
| Subtotal | 249,646 | 338,000 | 274,360 | +24,714 | -63,640 |
| Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund) | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (550,328) | (643,000) | (501,828) | (-48,500) | (-141,172) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (550,328) | (643,000) | (501,828) | (-48,500) | (-141,172) |
| Highway safety programs (23 USC 402) | (235,000) | (317,500) | (235,000) | --- | (-82,500) |
| Occupant protection incentive grants(23 USC 405) | (25,000) | (40,000) | (25,000) | --- | (-15,000) |
| Safety belt performance grants (23 USC 406) | (48,500) | --- | --- | (-48,500) | --- |
| Distracted driving prevention | --- | (50,000) | --- | --- | (-50,000) |
| State traffic safety information system improvement(23 USC 408) | (34,500) | (34,500) | (34,500) | --- | --- |
| Impaired driving countermeasures (23 USC 410) | (139,000) | (139,000) | (139,000) | --- | --- |
| Grant administration | (25,328) | (18,000) | (25,328) | --- | (+7,328) |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| High visibility enforcement | (29,000) | (37,000) | (29,000) | --- | (-8,000) |
| Child safety and booster seat grants | (7,000) | --- | (7,000) | --- | (+7,000) |
| Motorcyclist safety | (7,000) | (7,000) | (7,000) | --- | --- |
| Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration | 140,146 | 188,000 | 152,000 | +11,854 | -36,000 |
| Limitations on obligations | (659,828) | (793,000) | (624,188) | (-35,640) | (-168,812) |
| Total budgetary resources | (799,974) | (981,000) | (776,188) | (-23,786) | (-204,812) |
| Federal Railroad Administration | | | | | |
| Safety and Operations | 178,596 | 196,000 | 184,000 | +5,404 | -12,000 |
| Offsetting fee collections (legislative proposal) | --- | -40,000 | --- | --- | +40,000 |
| Direct appropriation | 178,596 | 156,000 | 184,000 | +5,404 | +28,000 |
| Railroad Research and Development | 35,000 | 35,500 | 35,500 | +500 | --- |
| System Preservation | --- | 1,546,000 | --- | --- | -1,546,000 |
| Network Development | --- | 1,000,000 | --- | --- | -1,000,000 |
| National Railroad Passenger Corporation: | | | | | |
| Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation | 466,000 | --- | 350,000 | -116,000 | +350,000 |
| Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation | 952,000 | --- | 1,452,000 | +500,000 | +1,452,000 |
| Subtotal | 1,418,000 | --- | 1,802,000 | +384,000 | +1,802,000 |
| Next Gen High Speed Rail Service (rescission) | --- | -1,973 | -1,973 | -1,973 | --- |
| Northeast Corridor Improvement Program (rescission) | --- | -4,419 | -4,419 | -4,419 | --- |
| Total, Federal Railroad Administration | 1,631,596 | 2,731,108 | 2,015,108 | +383,512 | -716,000 |
| Federal Transit Administration | | | | | |
| Administrative Expenses | 98,713 | --- | 100,000 | +1,287 | +100,000 |
| Formula and Bus Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (9,400,000) | --- | (9,400,000) | --- | (+9,400,000) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (8,360,565) | --- | (8,360,565) | --- | (+8,360,565) |
| Rescission of prior year contract authority | --- | -72,496 | -72,496 | -72,496 | --- |
| Research and Technology Deployment | --- | 120,957 | --- | --- | -120,957 |
| Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization) | --- | (9,500,000) | --- | --- | (-9,500,000) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | --- | (4,759,372) | --- | --- | (-4,759,372) |
| Transit Expansion and Livable Communities (liquidation of contract authorization) | --- | (1,500,000) | --- | --- | (-1,500,000) |
| (limitation on obligations) | --- | (212,185) | --- | --- | (-212,185) |
| Capital Investment Grants | --- | 2,235,486 | --- | --- | -2,235,486 |
| Operations and Safety | --- | 166,000 | --- | --- | -166,000 |
| Administrative programs | --- | (129,700) | --- | --- | (-129,700) |
| Rail transit safety programs | --- | (36,300) | --- | --- | (-36,300) |
| Research and University Research Centers | 44,000 | --- | 44,000 | --- | +44,000 |
| Bus and Rail State of Good Repair (liquidation of contract authorization) | --- | (1,500,000) | --- | --- | (-1,500,000) |
| (limitation on obligations) | --- | (3,207,000) | --- | --- | (-3,207,000) |
| Capital Investment Grants | 1,955,000 | --- | 1,816,993 | -138,007 | +1,816,993 |
| Rescission | -58,500 | -11,429 | -11,429 | +47,071 | --- |
| Subtotal | 1,896,500 | -11,429 | 1,805,564 | -90,936 | +1,816,993 |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority | | | | | |
| Capital and Preventive Maintenance | 150,000 | 135,000 | 150,000 | --- | +15,000 |
| Rescission | --- | -523 | -523 | -523 | --- |
| Subtotal | 150,000 | 134,477 | 149,477 | -523 | +15,000 |
| University Transportation Research (rescission) | --- | -293 | -293 | -293 | --- |
| Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants (rescission) | --- | -14,662 | -14,662 | -14,662 | --- |
| Research, Training and Human Resources (rescission) | --- | -248 | -248 | -248 | --- |
| Interstate Transfer Grants (rescission) | --- | -2,662 | -2,662 | -2,662 | --- |
| Urban discretionary accounts (rescission) | --- | -578 | -578 | -578 | --- |
| Total, Federal Transit Administration | 2,189,213 | 2,554,552 | 2,008,102 | -181,111 | -546,450 |
| Appropriations | (2,247,713) | (2,657,443) | (2,110,993) | (-136,720) | (-546,450) |
| Rescissions | (-58,500) | (-30,395) | (-30,395) | (+28,105) | --- |
| Limitations on obligations | (8,360,565) | (8,178,557) | (8,360,565) | --- | (+182,008) |
| Total budgetary resources | (10,549,778) | (10,733,109) | (10,368,667) | (-181,111) | (-364,442) |
| Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | | | | | |
| Operations and Maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund) | 32,259 | 33,000 | 33,000 | +741 | --- |
| Maritime Administration | | | | | |
| Maritime Security Program | 174,000 | 184,000 | 184,000 | +10,000 | --- |
| Operations and Training | 156,258 | 146,298 | 145,753 | -10,505 | -545 |
| Rescission | -980 | --- | --- | +980 | --- |
| Ship Disposal | 5,500 | 10,000 | 4,000 | -1,500 | -6,000 |
| Assistance to Small Shipyards | 9,980 | --- | --- | -9,980 | --- |
| Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account: | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses | 3,740 | 3,750 | 3,750 | +10 | --- |
| Rescission | -35,000 | --- | --- | +35,000 | --- |
| Subtotal | -31,260 | 3,750 | 3,750 | +35,010 | --- |
| Total, Maritime Administration | 313,498 | 344,048 | 337,503 | +24,005 | -6,545 |
| Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration | | | | | |
| Operational Expenses: | | | | | |
| General Fund | 20,721 | 20,408 | 22,391 | +1,670 | +1,983 |
| Pipeline Safety Fund | 639 | 639 | 639 | --- | --- |
| Pipeline Safety information grants to communities | (1,000) | (1,000) | (1,500) | (+500) | (+500) |
| Subtotal | 21,360 | 21,047 | 23,030 | +1,670 | +1,983 |
| Hazardous Materials Safety | 42,338 | 50,673 | 42,546 | +208 | -8,127 |
| Pipeline Safety: | | | | | |
| Pipeline Safety Fund | 90,679 | 150,500 | 90,679 | --- | -59,821 |
| Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund | 18,573 | 21,510 | 18,573 | --- | -2,937 |
| Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund (leg. proposal) | --- | 4,000 | 2,000 | +2,000 | -2,000 |
| Subtotal | 109,252 | 176,010 | 111,252 | +2,000 | -64,758 |
| Subtotal, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration | 172,950 | 247,730 | 176,828 | +3,878 | -70,902 |
| Pipeline safety user fees | -91,318 | -151,139 | -91,318 | --- | +59,821 |
| Special permit and approval fees (leg. proposal) | --- | -12,000 | --- | --- | +12,000 |
| Pipeline Safety Design Review fee (leg. proposal) | --- | -4,000 | -2,000 | -2,000 | +2,000 |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emergency Preparedness Grants: | | | | | |
| Limitation on emergency preparedness fund | (28,318) | (28,318) | (28,318) | --- | --- |
| (Emergency preparedness fund) | (188) | (188) | (188) | --- | --- |
| Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration | 81,632 | 80,591 | 83,510 | +1,878 | +2,919 |
| Research and Innovative Technology Administration | | | | | |
| Research and Development | 15,981 | --- | 13,500 | -2,481 | +13,500 |
| Office of Inspector General | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | 79,624 | 84,499 | 84,499 | +4,875 | --- |
| Surface Transportation Board | | | | | |
| Salaries and Expenses | 29,310 | 31,250 | 31,250 | +1,940 | --- |
| Offsetting collections | -1,250 | -1,250 | -1,250 | --- | --- |
| Total, Surface Transportation Board | 28,060 | 30,000 | 30,000 | +1,940 | --- |
| Total, title I, Department of Transportation | 19,505,282 | 19,550,026 | 17,634,203 | -1,871,079 | -1,915,823 |
| Appropriations | (17,942,016) | (19,685,493) | (17,769,670) | (-172,346) | (-1,915,823) |
| Rescissions | (-97,734) | (-62,971) | (-62,971) | (+34,763) | --- |
| Disaster relief category | (1,662,000) | --- | --- | (-1,662,000) | --- |
| Rescissions of contract authority | (-1,000) | (-72,496) | (-72,496) | (-71,496) | --- |
| Limitations on obligations | (52,068,700) | (53,805,557) | (52,029,480) | (-39,220) | (-1,776,077) |
| Total budgetary resources | (71,573,982) | (73,355,583) | (69,663,683) | (-1,910,299) | (-3,691,900) |
| TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT | | | | | |
| Management and Administration | | | | | |
| Administration, Operations and Management | 537,789 | 532,546 | 518,068 | -19,721 | -14,478 |
| Program Office Salaries and Expenses: | | | | | |
| Public and Indian Housing | 200,000 | 211,634 | 206,500 | +6,500 | -5,134 |
| Community Planning and Development | 100,000 | 103,882 | 103,500 | +3,500 | -382 |
| Housing | 391,500 | 398,832 | 396,500 | +5,000 | -2,332 |
| Policy Development and Research | 22,211 | 21,394 | 22,326 | +115 | +932 |
| Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity | 72,600 | 74,296 | 72,904 | +304 | -1,392 |
| Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control | 7,400 | 6,816 | 6,816 | -584 | --- |
| Subtotal | 793,711 | 816,854 | 808,546 | +14,835 | -8,308 |
| Total, Management and Administration | 1,331,500 | 1,349,400 | 1,326,614 | -4,886 | -22,786 |
| Public and Indian Housing | | | | | |
| Tenant-based Rental Assistance: | | | | | |
| Renewals | 17,242,351 | 17,237,948 | 17,237,948 | -4,403 | --- |
| Tenant protection vouchers | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | --- | --- |
| Administrative fees | 1,350,000 | 1,575,000 | 1,575,000 | +225,000 | --- |
| Family self-sufficiency coordinators | 60,000 | --- | 60,000 | --- | +60,000 |
| Veterans affairs supportive housing | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | --- | --- |
| Sec. 811 mainstream voucher renewals | 112,018 | 111,335 | 111,335 | -683 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-25,000) | --- | --- | (+25,000) |
| Subtotal (available this fiscal year) | 18,914,369 | 19,074,283 | 19,134,283 | +219,914 | +60,000 |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Advance appropriations | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Less appropriations from prior year advances | -4,000,000 | -4,000,000 | -4,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Tenant-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill | 18,914,369 | 19,074,283 | 19,134,283 | +219,914 | +60,000 |
| Public Housing Capital Fund | 1,875,000 | 2,070,000 | 1,985,000 | +110,000 | -85,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-10,350) | --- | --- | (+10,350) |
| Public Housing Operating Fund | 3,961,850 | 4,524,000 | 4,524,000 | +562,150 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-22,620) | --- | --- | (+22,620) |
| Choice neighborhoods | 120,000 | 150,000 | --- | -120,000 | -150,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-750) | --- | --- | (+750) |
| Family Self-Sufficiency | --- | 60,000 | --- | --- | -60,000 |
| Native American Housing Block Grants | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | --- | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-3,250) | --- | --- | (+3,250) |
| Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant | 13,000 | 13,000 | --- | -13,000 | -13,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-65) | --- | --- | (+65) |
| Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account | 6,000 | 7,000 | 6,000 | --- | -1,000 |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (360,000) | (900,000) | --- | (-360,000) | (-900,000) |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-35) | --- | --- | (+35) |
| Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account | 386 | 1,000 | --- | -386 | -1,000 |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (41,504) | (107,000) | --- | (-41,504) | (-107,000) |
| Housing Certificate Fund (rescission) | -200,000 | --- | --- | +200,000 | --- |
| Total, Public and Indian Housing | 25,340,605 | 26,549,283 | 26,299,283 | +958,678 | -250,000 |
| Community Planning and Development | | | | | |
| Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS | 332,000 | 330,000 | 330,000 | -2,000 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-1,650) | --- | --- | (+1,650) |
| Community Development Fund | 2,948,090 | 2,948,090 | 3,404,000 | +455,910 | +455,910 |
| Indian CDBG | 60,000 | 60,000 | --- | -60,000 | -60,000 |
| Sustainable housing and communities | --- | 100,000 | --- | --- | -100,000 |
| Capacity building | --- | 35,000 | --- | --- | -35,000 |
| Disaster relief | 300,000 | --- | --- | -300,000 | --- |
| (Disaster relief category) | 100,000 | --- | --- | -100,000 | --- |
| Subtotal | 3,408,090 | 3,143,090 | 3,404,000 | -4,090 | +260,910 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-15,715) | --- | --- | (+15,715) |
| Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108): | | | | | |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (240,000) | (500,000) | --- | (-240,000) | (-500,000) |
| Credit subsidy | 5,952 | --- | 6,000 | +48 | +6,000 |
| HOME Investment Partnerships Program | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,200,000 | +200,000 | +200,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-5,000) | --- | --- | (+5,000) |
| Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program | 53,500 | --- | 60,000 | +6,500 | +60,000 |
| Homeless Assistance Grants | 1,901,190 | 2,231,000 | 2,000,000 | +98,810 | -231,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-11,155) | --- | --- | (+11,155) |
| Total, Community Planning and Development | 6,700,732 | 6,704,090 | 7,000,000 | +299,268 | +295,910 |
| Housing Programs | | | | | |
| Project-based Rental Assistance: | | | | | |
| Renewals | 9,050,672 | 8,440,400 | 8,440,400 | -610,272 | --- |
| Contract administrators | 289,000 | 260,000 | 260,000 | -29,000 | --- |
| Subtotal (available this fiscal year) | 9,339,672 | 8,700,400 | 8,700,400 | -639,272 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-19,000) | --- | --- | (+19,000) |
| Advance appropriations | 400,000 | 400,000 | 400,000 | --- | --- |
| Less appropriations from prior year advances | -400,000 | -400,000 | -400,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Project-based rental assistance appropriated in this bill | 9,339,672 | 8,700,400 | 8,700,400 | -639,272 | --- |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Housing for the Elderly | 374,627 | 475,000 | 425,000 | +50,373 | -50,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-2,375) | --- | --- | (+2,375) |
| Housing for Persons with Disabilities | 165,000 | 150,000 | 165,000 | --- | +15,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-750) | --- | --- | (+750) |
| Housing Counseling Assistance | 45,000 | 55,000 | 45,000 | --- | -10,000 |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-275) | --- | --- | (+275) |
| Rental Housing Assistance | 1,300 | --- | --- | -1,300 | --- |
| Rent Supplement (rescission) | -231,600 | --- | --- | +231,600 | --- |
| Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund | 6,500 | 8,000 | 4,000 | -2,500 | -4,000 |
| Offsetting collections | -4,000 | -4,000 | -4,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal | 2,500 | 4,000 | --- | -2,500 | -4,000 |
| Total, Housing Programs | 9,696,499 | 9,384,400 | 9,335,400 | -361,099 | -49,000 |
| Appropriations | (9,932,099) | (9,388,400) | (9,339,400) | (-592,699) | (-49,000) |
| Rescissions | (-231,600) | --- | --- | (+231,600) | --- |
| Offsetting collections | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | --- | --- |
| Federal Housing Administration | | | | | |
| Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account: | | | | | |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (400,000,000) | (400,000,000) | (400,000,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on direct loans) | (50,000) | (50,000) | (50,000) | --- | --- |
| Offsetting receipts | -4,427,000 | -9,676,000 | -9,676,000 | -5,249,000 | --- |
| Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM)(Sec. 210) | -286,000 | -170,000 | -170,000 | +116,000 | --- |
| Additional offsetting receipts (Sec. 238) | -59,000 | --- | --- | +59,000 | --- |
| Administrative contract expenses | 207,000 | 215,000 | 215,000 | +8,000 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-1,075) | --- | --- | (+1,075) |
| Working capital fund (transfer out) | (-71,500) | (-71,500) | (-71,500) | --- | --- |
| General and Special Risk Program Account: | | | | | |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (25,000,000) | (25,000,000) | (25,000,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on direct loans) | (20,000) | (20,000) | (20,000) | --- | --- |
| Offsetting receipts | -400,000 | -588,000 | -588,000 | -188,000 | --- |
| Total, Federal Housing Administration | -4,965,000 | -10,219,000 | -10,219,000 | -5,254,000 | --- |
| Government National Mortgage Association | | | | | |
| Guarantees of Mortgage-backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account: | | | | | |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (500,000,000) | (500,000,000) | (500,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Administrative expenses (legislative proposal) | 19,500 | 21,000 | 20,500 | +1,000 | -500 |
| Offsetting receipts (legislative proposal) | -100,000 | -100,000 | -100,000 | --- | --- |
| Offsetting receipts | -521,000 | -647,000 | -647,000 | -126,000 | --- |
| Offsetting receipts (Sec. 238) | -5,000 | --- | --- | +5,000 | --- |
| Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM) (Sec. 210) | -24,000 | -23,000 | -23,000 | +1,000 | --- |
| Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association | -630,500 | -749,000 | -749,500 | -119,000 | -500 |
| Policy Development and Research | | | | | |
| Research and Technology | 46,000 | 52,000 | 52,000 | +6,000 | --- |
| Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity | | | | | |
| Fair Housing Activities | 70,847 | 68,000 | 68,000 | -2,847 | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-205) | --- | --- | (+205) |
| Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes | | | | | |
| Lead Hazard Reduction | 120,000 | 120,000 | 120,000 | --- | --- |
| Transformation initiative (transfer out) | --- | (-600) | --- | --- | (+600) |
| Management and Administration | | | | | |
| Working Capital Fund | 199,035 | 170,000 | 175,000 | -24,035 | +5,000 |
| (By transfer) | (71,500) | (71,500) | (71,500) | --- | --- |

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2012 Enacted | FY 2013 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Office of Inspector General | 124,000 | 125,600 | 125,600 | +1,600 | --- |
| Transformation Initiative | 50,000 | --- | 50,000 | --- | +50,000 |
| (By transfer) | --- | (119,870) | --- | --- | (-119,870) |
| Total, Management and Administration | 373,035 | 295,600 | 350,600 | -22,435 | +55,000 |
| (Grand total, Management and Administration) | (1,704,535) | (1,645,000) | (1,677,214) | (-27,321) | (+32,214) |
| General Provisions | | | | | |
| Rescission of prior-year advance | -650,000 | --- | --- | +650,000 | --- |
| Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development | 37,433,718 | 33,554,773 | 33,583,397 | -3,850,321 | +28,624 |
| Appropriations | (39,841,318) | (40,362,773) | (40,391,397) | (+550,079) | (+28,624) |
| Rescissions | (-431,600) | --- | --- | (+431,600) | --- |
| Disaster relief category | (100,000) | --- | --- | (-100,000) | --- |
| Advance appropriations | (4,400,000) | (4,400,000) | (4,400,000) | --- | --- |
| Rescissions of prior year advances | (-650,000) | --- | --- | (+650,000) | --- |
| Offsetting receipts | (-5,822,000) | (-11,204,000) | (-11,204,000) | (-5,382,000) | --- |
| Offsetting collections | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | --- | --- |
| (by transfer) | 71,500 | 191,370 | 71,500 | --- | -119,870 |
| (transfer out) | -71,500 | -191,370 | -71,500 | --- | +119,870 |
| (Limitation on direct loans) | (70,000) | (70,000) | (70,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (925,641,504) | (926,507,000) | (925,000,000) | (-641,504) | (-1,507,000) |
| TITLE III - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES | | | | | |
| Access Board | 7,400 | 7,400 | 7,400 | --- | --- |
| Federal Maritime Commission | 24,100 | 26,000 | 25,000 | +900 | -1,000 |
| Amtrak Office of Inspector General | 20,500 | 22,000 | 25,000 | +4,500 | +3,000 |
| National Transportation Safety Board | 102,400 | 102,400 | 102,400 | --- | --- |
| Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation | 215,300 | 213,000 | 225,300 | +10,000 | +12,300 |
| United States Interagency Council on Homelessness | 3,300 | 3,600 | 3,300 | --- | -300 |
| Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies | 373,000 | 374,400 | 388,400 | +15,400 | +14,000 |
| Grand total (net) | 57,312,000 | 53,479,199 | 51,606,000 | -5,706,000 | -1,873,199 |
| Appropriations | (58,156,334) | (60,422,666) | (58,549,467) | (+393,133) | (-1,873,199) |
| Rescissions | (-529,334) | (-62,971) | (-62,971) | (+466,363) | --- |
| Disaster relief category | (1,762,000) | --- | --- | (-1,762,000) | --- |
| Rescissions of contract authority | (-1,000) | (-72,496) | (-72,496) | (-71,496) | --- |
| Advance appropriations | (4,400,000) | (4,400,000) | (4,400,000) | --- | --- |
| Rescissions of prior year advances | (-650,000) | --- | --- | (+650,000) | --- |
| Offsetting receipts | (-5,822,000) | (-11,204,000) | (-11,204,000) | (-5,382,000) | --- |
| Offsetting collections | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | (-4,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (52,068,700) | (53,805,557) | (52,029,480) | (-39,220) | (-1,776,077) |
| (by transfer) | 71,500 | 191,370 | 71,500 | --- | -119,870 |
| (transfer out) | -71,500 | -191,370 | -71,500 | --- | +119,870 |
| Total budgetary resources | (109,380,700) | (107,284,756) | (103,635,480) | (-5,745,220) | (-3,649,276) |
| Discretionary total | (55,550,000) | (53,479,199) | (51,606,000) | (-3,944,000) | (-1,873,199) |

□ 1230

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,500,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,500,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. My amendment would reduce the proposed funding for salaries and expenses of the Office of Public and Indian Housing by $6.5 million. This is one of 13 offices which would receive increases for administrative expenses in the underlying bill.

Madam Chairman, we're in an economic emergency as a Nation. We're broke. We absolutely must stop spending money that we don't have. We're borrowing 40 cents or more on every dollar that the Federal Government expends. Raising the funding for the Office of Public and Indian Housing by $6.5 million while we're broke makes no fiscal sense to me.

This particular increase is among the highest for all the offices funded under this legislation. My amendment would simply freeze funding for this office for this next year. Passage of my amendment would bring this account back to this year's FY 2012 levels.

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

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

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

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

It's a good talking point, reducing administration accounts that received increases. We've scrubbed these accounts. We've held hearings, asked questions, and made recommendations about what should be funded rather than looking at an arbitrary number. The bill cuts $4 billion from fiscal year 2012, which is a fiscally responsible level.

I would urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. The amendment that has been offered removes a 3 percent increase in the administrative account for the Office of Public and Indian Housing. I rise to oppose the amendment.

In this instance, the cuts in the Office of Public and Indian Housing cover a number of things, including the VASH program. We're adding $75 million for additional VASH vouchers—veterans' homelessness vouchers—and that has to be administered. The arbitrary $6.5 million simply does not help with that effort. It hurts that effort.

The Office also implements the operating and capital funds for public housing and the Native American housing grants. All of these require either layoffs, removal of people, because the salaries and expenses of the Office are subject to normal increases, small increases year by year for salaries for people in those places, and they are clearly going to end up having to reduce the number of personnel while they're administering more, and particularly the housing and the homeless program for veterans.

So on that basis, I think this is an unwise reduction and one that is unjustified as well as unwise, and I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development, $103,500,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,500,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,500,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. My amendment would reduce the proposed funding for salaries and expenses for the Office of Community Planning and Development by $3.5 million.

This amendment, like the ones I presented last night and the one I just presented, would freeze the funding for these offices. I've heard my good friend from Iowa and my good friends on the other side talk about how the underlying bill has cut expenses for this whole underlying bill, but here in the House of Representatives, we've reduced our expenses by over 11 percent. It seems to me that it just makes fiscal sense to freeze funding for these offices in the underlying bill and not raise them.

We're in an economic emergency as a Nation. We are spending money that we simply do not have. We've got to stop the outrageous spending that's going on here in Washington, and I'm just asking a simple thing: let's freeze all of these offices at the current year's levels for 1 more year. Hopefully, next year we'll have policy put in place that will increase our economy and start creating jobs here in this Nation, but we're not doing that this year with this administration and the policies that we see in the other body on the other side of the Hill.

So let's just freeze the expenses of this office, and I'm proposing to freeze the expenses of virtually all the offices in this bill—most of them, anyway—and my amendment would bring the spending level that's proposed back to the current spending level of 2012.

When families and businesses get overextended, they don't continue to raise their spending levels, and we should not be raising this one either. My amendment would just freeze it at the current spending levels.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. This amendment again, as the gentleman has said, is an amendment that would freeze at the level of the 2012 funding here for salaries and expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development.

Now, this office, it turns out, administers and implements the CDBG program, which in the bill, as presented by my chairman, is increased substantially—several hundred million dollars in the CDBG program—and increases the funding for the HOME program, which had been held at a much lower level in last year's program. In both of those cases, they were considerably lower.

□ 1240

And just last night, we added an amendment to increase the funding for HPWA, Helping Persons With AIDS, one of those vulnerable populations that we have, and our housing programs—as with veterans who are homeless, others who are homeless, those who are vulnerable such as those living with AIDS—have proven to be rather strong programs that have strong support.

Furthermore, already, across the board in HUD, there has been a reduction in personnel services and in the salaries and expenses of $20 million already compared with last year's overall within HUD. So this is a duplicate and hitting at vulnerable populations that we do not want to or should not want to be reducing. The reduction again requires that there be some reduction in personnel because people's salaries go up. They go up because people get a COLA, or a cost-of-living increase, of some sort with their salaries, or they move up in their category because of

longevity. So it ends up putting people who have jobs out of work and reducing the personnel to provide service to the American people and slows down the work of the offices in all these places where I think we all have a stake in making certain that they are efficiently implemented.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We went through the hearing process. We have worked on these numbers to, number one, stay within our allocation, which we have done—we are actually cutting $4 billion in this bill—but also to prioritize. There's no one more sensitive about hardworking taxpayer dollars than I am. But the fact of the matter is, this is an absolutely critical function. The increase that is here is extremely important so that these programs are carried out properly without waste, fraud, and abuse.

For that reason, I would again urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Housing, $396,500,000, of which at least $8,200,000 shall be for the Office of Risk and Regulatory Affairs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, my amendment would reduce the proposed funding for salaries and expenses of bureaucrats here in Washington at the Office of Housing by $5 million. That's absolutely correct.

This amendment, as well as all of my amendments, will not cut the programs. It will not cut the programs one iota. What this does is it reduces the salaries.

I just heard my good friend from Massachusetts talking about Federal bureaucrats getting raises. I have frozen the salaries of people who work for me, and I know many Members of Congress have, for the last 2 years. Why should we be giving Federal bureaucrats more money when the American people are not getting raises? It makes no sense to me, particularly as we are in an economic emergency. We are spending money we don't have. We have to stop the outrageous spending that's going on here in Washington. Enough is enough. And raising this office, as well as all these offices, above the 2012 makes no economic sense to me whatsoever. Let's be fiscally responsible.

My good friend from Iowa, who I have the utmost respect for, has done a tremendous job in this bill, and I do appreciate the tremendous hard work that he and his committee has done. And I appreciate the $4 million that they've cut. But why raise the salaries of Federal bureaucrats?

My amendment would simply reduce the proposed funding back to the 2012 levels. I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I again rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. There are some factors that we need to take into consideration. For one thing next year, next fiscal year, we have an additional compensable day which has to be paid for. We have GSA that has raised rents. We have already cut $14 million out of salaries and expenses, so we would not be able to meet our requirements. We are not giving Federal employees raises, but there are additional costs that come into play because of rents, because of the additional day that our Federal workers will be working next year. And for those reasons—and again, I want to reiterate, we have cut $14 million out of this account—I would just urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OLVER. In this instance, it is again a case of freezing a salaries and expenses account at the previous year's level. But this one has an interesting sidelight in that, in the legislation that we have before us, we have adopted a Presidential recommendation for a partial-year funding for project-based section 8 vouchers, which is going to cause considerable additional administration than the usual program of doing full-year continuation of those voucher programs. There is going to be much uncertainty if this goes on all the way to adoption. There would be much uncertainty for the people who are the owners and providers of that housing, and probably some loss in actual affordable housing available under the project-based section 8 program. So this is a case where they need that assistance. This is where we administer the housing programs for the elderly and disabled, the so-called 202 programs and 811, chapters 202 and chapter 811 for elderly and disabled people, as well as housing counseling assistance.

In addition, we have the Federal Housing Administration, which is having a much larger level of activity as we are trying to dig out of the foreclosure crisis from the past, and that agency needs to have personnel that are qualified and able to do the right job.

So again here—and by the way, I made an error in my previous comments when I said there was a reduction across the board for HUD. What I should have indicated was that it was a reduction in the salaries and expenses account over a period of time going back to 2010 of $20 million across the programs of salaries and expenses within HUD over that time.

□ 1230

So I made a mistake saying it was a $20 million reduction in 1 year. But for all those reasons, I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Policy Development and Research, $22,326,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $115,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $115,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, again I rise to propose an amendment just to freeze the salaries of this Office of Policy Development and Research by a mere $115,000.

Madam Chairman, I hear colleagues around here talking as if millions of dollars, tens of millions—hundreds of millions of dollars is nothing. Well,

most of my constituents at home in Georgia, most Americans think that $1 million is a lot of money, and I certainly think $1 million is a lot of money. But we have proposed, in this underlying bill, to raise the administrative expenses and salaries.

My good friend from Massachusetts, in the previous amendment, said we need to increase the salaries of the bureaucrats. I hope my good friend from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), when he stood up on the last amendment saying that we weren't going to increase salaries of Federal bureaucrats, is factual. I hope that that goes in the RECORD and it becomes true that we're not going to raise the salaries of Federal bureaucrats.

But they're proposing raising the administrative expenses and salaries in all of these offices, so I'm proposing just to freeze these expenses for 1 more year. Let's bring this account back down to this current year's levels of spending.

We cannot continue on this road.

Madam Chairman, I'm a medical doctor. As a medical doctor, part of my medical practice for many years has been involved in treating addictions, drug and alcohol addictions. In addiction medicine, we have a saying: When there's no denial, there's no addiction.

Congress and government have a spending addiction. It's a spending addiction, and there's a tremendous amount of denial here in this city—in all branches of government, actually. We need to face the fact: We're broke as a Nation. We've got to stop the outrageous spending.

I'm proposing just a mere $115,000 to freeze the expenses for this office and salaries for this office for 1 more year. I don't think that's too much for me to ask. I don't think that's too much for the American taxpayer, the hard-working American taxpayer to ask for us to freeze the salaries of these bureaucrats here in Washington and freeze their expenses for 1 more year—not only for this amendment, but for the amendments that I've already presented and the ones that I will present. Let's freeze this spending for 1 more year, keep it at the FY 2012 levels.

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

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairperson, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OLVER. The gentleman from Georgia just wants to freeze everything. But our personnel, in an agency like this, they are subject to the civil service laws, to the personnel laws under OPM, and they are assigned in grades and then steps. They add several steps as they gain seniority and go from step 1 to step 7, and then they may sit for a while. But you end up with people—unless you're really trying to put people out of work. Unless you're trying to put people out of work—and there's no reason to do that for this kind of an agency at all—then there has to be a slow, small increase for those people who move from step to step along the salary scale.

So this is an amendment that would essentially cause disruption in the processing and in the personnel system for the agency, which has lots of work to do. We should be worrying about how to get productivity in the processing rather than about trying to jigger and freeze a step system's pay scale for the people who do the work at these agencies.

I again urge that this amendment not be adopted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I rise to disagree with the rhetoric and the mythology propounded here by the gentleman from Georgia.

The mythology is that we have a tremendous spending binge that we must reduce, that the country is broke, and it's broke because we're spending much too much money and we've got to reduce the spending. It's simply not true.

Twelve years ago, in 2000, we were looking at a $5.6 trillion surplus over the next 10 years. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Alan Greenspan, testifying in favor of President Bush's tax reductions, said we have to reduce taxes, because if we don't, we will pay off the entire national debt by 2012 and that would be a bad thing, for some reason which I won't go into now. He thought it would be a bad thing if we paid off the entire national debt.

The entire debate between the two candidates, Bush and Gore, then was: What should we do with this $5.6 trillion surplus.

How did we change from a $5.6 trillion surplus to the budget deficits we have right now? Not by increasing spending. If you look at the spending amount other than military, if you look at the discretionary spending of the Federal Government other than military, adjusted for inflation and population growth, it has not increased by a nickel since 2001, not by a nickel.

What has changed? What has changed to create the deficit? Because if you want to solve the deficit, you have to know what created it to undo it. What has changed to create the deficit is several things:

One, 40 percent of the deficit is caused by the Bush tax cuts, which will expire at the end of the year unless we change that. Forty percent of the current and anticipated deficits were caused by the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003;

Second, two unfunded wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—the first time in American history we fought major wars without increasing taxes to pay for them;

Third, aside from the wars, completely aside from the wars, we have doubled Pentagon spending since 2001 in real terms; and

Finally, we have a depression, or a recession. When you have a recession that started in 2007 or 2008, tax receipts go down. Expenses on things like food stamps and unemployment insurance goes up. That's when you should run a deficit. You should run a surplus in good times; you should run a deficit during a depression or recession in order to stimulate the economy and get it back up.

If we want to deal with the deficit—and we should deal with the deficit—we shouldn't reduce necessary government spending and certainly not nickel-and-dime step pay increases for Federal employees. If we want to reduce the deficit, we should undo most of the Bush tax cuts for the rich, because most of the Bush tax cuts went to rich people and to very large corporations. We are only collecting about 14 or 15 percent of GDP in taxes this year.

□ 1300

The normal range is between 19 and 21 percent. And I say ''normal,'' meaning the entire post-World War II period ranges between 18 or 19 and 22 percent. We're collecting 14 or 15 percent in the last couple of years because, one, the recession, and, two, because we greatly reduced effective taxes on multi-national corporations and on rich people.

We used to have in this country, under President Reagan, 25 different tax brackets. Someone making $5 million paid a higher tax rate than someone making $1 million, who paid a higher tax rate than someone making $250,000 and so forth. Now, the highest tax rate kicks in at below $250,000, and someone making $250 million pays no higher tax rate than someone making $175,000 or $200,000. There's something very wrong with that.

So if we want to deal with the deficit, deal not with the nonexistent problem, which is the huge nonexistent spending surge that didn't occur. And we have great needs in this country. We have to fix our highways, our roads, our bridges, our hospitals, our broadband. We have to invest so this country will be economically competitive, and our schools and our teachers and our cops and all of these things.

If you want to fix the deficit, don't shortchange what we should be doing to invest in this country. Get rid of the Bush tax cuts, or most of them, or get rid of those portions of the Bush taxes that went to rich people, high-income people and to big corporations. Make corporations, the large corporations, pay an effective tax rate again, instead of a large number of our top corporations paying zero dollars in taxes.

Reduce the Pentagon budget, which we can do. We no longer need all those troops in Germany to protect against a Soviet tank invasion, which is not likely to occur since the Soviets don't exist anymore. That's what we ought to be doing.

But the key thing is don't have this mythology that we have greatly expanded Federal spending over the last

10 years, or even over the last 3 years, which is simply not the case.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, $72,904,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $304,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $304,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, again I rise just to freeze the funding for salaries and office expenses for the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity by a meager $304,000. If we cannot cut out $115,000 or $304,000, what are we going to cut?

And as my friend from Massachusetts already said, actually, on two of my amendments, that it's to increase salaries of Federal bureaucrats. We've got to freeze the salaries of these bureaucrats. We've got to be fiscally responsible.

My amendment doesn't cut any program, doesn't cut any service, doesn't cut out any part of the necessary aspects of the Federal Government. All it does is it freezes the salaries and the expenses of this office, as the other amendments would do. It freezes it at this year's levels. Doesn't even go backwards, freezes it at this year's levels.

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

Mr. OLVER. I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chair, now at this point we have—I think this is the last of this group of amendments that have been proposed in this area, in essence. And when you put them together, because one was for $6.5 million, one was for about $5 million, then there were a couple that were a little—there was one that was a little over $1 million and then a couple that were smaller—the sum total of people who will be taken out of the—who this would require, the freeze, in that way, would require that some number around 200-or-so employees would be put out of positions.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia thinks that, well, they're Federal bureaucrats; but they're providing a service. In this instance, it is the service in the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, which has a budget, total budget, of $70-million-or-so. And this 300,000 is only a couple of percent out of it.

Most of the salaries and expenses, most of these agencies that he has been affecting are mostly done in salaries and expenses of the operation of the office. But they all provide a public service to people. In this instance, it's the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.

Well, it ensures that Americans have the same right, that all Americans have the same right to housing and investigates instances where those rights have been violated. So we are, in every instance of them, and we dealt with a couple of similar ones last night before in the other department under this bill—they only serve to slow down the effective operation of those offices to provide services across the whole gamut of things which have been given to them to do, whether it be public housing, whether it be the Veterans Administration program, here the Fair Housing Administration program, the FHA, the housing for elders, housing for disabled people. All of them are the same ilk. There's no reason to do anything other than the same thing that we have done in the past. And so I'm urging, again, a ''no'' vote on this.

I yield back the balance of my time;

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I understand the gentleman, and I appreciate the fact that he wants to cut spending. We have, in fact, in this bill cut the spending from the request $1.4 million on this particular line item in the budget.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Chair, we have additional rent that we have to pay. We have an extra day of work for the Federal workers next year that we have to pay. So there's not going to be any increase. It's basically going to maintain where we are in this function.

But, again, we have already cut from the President's request, $1.4 million. And there are additional costs we're going to incur just to stay even from last year. So with that, I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF HEALTHY HOMES AND LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control, $6,816,000.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) (''the Act'' herein), not otherwise provided for, $15,134,283,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2012 (in addition to the $4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available on October 1, 2012), and $4,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2013: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading are provided as follows:

(1) $17,237,948,000 shall be available for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts (including renewals of enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act) and including renewal of other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, from amounts provided under this paragraph and any carryover, the Secretary for the calendar year 2013 funding cycle shall provide renewal funding for each public housing agency based on validated voucher management system (VMS) leasing and cost data for the prior calendar year and by applying an inflation factor as established by the Secretary, by notice published in the Federal Register, and by making any necessary adjustments for the costs associated with the first-time renewal of vouchers under this paragraph including tenant protection and HOPE VI vouchers: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this paragraph may be used to fund a total number of unit months under lease which exceeds a public housing agency's authorized level of units under contract, except for public housing agencies participating in the Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration, which are instead governed by the terms and conditions of their MTW agreements: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the extent necessary to stay within the amount specified under this paragraph, pro rate each public housing agency's allocation otherwise established pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That except as provided in the following provisos, the entire amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this Act) shall be obligated to the public housing agencies based on the allocation and pro rata method described above, and the Secretary shall notify public housing agencies of their annual budget not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the 60-day notification period, with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That up to $75,000,000 shall be available only: (1) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies, after application for an adjustment by a public housing agency, that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs of vouchers resulting from unforeseen circumstances or from portability under section 8(r) of the Act; (2) for vouchers that

were not in use during the 12-month period in order to be available to meet a commitment pursuant to section 8(o)(13) of the Act; (3) for adjustments for costs associated with HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD–VASH) vouchers; and (4) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs as a result of participation in the Small Area Fair Market Rent demonstration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall allocate amounts under the previous proviso based on need as determined by the Secretary;

(2) $75,000,000 shall be for section 8 rental assistance for relocation and replacement of housing units that are demolished or disposed of pursuant to section 18 of the Act, conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8, the family unification program under section 8(x) of the Act, relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency, enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act, HOPE VI vouchers, mandatory and voluntary conversions, and tenant protection assistance including replacement and relocation assistance or for project-based assistance to prevent the displacement of unassisted elderly tenants currently residing in section 202 properties financed between 1959 and 1974 that are refinanced pursuant to Public Law 106–569, as amended, or under the authority as provided under this Act: *Provided*, That when a public housing development is submitted for demolition or disposition under section 18 of the Act, the Secretary may provide section 8 rental assistance when the units pose an imminent health and safety risk to residents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may only provide replacement vouchers for units that were occupied within the previous 24 months that cease to be available as assisted housing, subject only to the availability of funds: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this paragraph, $10,000,000 may be available to provide tenant protection assistance, not otherwise provided under this paragraph, to residents residing in low-vacancy areas and who may have to pay rents greater than 30 percent of household income, as the result of (1) the maturity of a HUD-insured, HUD-held or section 202 loan that requires the permission of the Secretary prior to loan prepayment; (2) the expiration of a rental assistance contract for which the tenants are not eligible for enhanced voucher or tenant protection assistance under existing law; or (3) the expiration of affordability restrictions accompanying a mortgage or preservation program administered by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such tenant protection assistance made available under the previous proviso may be provided under the authority of section 8(t) or section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(t)): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement the previous provisos, including, but not limited to, requirements for defining eligible at-risk households within 120 days of the enactment of this Act;

(3) $1,575,000,000 shall be for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program, of which up to $50,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary to allocate to public housing agencies that need additional funds to administer their section 8 programs, including fees associated with section 8 tenant protection rental assistance, the administration of disaster-related vouchers, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers, and other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That no less than $1,525,000,000 of the amount provided in this paragraph shall be allocated to public housing agencies for the calendar year 2013 funding cycle based on section 8(q) of the Act (and related Appropriation Act provisions) as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–276): *Provided further*, That if the amounts made available under this paragraph are insufficient to pay the amounts determined under the previous proviso, the Secretary may decrease the amounts allocated to agencies by a uniform percentage applicable to all agencies receiving funding under this paragraph or may, to the extent necessary to provide full payment of amounts determined under the previous proviso, utilize unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading from prior fiscal years, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That all public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements, and shall be subject to the same uniform percentage decrease as under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That amounts provided under this paragraph shall be only for activities related to the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under section 8, including related development activities;

(4) $60,000,000 shall be available for family self-sufficiency coordinators under section 23 of the Act;

(5) $111,335,000 for the renewal of tenant-based assistance contracts under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), including necessary administrative expenses;

(6) $75,000,000 for incremental rental voucher assistance for use through a supported housing program administered in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs as authorized under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make such funding available, notwithstanding section 204 (competition provision) of this title, to public housing agencies that partner with eligible VA Medical Centers or other entities as designated by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, based on geographical need for such assistance as identified by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, public housing agency administrative performance, and other factors as specified by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for (in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs), any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development administers in connection with the use of funds made available under this paragraph (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective delivery and administration of such voucher assistance: *Provided further*, That assistance made available under this paragraph shall continue to remain available for homeless veterans upon turn-over; and

(7) The Secretary shall separately track all special purpose vouchers funded under this heading.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, 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 75, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $460,000,000)''.

Page 75, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $460,000,000)''.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1310

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, we spend a lot of time talking about how we need to do more with less. The reality is that, all too often, we do less with less. This is the unfortunate reality facing our rental assistance programs if the House-proposed funding levels are enacted.

The Housing Choice Voucher program, more commonly known as section 8, provides rental assistance to over 2 million households with very low incomes. Half of these households are of seniors or people with disabilities. Most of the rest are of families with children.

Experts agree with HUD's assessment of section 8. It is a cost-effective means of delivering decent, safe, and affordable housing to low-income families in the private market. Because of the widely accepted success of the program, section 8 has enjoyed bipartisan support for many years.

Despite agreement among policy experts and politicians, section 8 funding levels continue to come up short of the actual need. The National Low Income Housing Coalition found that, according to the latest census data, for every 100 households with extremely low incomes, only 30 rental units are affordable and available. Three-quarters of renters with extremely low incomes pay housing costs that exceed half of their incomes, placing them at a high risk of housing instability and homelessness. Yet, because of limited funds, only one in four eligible families receives rental assistance.

Without increasing funds beyond what is included in this bill for the section 8 program, an estimated 58,000 low-income families will lose their existing rental assistance next year, putting these families at risk of homelessness. Even the more conservative estimate of the section 8 budget shortfall by the OMB finds that 30,000 low-income families will be at risk of losing their current vouchers and, therefore, of losing their homes.

With housing instability and homelessness comes the destabilizing of families and the possible long-term negative impacts on kids. That's why I'm offering this amendment.

This amendment would increase funding for section 8 voucher renewals

by $460 million to cover the actual costs of ensuring that existing vouchers will continue and that no family will lose an existing section 8 voucher. This does not increase the number of vouchers, though I would love to do that, but it does ensure that no families would lose their currently existing section 8 vouchers.

Additionally, by funding section 8 at the figures necessary to continue existing vouchers, we can make sure that it would be unnecessary for HUD to implement its proposal for $75 minimum rent even if that $75 exceeds the normal section 8 rental limit of 30 percent of income. To most of us here, $75 may not seem like a lot of money as it's a meal for two in many Washington and New York City restaurants, but for 500,000 of the poorest HUD-assisted families, families who have annual incomes of less than $3,000—that's around $250 a month—$75 is a lot of money. For 400,000 HUD-assisted families, $75 minimum would be a 50 percent rent increase from what they're paying now, leaving these families with less money for food, transportation, and other basic necessities. We're talking about families with annual incomes of $2,000 or $2,500 annually.

Madam Chairman, our first objective must be to prevent further hardship to the poorest people in our country and to prevent additional potential homelessness among vulnerable low-income families. To do this, we must ensure that we do not lose current section 8 assistance and that we do not impose a new minimum rent that could be way beyond 30 percent of income for people earning $2,000 and $2,500. This amendment is necessary in order to do that, so I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states:

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, the necessity for this amendment is undeniable.

The hardship and the suffering this budget would cause without this amendment, by imposing minimum rentals way beyond 30 percent of income on people with incomes of $2,000 to $2,500 annually, is undeniable. That this Congress should do such a thing is regrettable, to put it mildly.

I understand the rule. The rule would require an offset of an equal amount of money; but in this overly restrictive bill to start with, there is no way of finding such an offset of that amount of money without hurting people in an equal fashion in other ways. So that says that we have a choice of really injuring ''these'' people or of really injuring ''those'' people. It's not an acceptable choice. I understand the rule. That is regrettable.

I hope that as we progress with this budget that we can find a way of finding the funds that we have in this amendment for this purpose so that we do not injure all of these thousands and thousands of very low-income people.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

(RESCISSION)

Unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading, the heading, ''Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing'', and the heading ''Project-Based Rental Assistance'', for fiscal year 2013 and prior years may be used for renewal of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts and for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were appropriated: *Provided*, That any obligated balances of contract authority from fiscal year 1974 and prior that have been terminated shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That amounts previously recaptured, or recaptured during the current fiscal year, from section 8 project-based contracts from source years fiscal year 1975 through fiscal year 1987 are hereby rescinded, and an amount of additional new budget authority, equivalent to the amount permanently cancelled is hereby appropriated, to remain available until expended, for the purposes set forth under this heading, in addition to amounts otherwise available.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) (the ''Act'') $1,985,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2013 the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing any authority under paragraph (2) of section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section: *Provided further*, That for purposes of such section 9(j), the term ''obligate'' means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays, immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That up to $15,345,000 shall be to support the ongoing Public Housing Financial and Physical Assessment activities of the Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC): *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to make grants, notwithstanding section 204 of this Act, to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs including safety and security measures necessary to address crime and drug-related activity as well as needs resulting from unforeseen or unpreventable emergencies and natural disasters excluding Presidentially declared emergencies and natural disasters under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) occurring in fiscal year 2013: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading $50,000,000 shall be for supportive services, service coordinator and congregate services as authorized by section 34 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437z-6) and the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.): *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to $5,000,000 is to support the costs of administrative and judicial receiverships: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary shall provide bonus awards in fiscal year 2013 to public housing agencies that are designated high performers.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $110,000,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $110,000,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, the underlying bill is suggesting that Congress allot an increase of $110 million in Federal funding for the Public Housing Capital Fund from this fiscal year, from fiscal year 2012.

My amendment would simply freeze funding at our current level and reduce the proposed funding by $110 million. We've got to stop spending. That's what all my efforts are geared towards. We can continue to perform the necessary functions of the Federal Government for those who need it. My amendment would just freeze the proposed increase in funding so that we keep it at this current year's level.

I urge my colleagues to support this very simple amendment, which would save over $110 million for the hardworking taxpayers of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. The amendment that the gentleman from Georgia has now offered has to do with the Public Housing Capital Fund.

The public housing infrastructure currently has an estimated $26 billion of maintenance backlog. In fact, capital repairs accumulate at the rate of something over $3 billion a year, which is considerably higher than $1.9 billion that is contained in this—$1.985 billion that's contained in this bill. So what we are doing is, year by year, continuing to provide maintenance funding: the replacement of utilities, the replacement of appliances, as well as such simple maintenance as painting if it's needed, and so on.

□ 1320

In our more than a million housing units, in the 3,500 or so of our total housing authorities around the country, we are steadily putting these in a situation where we're building a further capital maintenance backlog gap year by year by year.

This is never a wise thing to do when it's at the extent that we are presently doing it. But the $110 million at least is a little bit better than not having the $110 million, which would be an even greater increase in the backlog gap that we have for maintenance, repair, and upgrading of our housing units.

All of those housing units are intended to last for many years and be used long into the future. If we don't maintain them properly in a reasonable way, then eventually we will lose those units. It is much more expensive to replace the units with new units than it is to maintain them in a proper way.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment so that we do not continue to dig our hole deeper on the maintenance needs for the stock of housing that we have in our 3,500 public housing authorities around the country.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in support of this amendment. This is a $110 million increase in spending, and it is simply too much under the circumstances.

I want to first of all, though, certainly commend Chairman LATHAM and all those who have worked on this bill because the material that has been provided to our office said that this bill overall contains a 7.1 percent decrease in funding, which I think is the biggest cut of any appropriations bill that we've dealt with so far. I also want to commend and salute the gentleman from Georgia for trying even harder to rein in spending, because I think almost everyone on both sides of the aisle knows that we have to reduce spending and we have to do more than we've been doing.

This $110 million increase is double the rate of inflation. The amendment by the gentleman from Georgia does not reduce the funding of this agency. It just holds it at the same level. We've cut our own budgets, Madam Chairwoman, for the last couple of years. We've tried to cut many other things. But megabillions have been poured into this program over the last 10 or 15 years. Even with the gentleman's amendment, this fund will still get $1.765 billion. I can tell you most people around the country think that's an awful lot of money.

I rise in support of this amendment. I certainly hope that if this amendment does not pass, that we will at least pass the much smaller cut in the gentleman's next amendment. But I think this is a good amendment.

We have to get serious about cutting spending when we're facing a national debt of over $16 trillion, which is going much higher and much faster. Unless we want this country to become a gigantic Greece and have the problems that we're seeing all over the world, then we've got to do more than we're doing.

So I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back that balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We have been fiscally responsible in this bill by reducing the public housing capital fund by $85 million below the budget request, and we're hearing that this funding level will be a challenge because there's a backlog, Madam Chairman, of over $25 billion in capital projects. However, this does represent one of the toughest choices we've had to make to meet our allocation in this bill. A deeper cut to this account will merely defer projects to future years and I believe will cost more money in the future by running up the cost of those projects in the years ahead.

With that, I would urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam 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 Georgia will be postponed.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I was going to introduce another amendment to this same program which would have been a decrease of just 10 percent of the increase. As I see things going on here today, we can't even cut out $115,000. Cutting out $11 million, I'm sure, is out of the question for my colleagues.

Madam Chair, we've just got to stop this outrageous spending here in Washington. So I'm not going to offer the other one. I would anticipate a point of order being brought against it, and rightfully so. So I'm not going to introduce that amendment.

I just ask my colleagues—and I hope that they hear from Americans all over this country—to stop the spending.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For 2013 payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), $4,524,000,000: *Provided*, That in determining public housing agencies', including Moving to Work agencies', calendar year 2013 funding allocations under this heading, the Secretary may, contingent on authorization, take into account the impact of changes in minimum rents, flat rents, and medical expense thresholds on public housing agencies' formula income levels.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 86, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $562,150,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $562,150,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairwoman, the underlying bill increases funding for the public housing operating fund by over $500 million for fiscal year 2013.

My amendment would simply return the funding back to this year from the proposed levels. It's a $500 million increase at a time when our Nation is broke and American taxpayers are struggling to put food on their tables and looking for jobs.

It is imperative that we look for commonsense cuts wherever we can, and this is one of those. It's a lot of money, $500 million. Some would say it's a very small amount compared to the overall funding level proposed in this bill, but it's still $500 million. We just have to stop spending money that we don't have.

I urge my colleagues to support this very simple amendment that would save over $500 million, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I do rise in opposition to the gentleman's

amendment. This is an amendment that on face value is somewhat confusing, shall we say.

While it appears that there is a large increase in this account when it says $562 million over last year, this account is approximately level funded from last year because last year we went in and took $500 million out of reserve funds of the public housing authorities that were sitting there that were unexpended balances.

□ 1330

Those reserves are no longer there. So what we're having to do in this bill basically to stay virtually even is to have the $562 million over last year.

This fund provides many of the necessary operating and maintenance activities for our housing authorities, including health, safety, and sanitation. Our funding levels for public housing build in savings from reform proposals that we urge the authorizers to complete before we go to a final conference on this bill. Again, in this entire bill, while you talk about the highway bill, financial services doing their work, but that would be extremely helpful if, in fact, we had authorizations that would actually limit spending and that we could follow.

But again, I just wanted to reiterate: We used $500 million a year ago out of the funds that were available, sitting there idle. So what, in fact, this does is basically even from last year. While it appears to be a large increase, it, in fact, is not because the use of those funds from last year, the reserve funds.

I believe we are providing a responsible level of funding for this program. And again, I want to reiterate, Madam Chairman, we are cutting about $4 billion in this appropriation bill—I think the gentleman earlier mentioned that's the largest percentage cut of any bill so far on the floor. But this particular issue, this particular amendment would be extremely devastating because of funding issues in the reserve account that we used last year. With that, I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. OLVER. I'm not sure I have anything much to add to what my chairman has said, other than to just point out, if you look back at the number of dollars that were assigned for the fiscal year '11 bill, that was over $4.6 billion. So in 2012, the amount of money brought that down to under $4 billion. The $500-plus million that the gentleman from Iowa had pointed out was part of the reserves that were taken from those housing authorities around the country that had substantial reserves. So that has been done. That was a one-shot kind of a deal. And now the funding has to go back to something that is in line with the yearly fundings, going back to a period of time of well into a decade ago, that were on a different guide path. So this is just returning to that.

It is at the President's request. It's below the amount that has been granted in the other body's allocation. They had a larger allocation in their numbers for it. This particular account is well below ours. It's $70 million or so below what has been provided by the chairman in the mark for this year.

So I think this is entirely appropriate, given the size of the maintenance gaps and the need to keep maintaining your facilities, your housing quality so that you don't end up losing that or ending up with much higher expense for replacement. I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq.), $650,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to determine the amount of the allocation under title I of such Act for each Indian tribe, the Secretary shall apply the formula under section 302 of such Act with the need component based on single-race census data and with the need component based on multi-race census data, and the amount of the allocation for each Indian tribe shall be the greater of the two resulting allocation amounts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, $2,000,000 shall be contracted for assistance for national or regional organizations representing Native American housing interests for providing training and technical assistance to Indian housing authorities and tribally designated housing entities: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $2,000,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $20,000,000: *Provided further*, That the Department will notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 88, after line 2, insert the following:

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program, as authorized under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4221 et seq.), $13,000,000, to remain available until expended, which amount shall be derived by transfer from the amount provided in this title under ''Management and Administration—Administration, Operations, and Management'' for the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HANABUSA. My amendment inserts the amount of $13 million for the Native Hawaiian housing block grant. This is in line with the President's budget. The President provided for the same amount and states that the Native Hawaiian block grant that is authorized under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self Determination Act of 1996, easier called NAHASDA. The block grant authorizes an annual grant to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands for housing and housing-related assistance.

Madam Chair, let us understand the significance of this block grant to this Congress and the Nation. In 1921, the Congress passed into law the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. Congress recognized that it was necessary to return Native Hawaiians to their land to support self-sufficiency, and the preservation of their values, traditions, and culture.

Madam Chair, in 1893, when the queen was overthrown, Hawaii was a vibrant, modern nation. And what happened after the overthrow resulted in the need—and Congress saw the need—to look at the return of Native Hawaiians to their lands.

In essence, a trust relationship was created by the creation of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act made very clear that only Hawaiians of 50 percent blood quantum qualify, that the lands could only be leased, not owned, and it also restricted the ability to mortgage and have occupancy restrictions as well.

This block grant assists in fulfilling the special trust relationship which was created and acknowledged in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. It assures the return to the land of Native Hawaiians, which was the concern of Congress. If this provision is authorized and people vote for it, what it will do is it will permit the existing and ongoing projects, along with those planned, to be competed with the ultimate goal of putting Native Hawaiians on the land, which was the purpose of

the trust relationship that we created in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part: ''An appropriation may not be in order as an amendment for an expenditure not previously authorized by law.''

Madam Chairman, the amendment proposes to appropriate funds for a program that has not been authorized. The amendment, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek to be heard on the point of order?

The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chair, I understand the point of order that has been raised. But let me, with all due respect, say that when we look at the language of any rule—the language that is, I guess, suspect here is not previously authorized by law—in fact, as stated by the President, as well as in my amendment, this provision has been authorized by law, and it is found in NAHASDA, title VIII.

□ 1340

When we look at the wording ''not previously authorized,'' the technical argument may be that it was authorized at some point in time and then expired in 2005. However, that is not what the rule says. The rule says: not previously authorized. And this has been previously authorized.

In the recent United States Supreme Court case of Lamie v. U.S. Trustee, it's very clear. And we can borrow from the Supreme Court when it gives its opinion as to what it means. The plain language is what controls in any interpretation of any statute or any rule. It is clearly plain language that what is being referred to here is the fact that it was not previously authorized. And it has been previously authorized.

In addition to that, I would also like to say that there is an exception to this rule that says that you can continue appropriations for public works and objects that are already in progress. And to that, Madam Chair, I point out that, as we have said, this money is used for the return of the Native Hawaiians to the lands, and it includes, of course, construction and public works.

They are projects ongoing that need this money in Kakaina, Waimanalo; Piilani Mai ke kai, phase II in Anahola on the island of Kauai; Laiopua on the Big Island on the Kona side; Lalamilo, Waimea; Kanehili, Kapolei; and East Kapolei, II, also in Kapolei, Kapolei being on the island of Oahu.

So on this point of order, Madam Speaker, I believe that it has been misinterpreted. The words are ''not previously authorized.'' And in addition to that, this specific provision has been authorized. In addition to that, the exception is for public works projects in progress. And the public works projects are the ones that I have listed, which as we know, is the object of the grant of the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member seek to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I will insist on my point of order. The fact of the matter is this program is not currently authorized. There are no ongoing public works in progress.

So, once again, I would insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The proponent of an item of appropriation carries the burden of persuasion on the question whether it is supported by an authorization in law.

Having reviewed the amendment and entertained arguments on the point of order, the Chair is unable to conclude that the item of appropriation in question is authorized in law. In response to one of the specific arguments. An authorization that has lapsed does not qualify under the rule.

The Chair is therefore constrained to sustain the point of order under clause 2(a) of rule XXI. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), $6,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, up to $633,000,000: *Provided further*, That up to $750,000 of this amount may be used for administrative contract expenses including management processes and systems to carry out the loan guarantee program.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.), $330,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, except that amounts allocated pursuant to section 854(c)(3) of such Act shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall renew all expiring contracts for permanent supportive housing that were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act that meet all program requirements before awarding funds for new contracts and activities authorized under this section: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, $3,404,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, unless otherwise specified: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided, $3,344,000,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (the ''Act'' herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.): *Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading, not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended for planning and management development and administration: *Provided further*, That $60,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, of which, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 204 of this Act), up to $3,960,000 may be used for emergencies that constitute imminent threats to health and safety: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for grants for the Economic Development Initiative (''EDI'') or Neighborhood Initiatives activities, Rural Innovation Fund, or for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5307): *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 89, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $396,000,000)''.

Page 89, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $396,000,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $396,000,000)''.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I first want to applaud and thank the committee for their work. They've reached the laudable goal of reducing the overall expenditures by $4 billion. And that is much appreciated and noted. I just happen to think we can do just a little bit better.

I'm looking at the committee report regarding the committee's recommendation on the Community Development Fund, specifically the Community Development Block Grants. And I read:

''This is $396 million above both fiscal year 2012 and the budget request.''

So you have the President making a budget request, and you have last year's expenditures. What this amendment does is reduces by $396 million to get it back to where we were. Again, I think the President is even also on the same page.

Now, Madam Chair, we have to recognize what a dire financial strait we're in in this country. We have to understand that we have a multitrillion-dollar challenge. We talk about a trillion with a capital T and it's hard to get your arms around it. But if you were to spend a million dollars a day everyday, it would take you almost 3,000 years to get to $1 trillion.

So when we're racking up a trillion-plus-dollar deficit each year, when our

national debt at the end of this year will approach $16 trillion, when we're spending more than $600 million a day in interest on our national debt, we're going to have to cut some spending.

To actually bring back and reduce this to the proper level, I think would be more appropriate. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. It returns the funding to the fiscal year 2012 level. Again, as the committee report says, this is $396 million above both fiscal year 2012 and the budget request. I think this is reasonable. I hope the committee would find a place where we can join on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chair, this is an amendment that would take a huge chunk out of the CDBG program. This is one of the areas in which I have been particularly, I thought, most commendable about what the chairman's mark is in the bill for the CDBG.

The CDBG is a hugely popular program in communities around the country. We have, as I have mentioned in my opening remarks at the beginning of this bill, 65 percent of our population living in communities in metropolitan areas with over half a million people, and close to 90 percent of our people live in communities with over 50,000 people. It's roughly around 50,000 people that are entitlement communities and get an amount of money that they may use in a flexible kind of a way in their cities and towns of large size, and can directly get that money to use for things that they need in their cities. Their cities and towns have suffered greatly in the Great Recession that we have had before us, and they have housing needs which are very substantial.

Now I would point out to the gentleman from Utah that the amount for the CDBG program as proposed by Chairman LATHAM I am commending him for and strongly support his allocation for this. The amount that he has provided in this bill within the allocation and with the $4 billion reduction that the bill entails is below the number that CDBG was given all the way back in 2008. It has varied up and down, depending upon the allocations and depending upon what has gone on. But this one still is below. And I strongly support it and would urge that it be maintained.

And by the way, about 20 percent of the whole amount goes directly to States, which then can use it in a discretionary way in groups of smaller communities. So it actually gets into rural areas and small communities—in communities like those of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, whose district has no community larger than about 15,000 people. But his district manages to get a considerable amount of money through the State of Kentucky for the congressional district.

□ 1350

So it is something that goes to everybody in their districts in a flexible way for things that are eligible under the law.

But when it is being used for the development of housing, then it ends up clearly directly providing for jobs. If it's used in the way of social services through nonprofit organizations, again it is providing jobs for people who are doing great service for our population. So I'm a strong supporter of this.

I certainly urge that the amendment be defeated, and I will stop there because other people wish to speak, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I will be brief because I know we have many more amendments to consider, but I want to focus on this one because I think this proposal to cut the Community Development Block Grant program by $396 million is particularly ill-advised, and I suspect Members on both sides of the aisle will understand that and will agree. We are all, after all, hearing from our mayors and from our local communities with great regularity that CDBG is money well spent.

First of all, this program has been much better funded in past years. Even with the increase in the current bill, for which we commend the chairman, even with that, the funding is much less than could be utilized.

We know the CDBG program has some very strong virtues. One of them is flexibility and community self-determination in terms of how this money is spent, how it is applied, and the kind of leverage that this money represents, for bringing forth participation and funding from other sources.

This is a program that has stood the test of time, that has strong bipartisan support in this Chamber and across the country. So I think the notion that we would cut back this appropriation by hundreds of millions of dollars is most unwise, and I urge defeat of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Community Development Block Grant program is very important to cities and States across the country. There is a great deal of local control in this program. Communities use the block grants to meet local needs such as building water and sewer infrastructure, community centers, housing for low-income families, and other development important to their local communities. Although the bill increases the funding, this funding level is still well below what it was in fiscal year 2010. The bill actually is $1.046 billion below the level of 2010, to be exact.

Madam Chair, as we were going through this bill, we had many Members on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, request additional funding for these grants. For many Members, there is strong constituent support for these programs. We have seen individual cases of abuse, not unlike a lot of other government programs, but really the way to fix those reforms, and we're not going to do it through the appropriations process, is through the authorizers, to have them do their work and make sure that these programs are well run, that they're focused and they actually do what the intention is.

Again, I want everybody to understand that we are actually below fiscal year 2010 levels on a very, very important program, and I would recommend and urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, 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 Utah will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 89, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 89, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 89, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $60,000,000)''.

Page 90, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $3,960,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,404,000,000)''.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, this amendment finishes the good work begun by the gentleman from Utah on the previous amendment. It saves $3.4 billion by eliminating all funding for the Community Development Block Grant program.

This program was created in 1974 with the stated objective of eliminating blight and providing affordable housing, but in the nearly four decades since then, it has degenerated into a Federal slush fund for pet projects of local politicians and politically connected businesses. It is plagued by profligate waste and outright fraud.

This is an unauthorized expenditure. The legal authority for it expired back in 1994, 18 years ago, and Congress has not bothered to renew it ever since, but we keep shoveling money at it year after year. Madam Chair, $3.5 billion averages to almost $50 from the earnings of a family of four, and they have a right to know where their $50, taken from their family budgets, is going.

Senator COBURN gave some examples in his Back to Black report: Summit County, Ohio, spent $100,000 of CDBG funds to create a doggie daycare and kennel last year, and Nyack, New York, directed $10,000 of CDBG funds to Amazing Grace Circus in 2009 to put on ''A Day At the Circus.''

CDBG funds are being spent creating a ''hip'' atmosphere for employees of an L.A. architectural firm, providing decorative sidewalks in a wealthy Virginia community, and upgrading Victorian cottages in Alabama. Indeed, some communities use these funds to pay off Federal loans they've taken out on projects that are now defaulting because they've utterly failed to produce all of the benefits they've promised.

Even in the best of circumstances, these are all projects that exclusively benefit local communities or private interests and ought to be paid for exclusively by those local communities or private interests. They are of such questionable merit that no city council is willing to face its constituents and say, This is how we have spent your local taxes. But they are more than happy to spend somebody else's Federal taxes, so we end up robbing St. Petersburg to pay St. Paul for projects so dubious that the purported beneficiaries won't pay for them.

And that's all before we discuss the realm of fraud. This program is replete with individuals directing six-figure sums to their personal bank accounts or political activities. The Office of Management and Budget has repeatedly branded this program as ''ineffective.'' That's its official designation for government programs that cannot ascertain how their funds are spent. HUD's own inspector general found that, in a relatively short 2-year timespan, over 150 criminal indictments were issued for false claims, bribery, fraudulent contracts, theft, embezzlement, or corruption in connection with this program.

This a slush fund that cries for abolition, and it should be one of the first places that we look to bring spending under control and stop wasting our constituents' money. Once again, though, this unauthorized program is not targeted for elimination by the Appropriations Committee. It is not even targeted for a token reduction in spending. As we just discussed, the Appropriations Committee proposes spending $400 million more than we spent last year, indeed, $400 million more than even the President requested.

Now, let's be very clear on this. The House Appropriations Committee, with a Republican majority that has a clear mandate to stop wasting money, is about to appropriate $400 million more than requested by the most spendthrift administration in our Nation's history on a program with no Federal nexus, with a solid history of fraud, and that funds the most unworthy of local projects and special interest handouts.

□ 1400

The rules of the House were specifically written to prevent this type of unauthorized expenditure, and they provide for a point of order to be raised if it's included in an appropriations bill. That is exactly what we have here. But, alas, that rule is routinely waived when these measures are brought to the floor, making this amendment necessary.

Madam Chairwoman, this is another critical test of the Republican majority's intention to stand by the promises it made to the American people in the most dangerous fiscal crisis in our Nation's history. I pray that we rise to the occasion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I believe, with the offering of this amendment, we are in great need of a reality check in this Chamber. After all, it was President Nixon, and it was a strong, bipartisan majority, with the Republicans playing a leading role, that first initiated the Community Development Block Grant programs, and I assume that this amendment will be rejected today by that same kind of bipartisan coalition.

The whole idea of the CDBG program was to get away from inflexible, one-size-fits-all approaches to urban development. The whole idea was to get away from top-down bureaucratic direction. CDBG was designed to empower communities, to give them flexibility, to maximize the possibility for leverage of private sector funds, to let the community determine its own projects and its own priorities.

All of us have experience with this program, I dare say. My experience has been that the bang for the buck from CDBG is virtually unmatched in any other Federal program. Housing rehabilitation, for example, is one of the main uses in many communities of CDBG funds. What you're doing with housing rehabilitation is not building public housing from scratch. You're not totally developing new neighborhoods, but you're taking houses that are likely to deteriorate, where a relatively small investment can rehab those houses, can salvage those houses, and can make quality housing available more widely in the community.

Another major use of CDBG funds is infrastructure. How many Habitat for Humanity communities have been built across our country with CDBG funds furnishing the basic infrastructure, and from there the volunteer efforts take off?

The gentleman sponsoring this amendment made the incredible statement that these are projects that communities wouldn't undertake on their own. On the contrary, no CDBG project is going to be undertaken without community participation, financial and otherwise, without community self-determination that this is a priority.

So there's an air of unreality about this debate. These are programs that maximize the values that many of our colleagues profess—self-determination, flexibility, leveraging of private funds. They're programs that have stood the test of time. And we, in this bill, should be proud to appropriate CDBG funds, because we know these funds will have great multiplier effects throughout this country. So I very strongly urge colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I rise to oppose the amendment—the same, basically, that I said before: we are below fiscal year 2010 levels. Certainly, I believe the authorizing committee must set very strict parameters as to how these dollars should be used, but we are below fiscal year 2010, and I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DIAZ-BALART

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. 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 90, line 12, before the period insert the following:

*Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading, not to exceed 25 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading may be expended for public services (as such term is defined for purposes of section 105 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305))

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this amendment is subject to a point of order, but I'd like to discuss what this amendment is attempting to address.

As we all know, the Community Development Block Grant program, which is known as the CDBG grant program, is one of the most widely utilized sources of assistance by local governments. These block grants are intended to address housing, community development and economic development needs as determined by local officials.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very straightforward. It simply gives greater flexibility to the local communities and the cities and the counties, et cetera, for part of their CDBG funding. It increases the cap of what is known as public services expenditures from the current 15 percent up to 25 percent.

Now, public services, in reference to this legislation, deals with issues like child care, senior services, disabled services, educational programs, medical services, transportation services, domestic violence, crime prevention, food banks, and others.

The current 15 percent public service cap was enacted into statute over 30 years ago; and it, frankly, just doesn't reflect the reality of today. We all acknowledge, obviously, the tremendous fiscal challenges that we are facing here in Congress, that our country is facing; but we also acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, the challenges that our local communities are facing.

CDBG public services funds have really played a key role in providing crucial aid to our most at-risk, our most vulnerable populations, especially during difficult times like these. The restrictive and, frankly, outdated cap has denied many communities, Mr. Chairman, the option of providing their residents with the most basic services within the framework of the existing CDBG program. So this amendment provides flexibility to local leaders to meet certain unique challenges.

Now, I want to make something very clear: this amendment does not increase or decrease CDBG funds, does not change the formula, and does not require those communities that are entitled to use more of their funds on public services. It simply grants those cities and counties greater flexibility in their usage of certain CDBG funds. Let me mention that my colleague, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, has a standalone piece of legislation that I'm honored to be a cosponsor of.

It's imperative that the authorizing committee, the Financial Services Committee, work to update the CDBG program—for a lot of reasons. I also need to mention that Chairman LATHAM is well aware of these concerns. I want to thank him and his staff for really trying to accommodate us on this issue, but unfortunately we were not able to do it at this time for a number of different reasons. I'd like to continue to work with Chairman LATHAM and the Financial Services chairman, Chairman BACHUS, on finding real solutions that will give local communities flexibility to meet their unique challenges and to make sure that those funds are well utilized.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Diaz-Balart amendment and to draw attention to a crisis that will soon hit the city of Miami and many other cities throughout south Florida, our State of Florida, and indeed throughout the Nation.

We are all aware of the difficult funding decisions that will need to be made by many departments and programs. Programs like the Community Development Block Grant may see overall reductions because of the sad realities of the current budget constraints and in the interest of fiscal responsibility. However, because of an arbitrary Community Development Block Grant expenditure cap, countless vulnerable citizens in the city of Miami and throughout the United States will lose their only means of sustenance.

□ 1410

This amendment is not about increased funding, Mr. Chairman, nor is it about changing the overall formula of the Community Development Block Grant. It is simply about providing greater flexibility to cities on how they allocate their CDBG funds. Currently, only 15 percent of Community Development Block Grant funds can go toward public services.

Now, what are public services? Well, they include food for senior citizens, the disabled, the homeless, the abused, or neglected children. They also may be used for child care, for health services, for job training services.

The city of Miami, which I am proud to represent, currently provides these vital services, especially meals, through the current Community Development Block Grant public services. But, because of the overall decrease in CDBG allocations, many disadvantaged men, women, and children will be without the vital support that they deserve and need.

This amendment is simply a painless solution to this development, allowing cities the flexibility they need in how they expand their CDBG funds. It would allow up to 25 percent of CDBG funds to go to public services, a position that has been endorsed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities.

The current 15 percent public service expenditure cap was enacted with the original statute over 30 years ago. It does not reflect the evolution of this program, nor the necessity to provide flexibility to local leaders on how funds should be expended during this time of belt tightening. The current restrictive and outdated limit has denied many communities the option of providing their residents with the most basic and necessary services within the framework established by the program.

CDBG public services have played a key role in providing crucial aid to our most at-risk and vulnerable constituents, especially during this enduring recession. Cities across our country have had to do more with less, and this amendment will help them accomplish just that.

I wish to thank Chairman LATHAM and his staff for working with Congressman DIAZ-BALART and me on trying to give this flexibility through the proper channel to our local leaders.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. LATHAM. I do.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I just want to make the point that I want to continue to work with these two great Members from Florida. It is a real problem for the community, and I will do everything possible to try to be of assistance with addressing this real problem for them.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Miami.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, again, want to thank you and your staff, who have been great on this issue, understanding the problem.

At this time I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies, Mr. LATHAM, and also with Mr. WOLF on the Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety, or DADSS.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the chairman. As the gentlemen are aware, the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, NHTSA, has been working on a public-private research program known as the Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety, or DADSS, that would develop a passive technology to detect if a driver's

blood alcohol content is above the legal limit.

I would urge the chairman to consider funding for the DADSS program as this bill moves forward, and I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, and rise to support his initiative.

Mr. Chairman, too many times a mother or a father or a loved one has gotten that dreaded call in the middle of the night that someone has been killed in an accident involving a drunk driver. And I appreciate my friend from Maryland raising the DADSS program, and also urge my good friend, the chairman, to look at this program as the bill moves forward.

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

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentlemen from Maryland and Virginia. I appreciate their taking the time to raise this very important issue. I will be mindful of their concerns as the process moves forward.

Mr. SARBANES. I appreciate it, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, $6,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5308): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $244,000,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in section 108(k) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 90, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates funding for the Community Development loan guarantee program. Like the Community Development Block Grants that we just discussed, these loan guarantees support strictly local projects that have no Federal nexus.

Now, unlike the House Appropriations Committee, President Obama has requested no taxpayer subsidies for this program, and that's a pretty profound statement. Remember, this is the same President who had no problem placing billions of taxpayer dollars at risk for failed schemes like Solyndra, for which he was soundly and rightly criticized by many in this House.

But even the architect of the Solyndra fiasco is unwilling to risk taxpayer money on this loan guarantee program, so, enter the House Appropriations Committee that apparently has money to burn.

What are the recent projects funded by these loan guarantees? Well, $7 million went to the city of Hartford to buy a 393-room Hilton Hotel; $15 million went to build a movie studio in Norristown, Pennsylvania; a $10 million loan to Bass Pro Shops to redevelop the Memphis Pyramid.

Now, why would we put our taxpayers' money at risk for these ventures? Obviously, private investors were unwilling to risk their own money. Obviously, President Obama sees these loans as far riskier than anything that he's loaned in the Solyndra fiasco. But we're about to put our constituents' hard-earned money at risk to prop up these projects.

Now, when Bass Pro Shops takes $10 million to redevelop the Memphis Pyramid, will this mean more jobs in Memphis? Well, yes. And will it mean precisely that many fewer jobs in other regions as, once again, we take from one community to give to another? Unfortunately, the answer is yes to that question as well.

My amendment simply takes taxpayer exposure to these risky loans down to the level of fiscal restraint proposed by the least fiscally restrained President in the history of our Nation. I'd invite my Republican colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to follow.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, here we have kind of the yang that went with the yin. The gentleman's amendment here a few minutes ago, the last one that he offered, was $3.5 billion, and taking that out of this allocation.

□ 1420

In this case, it's a $6 million amount. That's about 5,000 times as much as the six. The first was 5,000 times as much as this one. Maybe I'm off by an order of magnitude. I'm not quite sure.

The gentleman from California has pointed out that the President did not want to do this at all. Well, actually, the President had asked the committee to create a user fee to pay for this rather than the mechanism by which this really very small program—this $6 million program of loan guarantees—has been functioning, which was to pay for any risk involved. The gentleman is claiming, if there were any serious risk, that it should be paid for out of the subsequent years' allocations under CDBG.

It turns out, for those places that would use this program, the loan guarantee program, there has never been a penny lost of the Federal taxpayers on any of the section 108 projects that we have issued in this program, and there have been a number of them. It actually is one of the most flexible. The Community Development loan guarantee program is exceedingly flexible and very creative. It has been used to create larger projects, projects that create jobs and that may be part of the revitalization of a whole target area, and it always ends up bringing in substantial additional private investment into the neighborhood.

So it's creating jobs. It is used often for the reuse of old factory buildings that are no longer viable in the forms that they were. Particularly in my part of the country, it has been used in that kind of a way—and successfully—to make a project that may turn out to be housing, that may turn out to be a business incubator or whatever. This is a very flexible program and one that the Federal taxpayer has never lost money on.

The creation of jobs and the development of new businesses that come into a place that may be part of a development of this sort is what gives us a robust economy. A robust economy is the best way we have of reducing the deficit because you can end up cutting and cutting and cutting programs, and if you do not end up creating jobs in the long run, you're simply not going to return to a robust economy. I think we know that.

So I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think it is a counterproductive thing to do. It's very small. It has never lost any money. It operates quite well. The chairman, with my assent—though he didn't need my assent—certainly left it in there. I support his position very strongly, and I urge the defeat of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I also oppose the amendment.

The Community Development Block Grant program is very important to cities and States throughout our country. As a former mayor, I can attest to the fact of the impact the Community Development Block Grants have on our local communities. This year, we had many Members, both Republicans and Democrats, request funding for CDBG programs. For many Members, there is strong constituent support for the program.

The section 108 CDBG loan guarantee is a good community development tool because it does something that we should be interested in doing, and that is leveraging funding. With only $6 million provided in the bill, HUD is able to

make nearly a quarter of a billion dollars in loan guarantees for community development. So it's a small amount of Federal money that creates a pretty significant impact. Now, if a fee is warranted, we would encourage the authorizing committee to enact legislation to create a fee and lower the cost of the program.

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, $1,200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the amount made available under this heading, the threshold reduction requirements in sections 216(10) and 217(b)(4) of such Act shall not apply to allocation of such amount: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading used for projects not completed within 4 years of the commitment date, as determined by a signature of each party to the agreement, shall be repaid: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the deadline for 1 year if the Secretary determines that the failure to complete the project is beyond the control of the participating jurisdiction: *Provided further*, That no funds provided under this heading may be committed to any project included as part of a participating jurisdiction's plan under section 105(b), unless each participating jurisdiction certifies that it has conducted an underwriting review, assessed developer capacity and fiscal soundness, and examined neighborhood market conditions to ensure adequate need for each project: *Provided further*, That any homeownership units funded under this heading which cannot be sold to an eligible homeowner within 6 months of project completion shall be rented to an eligible tenant: *Provided further*, That no funds provided under this heading may be awarded for development activities to a community housing development organization that cannot demonstrate that it has staff with demonstrated development experience: *Provided further*, That funds provided in prior appropriations Acts for technical assistance, that were made available for Community Housing Development Organizations technical assistance, and that still remain available, may be used for HOME technical assistance notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 91, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $200,000,000)''.

Mr. FLAKE (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut $200 million from the HOME Investment Partnership and transfer the savings to the deficit reduction account. This simply takes the level of funding to where it was last year.

We are often told we need to cut spending. I think we need to. Yet, with this program, we're actually increasing the funding from $1 billion to $1.2 billion, so it's about a 20 percent increase. This is the largest Federal block grant to State and local governments, designed exclusively to create affordable housing for low-income households.

In 2011, a nationwide investigation by The Washington Post described the program as:

> a dysfunctional system that delivers billions of dollars to local housing agencies with few rules, safeguards or even a reliable way to track projects.

This was The Washington Post saying this. It wasn't some conservative Republicans. This was The Washington Post. According to The Post:

> These lapses have led to widespread misspending and delays in a two-decade-old program meant to deliver decent housing to the working poor. Nearly 700 projects awarded $400 million have been idling for years while the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has largely looked the other way. It does not track the pace of construction, and it often fails to spot defunct deals. Instead, they're trusting local agencies to police projects.

Again, that was a quote from the investigation.

In 2009–2010, HUD's Office of Inspector General came out with reports that questioned not only HUD's ability to monitor these HOME project funds but also whether the program was in compliance with its own rules. In addition, several Members of Congress have acknowledged concerns about HUD's ability to ensure that HOME funds are used in a way that produce the program's intended results.

The full Financial Services Committee has held congressional hearings in response to these concerns. In a spending bill just last year, Congress included language that placed additional restrictions on the use of HOME funds for FY12. The problem is those are the funds that are being implemented now. We don't even know if they're following the guidelines and are doing what we asked them to do. Yet here we're appropriating $200 million more to them rather than saying, Hey, we wanted you to do these things. Let's check and see if you've done them before we award you with more money.

It's difficult to evaluate these projects when they haven't been done yet. That's the reason we ought to cut back and simply go level with the funding of last year. Again, it's not a cut from last year. It's level funding from last year. It's the least we can do when running these kinds of deficits and when we have this kind of debt and when we've found massive, massive problems with this program.

□ 1430

The remedy isn't to award a 20 percent increase. If anything, we ought to be cutting the program. I'm simply saying with this amendment, let's take it back to where it was last year. What is the point of oversight that we exercise here in Congress if we exercise that oversight, we find problems, we ask for a remedy, and then we award money before we even see if the remedy was actually entered into? We have oversight here. We have the power of the purse. Let's use it.

This program is troubled. It has problems. It's not just people on one side of the aisle that recognize that. The Congress as a whole does. So why in the world are we awarding 20 percent more funding this year than we had last year? This amendment would take it back to last year's funding level.

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

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

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I rise today to speak on the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill on the floor.

First off, I want to say that whether it's the mayor of Jacksonville, Florida; Orlando; California; or Texas, every single mayor that I've talked to—Democrats or Republicans—support Community Development Block Grants and are very concerned with what we're doing here and making sure that we send funds that they can decide how the community is to use the funds to meet their needs.

In addition, I want to talk about transportation. I've been on the Transportation Committee for the entire 20 years that I've been here in Congress, and transportation has always been bipartisan. It did not matter who the President was, and it did not matter who the Speaker was. In fact, when Newt Gingrich was the Speaker and President Clinton was the President, the House passed the transportation bill over both of them and funded the Transportation Committee for 6 years.

This House has not been able to pass a transportation bill. For the first time, you see people who really don't want to put America to work because

the Transportation Committee is the committee that put the American people to work. When you look at the engineers or architects, they rate America as a ''D minus,'' as far as our infrastructure is concerned. Yet you have people that do not want to put the American people back to work.

In my home State of Florida, we received close to $3 billion for a high-speed train from Orlando to Tampa. What did we do? We sent it back. Eighteen States have our money, and they are putting people to work. We're talking about transportation money.

When you have people with other agendas besides putting people to work, that is a real problem in the area of transportation. We know that for every $1 billion we invest, it generates 44,000 permanent jobs. Yet you have people in this House with a different agenda, and their agenda has nothing to do with jobs and putting people to work. It is a sad state of affairs. But I've often said you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that is ostensibly before us.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, we were talking about the amendment that the gentleman from Arizona has offered, and he has offered an amendment that would take $200 million out of the HOME Investment Partnership program as recommended by Chairman LATHAM and the subcommittee and through the procedures of the subcommittee and the full committee actions before coming to the floor.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. There have been some controversies with the HOME Investment Partnership program; but there were statutory changes last year, and HUD is now in the process of finishing the rule to go along with those statutory changes. So those reforms are now basically in place.

To my understanding, at least, there has been no instance of our actual loss of money from the HOME Partnership program at any time, but there have been projects that have been stalled. This is one of the few programs that we have in this bill that actually results in the construction of housing. Most affordable housing projects use multiple sources to complete a development, and occasionally it is possible that the private development monies don't materialize to a project that has been approved for the HOME Partnership program. If that happens, then HUD takes the money back and uses it someplace else. It doesn't in any way end up resulting in a loss to the taxpayers of the country.

The HOME program is, as I say, one of the few programs that actually funds newly constructed housing under this legislation. These funds are used. They provide needed jobs in our communities; they ease the unemployment in the construction sector; they produce housing; and they don't end up costing the taxpayers any money.

To the degree that that is followed and we can produce housing, then I am certainly in favor of it and strongly support Chairman LATHAM's assignment of the additional money. I would point out that the level of the funding at the level that has been recommended by the Appropriations Committee and by the subcommittee that Mr. LATHAM chairs, that the amount of money that has been assigned is below the amount that was assigned 5 years ago for the 2008 budget.

We have been through ups and downs on this one over time, and I certainly would urge a ''no'' vote on the gentleman's amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

□ 1440

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise to associate myself with the remarks of our esteemed ranking member, JOHN OLVER of Massachusetts, and rise to oppose Mr. FLAKE's proposal.

Now, if Mr. FLAKE came to the floor and cut money from well-larded Arizona projects, I might ponder that type of amendment—but I don't support cuts in HOME. With the devastation that's occurred across our housing market, we shouldn't harm housing for sure. But, if he would take the money to balance the budget from the subsidized Central Arizona Water Project, or if he would take the funds from the major Federal monuments that are stacked wall-to-wall in his State of Arizona, or if he would take the funds from all the defense facilities that help to employ and hold up the economy of his State—those might be worthy of debate.

It's very interesting where he cuts money from—from among the poorest areas in this country, some of the most devastated parts of America that are trying to rebuild themselves. It's very curious to me when he proposes amendments, whether it be this one or other ones in subcommittee, he always leaves his home turf sacrosanct.

Mr. FLAKE. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes. I would be interested in the gentleman's response.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio.

For all I know, this cuts money from my district as well. I have not discriminated in where I have taken money from. I think everybody who has followed the process over the past several years knows that.

With regard to the Central Arizona Project, Arizona repays the Federal Government to the tune of about $55 million a year, still after all these years. The fact that we are 83 percent publicly owned in Arizona means that our local communities have to run their facilities and run their services on just a narrow sliver of private land.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, all those loans were subsidized and capital was made available at very favorable terms compared to my region of Arizona. That paid its own way. Just look where federal dollar flow to Arizona—if one looks at the defense bases across northern Ohio, we don't have anything like Arizona has. Defense dollars flow heavily to Arizona. Or, if we look at the kinds of subsidies we are providing for water in the West—The Central Arizona project or for Bureau of Land Management projects, for all of the investments that have been made to allow Arizona to even get water, federal funds have built Arizona—and then to say to the part of the country that said, Well, we want the West to develop. So we're going to help you out. But now you say, No, no, no, no. Now we're going to take money away from Cleveland and Toledo and Detroit and Pittsburgh and Philadelphia and Chicago and Milwaukee—all of the places that taxed themselves for the development of the modern West.

So I would say to the gentleman, I think the answer to the problem we have is economic growth, and we have to invest in that. The housing sector has been dead in the water since 2008, largely because of the nonregulation of the Bush administration during those years when the Wall Street house of cards and derivatives were created. So let's look at what happened back then.

But, please, don't take it out of the hides of the most stressed communities in America that, despite all the odds, are in the process of reinvesting and rebuilding themselves to fuel recovery.

So I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER). Oppose the Flake amendment. Support programs that will help the revitalization of the housing sector of this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS

Mr. BACHUS. 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 92, line 16, before the period insert the following:

: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to $200,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for necessary expenses for

activities authorized under the HOME Investment Partnerships Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of housing and infrastructure, and economic revitalization in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) in 2011: *Provided further*, That such disaster relief funds shall be awarded only to States and units of general local government that were awarded funds under section 239 of Public Law 112–55 (125 Stat. 703), shall be awarded directly to such States and units of general local government at the discretion of the Secretary, and shall be awarded in accordance with such formula or requirements as the Secretary shall establish, except that such formula or requirements shall give preference to awards based on a county's unmet housing needs for renter occupied units: *Provided further*, That prior to the obligation of such disaster relief funds a grantee shall submit a plan to the Secretary detailing the proposed use of all such funds, including criteria for eligibility and how the use of these funds will address long-term recovery and restoration of infrastructure: *Provided further*, That such disaster relief funds may not be used for activities reimbursable by, or for which funds are made available by, the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Army Corps of Engineers: *Provided further*, That such disaster relief funds allocated under this heading shall not be considered relevant to the other non-disaster formula allocations under this heading: *Provided further*, That a State or subdivision thereof may use up to 5 percent of its allocation of such disaster relief funds for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That in administering such disaster relief funds under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or the use by the recipient of these funds or guarantees (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), upon a request by a State or subdivision thereof explaining why such waiver is required to facilitate the use of such funds or guarantees, if the Secretary finds that such waiver would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of the HOME Investment Partnerships Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register any waiver of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers pursuant to HOME Investment Partnerships Act no later than 5 days before the effective date of such waiver

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the Bachus amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Let me acknowledge the point of order is due to be granted.

I am, however, here to ask for the cooperation of the appropriating committee as we move forward on addressing a problem that we found as a result of the many tornadoes that devastated our country last year. And I will use an example from the city of Tuscaloosa.

In the aftermath of the tornado that struck Tuscaloosa on April 27, HUD came in and calculated the loss of residences and rental units. Part of their charge was to replace the critical needs. However—and I will just use one census tract as an example—they came into a census tract that includes University Boulevard, which is a census tract made up almost entirely of rental units. However, according to HUD's calculation, they came in and they simply surveyed the owner-occupied units. Now, there were 23 owner-occupied units that were destroyed in the census tract, but there were 440 rental units that were destroyed in this same tract. So almost all the loss of property was rental units. It left the city of Tuscaloosa, a university town, woefully inadequate in its number of rental units.

In their calculation, they only take the owner-occupied units, and they extrapolate from that what they consider the number of rental units to be in that same census tract. Well, you can't really base a calculation of how many rental units there are based on how many owner-occupied dwellings there are. And to tell you how much they missed it, they calculated that there were no rental units destroyed, which is obviously a tremendous miscalculation.

So we've offered an amendment today which essentially will say that you have to consider—and your survey must include—both owner-occupied units and rental units and that you must calculate both of them, not simply the owner-occupied units.

HUD's model, in short, needs to be changed. We believe that our authorizing committee will correct this in future cases, but there's an urgent need to replace the rental housing that was lost in last year's tornadoes throughout the Nation. And my amendment simply creates a mechanism to do so and directs HUD to develop a formula for distributing assistance to communities that have already suffered damage. This will restore what we think is fairness and a more correct calculation.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Thank you for allowing me to explain the purpose of the amendment that my colleague Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL and I are proposing.

Communities in the State of Alabama and other states are still recovering from the devastating tornadoes of April 27, 2011.

A critical issue is replacing rental housing that was destroyed by the tornadoes. Rental housing is an important and affordable option for individuals and families, especially in larger cities.

Unfortunately, the methodology used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to award recovery assistance may be weighted—in some cases—against rebuilding rental housing.

To provide an example, according to a study by the office of Mayor Walt Maddox, one census tract in Tuscaloosa sustained tornado damage to 463 housing units: 23 owner-occupied units and 440 rental units. Rather than document the actual damage and distribute recovery aid accordingly, HUD used a mathematical model to calculate the damage.

The result is that only 2.2% of the units in this devastated neighborhood were deemed to have been severely damaged. None of the rental properties were included in the formula, regardless of their damage.

This bureaucratic discrepancy has put Tuscaloosa and other communities at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to receiving funding for the restoration of their rental housing stock.

HUD's model needs to be changed. We are working to correct it for future cases, but there is an urgent need to replace the rental housing that was lost during last year's tornadoes.

Our amendment creates a mechanism to do that. It directs HUD to develop a formula for distributing assistance to communities that have already suffered damage. This will help restore fairness and promote the continued recovery of our communities from some of the most devastating tornadoes in the history of the State of Alabama and our nation.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

Ms. SEWELL. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Chairman, I understand the point of order; but I rise today in support of this amendment by my fellow colleague from Alabama, which adds critical funding to assist communities devastated as a result of last year's severe weather.

This bipartisan amendment would add $200 million to the underlying bill and direct it towards communities that received CDBG disaster assistance in FY 2012. Prior to awarding of these new funds, this amendment directs HUD to establish a formula of funding that would give preference to applicants based on a county's unmet housing need, including renter-occupied units.

Currently, there is still an ongoing and urgent need for housing options, particularly rental units, across several parts of my district as well as my colleague's district. This amendment would help communities like Tuscaloosa, Alabama, receive adequate funds to help repair and rebuild the rental housing units that were destroyed by the April 27 tornadoes. This would help to provide rental housing units that will provide critical shelter for women, children, and families.

□ 1450

A recent report released by HUD estimated that the amount of unmet housing needs for Tuscaloosa County alone would exceed $56 million. Most of this figure was associated with unmet rental housing need.

The devastation and destruction that was caused by the April tornados across the State of Alabama is still being felt, especially in places that already have economically disadvantaged areas. This amendment would provide the additional funds needed for these affected areas to continue their efforts toward full recovery.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program, as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended, $60,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $20,000,000 shall be made available to the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended: *Provided further*, That $35,000,000 shall be made available for the second, third and fourth capacity building activities authorized under section 4(a) of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note), of which not less than $5,000,000 may be made available for rural capacity-building activities: *Provided further*, That $5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity-building activities for national organizations with expertise in rural housing, including experience working with rural housing organizations, local governments, and Indian tribes: *Provided further*, That no funds made available for capacity building activities under this heading in this Act or any prior Act may be set-aside, reserved, or awarded in connection with the Department's demand-response initiative, described in section V(A)(3)(d) of the Notices of Funding Availability for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any requirement in any Notice of Funding Availability, grant application, grant agreement, or work plan, any unexpended amounts provided under this heading for capacity building activities in fiscal years 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013 may not be used in connection with such demand-response initiative or any similar initiative, unless a grantee, in its sole discretion, decides to undertake or continue such a project: *Provided further*, That prior to undertaking, or asking others to undertake, any further demand-response or similar place-based initiatives, the Department shall submit for Congressional approval in its operating plan and budget proposal a detailed justification of such initiative, including how it fits within the Department's overall capacity building efforts, why it is consistent with authorizing legislation, and how the Department plans to implement it effectively.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency solutions grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended; the continuum of care program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; and the rural housing stability assistance program as authorized under subtitle D of title IV of such Act, $2,000,000,000, of which $1,995,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, and of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for project-based rental assistance with rehabilitation projects with 10-year grant terms and any rental assistance amounts that are recaptured under such continuum of care program shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than $286,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such emergency solutions grants program: *Provided further*, That not less than $1,650,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such continuum of care and rural housing stability assistance programs: *Provided further*, That up to $6,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the national homeless data analysis project: *Provided further*, That all funds awarded for supportive services under the continuum of care program and the rural housing stability assistance program shall be matched by not less than 25 percent in cash or in kind by each grantee: *Provided further*, That for all match requirements applicable to funds made available under this heading for this fiscal year and prior years, a grantee may use (or could have used) as a source of match funds other funds administered by the Secretary and other Federal agencies unless there is (or was) a specific statutory prohibition on any such use of any such funds: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible, including Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, and services funding through the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grant, Workforce Investment Act, and the Welfare-to-Work grant program: *Provided further*, That all balances for Shelter Plus Care renewals previously funded from the Shelter Plus Care Renewal account and transferred to this account shall be available, if recaptured, for continuum of care renewals in fiscal year 2013: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation from amounts allocated (which may represent initial or final amounts allocated) for the emergency solutions grant program within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 94, line 19, after each of the first and second dollar amounts, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 95, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 110, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I offer this amendment on behalf of citizens who feel that they have no voice in this Congress; people who have given up hope altogether. These are citizens who earn money by scavenging through alleys to find empty bottles and cans and get their return deposits. They survive by rummaging through garbage dumpsters to find food to eat. These are citizens who have no place to live. They're on the street.

According to the Detroit Rescue Mission Ministries, every night in the city of Detroit there are nearly 20,000 people who are in need of shelter and who are homeless. Nearly a quarter of these people are children. And what is perhaps most tragic is that many of these citizens—and I have spoken to them as I have seen them in the alleys—are men who have sacrificed themselves and proudly served this country in the military. Many of the homeless in the city of Detroit are veterans.

Some of the folks on the street I know personally. I grew up with them. They need help. They need substance abuse treatment. They need a place to stay. And in Detroit, because of the housing crisis, because foreclosures forced many people out of their homes, we also have many apartment buildings that are now vacant—vacant, but could be rehabilitated and renovated to provide a home to our veterans who are currently on the street.

This amendment that I offer will add $5 million to homeless assistance grants to provide our homeless veterans with a home, but also with the hope and dignity that all Americans deserve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I would just tell the gentleman that we accept your amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 134, line 11, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

HOUSING PROGRAMS

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of project-based subsidy contracts under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) (''the Act''), not otherwise provided for, $8,300,400,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2012 (in addition to the $400,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available October 1, 2012), and $400,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2013: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading shall be available for expiring or terminating section 8

project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for amendments to section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), for renewal of section 8 contracts for units in projects that are subject to approved plans of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, and for administrative and other expenses associated with project-based activities and assistance funded under this paragraph: *Provided further*, That of the total amounts provided under this heading, not to exceed $260,000,000 shall be available for performance-based contract administrators for section 8 project-based assistance: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may also use such amounts in the previous proviso for performance-based contract administrators for the administration of: interest reduction payments pursuant to section 236(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(a)); rent supplement payments pursuant to section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s); section 236(f)(2) rental assistance payments (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(f)(2)); project rental assistance contracts for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q(c)(2)); project rental assistance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(d)(2)); project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667); and loans under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667): *Provided further*, That amounts recaptured under this heading, the heading ''Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing'', or the heading ''Housing Certificate Fund'' may be used for renewals of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts or for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 8 project-based Housing Assistance Payments contract that authorizes HUD to require that surplus project funds be deposited in an interest-bearing residual receipts account and that are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary, shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amount otherwise provided by this heading for uses authorized under this heading.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

For capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for senior preservation rental assistance contracts, as authorized by section 811(e) of the American Housing and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000, as amended, and for supportive services associated with the housing, $425,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, up to $90,000,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects: *Provided further*, That amounts under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 202 projects: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of section 202 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed 5 years in duration: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in this fiscal year and hereafter, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 202 Project Rental Assistance Contract that requires surplus project funds to be deposited in an interest-bearing residual receipts account and be remitted to the Secretary upon termination of the contract, shall be remitted to the Secretary and deposited in this account upon termination of such contract, to be available until expended for capital advances and other eligible assistance for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited in this account pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amounts otherwise provided by this heading for uses authorized under this heading.

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

For amendments to capital advance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of such Act and for project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, for project rental assistance to State housing finance agencies and other appropriate entities as authorized under section 811(b)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Housing Act, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811(b)(1) of such Act, $165,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 811 Projects.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance excluding loans, as authorized under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, $45,000,000, including up to $2,500,000 for administrative contract services: *Provided*, That grants made available from amounts provided under this heading shall be awarded within 120 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That funds shall be used for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners, both current and prospective, with respect to property maintenance, financial management/literacy, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions, meeting their financial needs, and fulfilling the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership; for program administration; and for housing counselor training.

OTHER ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAMS

PAYMENT TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), up to $4,000,000, to remain available until expended, which is to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2013 so as to result in no fiscal year 2013 appropriation from the general fund estimated and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2013 appropriation: *Provided further*, That for the dispute resolution and installation programs, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may assess and collect fees from any program participant: *Provided further*, That such collections shall be deposited into the Fund, and the Secretary, as provided herein, may use such collections, as well as fees collected under section 620, for necessary expenses of such Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the requirements of section 620 of such Act, the Secretary may carry out responsibilities of the Secretary under such Act through the use of approved service providers that are paid directly by the recipients of their services.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

New commitments to guarantee single family loans insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund shall not exceed $400,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2013, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed $50,000,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing amount in the previous proviso shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund. For administrative contract expenses of the Federal Housing Administration, $215,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which up to $71,500,000 may be transferred to and merged with the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed $200,000,000,000 on or before April 1, 2012, an additional $1,400 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each $1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below $1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed $30,000,000.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee loans insured under the General and Special Risk Insurance Funds, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3 and 1735c), shall not exceed $25,000,000,000 in total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2013, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(l), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act,

shall not exceed $20,000,000, which shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed $500,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That $20,500,000 shall be available for necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Government National Mortgage Association: *Provided further*, That to the extent that guaranteed loan commitments will and do exceed $155,000,000,000 on or before April 1, 2013, an additional $100 for necessary salaries and expenses shall be available until expended for each $1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below $1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed $3,000,000: *Provided further*, That receipts from Commitment and Multiclass fees collected pursuant to title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 1(a)(1)(I) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, $52,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That with respect to amounts made available under this heading, notwithstanding section 204 of this title, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements funded with philanthropic entities, other Federal agencies, or State or local governments and their agencies for research projects: *Provided further*, That with respect to the previous proviso, such partners to the cooperative agreements must contribute at least a 50 percent match toward the cost of the project: *Provided further*, That for non-competitive agreements entered into in accordance with the previous two provisos, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall comply with section 2(b) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–282, 31 U.S.C. note) in lieu of compliance with section 102(a)(4)(C) with respect to documentation of award decisions.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, $68,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which $42,500,000 shall be to carry out activities pursuant to such section 561: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary may assess and collect fees to cover the costs of the Fair Housing Training Academy, and may use such funds to provide such training: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant or loan: *Provided further*, That, of the funds made available under this heading, $300,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the creation and promotion of translated materials and other programs that support the assistance of persons with limited English proficiency in utilizing the services provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL AND HEALTHY HOMES

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by section 1011 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, $120,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That up to $10,000,000 of that amount shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related diseases and hazards: *Provided further*, That for purposes of environmental review, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other provisions of the law that further the purposes of such Act, a grant under the Healthy Homes Initiative, Operation Lead Elimination Action Plan (LEAP), or the Lead Technical Studies program under this heading or under prior appropriations Acts for such purposes under this heading, shall be considered to be funds for a special project for purposes of section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $45,000,000 shall be made available on a competitive basis for areas with the highest lead paint abatement needs: *Provided further*, That each recipient of funds provided under the third proviso shall make a matching contribution in an amount not less than 25 percent: *Provided further*, That each applicant shall certify adequate capacity that is acceptable to the Secretary to carry out the proposed use of funds pursuant to a notice of funding availability: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading in this or prior appropriations Acts, and that still remain available, may be used for any purpose under this heading notwithstanding the purpose for which such amounts were appropriated if a program competition is undersubscribed and there are other program competitions under this heading that are oversubscribed.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For additional capital for the Working Capital Fund (42 U.S.C. 3535) for the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide and program-specific information technology systems, for the continuing operation and maintenance of both Department-wide and program-specific information systems, and for program-related maintenance activities, $175,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund under this Act shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund from amounts appropriated by previously enacted appropriations Acts may be used for the purposes specified under this Fund, in addition to any other information technology the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the funds made available under this heading for Development, Modernization and Enhancement, including development and deployment of a Next Generation of Voucher Management System and development and deployment of modernized Federal Housing Administration systems may be obligated until the Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations a plan for expenditure that—(A) identifies for each modernization project: (i) the functional and performance capabilities to be delivered and the mission benefits to be realized, (ii) the estimated life-cycle cost, and (iii) key milestones to be met; (B) demonstrates that each modernization project is: (i) compliant with the department's enterprise architecture, (ii) being managed in accordance with applicable life-cycle management policies and guidance, (iii) subject to the department's capital planning and investment control requirements, and (iv) supported by an adequately staffed project office; and (C) has been reviewed by the Government Accountability Office.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $125,600,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within this office.

TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE

For necessary expenses of research, evaluation, and program metrics activities; program demonstrations; and technical assistance and capacity building, $50,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That with respect to amounts made available under this heading for research, evaluation and program metrics or program demonstrations, notwithstanding section 204 of this title, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements funded with philanthropic entities, other Federal agencies, or State or local governments and their agencies for research projects: *Provided further*, That with respect to the previous proviso, such partners to the cooperative agreements must contribute at least a 50 percent match toward the cost of the project.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. Fifty percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be rescinded or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2013 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a nonfrivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. Sections 203 and 209 of division C of Public Law 112-55 (125 Stat. 693-694) shall apply during fiscal year 2013 as if such sections were included in this title, except that during such fiscal year such sections shall be applied by substituting ''fiscal year 2013'' for ''fiscal year 2011'' and ''fiscal year 2012'', each place such terms appear.

SEC. 204. Except as explicitly provided in law, any grant, cooperative agreement or other assistance made pursuant to title II of this Act shall be made on a competitive basis and in accordance with section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545).

SEC. 205. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1).

SEC. 206. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or through a reprogramming of funds, no part of any appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available for any program, project or activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted to Congress.

SEC. 207. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2013 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 208. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations regarding all uncommitted, unobligated, recaptured and excess funds in each program and activity within the jurisdiction of the Department and shall submit additional, updated budget information to these Committees upon request.

SEC. 209. The President's formal budget request for fiscal year 2014, as well as the Department of Housing and Urban Development's congressional budget justifications to be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall use the identical account and sub-account structure provided under this Act.

SEC. 210. A public housing agency or such other entity that administers Federal housing assistance for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California, the States of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi shall not be required to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of assistance provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 on the board of directors or a similar governing board of such agency or entity as required under section (2)(b) of such Act. Each public housing agency or other entity that administers Federal housing assistance under section 8 for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California and the States of Alaska, Iowa and Mississippi that chooses not to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of section 8 assistance on the board of directors or a similar governing board shall establish an advisory board of not less than six residents of public housing or recipients of section 8 assistance to provide advice and comment to the public housing agency or other administering entity on issues related to public housing and section 8. Such advisory board shall meet not less than quarterly.

SEC. 211. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to the conditions listed in subsection (b), for fiscal years 2013 and 2014, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may authorize the transfer of some or all project-based assistance, debt and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions, associated with one or more multifamily housing project to another multifamily housing project or projects.

(b) PHASED TRANSFERS.—Transfers of project-based assistance under this section may be done in phases to accommodate the financing and other requirements related to rehabilitating or constructing the project or projects to which the assistance is transferred, to ensure that such project or projects meet the standards under section (c).

(c) The transfer authorized in subsection (a) is subject to the following conditions:

(1) NUMBER AND BEDROOM SIZE OF UNITS.—

(A) For occupied units in the transferring project: the number of low-income and very low-income units and the configuration (i.e. bedroom size) provided by the transferring project shall be no less than when transferred to the receiving project or projects and the net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided by the transferring project shall remain the same in the receiving project or projects.

(B) For unoccupied units in the transferring project: the Secretary may authorize a reduction in the number of dwelling units in the receiving project or projects to allow for a reconfiguration of bedroom sizes to meet current market demands, as determined by the Secretary and provided there is no increase in the project-based section 8 budget authority.

(2) The net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided to the transferring project shall remain the same as the receiving project or projects.

(3) The transferring project shall, as determined by the Secretary, be either physically obsolete or economically nonviable.

(4) The receiving project or projects shall meet or exceed applicable physical standards established by the Secretary.

(5) The owner or mortgagor of the transferring project shall notify and consult with the tenants residing in the transferring project and provide a certification of approval by all appropriate local governmental officials.

(6) The tenants of the transferring project who remain eligible for assistance to be provided by the receiving project or projects shall not be required to vacate their units in the transferring project or projects until new units in the receiving project are available for occupancy.

(7) The Secretary determines that this transfer is in the best interest of the tenants.

(8) If either the transferring project or the receiving project or projects meets the condition specified in subsection (d)(2)(A), any lien on the receiving project resulting from additional financing obtained by the owner shall be subordinate to any FHA-insured mortgage lien transferred to, or placed on, such project by the Secretary, except that the Secretary may waive this requirement upon determination that such a waiver is necessary to facilitate the financing of acquisition, construction, and/or rehabilitation of the receiving project or projects.

(9) If the transferring project meets the requirements of subsection (d)(2)(E), the owner or mortgagor of the receiving project or projects shall execute and record either a continuation of the existing use agreement or a new use agreement for the project where, in either case, any use restrictions in such agreement are of no lesser duration than the existing use restrictions.

(10) The transfer does not increase the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended) of any FHA-insured mortgage, except to the extent that appropriations are provided in advance for the amount of any such increased cost.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms ''low-income'' and ''very low-income'' shall have the meanings provided by the statute and/or regulations governing the program under which the project is insured or assisted;

(2) the term ''multifamily housing project'' means housing that meets one of the following conditions—

(A) housing that is subject to a mortgage insured under the National Housing Act;

(B) housing that has project-based assistance attached to the structure including projects undergoing mark to market debt restructuring under the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Housing Act;

(C) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 as amended by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(D) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as such section existed before the enactment of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(E) housing that is assisted under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act; or

(F) housing or vacant land that is subject to a use agreement;

(3) the term ''project-based assistance'' means—

(A) assistance provided under section 8(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937;

(B) assistance for housing constructed or substantially rehabilitated pursuant to assistance provided under section 8(b)(2) of such Act (as such section existed immediately before October 1, 1983);

(C) rent supplement payments under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

(D) interest reduction payments under section 236 and/or additional assistance payments under section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act;

(E) assistance payments made under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959; and

(F) assistance payments made under section 811(d)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959;

(4) the term ''receiving project or projects'' means the multifamily housing project or projects to which some or all of the project-based assistance, debt, and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions are to be transferred;

(5) the term ''transferring project'' means the multifamily housing project which is transferring some or all of the project-based

assistance, debt and the statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions to the receiving project or projects; and

(6) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(e) The Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register the terms and conditions, including criteria for HUD approval, of transfers pursuant to this section no later than 30 days before the effective date of such notice.

SEC. 212. No funds provided under this title may be used for an audit of the Government National Mortgage Association that makes applicable requirements under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.)

SEC. 213. (a) No assistance shall be provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to any individual who—

(1) is enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education (as defined under section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002));

(2) is under 24 years of age;

(3) is not a veteran;

(4) is unmarried;

(5) does not have a dependent child;

(6) is not a person with disabilities, as such term is defined in section 3(b)(3)(E) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(3)(E)) and was not receiving assistance under such section 8 as of November 30, 2005; and

(7) is not otherwise individually eligible, or has parents who, individually or jointly, are not eligible, to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(b) For purposes of determining the eligibility of a person to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), any financial assistance (in excess of amounts received for tuition and any other required fees and charges) that an individual receives under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), from private sources, or an institution of higher education (as defined under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall be considered income to that individual, except for a person over the age of 23 with dependent children.

SEC. 214. The funds made available for Native Alaskans under the heading ''Native American Housing Block Grants'' in title III of this Act shall be allocated to the same Native Alaskan housing block grant recipients that received funds in fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 215. Notwithstanding the limitation in the first sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-g), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may, until September 30, 2013, insure and enter into commitments to insure mortgages under section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20).

SEC. 216. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 2013, in managing and disposing of any multifamily property that is owned or has a mortgage held by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and during the process of foreclosure on any property with a contract for rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or other Federal programs, the Secretary shall maintain any rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and other programs that are attached to any dwelling units in the property. To the extent the Secretary determines, in consultation with the tenants and the local government, that such a multifamily property owned or held by the Secretary is not feasible for continued rental assistance payments under such section 8 or other programs, based on consideration of (1) the costs of rehabilitating and operating the property and all available Federal, State, and local resources, including rent adjustments under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (''MAHRAA'') and (2) environmental conditions that cannot be remedied in a cost-effective fashion, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance. The Secretary shall also take appropriate steps to ensure that project-based contracts remain in effect prior to foreclosure, subject to the exercise of contractual abatement remedies to assist relocation of tenants for imminent major threats to health and safety after written notice to and informed consent of the affected tenants and use of other available remedies, such as partial abatements or receivership. After disposition of any multifamily property described under this section, the contract and allowable rent levels on such properties shall be subject to the requirements under section 524 of MAHRAA.

SEC. 217. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall report quarterly to the House of Representatives and Senate Committees on Appropriations on HUD's use of all sole-source contracts, including terms of the contracts, cost, and a substantive rationale for using a sole-source contract.

SEC. 218. During fiscal year 2013, in the provision of rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) in connection with a program to demonstrate the economy and effectiveness of providing such assistance for use in assisted living facilities that is carried out in the counties of the State of Michigan notwithstanding paragraphs (3) and (18)(B)(iii) of such section 8(o), a family residing in an assisted living facility in any such county, on behalf of which a public housing agency provides assistance pursuant to section 8(o)(18) of such Act, may be required, at the time the family initially receives such assistance, to pay rent in an amount exceeding 40 percent of the monthly adjusted income of the family by such a percentage or amount as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 219. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the recipient of a grant under section 202b of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q) after December 26, 2000, in accordance with the unnumbered paragraph at the end of section 202(b) of such Act, may, at its option, establish a single-asset nonprofit entity to own the project and may lend the grant funds to such entity, which may be a private nonprofit organization described in section 831 of the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000.

SEC. 220. The amounts provided under the subheading ''Program Account'' under the heading ''Community Development Loan Guarantees'' may be used to guarantee, or make commitments to guarantee, notes, or other obligations issued by any State on behalf of non-entitlement communities in the State in accordance with the requirements of section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided*, That any State receiving such a guarantee or commitment shall distribute all funds subject to such guarantee to the units of general local government in non-entitlement areas that received the commitment.

SEC. 221. Public housing agencies that own and operate 400 or fewer public housing units may elect to be exempt from any asset management requirement imposed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the operating fund rule: *Provided*, That an agency seeking a discontinuance of a reduction of subsidy under the operating fund formula shall not be exempt from asset management requirements.

SEC. 222. With respect to the use of amounts provided in this Act and in future Acts for the operation, capital improvement and management of public housing as authorized by sections 9(d) and 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(d) and (e)), the Secretary shall not impose any requirement or guideline relating to asset management that restricts or limits in any way the use of capital funds for central office costs pursuant to section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(g)(1), (2)): *Provided*, That a public housing agency may not use capital funds authorized under section 9(d) for activities that are eligible under section 9(e) for assistance with amounts from the operating fund in excess of the amounts permitted under section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2).

SEC. 223. No official or employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be designated as an allotment holder unless the Office of the Chief Financial Officer has determined that such allotment holder has implemented an adequate system of funds control and has received training in funds control procedures and directives. The Chief Financial Officer shall ensure that, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a trained allotment holder shall be designated for each HUD subaccount under the heading ''Administration, Operations, and Management'' as well as each account receiving appropriations for ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'' within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 224. Payment of attorney fees in program-related litigation must be paid from individual program office personnel benefits and compensation funding. The annual budget submission for program office personnel benefit and compensation funding must include program-related litigation costs for attorney fees as a separate line item request.

SEC. 225. The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall for fiscal year 2013 and subsequent fiscal years, notify the public through the Federal Register and other means, as determined appropriate, of the issuance of a notice of the availability of assistance or notice of funding availability (NOFA) for any program or discretionary fund administered by the Secretary that is to be competitively awarded. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2013 and subsequent fiscal years, the Secretary may make the NOFA available only on the Internet at the appropriate Government Web site or through other electronic media, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 226. The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to transfer up to 5 percent or $5,000,000, whichever is less, of the funds appropriated for any office funded under the heading ''Administration, Operations, and Management'' to any other office funded under such heading: *Provided*, That no appropriation for any office funded under the heading ''Administration, Operations, and Management'' shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent or $5,000,000, whichever is less, without prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to transfer up to 5 percent or $5,000,000, whichever is less, of the funds appropriated for any account funded under the general heading ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'' to any other account funded under such heading: *Provided further*,

That no appropriation for any account funded under the general heading ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'' shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent or $5,000,000, whichever is less, without prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may transfer funds made available for salaries and expenses between any office funded under the heading ''Administration, Operations, and Management'' and any account funded under the general heading ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'', but only with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 227. The Disaster Housing Assistance Programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, shall be considered a ''program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development'' under section 904 of the McKinney Act for the purpose of income verifications and matching.

SEC. 228. None of the funds made available by this Act, or any other Act, for purposes authorized under section 8 (only with respect to the tenant-based rental assistance program) and section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) may be used by any public housing agency for any amount of salary, for the chief executive officer of which, or any other official or employee of which, that exceeds the annual rate of basic pay payable for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule at any time during any public housing agency fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 229. Paragraph (1) of section 242(i) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-7(i)(1)) is amended by striking ''July 31, 2011'' and inserting ''July 31, 2016''.

SEC. 230. Subsection (d) of section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) GUARANTEE FEE.—The Secretary shall establish and collect, at the time of issuance of the guarantee, a fee for the guarantee of loans under this section, in an amount not exceeding 3 percent of the principal obligation of the loan. The Secretary may also establish and collect annual premium payments in an amount not exceeding 1 percent of the remaining guaranteed balance (excluding the portion of the remaining balance attributable to the fee collected at the time of issuance of the guarantee). The Secretary shall establish the amount of the fees and premiums by publishing a notice in the Federal Register. The Secretary shall deposit any fees and premiums collected under this subsection in the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund established under subsection (i).''.

SEC. 231. (a) Subsection (b) of section 225 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12755) is amended by inserting at the end the following sentence: ''Such 30 day waiting period is not required if the grounds for the termination or refusal to renew involve a direct threat to the safety of the tenants or employees of the housing, or an imminent and serious threat to the property (and the termination or refusal to renew is in accordance with the requirements of State or local law).''.

(b) Section 231 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12771) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by striking ''make such funds available by direct reallocation'' and all that follows through ''were recaptured'' and inserting ''reallocate the funds by formula in accordance with section 217(d) of this Act (42 U.S.C. 12747(d))''; and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

SEC. 232. Notwithstanding Section 24(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v(o)), amounts made available in prior appropriations Acts under the heading ''Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)'' or under the heading ''Choice Neighborhoods Initiative'' may continue to be provided as assistance pursuant to such Section 24.

SEC. 233. The proviso under the ''Community Development Fund'' heading in Public Laws 109–148, 109–234, 110–252, and 110–329 which requires the Secretary to establish procedures to prevent duplication of benefits and to report to the Committees on Appropriations on all steps to prevent fraud and abuse is amended by striking ''quarterly'' and inserting ''annually''.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 234. Title II of division K of Public Law 110-161 is amended by striking the item related to ''Flexible Subsidy Fund''.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 134, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 235. Notwithstanding the 13th proviso of the second undesignated paragraph under the heading ''Community Planning and Development--Community Development Fund'' in title XII of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5; 123 Stat. 218) and section 1497(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203; 124 Stat. 2209), a State or unit of general local government in a State may use not more than 75 percent of any amounts made available from a grant under such second undesignated paragraph or under such section 1497 for the purpose set forth in section 2301(c)(4)(D) of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 5301 note), at the sole discretion of the State or unit of general local government.

Mr. LATOURETTE (during the reading.) I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman for reserving the point of order. I think when I'm done consuming my 5 minutes, he will perhaps relent and think that that's a bad idea.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Fund has been a valuable tool all across America in helping to revitalize neighborhoods. I would suggest it has one fatal flaw. There are some homes in every community in America, whether it's Detroit, Los Angeles, Cleveland, where I'm from, where some homes just aren't coming back, and you can't revitalize the neighborhoods until you tear those houses down and start afresh.

One of the difficulties with the Neighborhood Stabilization Fund is it restricts the ability for a local community to use those funds to demolish homes. I will tell you from touring a number of these properties in my good friend MARCIA FUDGE's district on the east side of Cleveland, these are firetraps, these are rattraps. The last two Cleveland police officers who have been injured in the line of duty have been injured as they entered a dilapidated home. We toured one home in fact where the expression ''everything but the kitchen sink'' didn't apply because people had actually taken the kitchen sink, the toilet, the wiring, the gutters, and all of the copper.

Cities are stepping up all across the country to take care of this problem. In the State of Ohio, our Attorney General has devoted $75 million from the settlement with the top five big banks to this purpose. Mayor Jackson in Cleveland has expended a considerable amount of money. And Ms. FUDGE and I have introduced legislation that would authorize bonds through the Department of Treasury to supplement the great work that land banks all across this country are doing.

But because that bill languishes in the Ways and Means Committee, this simple amendment would give increased flexibility to communities that want to take grants that they've received from the Federal Government to stabilize their neighborhoods to give them the opportunity to use them for demolition if they reach the conclusion that in order to protect the neighbors in that neighborhood who are paying their taxes or keeping up their house, who are paying their mortgage but whose property values continue to plummet because they have this eyesore next door, that if the mayor of Cleveland or the mayor of Toledo or the mayor of Los Angeles reaches the conclusion that it's better in that instance to rip that house down and start over and work with the land banks that are popping up all across the country, they do that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully ask for passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order, but I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the gentleman from Ohio that I have really no problem with the intent of his amendment, that I think he is talking about something that is very real to a lot of folks.

My understanding is that waivers that have been asked for have all been accepted in the past, and the Secretary has said that if there's a waiver needed, that they would be glad to oblige. But having said that, I just want the gentleman to know that the reason why I must insist on the point of order is simply for consistency on the bill. We have struck on point of order every

other authorizing language that has come before the subcommittee or to the floor today. So with that, while I share his concerns that he has stated, I must insist on my point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment waives existing law.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my great friend from Iowa for those kind words. I know his heart is in the right place, even if his legislative initiatives at this moment are not.

A lot of people don't realize the history of rule XXI. I've had great conversations in the past with the prior Parliamentarians, the last two, Mr. Sullivan and Charlie—I can't remember Charlie's last name. We talked about the notion of equity. We're not only bound by the rules of the House, but just like in courts all across the country, the Chair has the power of equity in his possession.

Rule XXI has its origins in 1844 when John Quincy Adams, the only President of the United States to come back and serve in the House of Representatives, decided that the appropriations process was bogging down and, therefore, we should have rule XXI to prohibit authorizing on appropriations bills. It was designed to keep the appropriators from poaching on the territory of the authorizing committees.

We don't have that here. The chairman of the authorizing committee was just here, Mr. BACHUS. He doesn't have any problem with this. The only person who is raising the point of order and has a problem with this is the distinguished subcommittee chair of the Appropriations Committee. So that's my first argument on equity.

Secondly, because I had some spare time today, I also looked at the precedents of the House, and I would suggest to the Chair that this is a matter of first impression. The last time that this came to the attention of the Parliamentarian was in 2006. And, sadly, there is a big problem with getting the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD online, but we did get the previous one, which was in 1995 when the gentlelady from Missouri at the time, Ms. Danner, whom many of us remember, was attempting to make a provision in order on the Transportation, it wasn't Transportation-HUD at that time, it was the Transportation appropriations bill. And in construing the context of clause 2, rule XXI, the Chair at that time indicated that what she was attempting to do is—we have out of the highway trust fund, 2.8 cents goes to transit. That yields a certain amount of money, and she was attempting to wall off $26 million to go specifically to additional transit projects. The Chair in that instance specifically, and I think correctly, found that you cannot mandate or limit the discretion of the Secretary or another Federal official, nor can you mandate that money be used in a certain way that's not contemplated by the law. As a matter of fact, in section 1057 of the House manual that we all revere here very much, it cites the indications where this has been considered before.

The common theme with all of them is that the person offering the amendment or the Appropriations Committee attempting to implement the policy was attempting to mandate action on the part of a Federal official or mandate that money be spent in a certain way.

I brought up the June 9, 2006, ruling by the Chair, which occurs on page 10673, for those who may be following this at home, and in that instance the offending language was that the statement could not say that not less than a certain sum would be expended on that particular purpose.

This amendment was very carefully crafted. As the Chair, I know being a student of the law and parliamentary procedure, will note that we don't have the words ''not less than,'' it's ''not more than.'' Already the existing legislation, the Dodd-Frank Act, contemplates that States who receive—so there's no change in the Federal appropriation. If the city of Cleveland gets a $100,000 neighborhood stabilization fund, they get to spend it. It doesn't change. There's no Federal involvement after that. It's then up to Mayor Jackson to figure out how to expend it.

This expands the contemplated purpose of that that says a portion is already permitted to be used for demolition. This just says ''not more than.'' It's not a limitation. It just is increased flexibility for the communities that have received these grants. And honest to gosh, you know, with all of the problems that we have around this place, to go back and violate the spirit of John Quincy Adams' understanding of why we needed rule XXI, to prevent State and local communities from having the flexibility to demolish homes where fires are occurring, where people are selling drugs, where people are being murdered, is really beyond me.

So I appeal to the Chair not only based upon the precedents of the House, but upon the inherent authority of the Chair to exercise equity and understand that there might be a ''t'' not crossed or an ''i'' not dotted in this particular instance, but the equitable arguments are on the side of this amendment, and I respectfully ask the Chair to overrule the point of order.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak to the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized.

Ms. KAPTUR. Normally I enjoy working on a bipartisan basis, especially with our good colleague from eastern Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and so in a way I reluctantly rise in opposition to his proposal.

Let me mention that in a way we're into quite a 200-year extensive history of the rules of the House, but in essence the legislation as enacted works. Every single community that I represent that has ever asked HUD for any type of waiver, if the percentage was operating in there to their detriment, it has been granted. And so I think the legislation as is works. It keeps the focus on reinvestment. But if a mayor or if a council wants to use more of their funds for demolition, they merely ask HUD. And, quite frankly, HUD acts in quite an expeditious manner. So I think in a way this is a solution in search of a problem.

I think the gentleman, we welcome his concern about the neighborhoods of this country that have been devastated by the Wall Street-induced housing crisis and lack of regulation here in Washington, but I really don't think it is necessary, and I would support the subcommittee chair and ranking member in their concern by raising a point of order here.

I've expressed my interest in working with the gentleman on any community that you may represent that's facing this situation because every single one that we've had come to us, we have resolved with HUD's full cooperation. So I would support the subcommittee chair's invoking of a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment explicitly supersedes existing law, namely, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 134, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 235. Notwithstanding any other provision of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f et seq.), any amounts made available under this title under the heading ''Public Housing Operating Fund'' and allocated to a public housing agency for activities under section 9(e)(1) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)(1)), and any public housing operating reserve amounts for a public housing agency, may be used by such agency for any eligible activities under section 9(d)(1), in addition to the other purposes for which the amounts

may be used under such heading: *Provided*, That an activity funded pursuant to this section shall be subject to the requirements otherwise governing activities under such section 9(d)(1).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that is of great importance to some of the strongest and best-managed housing authorities in our country.

Currently, housing authorities in our districts receive Federal funds through two distinct streams. One funds day-to-day operations, and the other provides capital funds for construction projects and important modernizations to our Nation's housing stock. Both streams are currently underfunded, not only in this bill but also in the fiscal 2013 administration request.

□ 1510

Now, I believe it's prudent to maintain these two distinct funding streams, but some of our housing authorities do need additional flexibility in tough funding years. Currently, some well-performing housing authorities, like the Raleigh Housing Authority in my district, have created efficiencies in their operating budget and pinched pennies in every way imaginable.

Unfortunately, in order to reallocate these operations savings to urgent capital needs, they have to go through a very cumbersome and cost-ineffective program, that is, HUD's Operating Fund Financing Program. This program requires authorities to go through a financial middleman rather than just letting authorities use their operating funds and savings directly. This process costs unneeded interest payments and it adds unnecessary red tape.

While I hope that our authorizers will be able to improve and streamline this process, I propose that this committee allow housing authorities to use unused operating funds for capital projects directly without having to go through the Operating Fund Financing Program.

My amendment is narrow in scope as it's targeted to 2013 funds and existing reserves only. It's not prospective.

This stopgap solution would provide flexibility for housing authorities, incentivize the wise spending of operating dollars, and help clear up the public housing capital improvement backlog at a time when the construction industry is still reeling from the recession. This amendment would be a win for Americans who need public housing and a win for Americans who are looking for jobs.

This is not a new endeavor for the Transportation and Housing Appropriations bill; indeed, it's a continuation of the public housing operating fund offset discussion that we held last year.

However, I understand that there is a point of order. So I will register the hope that the authorizers can conclude their work to address this issue before the end of the year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment waives existing law.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? Seeing none, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment explicitly supersedes existing law. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman and Members, I rise in opposition to this underlying bill, the Republican Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill for the coming fiscal year, commonly referred to as THUD. This bill drastically underfunds critical transportation, infrastructure, and housing programs.

First, on transportation, the American Society of Civil Engineers' 2009 report for America's infrastructure estimated that there is a $549.5 billion shortfall in investments in roads and bridges, and an additional $190.1 billion shortfall in investments in transit. Yet this bill provides no funds for the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery program, better known as TIGER.

Now, TIGER would finance a wide variety of innovative highway, bridge, and transit projects in urban and rural communities across the country, provided there is sufficient funding. One such project is the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor in Los Angeles County, a light-rail project that will run through my district. TIGER grants could be used to finance stations along this corridor in the communities of Leimert Park and Westchester, thereby ensuring that these communities have access to light-rail.

Last week, I introduced H.R. 5976, the TIGER Grants for Job Creation Act, which would provide a supplemental emergency appropriation of $1 billion over the next 2 years for the TIGER program, and 48 of my colleagues have already cosponsored the bill.

Last night, I offered an amendment to fully fund TIGER at the requested level, without cutting funding for other programs. Representatives BETTY MCCOLLUM, BARBARA LEE, EMANUEL CLEAVER, KAREN BASS, LAURA RICHARDSON, BOBBY RUSH, and DORIS MATSUI joined me in offering this amendment. The Republicans objected to this amendment to their appropriations bill because it was not in order under their rule. So this bill has no funding for this critical program to create jobs by rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure.

Why did we have so much support on this legislation? Why do we have so many people who are signing on to basically beg for TIGER funding? It is because TIGER funding will create millions of jobs. It's because jobs are needed so desperately in this economy. It is because not only will we create millions of jobs, our infrastructure is in great disrepair. We have bridges that have been designated as unsafe. We have roads, we have water projects, we have all kinds of infrastructure needs that are unmet. This is the least that the American public could expect.

This transportation bill has been waited on in many communities across this country. People thought when we passed this bill that we truly were going to expand job opportunities, that we truly were going to repair the infrastructure, but we find that this bill does not do this.

But in addition to the disappointment that we are all experiencing because of the objection to repair of the infrastructure and job creation, we find that the same thing is happening in housing. We bemoan the fact that our veterans are homeless and they are on the streets, and that our shelters are all full, and that when we go into many of these communities—not only in our inner cities, but in our rural areas also—we find that people are not only sleeping on the streets, but under these bridges that are in great disrepair.

This legislation cuts money from the homeless program. This will cut $231 million in homeless assistance grants compared to the President's budget request. At this level, HUD would be unable to fund all renewals of existing grants, jeopardizing assistance to approximately 25,000 of our most vulnerable citizens.

This bill provides less than $2 billion for the Public Housing Capital Fund, despite a $30 million backlog of needed repairs. This is a huge cut, even when compared to funding during the Bush administration. In fact, in fiscal year

2008, the capital account received $2.4 billion in funding. This underfunding means that we will continue to lose public housing units as they fall into disrepair and long-term capital needs are neglected.

The people who are serviced by this account are vulnerable, and so I would simply ask that this be given some real consideration and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, Americans need to know that Tea Party Republican obstructionism has brought us to the brink of yet another manufactured crisis.

We have less than 2 days to pass critical highway and student loan bills that will keep Americans on the job and prevent student loan rates from doubling. Yet Tea Party Republicans are wasting time on frivolous amendments and on a purely meritless, political, and partisan vote to hold the Attorney General in contempt.

Reports indicate that bipartisan Senate leadership has reached a deal on student loans and the highway bill as well, a deal which is now being blocked in the House by the Tea Party Republicans. This is not governing, ladies and gentlemen; it's Tea Party gridlock.

Americans long for a Congress that is capable of honest debate and compromise in solving the important issues of the day. That's what the Founders and the Framers intended of us.

It's been over 100 days since the Senate passed a bipartisan highway bill with 74 votes. While the House Tea Party Republicans quibble, they put 1.9 million jobs at risk.

□ 1520

Mr. Chairman, if the Tea Party Republicans prevent a deal on student loans, over 7.4 million students will see their interest rates double, costing students $6 billion.

They brought us to the brink of a government shut down in February of 2011. Last summer they brought the country to the brink of default and caused the first downgrade in the history of the United States of our credit rating. This year, they opposed the middle class tax cut, and they have successfully ignored and blocked the President's job act.

Mr. Chairman, we should listen to the American people, not the big-dollar corporate backers of the Tea Party. I, myself, never knew that any of the real Tea Partyers of 1776 were millionaires or even wealthy. They were people like the working people of today. We call them the middle class.

Today, we are debating cut after draconian cut to our Nation's transportation and housing programs, which impact and hurt the middle class. These cuts put good, middle class jobs at risk. They make it harder for small businesses to operate, and they cause harm to low-income Americans who are struggling to put food on the table and a roof over their heads.

The Tea Party-millionaire Republicans will spend all week circling the toilet bowl drain and debating these amendments that have no chance of becoming law, when we should be lowering student loan rates and passing a long-term highway bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great country, but how long can we withstand the best efforts of this millionaire Tea Party Republican Congress to bring America to its knees?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is no secret to anyone in this Chamber that the American people are unhappy with Congress. In fact, our approval ratings could only be described as terrible. As much as television personalities might like to analyze why, I don't think it's difficult to understand. Time and time again, Mr. Chairman, our work ignores their priorities.

Now, under Republican leadership, we have spent months arguing over eliminating regulations, shrinking government, and crippling the Obama administration. Yet since the lowest point of economic downturn in 2008, the American people have cared mostly about two things: good jobs and stable housing. These are issues that have hit the African American community especially hard, which is why I come to the floor today with several of my colleagues from the Congressional Black Caucus.

Today, Mr. Chairman, unemployment among African Americans is above 13 percent, much higher than the national average. Concerns about stable housing are really nothing new, but they have been especially difficult since the start of our recession. In fact, 42 percent of homeless families with children are African American. So we were all glad to see the House take up the Transportation-HUD bill this week. We hoped to see some relief for our struggling communities.

But sadly, this bill falls short. It fails to adequately fund project-based section 8 rental assistance for low-income families. That means over 1.2 million families, Mr. Chairman, would be at risk of losing their homes. These are primarily seniors, families with children, and people with disabilities, including many who are in the great Hoosier State in my district.

The bill cuts homeless assistance grants, leaving an estimated 25,000 people without the assistance they need to get back on their feet. It entirely eliminates the Choice Neighborhoods program. In Indianapolis, we need these funds to rebuild blighted public housing projects, improve economic development and job opportunities in surrounding neighborhoods for low-income families.

It also eliminates the Sustainable Communities, which coordinates Federal, State and local public housing investments, helping communities make the best with limited funding.

I also want to add that I plan to strongly oppose any amendment that makes it harder to enforce the Fair Housing Act. Congress should not restrict HUD's work to end housing discrimination, intentional or unintentional.

These cuts, Mr. Chairman, strike at the very heart of what my constituents care about, having a stable place for their families to live and stay.

Over the last several months, Mr. Chairman, there has been one topic we have all agreed on, transportation projects equal jobs. Now, sadly, this bill defunds some of our most important job-creating programs. It eliminates funding for TIGER grants, which have put thousands of people to work across this country. My district received one of these grants to construct our great cultural trail. Many of my constituents worked to construct this trail, and today it is absolutely revitalizing neighborhoods and growing businesses and creating long-term job opportunities.

This bill also eliminates funding for high-speed rail, which early estimates predict could have created thousands of jobs in the great Hoosier State. Now, of course, there are other issues; but there are too many to name at this time.

But in talking today, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to express my disappointment. This week we are finally considering the one bill each year that must address top priorities for all Americans, jobs and housing. Instead, we're cutting programs.

My question to these people is, Mr. Chairman, and those obstructionists, what are you expecting our communities to do?

These are programs that work. They employ our constituents, Mr. Chairman, and they also improve our society.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, here we are once again. We find ourselves debating a bill that is under veto threat due to the Republicans my-way-or-the-highway posture.

Mr. Chairman, last month saw the largest drop in construction jobs in 2 years, workers who joined the more than 2.2 million construction workers who are out of work.

However, instead of providing certainty to our Nation's construction workers by investing in the TIGER program and light-speed rail, the Republican majority has actually zeroed these programs out completely. Apparently, the majority seems to only believe in certainty when it means historically low tax rates for multi-millionaires and billionaires.

Mr. Chairman, the majority's lack of investment in our Nation's infrastructure is bad enough. Unfortunately, it gets even worse. At a time when the need for HUD programs is growing, this bill drastically undercuts homeless assistance grants, putting 25,000 Americans at risk of losing assistance. It jeopardizes assistance to homeowners attempting to stay in their homes and actually zeroes out the Choice Neighborhoods program. Why?

Mr. Chairman, why we would essentially eliminate a program that improves economic development and viability and job opportunities for our Nation's most vulnerable is beyond my ability to comprehend.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have made it abundantly clear that the number one priority of the 112th Congress ought to be job creation.

□ 1530

By bringing this bill to the floor, the majority is saying to the American people, not only doesn't their unemployed status or opinions matter, but don't expect any relief from this Republican-led Congress as our Nation struggles to cope with the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression.

Mr. Chairman, this is just totally unbelievable. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2013''.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

ACCESS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Access Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, $7,400,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation funds received for publications and training expenses.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 307), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902, $25,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 135, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $900,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $900,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the proposed funding for salaries and expenses for the Federal Maritime Commission by $900,000. This is not a cut. This is just to keep those salaries at what they are, to cap it at the 2012 levels. This is one of 13 offices that would receive increases for salaries or administrative expenses in the underlying bill.

I urge the support of my amendment, which would just freeze these salaries.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Maritime Commission is responsible for resolving disputes between shippers—both foreign and domestic—and the public, protecting consumers from unfair business practices, and monitoring ocean transportation and trade.

The increase in this account has to do with the annualization of already onboard personnel and of the increases in the claims and the workload of the Federal Maritime Commission. To reduce this account, you will affect the backlog of cases and claims, thus costing businesses, exporters, and ports time and money while they wait for the FMC to adjudicate their claims.

Usually, we are in the business of trying to reduce backlogs and delays in doing business. With that, I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I will be very brief.

I merely want to concur in the position of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $25,000,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern the obtaining of such services within the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may select, appoint, and employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Office of Inspector General, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern such selections, appointments, and employment within Amtrak: *Provided further*, That concurrent with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2014, the Inspector General shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2014 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS–15; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902), $102,400,000, of which not to exceed $2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses. The amounts made available to the National Transportation Safety Board in this Act include amounts necessary to make lease payments on an obligation incurred in fiscal year 2001 for a capital lease.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101–8107), $145,300,000: *Provided*, That in addition, $80,000,000 shall be made available until expended to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for mortgage foreclosure mitigation activities, under the following terms and conditions:

(1) The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (''NRC'') shall make grants to counseling intermediaries approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (with match to be determined by the NRC based on affordability and the economic conditions of an area; a match also may be waived by the NRC based on the aforementioned conditions) to provide mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance primarily to States and areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures to help eliminate the default and foreclosure of mortgages of owner-occupied single-family homes that are at risk of such foreclosure. Other than areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures, grants may also be provided to approved counseling intermediaries based on a geographic analysis of the Nation by the NRC which determines where there is a prevalence of mortgages that are risky and likely to fail, including any trends for mortgages that are likely to default and face foreclosure. A State Housing Finance Agency may also be eligible where the State Housing Finance Agency meets all the requirements under this paragraph. A HUD-approved counseling intermediary shall meet certain mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance counseling requirements, as determined by the

NRC, and shall be approved by HUD or the NRC as meeting these requirements.

(2) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance shall only be made available to homeowners of owner-occupied homes with mortgages in default or in danger of default. These mortgages shall likely be subject to a foreclosure action and homeowners will be provided such assistance that shall consist of activities that are likely to prevent foreclosures and result in the long-term affordability of the mortgage retained pursuant to such activity or another positive outcome for the homeowner. No funds made available under this paragraph may be provided directly to lenders or homeowners to discharge outstanding mortgage balances or for any other direct debt reduction payments.

(3) The use of Mortgage Foreclosure Mitigation Assistance by approved counseling intermediaries and State Housing Finance Agencies shall involve a reasonable analysis of the borrower's financial situation, an evaluation of the current value of the property that is subject to the mortgage, counseling regarding the assumption of the mortgage by another non-Federal party, counseling regarding the possible purchase of the mortgage by a non-Federal third party, counseling and advice of all likely restructuring and refinancing strategies or the approval of a work-out strategy by all interested parties.

(4) NRC may provide up to 15 percent of the total funds under this paragraph to its own charter members with expertise in foreclosure prevention counseling, subject to a certification by the NRC that the procedures for selection do not consist of any procedures or activities that could be construed as an unacceptable conflict of interest or have the appearance of impropriety.

(5) HUD-approved counseling entities and State Housing Finance Agencies receiving funds under this paragraph shall have demonstrated experience in successfully working with financial institutions as well as borrowers facing default, delinquency and foreclosure as well as documented counseling capacity, outreach capacity, past successful performance and positive outcomes with documented counseling plans (including post mortgage foreclosure mitigation counseling), loan workout agreements and loan modification agreements. NRC may use other criteria to demonstrate capacity in underserved areas.

(6) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to $3,000,000 may be made available to build the mortgage foreclosure and default mitigation counseling capacity of counseling intermediaries through NRC training courses with HUD-approved counseling intermediaries and their partners, except that private financial institutions that participate in NRC training shall pay market rates for such training.

(7) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to 5 percent may be used for associated administrative expenses for the NRC to carry out activities provided under this section.

(8) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance grants may include a budget for outreach and advertising, and training, as determined by the NRC.

(9) The NRC shall continue to report bi-annually to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as well as the Senate Banking Committee and House Financial Services Committee on its efforts to mitigate mortgage default.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 137, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,300,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $12,300,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Funding for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation is over $12 million higher than what the President's budget request was. Now, the President and I don't typically see eye to eye on most spending issues, but I am proud to support his requested level of funding for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

By supporting my amendment, why don't we show the American people that we are serious about our Nation's fiscal crisis and that both parties are capable of working together by setting the funding back to the President's requested funding level for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, which would save the American taxpayers over $12 million.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. This is one of those cases in which we've gone back and forth here today with the gentleman from California. This must be the eighth or ninth of these, and it's hard to find ways of being very creative or original about what you're saying.

The interesting thing here is that, for some of the time, the gentleman has been going back to whatever we had done several years ago, going back arbitrarily to some point in the past. Here, of course, he is supporting the President's position. I was not aware that the gentleman from California supported the President's position in much of anything.

Mr. LATHAM. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is from Georgia.

Mr. OLVER. Excuse me. Thank you very much.

Please forgive me. You don't even look alike. I think I was mistaking you for a different member of the California delegation.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa for correcting me.

In any case, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The gentleman's amendment would take the position of this subcommittee down by $12.3 million. Basically, the position of the subcommittee has been that we are providing a little bit more for the NeighborWorks program than the President requested and that we are providing a little bit less for the HUD Counseling program than the President requested. Together, though, they would be about the same.

NeighborWorks, which is what the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation's common name is, is a major nonprofit organization that operates all over the country. It has affiliates in 50 States, and I'm sure it has an affiliate somewhere in the gentleman's district. The NeighborWorks program is a group that we relied on very heavily to do counseling during the very height of the foreclosure crisis 3 or 4 years ago. We relied on it to go out there and actually contract with and manage the process of providing counseling to hundreds of thousands of people who were engaged in or who were subject to foreclosure.

So we on our side, on this side—in this branch at least—have felt that NeighborWorks has been a very good organization, which is in large part why we have given them a little bit more and why we have given a little bit less to the HUD program.

We argued the HUD program last night. They leverage something close to $4 billion in direct investments to serve low- and moderate-income families through all of their affiliates in all the work that they do. It's a very, very good and reliable organization that we've come to value very highly.

They also administered this Foreclosure Mitigation Counseling program, which gives targeted assistance to families at risk of losing their homes. The gentleman seems to cut this account because it is above the President's request, but I think I have explained that we're slightly above on this one and slightly below on the other one.

Again, I would say I was not aware that the gentleman from Georgia—I went to California again, didn't I?—was such a fan of the President's request numbers, that he valued them so highly. I believe—and I think that my chairman believes—that NeighborWorks is deserving of this small increase, and I believe that Chairman LATHAM has thoughtfully targeted resources in this area. I hope the amendment will be defeated, and I urge the Members to vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1540

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

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

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

NeighborWorks really is a program that has some metrics in place to make sure that the dollars are used correctly in a proper way. In Iowa and across the country, about every dollar that goes through NeighborWorks leverages $48 in non-Federal direct investment because of it.

I just want to reiterate that we've gone through every line in this appropriations bill, tried to make decisions that would increase growth, job creation, tried to do the very best job we could. We've looked at every area. There are some priorities of things

that actually work that we've tried to sustain funding for.

I just don't want folks to forget overall in this bill, we are nearly $4 billion below last year's funding level. That's a cut of $4 billion. It's $2 billion below the President's request. I think, as one gentleman here today stated, this is the largest percentage reduction of any appropriation bill yet to come to the floor. We're trying to be fiscally responsible, to actually prioritize spending in this bill to things that actually work.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in opposition to this amendment and to say to the gentleman from Georgia that I don't really know where you might live in Georgia, but imagine neighborhoods in our country where there is no private lender with competitive rates; imagine neighborhoods that are crammed at the edges with payday lenders who are more than willing to bilk people who have checks to cash, maybe even Social Security checks, and they charge them royally for that; imagine a neighborhood where there is no church-run credit union, maybe a multilingual neighborhood with no lending arm of any reputable institution. If there is somebody in the neighborhood willing to make a loan, such as a loan shark, they charge fees. Imagine the trouble that a family can get into. Imagine how difficult it is in those neighborhoods to accumulate capital to make a loan because everything is being taken out by predatory practices and nothing is put back in.

NeighborWorks is one of the few institutions in this country that has proven itself and works in exactly those kinds of neighborhood. NeighborWorks tries to save families and give them a chance to get on the ladder up to opportunity. Particularly during this time, when we know we've had the largest transfer of wealth in American history from Main Street to Wall Street. NeighborWorks is a lifeline. People have had their equity taken away, including in neighborhoods like I'm talking about, where people were beginning to own their own homes for the first time, where they needed financial counseling, mortgage counseling, advice on if you're going to buy a home, what a reasonable down payment is, based on how much do they earn. People need sound advice on mortgages—that you shouldn't pay more than this out of your check so you don't get in trouble. People need advice as they try to find reputable people to repair their homes so they get a decent price on their roof and gutters—it all seems so simple if you live in the suburbs, and you've got enough money, and the region is not disinvested, and you're not living at the edge.

NeighborWorks is one of those programs that is needed, particularly at this time in our country with the housing market being in the condition that it is. With the enormous challenges facing built communities in the built environment in city after city, NeighborWorks serves community after community, both urban and rural. It's amazing what's happened even to rural small towns in this country and their emptying out that is really historic in nature.

A program like NeighborWorks has proven itself time and again. It pays back to the American people their equity not being lost, in helping capital accumulate in some of the most forgotten corners of this country, and with their staff that are highly trained and highly reputable.

I would not want to be without NeighborWorks in Ohio, not in the housing situation that we're facing today. I'm not sure about Georgia. But I would bet in Atlanta they value NeighborWorks if they have one, and I assume that they do. But you have to imagine yourself living in a place like you may not know. And for the American Dream to happen, organizations like NeighborWorks are absolutely essential.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think it may be well intentioned, but I think it's going to achieve exactly the wrong result. I think Chairman LATHAM of the full committee and Ranking Member OLVER have reached an accommodation here to help our housing market recover in some of the most forgotten places and not to have any more hemorrhaging of equity and investment capital across this country. I urge a no vote on the Broun Amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chair, 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 Georgia will be postponed.

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

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor about a half an hour ago and went back to my office stunned by the defeat at the hands of Mr. LATHAM and his point of order and the ruling of the Parliamentarian and the Chair at the time and the interesting comments from my friend from western Ohio, who I trust, after she has the opportunity to meet with Mr. Rokakis and Mr. KILDEE in Michigan and Cleveland, will have a different view on whether or not the Neighborhood Stabilization fund, without additional resources to demolish homes, is working well.

When I got back to the office, I turned on the television and I saw—I like a good Republican bashing as much as other folks, but a string of speakers came to the microphone and just bashed the lack of a Republican plan on transportation.

I'm not going to go back to 1844, but I am going to go back to September of 2009, the last bill, SAFETEA–LU, expired in September of 2009. In September of 2009—people who know the answer, you can shout it out—the President of the United States was a Democrat, Barack Obama, who is currently the President today. The majority leader in the United States Senate—shout it out if you know it—was HARRY REID, a Democrat of Nevada. The Speaker of the House was the first woman-elected Speaker in the history of the United States, NANCY PELOSI of California.

The Democratic Party controlled all three levers of the Federal Government. They had in position as the chairman of the Transportation Infrastructure Committee a gentleman who has forgotten more about transportation than most of us will ever learn, Jim Oberstar of Minnesota. Mr. Oberstar prepared a 6-year fully funded, robust Federal transportation 6-year reauthorization. He was not allowed by the leadership within the Democratic Party to bring that bill forward.

So for people to come to the floor and say that Mr. LATHAM is not doing his job, this negotiation that is going on on the transportation authorization currently is somehow a failure of Republican leadership, I say get up and look in the mirror. You have to take a look at the fact that everybody is responsible for this mess, and everybody knows that you don't fix the Nation's infrastructure unless you provide the necessary resources to fund the trust fund. Both parties are guilty of being absent without leave, but to blame it and to hang it on the Republican Party is worse than nonsense. It completely ignores historical fact.

One other factoid about the President of the United States, President Obama. He has become the first President since Dwight Eisenhower to not send up his vision of a comprehensive transportation reauthorization bill. A lot of people in this House weren't even born when Dwight Eisenhower was the President of the United States, but he became the first President. And our good friend and former colleague, Mr. LaHood, who is the Secretary of Transportation, he would come before the subcommittee year after year after year and had no ideas, no gas tax, no vehicle miles traveled, no idea how we're going to replenish the highway trust fund until this year. Until this year, he came and said: I've got this

brainy idea. We're going to fund it with OCO, the overseas contingency account, that the United States has used to support our troops in conflicts around the world.

It was worse than fiction; it was a fantasy. And he knew it, but he delivered it with a straight face. I give him a lot of credit for that. But to come to the floor and attempt to hang this around the Republicans for failing to lead on transportation is laughable. Ours is the party of Teddy Roosevelt and the Panama Canal, Abraham Lincoln and the transcontinental railroad, Dwight Eisenhower and the interstate highway system. Ronald Reagan and George Bush all supported working wages to build our infrastructure.

□ 1550

We will not take a back seat, nor will we be criticized by a party that completely failed in its mandate given to them in the election of 2008 to do a single thing, to employ people in the transportation sector and to move this country forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness in carrying out the functions pursuant to title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, $3,300,000.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 401. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2013 pay raises for programs funded in this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act or previous appropriations Acts.

SEC. 402. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 403. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 404. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 405. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2013, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

(1) creates a new program;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

(4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either the House or Senate Committees on Appropriations for a different purpose;

(5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less;

(6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or

(7) creates, reorganizes, or restructures a branch, division, office, bureau, board, commission, agency, administration, or department different from the budget justifications submitted to the Committees on Appropriations or the table accompanying the explanatory statement accompanying this Act, whichever is more detailed, unless prior approval is received from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the report shall include:

(A) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(B) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation; and

(C) an identification of items of special congressional interest: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated or limited for salaries and expenses for an agency shall be reduced by $100,000 per day for each day after the required date that the report has not been submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 406. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2013 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2013 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2014, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines under section 405 of this Act.

SEC. 407. All Federal agencies and departments that are funded under this Act shall issue a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on all sole-source contracts by no later than July 30, 2013. Such report shall include the contractor, the amount of the contract and the rationale for using a sole-source contract.

SEC. 408. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or ''new age'' belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N–915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 409. No funds in this Act may be used to support any Federal, State, or local projects that seek to use the power of eminent domain, unless eminent domain is employed only for a public use: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities: *Provided further*, That any use of funds for mass transit, railroad, airport, seaport or highway projects as well as utility projects which benefit or serve the general public (including energy-related, communication-related, water-related and wastewater-related infrastructure), other structures designated for use by the general public or which have other common-carrier or public-utility functions that serve the general public and are subject to regulation and oversight by the government, and projects for the removal of an immediate threat to public health and safety or brownfields as defined in the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Public Law 107–118) shall be considered a public use for purposes of eminent domain.

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 411. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service, and has within 90 days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year, made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 412. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 148, line 11, after ''entity will'', insert ''ensure that domestic content makes up 85 percent of all steel, iron, and manufactured goods, including rolling stock, and''.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we just heard a rather strong plea from one of my Republican colleagues about the transportation program and whether Democrats and Republicans should continue to fight about who did what when or didn't do it.

This amendment is something that we all ought to agree to. This amendment is something that both Democrats and Republicans should be supporting. This amendment is about American jobs—not foreign jobs, not about shifting our jobs overseas, but rather about bringing those jobs back home. This amendment is about making it in America. This amendment is about no longer allowing our tax money to be spent on foreign-made equipment but, rather, to require that our tax money be spent on American-made equipment so that there will be American jobs.

This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. This is an all-American issue. This is about making it in America. It simply says that the current 60 percent requirement is insufficient and that we ought to have a higher requirement of 85 percent. And I will argue strongly—and I think correctly—that 85 percent is achievable.

I'll give two examples: In a recent contract for the new BART trains, the Bay Area Rapid Transit trains, one bidder—a French company, Alstom—said that they could build those trains at 95 percent. A second bidder—foreign, Bombardier—said they would do it at 66 percent. Unfortunately, BART decided to go with the 66 percent because it was a couple of percentage points cheaper. $1 billion in American jobs were lost.

Within a month after that, Los Angeles wanted to build some new transit cars. Siemens said they could build those transit cars at 85 percent American content. They lost that bid to a Korean company because there was a couple of percentage points difference. Again, millions of American jobs, millions of dollars spent overseas, and American jobs lost.

It's time for us to bring the jobs home. It's time for us to onshore. It's time for us to make it in America. And it's time for us, as Democrats and Republicans, to do just that. And that's what this amendment does.

I suspect it will be ruled out of order. What a shame. What a shame that we cannot stand here on the floor, amend a bill that's going to, over time, spend $60 billion, and not require that that money, our tax money, be spent in America.

What's wrong with making it in America? Oh, I suppose it has to do with some point of order. Do you think the American public really wants to hear a point of order? Or do they want to hear about American-made equipment and American jobs? No. We'll do a point of order, which I will appeal and probably lose. And thousands upon thousands of American jobs will be lost because of a point of order rather than for this House to stand up and say, We're going to make it in America. We're going to spend our tax money on American jobs, on American-made equipment.

So give me your point of order, and let's see what the American public has to say about your point of order.

I yield back the balance of my time

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, we had a markup this morning in Appropriations, and I supported an amendment about American content. And I believe that this is probably a very, very good amendment.

To be consistent—and I have raised points of order against some things that I support today, one offered by my good friend from Ohio, and other amendments that I would otherwise be supportive of if they were not breaking precedent to the rules of the House.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to speak on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. On the point of order, I thank the chairman for his thoughts on the issue. But for his consistency, I cannot thank him. I think I understand that we seem to operate on rules, unless we don't want to operate on those rules.

I understand that the chairman is interested in this issue and has worked, as chairman of the subcommittee, to try to raise the level of American-made, and I thank him for that.

We have an opportunity here to really take this issue up and put aside the rules and do what's good for America. This is about billions and billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of jobs. We ought to put it aside, put aside the consistency and deal with American jobs.

I don't know what my opportunity will be to overrule the point of order. But I'm going to do everything I possibly can to see that we have American-made jobs and that we spend our tax money on American-made equipment.

I do understand the chairman's position and the bind that he's in. But sometimes consistency doesn't lead to the right result.

□ 1600

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 3, language in an appropriation bill that is subject to a point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI but is permitted to remain, such as by waiver in House Resolution 697, may be modified by germane amendment that does not contain additional legislation.

Section 412 of the bill constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI that has been permitted to remain. The amendment by the gentleman from California would expand section 412 by imposing on entities by the bill an additional restriction on expenditure of funds in the bill, to wit: that 85 percent of a certain class of goods be procured domestically. That expansion constitutes additional legislation.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I have an amendment that would prohibit funds from being used to enforce congressionally mandated Temporary Flight Restrictions, or TFRs, for sports stadiums. These permanent TFRs, to be quite honest with you, are impractical, they're ineffective, and they create serious problems for hundreds of thousands of pilots, countless air shows, aerial surveyors, and a whole lot of other small businesses and individuals that utilize aviation.

In 2004, Congress mandated the FAA to impose permanent TFRs in the airspace above and around sports stadiums with a seating capacity greater than 30,000. Think of these as restricted airspace bubbles that basically extend 3,000 feet high and they have a 3½ mile-wide radius that is in effect 1 hour prior to the event to 1 hour just after the event. And in any given year, there are roughly 3,000 of these stadium TFRs.

Now, proponents of these claim that they bolster national security and mitigate an aerial threat. I can't help but absolutely laugh at that assertion. First, there's absolutely no realtime mechanism or capability to prevent an aerial attack originating within or outside the 3½ miles at 3,000 feet above ground level, and the logic would apply even if the restrictions were expanded exponentially. In fact, if you take a jet traveling at 500 miles an hour, it's just going to take a few seconds to penetrate that TFR to reach that stadium.

It's also very convenient that the proponents of these TFRs are exempt from the restrictions that they successfully sought after.

The bottom line is the FAA doesn't want or need these congressionally mandated TFRs. In fact, the FAA publicly stated they would not issue these TFRs absent the congressional mandate, but, rather, they would use their existing authority to coordinate with local law enforcement to issue them on a case-by-case basis. That's what we're trying to get at.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to reiterate these stadium TFRs do nothing to improve security. And I would yield time to anybody out there, any Member, that would like to try and make the argument while keeping a straight face that they do improve security.

These TFRs are about banner towers, which is to prevent what sports groups call ''guerilla advertisers,'' from operating within the airspace around these stadiums. That's all this is about. And what was Congress's solution? We simply gave complete control of the airspace to sports teams and exempted them from their own restrictions. And I think that's wrong.

In light of the fact that I would like to solve this issue eventually instead of trying to ram an issue through or try to push something through that could fail or be passed, I'd rather come up with a good piece of legislation that actually solves the problem and addresses some of the concerns. That's basically what I was trying to do.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman for his comments today. He has been a tremendous advocate for this position. We have talked on many occasions about this particular subject. He is working very hard to resolve the issue.

I would hope that we could have some public hearings and actually get input to make sure that we make the right decisions, and I certainly would want to work with the gentleman to make sure that we do get a full hearing on this issue, that everything can be brought to light, and we're all concerned about homeland security, safety issues, all those things. I think the gentleman makes a very, very good point, and would just offer to do everything we can to work with him.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I want to thank the chairman for the comments and look forward to working on this. I think this is an issue that we can solve and an issue that we can fix ultimately for all those pilots out there and the folks that are concerned.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 413. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c).

SEC. 414. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class airline accommodations in contravention of sections 301–10.122 and 301–10.123 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 415. None of the funds made available under this Act or any prior Act may be provided to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, or allied organizations.

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to any corporation that was convicted (or had an officer or agent of such corporation acting on behalf of the corporation convicted) of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation, or such officer or agent, and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 417. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 418. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Sixth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Seventh amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Eighth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Ninth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Tenth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Eleventh amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Twelfth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Thirteenth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Fourteenth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. CHAFFETZ of Utah.

Second amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the sixth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) 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 168, noes 256, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

AYES—168

Adams
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—256

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews

Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Engel
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1636

Ms. SEWELL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. CARTER, CRENSHAW, COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Messrs. ELLISON and HUNTER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. TERRY and ISSA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the seventh amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 240, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

AYES—178

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—240

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews
Bass (CA)
Cantor
Engel
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Pence
Schrader
Stivers
Sullivan
Thompson (MS)

□ 1640

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the eighth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 248, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

AYES—174

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—248

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews
Conyers
Gohmert
Hall
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1644

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the ninth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 229, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

AYES—193

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—229

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)

Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Burton (IN)
Gohmert
Hall
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Schmidt
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1648

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the tenth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 247, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

AYES—178

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—247

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1652

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the eleventh amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 250, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—169

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—250

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

Bass (CA)
Conyers
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Meeks
Schakowsky
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Waters

□ 1655

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 429, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the twelfth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 264, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—160

Adams
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—264

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul

Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Gohmert
Harris
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1658

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the thirteenth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 249, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—172

Adams
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—249

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Akin
Carson (IN)
DeFazio
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
McCarthy (NY)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1702

Mr. POLIS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the fourteenth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—172

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Benishek
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais

Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—250

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Bilirakis
Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1705

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 267, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

AYES—157

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Upton
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—267

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1710

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 80, noes 342, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

AYES—80

Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Bartlett
Black
Blackburn
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Harris
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Long
Lummis
Manzullo
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Royce
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder

NOES—342

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Gutierrez
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1713

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 434, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 300, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

AYES—123

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Culberson
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emerson
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Long
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paul
Pence
Petri
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Stearns
Stutzman
Thornberry

Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—300

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bass (CA)
Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1717

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 242, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

AYES—178

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lipinski
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—242

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Berg | Jackson (IL) | Paul |
| Bucshon | Johnson, E. B. | Rehberg |
| Frank (MA) | Lewis (CA) | Stivers |
| Gohmert | Mack | Thompson (MS) |

□ 1720

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, 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. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2015

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEST) at 8 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE REPORT 112–546 AND ACCOMPANYING RESOLUTION, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 706, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM TO INITIATE OR INTERVENE IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS TO ENFORCE CERTAIN SUBPOENAS

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–553) on the resolution (H. Res. 708) relating to the consideration of House Report 112–546 and an accompanying resolution, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 706) authorizing the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT). Pursuant to House Resolution 697 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5972.

Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST) kindly take the chair.

□ 2017

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEST (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 11 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 150, line 9.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I want to begin by thanking the committee for its extraordinarily hard work in identifying ways to cut spending.

All of us hear from our constituents. They want us to reduce what the Federal Government spends, to be wise and proper stewards of the Federal taxpayer dollar. All too often, they look at Washington and they see a monument to waste of the American taxpayer dollar.

Mr. Chairman, for the legislation that is in front of us, the fiscal year 2013 proposed funding level is $51.6 billion, which is $1.9 billion below the President's request. I think it is admirable that we have saved nearly $2 billion below the President's request. However, we know that there is much more work that can be done, that should be done, that must be done. Therefore, my 1 percent across-the-board spending reduction amendment will save taxpayers an additional $516 million.

□ 2020

That is $516 million that our children and our grandchildren will not have to pay back with interest.

I'm fully aware of the strong opposition that many appropriators have for these across-the-board spending cuts. When I've offered these cuts, I have been told that ''the cuts of this magnitude, quite honestly, go too deep.'' I've also heard that these 1 percent spending reductions would be ''very damaging to our national security and to things that are important to life and property.''

However, the taxpayers are demanding that the bureaucracy do what they are doing and save a penny on a dollar. Our Governors are quite active in this arena. Of course, we have heard from former Governor Mitt Romney, Governor Chris Christie, Governor Rick Perry, Governor Mitch Daniels, Governor Brian Schweitzer, Governor Chris Gregoire, just to name a few of our State executives. In the chairman's home State of Iowa, former Democratic Governor Chet Culver issued a 10 percent across-the-board spending reduction.

These across-the-board spending cuts are used around our country in a bipartisan fashion, and the reason they are is because they work. They work. This is how you get results, by actually cutting into the baseline and reducing the outlays of government. They are effective because they cut spending within each agency and force each agency to do a review and find the waste and find ways to preserve those precious dollars that are coming from the taxpayers.

Admiral Mullen made the statement that ''the greatest risk to our Nation's security is our Nation's debt.'' Mr. Chairman, we all know that. The American people know this. They have grown ill and fatigued with what they see as waste of their money here in Washington because this government never satisfies its appetite for the taxpayers' dollar. Because of that, because they think they can go to the well and ask for more, because they think they can go to the presses and print those dollars, they don't do the hard work of prioritizing. That is what we're to do here in this House.

In that spirit of forcing the actions of prioritizing, forcing the actions of the bureaucracy, having to save one penny on a dollar so that our children and grandchildren are not paying that back with interest, that is the reason that I bring these amendments. It's important because right now we're borrowing 40 cents of every dollar that we spend. We cannot afford this. It is incumbent upon us to make certain that we do the hard work, that we cut a little more, that we make the demands on the bureaucracy that our constituents are making on their businesses and on their family budgets. It is time for us to save just a penny on a dollar, make the cut, do it for our children and future generations.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.