

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. I once again urge the House of Representatives to set politics aside and immediately take up legislation to right this wrong.

#### STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, it's time that the Congress get to work and stop this doubling of the interest rates on our student loans.

I'd like to take this moment to remind my colleagues here in the House that our generation was able to graduate from universities and enjoy great success for the most part debt free because college costs were less and we were able to get a combination of grants and scholarships.

What we're doing to today's generation is unforgivable; it's unconscionable. They're expected to graduate with \$30,000 in debt, on average. We were able to start building families and homes and businesses and buy cars. Our generation that we're handing over to is expected to pay loans. We just simply cannot allow this to happen. It's not right.

We all have an obligation to pay forward. This country has been so good to our generation; it's time for us to pay back. Let's step up, get to work, and stop this increase from taking place.

And last, but not least, let's put it in perspective. For what we spent on the war in Iraq, \$1 trillion, we could have sent an entire generation of young men and women through college and let them graduate debt free.

Let's get our priorities in order, Mr. Speaker.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 further consideration of H.R. 2609, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 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. 2609.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) kindly take the chair.

□ 1235

##### 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. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. HOLDING (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, July 9, 2013, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 60, line 12.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B)) with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, in this House, in 2007, a bill was passed called the Energy Independence and Security Act. One of the features of this bill was to take away consumer choice when deciding which light bulbs our constituents could use in their own homes. Since that time, I have heard from literally tens of thousands of people on the inequities of this provision. Mr. Chairman, they're right.

While the government has passed energy-efficiency standards in other realms over the years, they have never moved so far and lowered standards so drastically to a point where at this date, over 5 years, the technology is still years off in making light bulbs that are compliant with the 2007 law and at a price point that the average American can afford.

Last year, light bulb companies talked about their new 2007 law-compliant bulbs that are available now, but they're available at price points of \$20, \$30, \$40, and \$50 each bulb.

Opponents to my amendment will claim that the 2007 language does not ban the incandescent bulb. This is true. It bans the sale of the 100-watt, the 60-watt, and the 45-watt bulbs. The replacement bulbs are far from economically efficient, even if they are energy efficient. A family living paycheck to paycheck can't afford to replace every bulb in their house at \$25 a bulb, even if those bulbs will last 20 years.

This Congress should be on the side of the consumer and on the side of consumer choice. If the new energy-effi-

cient light bulbs save money and if they're better for the environment, we should trust our constituents to make the choice on their own toward these bulbs. Let the market decide. We should not be forcing these light bulbs on the American people. The bottom line is the Federal Government has no business taking away the freedom of choice from Americans as to what type of light bulbs to use in their homes.

The columnist, George Will, speaking on a television program back in December of 2007, describing the efforts of the then-110th Congress, was fairly disparaging. He pointed out that Congress had not done much work in the calendar year 2007. He went on to say that the sole functions of the Federal Government are to defend the borders and deliver the mail, but all the Congress had managed to do was ban the incandescent bulb.

This exact amendment was passed the past 2 years by voice vote and both times was included in the legislation signed into law by President Obama. It allows consumers to continue to have a choice and a say as to what they put in their homes. It's common sense. Let's give some relief to American families at least until replacement light bulbs can be marketed at prices that don't break the bank.

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 rise in opposition to the very distinguished Member's amendment—Dr. BURGESS—and simply say that his amendment would prohibit the Department of Energy from promulgating light bulb efficiency standards.

It is a common misunderstanding that there is some type of ban on the incandescent light bulb that effectively requires people to have the limited choice of only a compact fluorescent bulb. This is simply not true. Regulations require only that bulbs be more efficient.

So this debate really isn't about choice—or energy efficiency for that matter. It's about endangering American jobs, specifically American manufacturing jobs. Given that American manufacturers have committed to following the law regardless of whether or not it is enforced, the only benefit of this ill-informed rider is to allow foreign manufacturers who may not feel a similar obligation to import non-compliant light bulbs that will not only harm the investments made by U.S. companies, but place at risk the U.S. manufacturing jobs associated with making compliant bulbs.

Further, it is the equivalent of a \$100 tax on every American family—that's \$16 billion across our Nation—through increased energy costs.

The performance standards for light bulbs were established in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. At that time, the bill enjoyed strong

bipartisan support of both Republicans and Democrats. Ninety-five House Republicans voted for final passage, and the bill was signed into law by President Bush.

As far as I'm aware, the issues that inspired this standard have not changed and, I would argue, have gotten worse. Families are struggling every day to meet rising energy bills, and there are real savings to be had by moving to more efficient light bulbs.

Further, while claiming that the incandescent bulb is dead makes for a great sound bite, it just doesn't reflect reality. As a result of the 2007 law, manufacturers already are making a variety of new energy-saving bulbs for homes, including more efficient incandescent bulbs. These bulbs look like and turn on like the bulbs we have been using for decades, but are upwards of 28 to 33 percent more efficient. And that's good for everyone. This is amazing progress in a very short time, considering that previously the basic technology of incandescent bulbs had not changed substantially since they were first introduced over 125 years ago.

Philips, GE, and Sylvania are among those currently manufacturing efficient incandescent bulbs. One is making them entirely within the United States, and the others are manufacturing the key components in their U.S. factories.

So I would urge my colleagues to please see the light and oppose this amendment. And my dear colleague, Dr. BURGESS, knows that, despite the fact that we disagree on this issue, I have the highest respect for his service in this Congress to the people of Texas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. BASS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce, with respect to hydraulic fracturing operations in the Inglewood Oil Field—

(1) the exclusion in section 1421(d)(1)(B) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300h(d)(1)(B));

(2) section 261.4(b)(5) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(3) the limitation in section 402(1)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(1)(2)).

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to introduce a straightforward and narrow amendment that restricts Federal resources from supporting hydraulic fracturing in the Baldwin Hills/Inglewood Oil Field, the largest urban oilfield in the United States.

The urban location of the Inglewood Oil Field, as well as the area's susceptibility to earthquakes, requires unique health and safety considerations and precautions. The Inglewood Oil Field is nearly 90 years old, a 1,000-acre oilfield with over 350 oil wells in the center of Los Angeles. It is surrounded by thousands of homes, schools, and parks. In fact, 300,000 residents of Los Angeles, Baldwin Hills, Ladera Heights, Culver City, and Inglewood live and work directly around the field. Additionally, the oilfield borders the Kenny Hahn State Recreation Area, a park that welcomes thousands of families and visitors each year. Not only is the area around the Inglewood Oil Field densely populated; it also sits on the Newport-Inglewood fault, making it very vulnerable to severe earthquakes.

Clearly, the urban landscape and history of seismic activity in this area necessitates stringent health and safety reviews prior to any new oil and gas extraction. However, hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, is occurring in the Inglewood Oil Field without proper regulation or even a comprehensive study of its safety and impact.

During my time in the California State Assembly, and since coming to Congress, I have heard numerous times directly from my constituents that they are fearful about the environmental health and seismic effects of fracturing in the Inglewood Oil Field and the impact it will have on their families and communities. They have discussed with me several concerns about fracking in the oilfield, like the impact on ground and drinking water safety, toxic chemical dispersion into the soil and air, and disruption of the Newport-Inglewood fault, which could lead to major earthquakes or landslides.

In fact, environmental conservation and health community leaders, like Lark Galloway Gilliam, Jim Lamm, and Mary Anne Greene, a member of the Community Advisory Council, have continually advocated for increased assessment and regulation of fracking in the Inglewood Oil Field.

□ 1245

In addition, Tom Camarella from Culver City has also expressed these concerns, and I believe these concerns are justified.

The people of Los Angeles and Culver City are entitled to an extensive long-term and transparent assessment of fracking operations at the oilfields. Ensuring the health and safety of our constituents should be a top priority.

That is why I rise today to offer this amendment, which will ensure that no Federal funds in this bill will be used to implement, administer, or enforce fracking in the Inglewood Oil Field for the coming fiscal year. This is a small step in the greater fracking debate, but I am proud to amplify the concerns of my community with this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

The amendment would prohibit, as she said, hydraulic fracking operations or fracking within the Inglewood Oil Field in Los Angeles.

I appreciate my colleague's passion for this particular issue and obviously her desire to protect her constituents, but the Energy and Water appropriations bill is not the proper place for such a unique prohibition on fracking.

Inglewood Oil Field is not Federal land nor does the Department of Energy's Office of Fossil Energy have any current projects that involve Inglewood in its natural gas portfolio. Furthermore, fracking activities are currently regulated both locally and by her own State of California.

This is a complex authorizing issue, but we are still waiting to hear from the Department's lawyers on what effect, if any, this language would actually have in the fiscal year 2014. Therefore, I must oppose her amendment and urge other Members to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. BASS. 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 gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

Mr. MEADOWS. 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. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of individuals appointed to their current position through, or to otherwise carry out, paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 5503(a) of title 5, United States Code.

Mr. MEADOWS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a simple and straightforward amendment. It prohibits the use of funds for the payment of salaries to Presidential recess appointees until they are formally confirmed by the Senate.

In 1863, a law was passed that barred unconfirmed recess appointees from being paid. That law stayed on the books until 1940. However, over time, a number of broad exceptions were made that gradually eliminated the original intent of that law and rendered the prohibition useless. This amendment reapplies the original intent of that law to further reassert the Senate's authority in the confirmation process and prevent taxpayers from having to pay salaries of unconfirmed Presidential appointees.

Recent decades have seen a constant erosion of congressional powers in deference to the executive. The Senate is required to confirm Presidential appointments for a reason. It is a check on the executive powers. This amendment is an opportunity to reempower that check by disincentivizing recess appointments except in cases where they are truly needed.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that will help stop Congress from taking the Corps of Engineers back to the 1980s.

In 2007, Congress passed legislation requiring the Army Corps of Engineers to update its principles and guidelines, the P&G. These are used by the Corps in formulating, evaluating, and implementing water resource projects. This is something I've been involved with since I first came to Congress 17 years ago. I served on the Water Resources Subcommittee, and discovered that the Corps was trapped in time.

This update was critical in that these have not been updated since 1983. If you understand how the Federal Government operates, for something that was approved in 1983, they were probably in the works in the early seventies.

Earlier this year, the Council on Environmental Quality finally released an updated P&G that lays out broad principles to guide water investment as well as draft interagency guidelines for implementing the principles and requirements. These new P&G were developed over the last 6 years by Federal agencies and they incorporated extensive comments from the public, as well as the National Academy of Sciences.

The modernized P&G will help accelerate project approval, reduce costs, and support water infrastructure projects with the greatest economic and community benefits. They will allow for better consideration of long-term benefits, provide more flexibility for local communities, and promote more transparency in the Federal decisionmaking process.

Unfortunately, there appears to be language in the committee report accompanying this legislation that would prevent the Corps from implementing them. The report states:

The Corps shall continue to use the document dated March 10, 1983, and entitled, "Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies," during the fiscal year period covered by the Energy and Water Development Act for 2014.

Does it make any sense at all to take work that has been in the process for years and tell an agency, You can't update your planning documents, prevent you from using updated resources?

During the floor debate on this issue in 2007, I indicated that I was embarrassed that the Corps was operating under guidance from a quarter century ago; now they are 30 years old. These principles and guidelines are older than most of our staff.

In 1983, Ronald Reagan was in his first term, Michael Jackson moonwalked for the first time, and Microsoft Word was first released. Think about the advancements in science, economics, and flood management, not to mention our environmental consciousness, all that have happened since 1983. That's what led the National Academy of Sciences, in the year 2000, to conclude that these needed to be "revised to better reflect contemporary management paradigms; analytical methods; legislative directives; and social, economic, and political realities." It is even more true today than it was 13 years ago.

This issue is not just about a bureaucratic process for economists and scientists. These projects have significant impact on the ground.

In 2007, I highlighted the problems from an organization called Levees.org, a nonpartisan grassroots group founded after Katrina. The group's mission was to help educate the people of New Orleans about what happened in Katrina and how to move forward. They supported the amendment at that time because they know this issue is a matter of life and death, to be able to have the Corps use the best information, the best technology, and do the best job. Relying on principles and guidelines that are a quarter century old is not our very best. Over a third of a century is not our very best.

I can comprehend no reason why Congress would require the Corps to continue to rely on outdated documents and not take advantage of the work, the research, and the progress that's been made by people in the administration, in the Corps of Engineers, and the scientific community.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to offer the amendment because I truly believe that we ought to be able to understand with the committee what's going on, understand the benefits that led Congress to embed this in the law in the first place. I would look forward to having a conversation with my good

friend, the chair of the subcommittee, and the ranking member to see if we can't resolve this for the benefit of the public.

Thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

Mr. SCALISE. 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. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used within the borders of the State of Louisiana by the Mississippi Valley Division or the Southwestern Division of the Army Corps of Engineers or any district of the Corps within such divisions to implement or enforce the mitigation methodology, referred to as the "Modified Charleston Method".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to present this amendment that deals with the Corps of Engineers' new program that was put in place 2 years ago, specifically in the New Orleans district, called the Modified Charleston Method.

The Corps changed the usual and normal method for mitigation. On any kind of mitigation that's done on wetlands throughout the country, you have to mitigate if you are going to do development. Everybody understands that. Everybody has worked with that over the years.

Two years ago, the Corps changed, specifically for the New Orleans district, that process and literally put in place a process that has made it very unworkable to do a lot of our flood protection projects and economic development projects.

This amendment, by the way, is identical to language that we passed in the same appropriations bill last year, so the House has already gone on record saying that this is an unworkable plan by the Corps of Engineers. This new MCM method, as it is being referred to, has literally shut down many flood protection projects and economic development projects in south Louisiana.

What we have been saying to the Corps of Engineers is let's work together on putting reasonable rules in place. This rule is unworkable, so much so that the Corps didn't even use these rules when they were doing their own projects. Americans understand that when government tries to impose rules on the people and yet doesn't even follow those same rules themselves, it shows there is a problem. Yet that's what is happening in this case.

All we are saying is everybody understands we need to do mitigation, but

when the Corps comes out with these new rules that triple, in many cases, the amount of mitigation that needs to be done to a point where it is unworkable—as an example, just last year, Corps permit applications for development projects were down by 33 percent because they literally took off the table the ability to do any kind of development in many areas of south Louisiana—that's not how rules and regulations are supposed to work. You ought to be working with local communities and not saying you can't even protect yourself from flooding. Literally, if you look at the wetlands rules, they are preventing us from restoring wetlands with these rules on wetlands. It doesn't make sense. It is something that's unworkable.

This amendment addresses this problem and says, if the Corps can't move forward with the Modified Charleston Method, then let's go back to the table and put some rules in place that actually make sense, put some common-sense rules in place.

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support my colleague from Louisiana's amendment.

Not to belabor the point, but just in the last 11 months, mitigation costs in the New Orleans district for the Corps of Engineers and projects related to this have increased right at \$11 million.

□ 1300

It affects all types of projects, and I'll just give you a few examples:

One is a pipeline because we're responding to an increased need for natural gas transportation as our Louisiana oil refineries expand. One is a grocery store that provides fresh food, especially in our food deserts. Another one is the expansion of a 100-acre commercial park in St. Tammany Parish to create jobs and new office space. The last is a St. Tammany Parish drainage project, which would help Louisiana with its flood protection and protect our community.

So this is a matter that is of vital importance. We are not diminishing the need for mitigation or underestimating its importance. What we are trying to say is that it should be reasonable and that the method that we had before we moved to the Modified Charleston Method was a good method, but we need to make sure that the Modified Charleston does not hamper our growth in Louisiana and prohibit us from protecting our citizens and our residents from future damage caused by storms or prohibit us from prospering from economic development at the same time.

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition to these very able gentlemen's amendment. While I have some sympathy for this issue—and it's not a new one to this bill—I believe that more consistency should be brought to the way we evaluate wetland impacts, not less, as this amendment would ensure.

The Charleston Method has been utilized for over two decades in various Corps districts, and it is a quick and inexpensive and consistent methodology for use by the regulated public and the Corps. In 2006 and 2007, the New Orleans district worked with its Federal and State partners to modify the Charleston Method so that it better reflected the unique conditions found in south Louisiana, resulting in the Modified Charleston Method that our colleagues have suggested.

The use of this method is a long-standing one in many Corps districts. Many regulatory customers use the tool to assess their potential mitigation requirements for their impacts as well as credits required at mitigation banks. This transparency in Corps mitigation requirements has helped the applicant prepare a complete application package and determine mitigation costs up front—importantly, costs up front—costs often that are borne by the Federal taxpayer.

The suspension of the use of the Charleston Method in Corps districts would require that any pending permit application, under section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and pending mitigation banks, would need to be reevaluated using a different assessment tool or methodology, or, in the absence of such a methodology, use the best professional judgment to determine appropriate mitigation requirements for impacts and for available credits in mitigation banks. All approved mitigation banks with available credits that were determined by the process would be temporarily closed until a new methodology could be developed and the banks' credits converted to the credit system of the new methodology.

These banks were established utilizing the credit system of the Charleston Method, and until a similar credit system can be determined for proposed impact sites, it would not be possible to correlate the new requirements in the old credit system.

So we are into the weeds on this one, and we know that the difficulty at the edges—where the water meets the land, where we have very severe coastal conditions that occur as a result of weather changes and so forth—do require us to be more land planning conscious. I've seen the work that the Corps has done in Louisiana, and I appreciate the gentlemen's concern about their home State. I think to try to change this in this bill is probably not wise policy, and we know the costs of these damaged areas to the taxpayers of the United States. With coastal storms being what they are, we anticipate

greater coastal activity, and I think that wiser planning is better than moving to a process that, I think, is less rigorous.

So, on those bases, I oppose the gentlemen's amendment, but I do thank them very much for their deep service to their State, to their region, which has been so impacted by changes in our environment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

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

The 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. \_\_\_\_\_. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development", and increasing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers—Civil—Department of the Army—Corps of Engineers—Civil—Construction", by \$20,000,000.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LYNCH. First of all, I want to thank the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, and also Ms. KAPTUR from Ohio, the ranking member, for the great work they've done.

In spite of the fact that many Members are coming up with refining amendments, I do want to acknowledge the great work they've done, for example, on the manufacturing piece that's in this bill as well as the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, which has been amply funded and is so important to a lot of the coastal communities. Myself representing the Port of Boston and a large swath of the South Shore of Massachusetts—some beautiful cities and towns—I do appreciate the work that they've done. However, there does appear to be a gap in funding with respect to the Army Corps of Engineers.

The purpose of my amendment would be to increase funding to the Construction account for the Army Corps of Engineers by \$20 million. This increase would, of course, be offset by decreasing the Fossil Fuel Research account by a corresponding amount.

I am fortunate to represent a district that relies heavily and benefits greatly from the proximity to the coast, and I have wonderful, historic, beautiful towns and cities, like Quincy, Weymouth, Hull, Cohasset, Hingham, and Scituate, that, as I say, are benefiting

greatly because they're on the coast. They house commercial fishing fleets and host wonderful beaches and marinas, and they are vital components of our Statewide economy and regional economy. But while these benefits are there, they are also exposed to the most recent violent coastal storms that have become increasingly devastating in recent years.

Like many of my colleagues, I have seen firsthand the devastating effects that these much more intense storms have had on our communities—beaches erode, and roadways and bridges get washed away. In our case, we have not been hit as hard as places like the district of the gentleman from Louisiana or New Jersey or New York with the Superstorm Sandy effects, but much of our seawall infrastructure and protection for our beaches have been damaged considerably. We've benefited from prior Congresses that have made sure that the funding and the maintenance have been there to preserve that protection, and we are at that point again.

It seems like we are having 100-year storms every 3 or 4 years now in my district, and I'm sure it's like that in a lot of places across the country. I think it's entirely appropriate that we balance this out, that we rebalance the priorities here, by putting \$20 million into the Construction account for the Army Corps of Engineers while we are removing a corresponding amount from the Fossil Fuel Research account. I think that most of us realize that the impacts of climate change are at least increasing the intensity of the storms that we've seen in recent years, and we need to provide the Army Corps of Engineers in our communities with the resources they need to protect against these natural disasters. I believe my offset does that in a fitting way.

Like President Obama, I think we need an all-of-the-above energy policy. I'm not here today to debate the cause of global warming or of climate change, but temperatures and sea levels are rising, and fossil fuel consumption is a contributing factor. So, as long as we are forced to rely on fossil fuels, we need to also deal with the fallout from our own energy policies. We need to protect our coastal communities from future devastation.

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

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

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

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

I share the gentleman's support for smart investments in our Nation's water resources infrastructure, though. In fact, the Army Corps of Engineers has always been one of the top priorities in our Energy and Water bill.

Total program level funding is \$50 million above the budget request and

almost \$150 million above the post-sequester level. There is very strong Member interest in the harbor maintenance activities, and most of these additional funds were included in the Operation and Maintenance account. Even so, construction funding is less than 1 percent below the President's budget.

On the other hand, the bill already reduces funding for fossil energy by \$84 million below the fiscal year 2013 level. That's a 16 percent reduction. Fossil fuels, such as coal, oil, and natural gas, provide for 82 percent of our Nation's energy needs, and we will need to continue to use these valuable energy resources for generations to come. Research conducted within this program ensures we use our Nation's fossil fuel resources well and as cleanly as possible. In fact, if we increased the efficiency of our fossil energy plants by just 1 percent, we could power an additional 2 million households without using a single additional pound of fuel from the ground.

We simply cannot take a further reduction to this account, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Congressman LYNCH, I think, has really thought through this proposal very well. His is a modest amendment. Actually, the bill that we are considering is \$29,425,000 above the budget request of the administration, so he is merely conforming his amendment to the initial request.

For the record, we anticipate that the Department will with this change spend approximately \$420 million this year for fossil energy research and development.

I agree with my esteemed colleague from New Jersey about the importance of natural gas, as Ohio is a State that has benefited deeply from that. A lot of that technology is going very well, and the companies are making significant profits. They can invest some of that in their own advanced development now. Then with the additional drilling for oil on public lands and so forth, we are producing more than we have in modern history over the last several years.

So I think it's worthy to transfer some of these dollars to the Corps. We have over \$60 billion worth of Corps projects that are backed up, and in terms of job creation, that just rings home across this country because those Corps dollars will be put to work in projects that have been backed up from coast to coast.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I appreciate her gracious remarks.

I do want to point out, though, that, since 2010, we've cut \$688 million from

this account. Now, we all have great respect and admiration for the Army Corps of Engineers, but having cut \$688 million since 2010 has been reducing their ability to prioritize those projects around the country that need to be worked on. Some of those are Democratic districts, and some of those are Republican districts. That's not what this is about. This is about our infrastructure. So a \$688 million cut since 2010 is a serious obstruction for them to do their job, and that's all I'm asking here.

I'm asking that we recognize our responsibility and our stewardship of protecting seawalls and ports and marinas, whether they're on the Great Lakes or whether they're on the Atlantic or Pacific coast. I am just asking that we step up and meet our responsibility in a meaningful way.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman, and I, evidently, very strongly support his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

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

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

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

□ 1315

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The 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. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Energy Conservation Standards Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits" and identified by regulation identification number 1904-AC87.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, as I begin to talk about this amendment that Mr. ROKITA and I have worked on and bring to you today, I want to pause and take just a moment and commend our appropriators and the chairman. He is accustomed to seeing me come down and try to cut 1 percent, 5 percent more out of the budget, but the appropriators this year have done that work for us.

This bill before us today totals \$30.426 billion, which is \$2.9 billion below last year's level, \$700 billion below the sequester level, and \$4 billion below the President's request. Indeed, it's below the pre-Pelosi budget, which was \$31.5 billion.

As my former colleague in the Tennessee State Senate used to say—Tim Burchett, now mayor of Knoxville—he would quote Tennessee author Alex

Haley, who said “find the good, and praise it.” So I praise them for doing these cuts on the front end, and I focus my attention on the issue we have with ceiling fans and this administration’s interest in overregulating ceiling fans.

As many of my colleagues know, ceiling fans and ceiling fan light kits already face existing regulations set in place by the Energy Policy Act of 2005. These provisions burden ceiling fan manufacturers with ineffective mandates. However, despite the current mandates, the Department of Energy is looking to require additional mandates that will impact everything such as the angle of the blade, shape, airflow, light kits. They are determined to redesign the American fan and have issued a 101-page rulemaking framework document which evaluates the potential energy savings that new regulations would supposedly provide.

We’ve already seen the Federal Government stretch their regulatory tentacles into our homes and determine what kind of light bulbs we have to use. Now they’re coming after our ceiling fans. It is a sad state of affairs when even our ceiling fans aren’t safe from this administration. Enough is enough.

These new regulations being considered by DOE will significantly impair the ability of ceiling fan manufacturers like Hunter Fans in Memphis to produce reasonably priced, highly decorative fans. They will also force our constituents to use less energy-efficient mechanisms to cool their homes, using more energy. It is imperative that we join together and prohibit any funding in this bill from being used by DOE to finalize, implement, or enforce new regulations on ceiling fans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by my friend, the gentlelady from Tennessee. Like her, I also want to thank the appropriators.

As a member of the Budget Committee, our responsibility is to issue top-line numbers that we stay within in order to bring down the deficit and ultimately address the towering debt that we’re facing as a country not only today, but the even worse debt we’re going to be facing given the current trend that we’re on in the future.

Mr. Chair, remember when we were told to keep our tires properly inflated and to get a regular tune-up to save fuel? Some people snickered and commented, “Is this an energy policy?” At least those ideas actually saved energy and actually saved cost, albeit a drop in the bucket. But now, in one of its latest efforts, along comes the Department of Energy and proposes a regulation to impose destructive and unnecessary energy-efficiency standards for ceiling fans. And like much of their agenda, it is completely counter-

productive. It’s another example of Big Government run amok. It’s an example of the complete disregard bureaucrats have for the practical implications of the regulations that they issue.

The Department of Energy contends that a certain amount of energy would be saved by requiring greater efficiency from ceiling fans, as the gentlelady mentioned and explained. Of course, that ignores the fact that ceiling fans are already far more energy efficient than other cooling devices like air-conditioners. Recently, General Electric published an article stating that an average electric central air-conditioner consumes 5,000 watts of electricity during operation. By contrast, a ceiling fan consumes as little as just 30 watts when operating under similar conditions. That’s over 165 times less electricity than consumed by your typical central air-conditioning system.

The proposed ceiling fan regulations would increase the cost of ceiling fans and reduce the manufacturer’s ability to produce aesthetically pleasing devices marketable to people like us, the consumers. As a result, energy savings from these efficiency standards would not outweigh the increased costs of energy consumption brought about by the consumers foregoing ceiling fans and shifting to high-energy consumption devices and increased usage of existing devices.

The Department of Energy’s proposed regulations on ceiling fans are absolutely counterproductive. They will encourage more energy consumption, they will reduce consumer choice and they have the potential to destroy jobs, including in Indiana.

Americans need an energy policy to unleash our economy, not economically destructive dictates from Washington bureaucrats. This is yet another example of this administration double-dipping in the pockets of Americans, using taxpayer dollars to raise prices on consumers.

As such, I urge a “yes” 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 CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition to the gentlelady’s amendment and wish to point out to our colleagues that this amendment will prohibit any funds made available by the act from being used by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled, “Standards, Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits” and identified by regulation identification number 1904-AC87.

The Department of Energy is initiating the rulemaking and data collection process to consider amending the energy conservation standards for ceiling fans and ceiling fan light kits. Making ceiling fans more efficient would potentially reduce carbon output by 22 million metric tons. This amendment would erode the Department of

Energy’s effort to curb carbon emissions and save consumers money on their electric bills. The Department estimates that the higher standards for ceiling fans will result in \$4.3 billion in undiscounted energy bill savings through 2030.

Also, I would be remiss if I did not point out that these amendments seek to undercut the administration’s rule-making authority given to it by Congress. Speaker after speaker on the other side of the aisle criticized this administration for not undertaking rulemaking on other issues and instead issuing guidance. Now we have rulemaking that allows for public comment, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are still not satisfied.

The Department is following its responsibility under the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to regulate ceiling fan energy usage. And you know what? It’s not a bad idea. We actually own ceiling fans in our family. What’s interesting about them is, if you have two or three speeds on them, the first speed, which is supposed to be the low speed, is more than we want, and it’s very hard to get these fans demonstrated in the showroom sometimes. If you want to be a responsible consumer, I think it would be really helpful to the buying public to have standards, to be able to have labeling, to know what you’re buying.

This is an important market. I would guess it’s one that’s growing in our economy. But I think it’s really important to have this kind of effort. The industry will be able to comment. That’s what rulemaking is all about. We can work with consumers. Consumers like us can write in. We can make our comments. Overall, we get a better product and we get one that’s more energy efficient.

I know that there’s a Hunter Fan Company located in Memphis, Tennessee, so I imagine the gentlelady may be speaking on their behalf. That’s okay. That’s what we’re all here for. But the consumers out there also have a right to try to buy the most energy-efficient product.

The fan that we bought, the light is too bright in the ceiling. And I don’t know if you’ve ever tried to install one of those things. It’s not so easy to get that off and to put the different bulbs in and all. As I think it’s an industry that is growing and improving, I would think they could use a little bit of help.

This amendment is anti-consumer. I think it should be defeated, but I admire the gentlelady for bringing it to the floor and the gentleman who supported her. I think working together we can all make it a little bit better for the environment, for consumers, and for the company. They will sell more fans, and people will have more confidence in their product.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).



The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to relocate or consolidate general and administrative functions, personnel, or resources of the Buffalo and Chicago Districts of the Corps of Engineers Great Lakes and Ohio River Division.

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment seeks to stop a flawed plan that would endanger crucial Army Corps projects in the Great Lakes region.

The Army Corps of Engineers' Great Lakes and Ohio River Division is attempting to move key functions performed in Buffalo and Chicago regions out of their respective States.

This is unacceptable.

When it comes to protecting the safety, health, and future of our waterways, there is no substitute for having a team of qualified people on the ground. Taking key staff out of western New York will only hinder the delivery of high-impact projects already in progress. And any plan to turn the Buffalo and Chicago districts into mere satellite offices is a wrongheaded decision to divest in our Great Lakes.

In my community alone, the Army Corps is overseeing a \$44 million restoration of the Buffalo River and \$359 million restoration of the former Linde site in Tonawanda, among dozens of other projects.

The Buffalo district overseas 38,000 square miles from Massena, New York, to Toledo, Ohio—planning, constructing, and operating water projects to reduce floods, maintain navigation, protect the shoreline, and support water quality efforts. Failure to see these projects through to completion would not only harm western New York, but delays and cost overruns would impact the bottom line of the Army Corps.

Mr. Chairman, the Great Lakes system moves more than 160 million tons of cargo a year, supports 227,000 jobs, and contributes \$33.5 billion to the economy annually. As an engine of economic activity and valuable natural resources, we should be committing more resources to the Great Lakes, not less.

A similar amendment was offered by Senator KIRK and Senator DURBIN and was adopted by the Senate Appropriations Committee last week.

I thank my colleagues, especially Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for their support of this bipartisan amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will support the amendment, but I do have some concerns.

Of course we want the Corps to take a look at the cost of their operation across the Nation to see where they can make savings.

We are seeking from the Corps information before we make any final decisions, but I'm supportive of their objectives. We just need to take a closer look at the financial justification for what they're doing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. HIGGINS from New York, for putting forth this amendment.

He and I stood together in Buffalo to talk about the adverse effects this proposal by the Army Corps of Engineers would have on the growth and maintenance of the Great Lakes, one of our Nation's greatest resources. But this issue is not specific to just western New York and it's not partisan. It's about preserving our Great Lakes.

Many of us don't know, but there are 4,500 miles of U.S. coastline along the Great Lakes, making it larger than both the Atlantic and Pacific coast combined. And among this huge length of coastline, there are many hundreds of projects. Many harbors that are critical to commercial navigation and recreation are in serious disrepair.

By moving contracting officers, those who are on the ground and require face-to-face contact with the companies doing the actual work, these projects will only fall further into disrepair. It won't save a dollar to move these employees to an office far from the site of a project. If you move these workers to Detroit or Louisville, some of them working on Buffalo or Chicago-area projects will have to be flown in and stay at local hotels at government expense. How can this possibly save money? Common sense tells me it's going to be more costly.

□ 1330

This amendment is simple, as it will prevent funds in this bill from being used for this proposal. It will help maintain the Great Lakes, which are a key economic driver to our national economy.

I hope my colleagues will support this bipartisan amendment that will ensure the Army Corps of Engineers will provide timely delivery on projects that reduce flooding, protect the shoreline, maintain navigation, and support water-quality efforts all along the Great Lakes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. First, I want to express my thanks to the chairman for saying that he would accept this bipartisan amendment, and to my colleagues who have spoken about it.

The decision to eliminate many of the functions from the Chicago and the Buffalo offices were done without consultation with the local communities and without seeking the approval of the Congress, which is what they are supposed to do.

The downsizing just in Chicago could cause as many as 200 jobs lost in our area, and it certainly could affect the health and safety of our waterways. Chicago is the point of entry from the Mississippi River to the Great Lakes, and its harbors are of major economic importance not just to Chicago, but to the entire Great Lakes region. As my colleague pointed out, it's a shoreline greater than either the Pacific or the Atlantic Coast. Actually, I just learned that from you today. Thank you for that important information.

Its harbors are of major economic importance to all of us, and it assists in the rehabilitation of the Chicago shoreline. It also, from the Chicago district office, leads the fight against the spread of the Asian carp into Lake Michigan.

I have very serious concern about the downsizing of the Chicago district and the impacts it would have on those efforts. Like the chairman, I understand the Corps' efforts to reduce costs and our interest in doing that; but the minimization of the Chicago and Buffalo areas would trade short-term savings with much more significant and lasting long-term costs.

As my colleague pointed out, Senator KIRK and Senator DURBIN passed a similar amendment in the Senate. I urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting us in this important bipartisan amendment to prevent the Army Corps from reducing its Chicago and Buffalo offices.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Congressman HIGGINS for offering this important amendment, and Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY for her leadership on lakes issues, and also Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his openness to those of us who happen to live in the Great Lakes region.

Obviously, I rise in support of the amendment. Also, I just wanted to say on the record to the Corps, it would be wonderful if somebody over at the Corps had a map and they took all of the watersheds of the Great Lakes and they put them all together and then the staff for the Great Lakes would be located somewhere in those watersheds, because right now, that isn't the case. And it causes us all kinds of bloody problems up in our part of the world where we do adjoin Canada up there. You know, there's another country north of us. It has been so hard to

get them to recognize the coastline that you described. And so this is my moment to vent a little bit on the floor and say: Hello, Corps. We're out there.

I happen to represent the largest watershed in the Great Lakes, and we really need the Corps' focus on the most important freshwater system that exists on the face of the Earth. Twenty percent of the freshwater on the globe, surface freshwater, is up in our region. And it always seems like it's never together. It's never together. So the gentleman's amendment helps to focus a little bit on this, but the challenge goes beyond just this amendment.

I know the Corps will hear us, and I know as they talk about restructuring, meeting budget realities, they will view us as a system that is important to think of as a whole, not just in little pieces and dangling particles and things that happen out there, but rather as an extraordinarily important water system for our continent and for our world.

So I wanted the opportunity to say that on the record, and I thank Congressman HIGGINS for his leadership, and I thank the chairman for his understanding. We in the Great Lakes region face our own set of issues, and we need the Corps' full cooperation. I ask my colleagues to support the Higgins amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 801 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17281).

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

Mr. WALBERG. My amendment prohibits the use of funds to be used to carry out section 801 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, which creates a national media campaign to promote alternative green energies. The 2007 energy law directs the Department of Energy to run a national media campaign to promote alternative energies, encourage energy efficiency, and discourage the use of fossil fuels, authorizing \$5 million a year.

Promoting green-energy technology is really not the role of the Federal Government apart from an all-of-the-above energy plan, and it certainly is not part of the core mission of the Department of Energy. The American people don't need more government bureaucrats to tell them what energy sources they should use. The govern-

ment needs to get out of the business of picking winners and losers in the energy market and certainly shouldn't be funding advertising campaigns on behalf of private green-energy firms, which is normally a losing proposition to the taxpayer.

This amendment is more than fair. It was included in the last Congress' attempt at this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it and to defend this taxpayer media campaign.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am in support of the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals:

(A) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(B) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in subsection (A); or

(C) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

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

Mr. GRAYSON. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, expands the list of contractors who are forbidden from contracting with the Federal Government, to include such contractors as those who have been convicted of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, et cetera. This amendment is identical to language that was inserted in the Military Construction, Veterans Administration, and the Homeland Security appropriations bills by voice vote.

Since brevity is sometimes an underappreciated virtue, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We accept the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant for many years was the only plant operating in America in which uranium was enriched. This facility has met the national security needs of the United States since 1952, producing enriched uranium for nuclear weapons and commercial nuclear reactors.

On May 24, 2013, it was announced that the facilities of the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant would be transitioned back to the Department of Energy, resulting in 1,200 lost jobs and a vast need to start cleanup of the area.

Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Secretary of Energy now has full responsibility for decontamination and decommissioning cleanup work at the Paducah site and for reindustrialization of the materials and facilities at that site. I was pleased that Secretary Moniz recently announced on July 3 Request for Offers to utilize the assets, land, and facilities at the Paducah Department of Energy site.

As we move forward to finish the legacy cleanup of this plant and, most important, to reindustrialize that site to create new jobs, we are going to need to work with the chairman's committee on a very close basis. I hope that we can work with you in the coming years to ensure that we provide the Department the necessary support to accelerate reindustrialization through the Request for Offers process and also expedite the cleanup.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey personally for his commitment in working with us on this, for the job that you have done on the 2014 Energy and Water appropriations bill, and I just hope that you will continue working with us.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I look forward to working with my friend from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), who is a strong advocate on behalf of Kentucky, for jobs for Kentucky and the Paducah



plant. We do appreciate the work that the Department is doing to reindustrialize the Paducah site. We also recognize that the cleanup on the site must get done in a timely fashion, and we hope to work with the various stakeholders and with Congressman WHITFIELD to ensure that happens.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. BARROW OF GEORGIA

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any authority, in any preceding provision of this Act, to use funds for the purchase or hire of motor vehicles.

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this week marks the beginning of sequestration-related furloughs in my district. As a result, 3,200 employees at Fort Gordon near Augusta, Georgia, will be doing without 20 percent of their pay for the next few months.

Also, like many in this House, my district is home to projects caught in the Corps of Engineers' construction backlog. In particular, the New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam near Augusta has been waiting for repairs by the Corps of Engineers for 13 years, when Congress first authorized them.

This bill includes language to allow the Federal Government to purchase more cars on top of the 700,000 vehicles it already owns. My amendment would simply prohibit the expenditure of funds to purchase more vehicles. I believe there are better ways to spend that money.

I am serious about cutting unnecessary and wasteful spending. I also believe that cutting spending shouldn't be an end unto itself. It's an opportunity to reduce our deficit, but it's also an opportunity to make our government work better.

This amendment represents a relatively small change to the bill, but I believe it speaks to a larger principle. It would be an inappropriate use of taxpayer money to purchase more cars when so many folks across the country are being forced out of work and so many critical projects sit untouched. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the gentleman from Georgia's amendment. His amendment is overly broad and would prevent the Department of Energy, the Army Corps of En-

gineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the National Nuclear Security Agency, all agencies covered under our bill, from leasing or purchasing any new vehicles.

I understand my colleague's concern with the size of vehicle fleet within some of these agencies; and, in fact, I share some of those very concerns. That's why our bill actually carries a reporting requirement within the Department of Energy to report on its vehicle fleet.

□ 1345

However, this amendment would have serious unintended consequences, ranging from maintenance of Corps sites to science at our national labs, such of which are tied to the nuclear stockpile that are involved in protecting our nuclear sites.

Therefore, I must oppose the amendment. I certainly understand his reasons for doing it. I'm supportive in theory, but there are some potentially unintended consequences, so I must oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

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

The 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. \_\_\_\_\_. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Department Administration", and increasing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers—Civil—Department of the Army—Corps of Engineers—Construction", by \$2,000,000.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan amendment that reestablishes priorities here. It's similar to an amendment we passed overwhelmingly last year on this same piece of legislation, the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

What this amendment does is it transfers \$2 million out of the Department of Energy's Administrative account and moves that money into the Corps of Engineers construction budget. And the reason we're doing this is to move more projects forward, to actually get some of that backlog that the Corps of Engineers have moved forward and open up the door for projects all across the country that are vital to not only our Nation's waterways, our economy, our ability to export, but in Louisiana, for example, it would provide opportunity to move forward on the Louisiana Coastal Area plan, which is a coastal restoration plan that's a major flood protection project.

So what we're talking about is, literally, one penny, one penny coming out of administration, of bureaucracy

in Washington, to move that money into actual construction projects.

And I think when you talk to taxpayers across the country, they are less concerned about having bureaucracy in Washington. They want to actually see government get things done. They want to see this backlog get cleared out, and they want to see other projects that are important to our Nation's economy move forward. And that's what this amendment does. It's a bipartisan amendment.

I want to thank my colleagues—Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CASSIDY—who have also helped work on this. But again, this deals with projects all across the country that are in a backlog that could help move our economy forward rather than spending that money on administration in Washington.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If I may ask a question of Mr. SCALISE, are you seeking money for the overall account or are you seeking a certain amount of money for a project in your neck of the woods in Louisiana?

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The way that this amendment is drafted actually would apply nationwide. This would move \$2 million out of that administrative account in the Department of Energy, move it into the overall Corps construction budget, so it would be available to the Corps of Engineers for construction projects across the Nation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do rise in opposition to the amendment.

And let me say, I appreciate the gentleman's passion for coastal restoration. I know it's a high priority for his district and others around the Nation.

The bill before us includes over \$5 million to continue studies, engineering and design work and various components of the program. That's nearly 6 percent of the entire Investigations account dedicated to continuing work in coastal restoration in Louisiana.

The committee had to make some tough choices in the bill. While the Army Corps was a high priority, it was not completely spared. The Construction account, specifically, is slightly below the President's budget request, and almost 20 percent below the fiscal year 2013 appropriations.

The Corps has numerous projects already under construction that were not included in the President's budget and, so, aren't likely to be funded in fiscal year 2014.

While construction funding is trending downward, I believe it is most prudent to prioritize funding for ongoing projects so they can be completed and the Federal Government can realize the public safety, economic and other benefits from previous spending,

rather than starting new projects. It's unclear to me whether this is a new project, but I take the gentleman at his word that this is not a new project.

I do oppose the amendment. The reduction would substantially work against our purposes of trying to balance the Federal budget and lower the Federal deficit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I would urge everyone to support the bipartisan amendment that's being offered by my colleague, Mr. SCALISE, from Louisiana.

And just in response to the last comment about reducing the budget and getting our fiscal house in order, there are two ways to do it, and one way to do that is to make wise investments that give you a return on your dollar.

This investment, alone, would secure the coastal area of Louisiana, which would prevent the Federal Government from spending money in future years because of effects of hurricanes or surge or coastal erosion. The dollar we spend today, I'm sure, and I feel very comfortable in saying, we will recoup multiple dollars because of that.

If you just look at Louisiana and what we've contributed to the Nation's economy and to the Federal Government since 1950–2006, the Federal Government, the Federal Treasury has received over \$150 billion from Louisiana. And we do that in a number of ways.

But if you think about Louisiana, you think about the coast that we're talking about. We're talking about 33 percent of the Nation's seafood comes from the coast of Louisiana. We're talking about almost a quarter of the Nation's domestic energy, and you look at it's home to the country's largest port system.

So when we talk about what we're protecting and the \$2 million that we would spend today and the amount of money that we would recoup, I would just say that it's probably the prudent thing to do is to spend this money so that we can continue to protect Louisiana and the investment it makes in the country so that we continue to do it.

And I would also add that the bipartisan amendment simply builds on President Obama's 2014 budget request, and the administration called this a high-priority construction project.

So I would just urge everyone to support this bipartisan amendment and to look at it not as just spending or construction, but as truly an investment in the future of the country in terms of making sure that our energy production, our seafood, that the people in south Louisiana continue to have comfort and some protection.

And I would just tell you that either we spend it today or we're going to spend it tomorrow in an exponential number, because restoring the coast of

Louisiana is a national priority and it's a national need. And if you look at the coast of Louisiana, every hour we still lose a football field of land, and at some point, we're going to pay for it. My preference would be to pay for it when we're not spending as much.

So it's almost like that leaking roof. You can pay for it now and just replace some shingles, or you can wait a couple of years and replace not only the shingles, but the roof, the ceiling, the carpet, and the electrical.

So, at some point, it's your choice. And I would just urge us to support this amendment, and let's spend the money now while we can get a great return on our investment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I am rising to express sympathy with the authors of this amendment, Congressman SCALISE and Congressman RICHMOND. And you're eloquent spokesmen for your districts and your regions.

I hope that you and the membership understand that one of the reasons that we reluctantly opposed your amendment is because the mark we were given in our bill is so far below what we need to meet all national needs. Your proposal is actually a new start, if we were using the classification system that we use. And as much as we want to fund it, we simply don't have the funds in the bill to do it.

The Corps has over \$60 billion worth, \$60 billion of backed up projects that they are not able to complete. It would be the biggest job creator in this country if we could move off the dime and fund those projects.

But to take and prioritize Louisiana as a new start over, for example, Sacramento, that has major challenges with their levee system, or St. Louis, how does one choose? Or the Great Lakes, where we can't dredge ports.

And I often tell the story that, without the dredging in the Great Lakes, pretty soon, rather than having a channel that's like this—they keep narrowing the channel because we have less and less money—pretty soon it's going to silt up. We won't be able to get anything through.

So we have a problem in our bill in trying to fund everything that is necessary for the sake of the Nation.

So your proposal is worthy, but how do we put you in the front of the line when others have been in line and we've not been able to complete their projects? We need to be able to have \$60 billion in order to complete the work of the Corps with just existing projects that are already in line.

So I reluctantly stand here today in a very uncomfortable position. That project that you're referring to is billions of dollars in cost, and starting it now is something we simply can't afford, based on the allocation that we were given in our committee. We're

below last year. We're below what's necessary for the Nation, and we're paying the price from coast to coast. So, Louisiana is deserving of attention, but so are 49 other States that have projects backed up.

And I say to the chairman, I completely share your pain in trying to hold the line at completing what is in line and not letting anyone else cut the line for their projects, no matter how worthy they are. Our fundamental problem is we don't have the funds to complete everything that is necessary.

So I urge my colleagues to vote with us in opposition to this amendment, as much as I sympathize with its worthiness. It just isn't possible with everything else that is in line ahead of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASSIDY. First, let's be clear, this is not just for Louisiana. This \$2 million will be available nationwide.

And that said, I rise in support of this amendment. Budgets are about establishing priorities and then making wise use of scarce resources. We know with these scarce resources, \$1 million in a planning grant, which later on will be funded to greater dollars, can actually save billions in hurricane repair.

So, if I may say, there is lots of money right now in the Corps. The fact is the Corps has even a larger backlog, and these projects are not \$2 million to complete. It takes \$500,000 to begin the NEPA process or the sampling of the soil or something like that. So small amounts of dollars at the beginning can initiate a process that comes to fruition with an authorization later on.

This is a national issue. Let me just speak just about Louisiana, because you could equally speak about your home State.

The gasoline that is sold in Philadelphia is produced in St. Charles Parish. If a hurricane knocks out that petrochemical plant, gasoline prices rise by 20 cents a gallon in the Northeast.

Now, you could say something similar in Ohio and Mr. GARAMENDI in California and others elsewhere. So we're not saying initiate a process which completely funds. We're saying give seed money so that community in California, Ohio, or Louisiana can begin the process where later on we can make a decision regarding greater funding.

We can, as Mr. RICHMOND said, either spend a little bit now and potentially save billions in the future or, on our budget priorities, we can say we're going to be penny-wise but pound-foolish.

I urge passage of the amendment. I thank my colleague for introducing it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

The amendment was agreed to.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceeding were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

Amendment by Mr. HECK of Nevada.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

## □ 1400

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 266, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

## AYES—156

Bass	Engel	Levin
Beatty	Enyart	Lipinski
Becerra	Eshoo	Loebsack
Bera (CA)	Esty	Lowenthal
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Lowe
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lynch
Bonamici	Foster	Maloney,
Brady (PA)	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Braley (IA)	Fudge	Markley
Brown (FL)	Gabbard	Matsui
Brownley (CA)	Galleo	McDermott
Butterfield	Garamendi	McGovern
Capps	Garcia	McNerney
Capuano	Grayson	Meeks
Carney	Green, Al	Michaud
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Cartwright	Gutiérrez	Moore
Castor (FL)	Hahn	Moran
Chu	Hanabusa	Murphy (FL)
Cicilline	Hanna	Nadler
Clarke	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano
Clay	Heck (WA)	Neal
Cleaver	Higgins	Nolan
Cohen	Himes	O'Rourke
Connolly	Honda	Pallone
Conyers	Hoyer	Pascarell
Cooper	Huffman	Pastor (AZ)
Crowley	Jackson Lee	Payne
Cummings	Jeffries	Pelosi
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
DeFazio	Keating	Polis
DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Delaney	Kennedy	Quigley
DeLauro	Kildee	Rangel
DelBene	Kilmer	Richmond
Deutch	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Duckworth	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Edwards	Latham	T.
Ellison	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta

Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman

## NOES—266

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benish
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte

Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—12

Campbell	Horsford	Rogers (MI)
Gohmert	Hunter	Shimkus
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Webster (FL)
Holt	Negrete McLeod	Young (FL)

## □ 1426

Messrs. TIPTON, BENTIVOLIO, PALAZZO, COSTA, HUDSON, MESSER, PETERS of California, ISRAEL, and RYAN of Ohio changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. CLARKE changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 155, noes 266, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

## AYES—155

Bass	Eshoo	Matsui
Beatty	Esty	McDermott
Becerra	Farr	McGovern
Bera (CA)	Fattah	McNerney
Bishop (NY)	Foster	Meeks
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Michaud
Bonamici	Fudge	Miller, George
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Moore
Braley (IA)	Garamendi	Moran
Brown (FL)	Garcia	Murphy (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Grayson	Nadler
Butterfield	Green, Al	Napolitano
Capps	Grijalva	Neal
Capuano	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Carney	Hahn	O'Rourke
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	Pallone
Cartwright	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Castor (FL)	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Chu	Higgins	Payne
Cicilline	Himes	Pelosi
Clarke	Honda	Perlmutter
Clay	Huffman	Peters (CA)
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Peters (MI)
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Conyers	Keating	Polis
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kennedy	Quigley
Cummings	Kildee	Rangel
Davis (CA)	Kind	Richmond
Davis, Danny	Kuster	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Rush
Delaney	Lee (CA)	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Levin	Sánchez, Linda
DelBene	Lewis	T.
Deutch	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Doggett	Loebsack	Sarbanes
Doyle	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Edwards	Lowe	Schiff
Ellison	Lynch	Schneider
Engel	Maloney,	Schrader
Enyart	Carolyn	Schwartz
	Markey	Scott (VA)

Scott, David  
Serrano  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sires  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez

Walz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Womack  
Woodall  
  
Broun (GA)  
Campbell  
Holt  
Horsford  
Huelskamp

Yoder  
Yoho  
  
Hunter  
McCarthy (NY)  
Negrete McLeod  
Rogers (MI)  
Shimkus

Young (AK)  
Young (IN)  
  
Stivers  
Webster (FL)  
Young (FL)

Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shuster  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Southerland  
Stockman

Stutzman  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Walberg  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield

Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoho  
Young (IN)

## NOES—266

Aderholt  
Alexander  
Amash  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Capito  
Cárdenas  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costa  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Galleo  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar

Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Holding  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Kelly (PA)  
Kilmer  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meng  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR  
The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1432

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF  
GEORGIA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 252, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

## AYES—165

Aderholt  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman  
Collins (GA)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Crawford  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores

Forbes  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hurt  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
Kingston  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson

## NOES—252

Alexander  
Andrews  
Barber  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Collins (NY)  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fitzpatrick  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galleo  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gerlach  
Gibson  
Granger  
Graves (MO)

Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Harper  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney,  
Carolyne  
Maloney, Sean  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell

Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Radel  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Richmond  
Rogers (KY)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walden  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Wolf  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—17

Campbell	Horsford	Shimkus
Cole	Hunter	Smith (NE)
Delaney	McCarthy (NY)	Tiberi
Gohmert	Negrete McLeod	Webster (FL)
Gutiérrez	Noem	Young (FL)
Holt	Rogers (MI)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1439

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 238, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

AYES—184

Andrews	Edwards	Lipinski
Barrow (GA)	Ellison	Loeb sack
Bass	Engel	Lofgren
Beatty	Enyart	Lowenthal
Becerra	Eshoo	Lowe y
Bera (CA)	Esty	Lujan Grisham
Bishop (GA)	Farr	(NM)
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Lujan, Ben Ray
Blumenauer	Foster	(NM)
Bonamici	Frankel (FL)	Lynch
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Maloney,
Braley (IA)	Gabbard	Carolyn
Brown (FL)	Gallego	Markey
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	Matsui
Bustos	Garcia	McCollum
Butterfield	Grayson	McDermott
Capps	Green, Al	McGovern
Capuano	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Cárdenas	Grijalva	McNerney
Carney	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Hahn	Meng
Cartwright	Hanabusa	Michaud
Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Moore
Chu	Higgins	Moran
Cicilline	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Clarke	Hinojosa	Nadler
Clay	Honda	Napolitano
Cleaver	Hoyer	Neal
Cohen	Huffman	Nolan
Connolly	Israel	O'Rourke
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Cooper	Jeffries	Pascarell
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Crowley	Kaptur	Pelosi
Cuellar	Keating	Perlmutter
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Peters (CA)
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Peters (MI)
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Pingree (ME)
DeFazio	Kilmer	Ruiz
DeGette	Kind	Polis
Delaney	Kirkpatrick	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Kuster	Quigley
DelBene	Langevin	Rangel
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
Doyle	Levin	Ruppersberger
Duckworth	Lewis	Rush

Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Shiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Lummis
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
McHenry
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Palazzo
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)

Campbell
Cole

Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas

## NOES—238

Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NY)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzing (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latto
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri

## NOT VOTING—12

Cramer
Gohmert

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Hunter	Negrete McLeod	Shimkus
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Young (FL)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1445

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California 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. QUIGLEY

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 227, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

AYES—196

Amash	Eshoo	Lowey
Andrews	Esty	Lynch
Beatty	Farr	Maloney,
Becerra	Fattah	Carolyn
Bera (CA)	Foster	Marchant
Bishop (NY)	Frankel (FL)	Marino
Blumenauer	Fudge	Markey
Bonamici	Gabbard	Masie
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	Matsui
Braley (IA)	Garcia	McDermott
Brooks (AL)	Gibson	McGovern
Brownley (CA)	Grayson	McNerney
Buchanan	Green, Al	Meeks
Burgess	Green, Gene	Meng
Bustos	Griffith (VA)	Messer
Butterfield	Grijalva	Messier
Capps	Hahn	Michaud
Capuano	Hall	Miller, George
Cárdenas	Hanabusa	Moore
Carney	Hastings (FL)	Mulvaney
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)
Cartwright	Herrera Beutler	Nadler
Castor (FL)	Higgins	Napolitano
Castro (TX)	Himes	Neal
Chu	Hinojosa	Nolan
Cicilline	Honda	O'Rourke
Clarke	Huelskamp	Owens
Clay	Huffman	Pallone
Cohen	Israel	Pascarell
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)
Cooper	Jeffries	Payne
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Crowley	Jones	Perlmutter
Cuellar	Kaptur	Peters (CA)
Cummings	Keating	Peters (MI)
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Petri
Davis, Rodney	Kennedy	Pingree (ME)
DeFazio	Kildee	Pitts
DeGette	Kilmer	Pocan
Delaney	Kind	Polis
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Price (GA)
DelBene	Kuster	Price (NC)
DeSantis	Labrador	Quigley
Deutch	Lance	Radel
Dingell	Langevin	Rahall
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Ribble
Doyle	Larson (CT)	Rice (SC)
Duckworth	Lee (CA)	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Edwards	Lewis	Ruiz
Ellison	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Engel	Loeb sack	Rush
Enyart	Lowenthal	Salmon

Sánchez, Linda T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Shea-Porter

Sherman  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Tierney  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas

## NOES—227

Aderholt  
 Alexander  
 Amodei  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Barber  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barrow (GA)  
 Barton  
 Bass  
 Benishkek  
 Bentivolio  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Bonner  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Bridenstine  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Broun (GA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Buechson  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Carter  
 Cassidy  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Coble  
 Coffman  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Conaway  
 Connolly  
 Cook  
 Cotton  
 Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Culberson  
 Daines  
 Davis, Danny  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Ellmers  
 Farenthold  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gallego  
 Gardner  
 Garrett  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gingrey (GA)  
 Goodlatte

Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Griffin (AR)  
 Grimm  
 Guthrie  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hanna  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Heck (NV)  
 Hensarling  
 Holding  
 Hoyer  
 Hudson  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hurt  
 Issa  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jordan  
 Joyce  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lankford  
 Latham  
 Latta  
 LoBiondo  
 Lofgren  
 Long  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lujan Grisham (NM)  
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
 Lummis  
 Maffei  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matheson  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCollum  
 McHenry  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Moran  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Nunnelee

Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Pearce  
 Perry  
 Peterson  
 Pittenger  
 Poe (TX)  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Rangel  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Richmond  
 Rigell  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rokita  
 Rooney  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Royce  
 Runyan  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Sanford  
 Scalise  
 Schock  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Sessions  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Southerland  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Stockman  
 Stutzman  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Terry  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Vela  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walorski  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—11

Campbell  
 Gohmert  
 Holt  
 Horsford

Hunter  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 Negrete McLeod  
 Paulsen

Rogers (MI)  
 Shimkus  
 Young (FL)

Veasey  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth  
 Yoho

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1452

Mr. WENSTRUP changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 332 (Quigley), I was unexpectedly detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOSAR was allowed to speak out of order.)

## A MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF THE YARNELL 19

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, we, the Arizona delegation, rise today in the wake of the tragic Yarnell Hill Fire that has left our hearts, the hearts of Arizonans and the hearts of Americans across the country overwhelmed with disbelief and sadness.

This was the largest loss of life of first responders since 9/11.

The town of Yarnell and the people of Arizona will never forget and will forever honor the 19 heroes of the elite Granite Mountain Hotshot fire crew who lost their lives in an act of self-sacrificing bravery.

Out of my deepest respect for these fallen heroes, their families and the communities of Prescott, Peeples Valley and Yarnell, I ask you to keep them in your prayers.

I now ask you to join me and my colleagues for a moment of silence to honor the Yarnell 19's ultimate act of courage and sacrifice.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

The CHAIR. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 86, noes 338, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

## AYES—86

Amodei  
 Bachmann  
 Barrow (GA)  
 Barton  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn

Brady (TX)  
 Bridenstine  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Collins (GA)  
 Conaway

Crawford  
 Edwards  
 Farenthold  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Garrett

Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Graves (MO)  
 Griffin (AR)  
 Guthrie  
 Hall  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Heck (NV)  
 Hultgren  
 Hurt  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 King (IA)  
 Kline  
 Labrador  
 Lamborn  
 Lankford  
 Matheson

McCaul  
 McKeon  
 Meehan  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Neugebauer  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Petri  
 Poe (TX)  
 Pompeo  
 Renacci  
 Ribble  
 Rigell  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rooney

Ross  
 Salmon  
 Scalise  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shuster  
 Smith (TX)  
 Southerland  
 Stivers  
 Stockman  
 Thornberry  
 Turner  
 Walorski  
 Radel  
 Weber (TX)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westmoreland  
 Wittman  
 Yoder  
 Young (AK)

## NOES—338

Aderholt  
 Alexander  
 Amash  
 Andrews  
 Bachus  
 Barber  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Becerra  
 Benishkek  
 Bentivolio  
 Bera (CA)  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonamici  
 Bonner  
 Boustany  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Broun (GA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Buchanan  
 Buechson  
 Burgess  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardenas  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Carter  
 Cartwright  
 Cassidy  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu  
 Cicilline  
 Clarke  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Coble  
 Coffman  
 Cohen  
 Cole  
 Collins (NY)  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Cook  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Cotton  
 Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crenshaw  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Cummings  
 Daines  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 Davis, Rodney  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro

DelBene  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle  
 Duckworth  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellison  
 Ellmers  
 Engel  
 Enyart  
 Eshoo  
 Esty  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Fortenberry  
 Foster  
 Foxx  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Garcia  
 Gardner  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gingrey (GA)  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Grayson  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffith (VA)  
 Grijalva  
 Grimm  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hahn  
 Hanabusa  
 Hanna  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Heck (WA)  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Higgins  
 Himes  
 Hinojosa  
 Holding  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Hudson  
 Huelskamp  
 Huffman  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Israel  
 Issa  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jeffries  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jordan

Joyce  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kirkpatrick  
 Kuster  
 LaMalfa  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 Latta  
 Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loebsack  
 Lofgren  
 Long  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lujan Grisham (NM)  
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
 Lummis  
 Lynch  
 Maffei  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Markey  
 Massie  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McClintock  
 McCollum  
 McCormack  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHenry  
 McIntyre  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McNeerney  
 Meadows  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Messer  
 Michaud  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Miller, George  
 Moore  
 Moran  
 Mullin  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal



Nolan	Royce	Thompson (CA)
Nunnelee	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)
O'Rourke	Runyan	Thompson (PA)
Owens	Ruppersberger	Tiberi
Pallone	Rush	Tierney
Pascarell	Ryan (OH)	Tipton
Pastor (AZ)	Ryan (WI)	Titus
Paulsen	Sánchez, Linda	Tonko
Payne	T.	Tsongas
Pearce	Sanchez, Loretta	Upton
Pelosi	Sanford	Valadao
Perlmutter	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
Perry	Schakowsky	Vargas
Peters (CA)	Schiff	Veasey
Peters (MI)	Schneider	Vela
Peterson	Schock	Velázquez
Pingree (ME)	Schrader	Visclosky
Pittenger	Schwartz	Wagner
Pitts	Schweikert	Walberg
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Walden
Polis	Scott, David	Walz
Posey	Serrano	Wasserman
Price (GA)	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Price (NC)	Shea-Porter	Waters
Quigley	Sherman	Watt
Rahall	Simpson	Waxman
Rangel	Sinema	Webster (FL)
Reed	Sires	Welch
Reichert	Slaughter	Whitfield
Rice (SC)	Smith (MO)	Williams
Richmond	Smith (NE)	Wilson (FL)
Roby	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Rohrabacher	Speier	Womack
Rokita	Stewart	Woodall
Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman	Yarmuth
Roskam	Swalwell (CA)	Yoho
Rothfus	Takano	Young (IN)
Roybal-Allard	Terry	

## NOT VOTING—10

Campbell	Hunter	Shimkus
Gohmert	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Holt	Negrete McLeod	
Horsford	Rogers (MI)	

## □ 1501

Messrs. DAINES, PASTOR of Arizona, and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, 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. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, 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 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

## □ 1715

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP) at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

## ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 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. 2609.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) kindly take the chair.

## □ 1716

## 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. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. PRICE of Georgia (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, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 60, line 12.

## AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. BASS

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on my amendment to the end that the amendment stand disposed of by the voice vote taken on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

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

Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the noes have it and the amendment is not adopted.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment by Ms. TITUS of Nevada.

Amendment by Mr. LYNCH of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) 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 182, noes 243, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

## AYES—182

Amash	Green, Al	Pallone
Andrews	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Bass	Griffith (VA)	Pastor (AZ)
Beatty	Grijalva	Payne
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Bera (CA)	Hahn	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Peters (CA)
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Peters (MI)
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Petri
Brady (PA)	Herrera Beutler	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Pocan
Brown (GA)	Himes	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Bustos	Honda	Quigley
Capps	Huffman	Rahall
Capuano	Israel	Rangel
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Rohrabacher
Carney	Jeffries	Royal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Jones	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Salmon
Chu	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Ciçilline	Kelly (IL)	T.
Clarke	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kind	Schiff
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Conyers	Kuster	Schrader
Cooper	Lance	Schwartz
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Cummings	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Loebach	Sherman
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Sinema
Delaney	Lowe	Sires
DeLauro	Lynch	Slaughter
DelBene	Maloney,	Speier
Deutch	Carolyn	Stockman
Dingell	Marino	Takano
Doggett	Markey	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	Massie	Tierney
Duckworth	Matsui	Titus
Duncan (TN)	McDermott	Tonko
Edwards	McGovern	Tsongas
Ellison	McNerney	Van Hollen
Engel	Meeks	Vargas
Enyart	Meng	Veasey
Eshoo	Mica	Vela
Esty	Michaud	Velázquez
Farr	Miller, George	Visclosky
Fattah	Moore	Walz
Foster	Moran	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Mulvaney	Schultz
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Gabbard	Nadler	Watt
Garamendi	Napolitano	Waxman
Garcia	Neal	Welch
Gibson	Nolan	Wilson (FL)
Gohmert	O'Rourke	Yarmuth
Grayson	Owens	

## NOES—243

Aderholt	Bridenstine	Cole
Alexander	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Bachmann	Brown (FL)	Conaway
Bachus	Buchanan	Cook
Barber	Bucshon	Cotton
Barletta	Burgess	Courtney
Barr	Butterfield	Cramer
Barrow (GA)	Calvert	Crawford
Barton	Camp	Crenshaw
Benishek	Cantor	Cuellar
Bentivolio	Capito	Culberson
Bilirakis	Carson (IN)	Daines
Bishop (GA)	Carter	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT)	Cassidy	Denham
Black	Chabot	Dent
Blackburn	Chaffetz	DeSantis
Bonner	Clyburn	DesJarlais
Boustany	Coble	Diaz-Balart
Brady (TX)	Coffman	Duffy