

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I wanted to thank the gentleman from the Lake Okeechobee region of Florida (Mr. MURPHY) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for the very effective manner in which they have handled themselves in bringing this to our attention. And I want to thank the chair for accepting this important amendment, which is so important to Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Again, I thank the chair and ranking member for their hard work, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

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

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about setting priorities. The Army Corps of Engineers construction account has a serious backlog of over \$60 billion. According to a recent CRS report, there is a backlog of more than 1,000 authorized studies and construction projects.

The President's budget inadequately addresses this backlog, only allocating \$1.1 billion for these important infrastructure projects, a 32 percent reduction over fiscal year 2014-enacted levels.

Now, I applaud the committee for providing \$48 million more for Corps construction over the 2014-enacted levels, but more needs to be done. This is especially prevalent with the recent passage of the bipartisan water re-

sources conference report, which contained authorizations for existing projects, such as the Louisiana Coastal Area, and new projects, such as Morganza to the Gulf.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment transfers \$5 million out of the Department of Energy's administrative account and moves that money into the Corps of Engineers construction budget. The goal is to move more projects forward, to reduce the backlog, and to open up the door for projects across the country vital to our Nation's waterways, our economy, and our ability to export.

Louisiana, for example, contains 3 million acres of coastal wetlands. Louisiana's coast is home to over 2 million people, supporting vital ecosystems, national energy security, thousands of jobs, and a unique culture.

As you may know, our coastal wetlands are rapidly disappearing. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that if present land-loss trends continue, Louisiana will lose 2,400 square miles of land between 1932 and 2050. That is an area about 25 times that of Washington, D.C.

Morganza to the Gulf, which is one of five new projects authorized in WRRDA's hurricane and storm damage risk reduction subsection, is of immense importance to Louisiana's coastal restoration and protection efforts. The project's purpose is to protect the remaining fragile marsh and wetlands from hurricane storm surge. This is one of many projects around the country that needs funding and is vital to our Nation's infrastructure.

Taxpayers wish to see this backlog cleared out and other projects important to our Nation's economy moved forward. That is what this amendment intends to help achieve.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I must rise in opposition to the amendment.

I appreciate the gentleman's passion for coastal restoration. I know it is a high priority for his district, his State, and, in fact, for the country.

The committee often hears complaints that projects take too long and cost too much to build, in large part attributed to inefficient funding. If that is true, then the only responsible way to allow for new starts is to finish understanding the impacts of the selected new starts on the Corps' future budget requirements and on the expected costs and timelines of ongoing projects. Unfortunately, we do not have that information, and the administration has shown no willingness to provide it.

The fiscal year 2014 act allowed for a limited number of new construction starts, with the requirement that the administration provide information to show that these projects would be affordable at reasonable construction account levels and that these new

projects would not unduly delay or increase the cost of ongoing projects.

To say that the so-called analysis from the administration was inadequate would be an understatement. And no information at all was provided for the new start proposed in the fiscal year 2015 budget request.

Additionally, the administration continues to propose budgets with significant cuts to the construction account, including a 32 percent cut for fiscal year 2015. In fact, several individual projects authorized in the recent WRRDA are each estimated to cost more than what the administration requested for the entire nationwide construction program. Clearly, as promising as some new projects may be, it would be fiscally irresponsible to initiate new projects with no information on the impact of doing so.

I understand that some Members with authorized projects in their districts are anxious to get construction underway. I also understand, however, that many Members with projects already under construction in their districts want to see those projects completed and to start realizing the benefits of these Federal, State, and local investments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$15,000,000)”.

Page 7, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from New Mexico and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise to amend the Energy and Water Appropriations bill to increase the construction account by \$15 million to ensure local governments like the city of Rio Rancho, the county of Bernalillo, and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District get reimbursed for work they have done in conjunction with the Army Corps of Engineers. The Army Corps of Engineers works with local governments in New Mexico to construct levees, implement flood control measures, and other important infrastructure for the safety of the public.

More specifically, the city of Rio Rancho entered into a reimbursement contract with the Army Corps of Engineers and has not been paid back for several years due to the lack of appropriations. The same goes for the county of Bernalillo, the Middle Rio Grande

Conservancy District, and other communities across the United States.

This delay in reimbursement has led to interruptions in financing for other city projects and also has the potential to hurt the credit rating of these entities if they do not recover these funds via reimbursement, as stated in their contracts with the Federal Government.

By increasing the dollar amount in this account, which includes a number of programs and accounts that are critical to local governments—like engineering, construction, technical assistance, flood control, and environmental infrastructure—we can get these entities reimbursed and get these liabilities off the books of the Army Corps of Engineers to get other projects going.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this increase has zero impact on the budget and, in fact, would save money by reducing liability for the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, local governments have been left holding an IOU from the Federal Government for doing work based on the good faith written agreements with the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Chairman, I understand there may be opposition from some of my colleagues, but I am hoping that I can persuade the chairman to support me in this effort.

Under section 593 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, the city of Rio Rancho and other local governments entered into agreements with the Army Corps of Engineers. When city and local governments enter into reimbursement contracts, they expect to be reimbursed. They have annual budgets with the expectations they will get paid back. Congress should live up to these obligations in the authority given to the agency by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the constraints that the subcommittee dealt with, with the allocations given to them. But we need to make sure that we are working to make these local governments whole with the agreements and contracts they have with the Federal Government.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

First, though, let me assure my colleague that I am sympathetic to the need for increased construction funding. In fact, the underlying bill increases construction funding by almost \$50 million above fiscal year 2014 and by almost \$600 million, or 52 percent above the budget request.

While I understand there is always more that can be done, we could shift the entire expenses account to construction, and there still would be more that needs to be done.

Although it may seem like an easy offset here on the floor, Members

should recognize that a \$50 million cut to the expenses account cannot be sustained in conference. Funding for the expenses account in the underlying bill already reflects a 2 percent reduction from fiscal year 2014 and a 4 percent reduction from fiscal year 2012.

For those reasons, I must oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a question either to the chairman or the ranking member:

With local governments like this entering into agreements with the Army Corps of Engineers and doing work like this, is there something that could be done associated with trying to get an assessment of those, and maybe we can chip away at those reimbursements in a timely manner? Is that something that we might be able to work on?

Mr. Chairman, I would yield to anyone who might be able to respond to that.

Mr. Chairman, my question is:

With local governments, like the ones in New Mexico and other parts of the United States, that have entered into agreements with the Army Corps of Engineers or others for reimbursement in a timely manner, is there a way that we might be able to chip away or work at this? I would be willing to withdraw the amendment if I could get an assurance that this is something that we can look at and work at.

I have offered this amendment in years past. And, again, there are local governments across the United States that are waiting for reimbursement, and I think it is something that would be good for us to take a look at.

I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I certainly understand the gentleman's concern, and I agree with him. It all comes down to funding levels.

But I would be more than willing to work with the gentleman to try to see if we could address his concern, which is a concern for all of us, as we move forward into the conference process.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, would that be agreeable or amenable to the ranking member?

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. The chairman and I work very closely on matters like this. It is difficult because of the fact that we have no new starts. We have a backlog that is enormous. And the Corps is under pressure. But we will be very happy to work with the gentleman and to try to resolve situations that you may face in your region.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the staff for their time and their effort and the courtesy of the chairman and the ranking member.

I will not offer this amendment today and we will see if we might be able to work together, Mr. Chairman, and if not, we will come back next year and we will see what we can do. Maybe we will need to take a vote. But I appreciate everyone's courtesy today.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 17, before the semicolon, insert “; of which \$44,000,000 shall be for environmental infrastructure projects for financially distressed municipalities”.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Rhode Island and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the hard work that they have done on this piece of legislation.

My amendment is a simple one. As we all recognize, the Army Corps of Engineers provides invaluable assistance to financially strapped communities through its general construction fund, specifically for wastewater and water improvements and, in past years, has allocated specifically funds for this purpose. However, this year's report does not include any money for this account.

So the amendment I offer would direct that \$44 million, which is 3 percent of the total allocation for construction projects in the Army Corps of Engineers, be set aside to support environmental infrastructure programs specifically for financially distressed communities around the country.

□ 1445

As we know, Mr. Chairman, there are approximately \$298 billion of unmet needs for wastewater and stormwater treatment that are projected over the next 20 years. Of that, about 15 to 20 percent represents water treatment, and that percentage is expected to grow over time because of increases in Federal regulations.

In older cities, a single system, in fact, combines both stormwater and sewage; and rain, obviously, and snow can overwhelm those systems and present tremendous challenges.

Seventy-two percent of the United States population is served by sewage treatment plants, and 3.8 million Americans are served by facilities providing less than secondary treatment, which is the basic requirement of law.

This is a huge unmet need, and for municipalities—particularly financially distressed municipalities—investing in water treatment facilities can be a tremendous burden that they can't meet alone.

In fact, since 2007, the Federal Government has required cities to invest more than \$15 billion in new pipes, plants, and equipment to address sewer and wastewater treatment.

So we are imposing—and rightly so, I am not criticizing that—but we are imposing these standards, and the costs of those are being borne by municipalities.

What this amendment attempts to do is to ensure that at least some portion of that account is set aside for wastewater treatment projects and particularly targets facilities that have financial challenges—financially distressed communities.

I have spoken with the ranking member, and I recognize the chairman has reserved a point of order. I would ask if my ranking member would continue to make the case that these wastewater treatment facilities require some additional investment, and if that is the case, I look forward to working with the chairman and my ranking member, so that we can be sure that this investment is preserved, as it has been in past years, so that communities that really need assistance with their wastewater treatment facilities will have some access to these resources, and if so, I am prepared to withdraw my amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CICILLINE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. There is no objection from our side. We look forward to working with the gentleman.

In your region of the country, the Midwest, the Great Lakes, and the Northeast, in particular, those needs are huge.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for flood damage reduction projects and related efforts in the Mississippi River alluvial valley below Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as authorized by law, \$260,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as are necessary to cover the Federal share of eligible operation and maintenance costs for inland harbors shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCALLISTER

Mr. MCALLISTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$47,000,000)”.

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$127,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MCALLISTER. Mr. Chairman, first, let me just say to Chairman SIMPSON that I appreciate all the hard work you all have done on this whole committee bill and appropriation process.

I know it is not an easy task, and there is a lot of juggling to offset prices on everything, but my amendment will increase the MR&T, the Mississippi River and Tributaries project, by \$47 million, to bring it back to FY14 levels. The FY14 enacted \$307 million, and FY15 committee was \$260 million.

The offset for this is reducing the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy by \$127 million. This number is necessary to make it outlay neutral. This is less than 7 percent of the proposed spending by the committee. Budget authority will be reduced by \$80 million.

The Mississippi River and tributaries are the main arteries of commerce for the Nation—as we see in the reports today, that we have flooding going on in the Mississippi River, starting from the north up above St. Louis, coming down.

This MR&T project is the largest flood control project in the world, providing protection for the 36,000-square mile lower Mississippi valley acreage.

The navigation features of the MR&T project seek to facilitate navigation and promote commerce on the Nation's most vital commercial artery. Waterborne commerce on the Mississippi River increased from 30 million tons in 1940 to nearly 500 million tons today.

Since the initiation of the MR&T project in 1928, the Nation has received a \$24 return for every dollar invested. The remaining work to be completed will have an estimated 37 to 1 return on investment.

With the Panama Canal expansion project underway, we must continue to invest in this vital resource, not reduce funding. These waterways are too important to our Nation.

I just want to say how important the Mississippi River is to the Nation as a whole, not just to my district and those of us that border the Mississippi River and their tributaries all up and down the central United States.

It is very vital to the agriculture industry, to the commerce industry, to everything, and the flood control. It just has a tremendous impact that we all need to be aware of. I know that this \$127 million looks like a lot in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, but we try to find different places that we can take it.

This is one that we found the less neutral, only reducing it 7 percent of its total budget. It was the largest that we found that we could take it from.

Again, I just want to commend the committee on the hard work they have done, and I know it is not an easy challenge at all for them to reduce and have to answer to certain parties for what was reduced and not reduced.

We have worked on this bipartisan—got a lot of bipartisan support on it throughout yesterday and today, and I appreciate your consideration and support on trying to make sure that we do everything we can to take care of the MR&T.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. Let me assure my colleague, though, that I agree with him about the importance of making investments in navigation and flood control infrastructure.

In fact, a lot of the problem was trying to find an offset for \$47 million, and as the gentleman knows, it is very difficult because there are things in this bill that are very important to at least someone within this body.

Because of the importance of navigation and flood control, that is why the underlying bill increases funding for MR&T by 6 percent above the President's budget request and focuses funding, such that navigation is increased by 21 percent and flood control by 15 percent above the budget request.

While I understand that there is almost always more that can be done, we must balance several competing activities within the Energy and Water bill. The amendment would reduce the EERE account, which is already cut by \$113 million below last year's level and \$528 million below the President's budget request.

So while we did increase funding for the MR&T account above the President's request, the EERE account is already \$528 million below the budget's request by the administration. Within the EERE account, the funding the bill preserves is just as important as the funding it cuts.

The bill focuses funding for three main priorities: helping American manufacturers remain competitive, supporting weatherization assistance programs, and addressing future high gas prices.

This funding supports breakthrough research to reduce what Americans pay at the gas pump and to help our companies compete in the global market, which creates jobs here at home.

For these reasons, while I sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do with the amendment and tried to help on crafting an amendment that we can find \$47 million for, I must oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

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

Mr. MCALLISTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$18,800,000) (increased by \$9,500,000) (increased by \$9,300,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Arkansas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the chairman and the committee for their hard work putting this bill together. I know it has taken a lot of time and effort to get here, and I appreciate that.

My amendment addresses a very real threat to the lives and livelihoods of Arkansans and Americans across the country and the citizens and businesses in areas of the depletion of aquifers and lack of water for agriculture during times of drought.

The Bayou Meto and Grand Prairie projects in my district, which are well on the way to completion, will provide an economical and environmentally sensible alternative for protecting aquifers from catastrophic depletion and provide both a renewable agriculture water supply, as well as a valuable role in water quality and quantity control efforts for one of our Nation’s most critical waterways, the Mississippi River.

In most of the Mississippi Delta, aquifers provide significant portions of water used for ag irrigation. With the increasing water demands of agriculture, businesses, and municipalities, aquifers across the country, especially the alluvial and Sparta-Memphis aquifers which supply much of the Mississippi Delta, face the increasing threat of depletion.

This takes the immediate form of drastically lowering well yields and the requirement to drill more often and deeper to access sufficient quantities of water.

Bayou Meto and Grand Prairie were designed to address the threat of aquifer depletion, both to ease demands on aquifers and to ensure a steady and renewable water supply for agriculture in Arkansas’ Mississippi Delta region.

First authorized in 1996, these projects are a framework of canals, pumps, and pipes that pull excess water from the delta’s rivers in times of abundance and store it for future use.

During periods of drought, farmers are able to take from those canals and

reservoirs, instead of further depleting the aquifers or taking from the rivers and streams that feed the Mississippi, helping ensure a continued and reliable water supply, both for agriculture and municipalities.

In addition to the ag benefits, Bayou Meto and Grand Prairie will work to ease demands on the water table, help mitigate the flood damage done to homes and businesses, ensure a safe and steady food and water supply for American citizens, and provide a habitat for various amphibians and waterfowl across the South.

Most importantly, Bayou Meto and Grand Prairie will support jobs for a region of our country persistently above the national unemployment rate.

Without these two important projects, Mississippi Delta farmers will be forced to continue depleting aquifers, the same aquifers municipalities and businesses depend on, risking losing their livelihood.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I rise in opposition, although I am hopeful that my colleague will withdraw the amendment.

First, let me assure the gentleman that I am sympathetic to the issues that he has highlighted in his statement.

Adequate water supply, whether it is for agricultural irrigation or municipal or industrial use, is a basic necessity for economic prosperity. In the committee’s view, however, navigation and flood control are top priorities for the Corps of Engineers, and the bill before us prioritizes funding accordingly.

My colleague from Arkansas has proven to be a strong advocate for his constituents and for the projects that seek to further develop the agricultural irrigation infrastructure important to his constituents.

If the gentleman will agree to withdraw the amendment, I will agree to work with him, moving forward, to try to address these needs, if additional funding beyond that necessary for navigation and flood control becomes available.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman for his commitment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction,

aquatic ecosystem restoration, and related projects authorized by law; providing security for infrastructure owned or operated by the Corps, including administrative buildings and laboratories; maintaining harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency that serve essential navigation needs of general commerce, where authorized by law; surveying and charting northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removing obstructions to navigation, \$2,905,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as are necessary to cover the Federal share of eligible operation and maintenance costs for coastal harbors and channels, and for inland harbors shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund; of which such sums as become available from the special account for the Corps of Engineers established by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 shall be derived from that account for resource protection, research, interpretation, and maintenance activities related to resource protection in the areas at which outdoor recreation is available; and of which such sums as become available from fees collected under section 217 of Public Law 104-303 shall be used to cover the cost of operation and maintenance of the dredged material disposal facilities for which such fees have been collected: *Provided*, That 1 percent of the total amount of funds provided for each of the programs, projects, or activities funded under this heading shall not be allocated to a field operating activity prior to the beginning of the fourth quarter of the fiscal year and shall be available for use by the Chief of Engineers to fund such emergency activities as the Chief of Engineers determines to be necessary and appropriate, and that the Chief of Engineers shall allocate during the fourth quarter any remaining funds which have not been used for emergency activities proportionally in accordance with the amounts provided for the programs, projects, or activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HAHN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$57,600,000)”.

Page 20, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$73,309,100.00)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself however much time I may consume.

I rise to offer the Hahn-Huizenga amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill to utilize the harbor maintenance trust fund as the target set forth in the recently passed Water Resources Reform and Development Act.

As a representative of the Nation’s busiest port complex and the co-founder, along with you, Mr. Chairman, of the Ports Caucus, I have fought hard, from my first day here in Congress, to increase the funding for our Nation’s ports and to fully utilize the harbor maintenance trust fund to ensure that the money that we collect at

our ports goes back to our ports. Around here, they are starting to call me "Miss Harbor Maintenance Tax."

After working for months with my colleagues, we reached a plan to finally put the harbor maintenance trust fund to work and fully utilize this trust fund by 2025.

I appreciate the chairman and the ranking member and the hard work that you put on the bill before us today, but I have one little problem with it. The bill on the floor today fails to follow the law that we just passed 7 weeks ago in such a bipartisan fashion, and we are falling behind by over \$57 million towards utilizing that harbor maintenance fund.

That is money that our ports have paid for and they need. I understand the difficult task the Appropriations Committee has in front of it, but for our ports to remain competitive, they need this funding.

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

□ 1500

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment, but let me assure my colleagues that I agree with her about the importance of sufficient maintenance of our Nation's water resources infrastructure, including our waterways. It seems like the amendments that Members are offering, I agree with them; however, there are challenges that they face.

I also agree that since the harbor maintenance tax is collected for a specific purpose and since the need for dredging is apparent, we should be using these funds for their intended purpose to the greatest extent possible rather than allowing a balance to accumulate in the trust fund. That is an issue we have been dealing with for the last several years, trying to figure out how we can do that without harming all of the other programs within the budget. Unfortunately, that is what they do. Until we change our budget rules or something, and I don't have the answer to it yet, but we have been trying to work with the Budget Committee and with the Appropriations Committee to try to make sure that those taxes collected for the harbor maintenance trust fund are used for what they are intended to do. And if the account is just growing, then we shouldn't be collecting the tax.

Ms. HAHN. That sounds like support for my amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. I know that is what it sounds like. In fact, the bill continues to increase funding for harbor maintenance trust fund activities above the previous year and above the budget request, as the committee has repeatedly done over the past few years. The bill includes more than \$1.1 billion for these activities, which equates to more than a 20 percent increase over the

amount requested by the administration for fiscal year 2015. While I understand that there is almost always more work that can be done, we must balance several competing activities within the Energy and Water bill.

The amendment would reduce the nuclear energy account by \$12.8 million, which would bring the account below the fiscal year 2014 level. The underlying bill provides a total of \$899 million for nuclear energy programs, only \$10 million above last year. That is what seems strange about this, doing what we all think is the right thing to do using the harbor maintenance trust fund to do harbor maintenance. By increasing that, we hurt nuclear energy, which I don't think is the intent of the gentlelady or the gentleman from Louisiana who want to do this.

In addition to protecting the Department of Energy's nuclear energy materials, this funding protects a range of national security programs at the NNSA, Department of Homeland Security, and other Federal agencies. Furthermore, I oppose the reduced funding for nuclear energy research and development, which is a critical part of this bill's support for a balanced energy portfolio. Nuclear power currently generates 20 percent of the Nation's electricity, and it will continue to play a large role in the future.

As I said, I am sympathetic to what the gentlelady is trying to do. In fact, I was cosponsor at one time of a bill by my friend from Louisiana that said you have to use the harbor maintenance trust fund and use it to dredge the harbors. If there is a need out there, we ought to be using that to do it.

We need to work together to try to solve this problem. And believe me, it would help us a lot in crafting this bill if somehow we could do that. Otherwise, we shouldn't be collecting the tax if we have a need and the account is growing. But it is because of our budget rules and so forth that it creates this problem. I understand what the gentlelady is doing. Unfortunately, her amendment would hurt the nuclear account and other accounts within the bill which has been the problem in the past.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the chairman for yielding and for your sympathy toward the intent of the amendment. I commend Congresswoman HAHN and Congressman HUIZENGA for elevating the question of our ports. Waterborne shipping is the most-efficient mode for moving goods in and out of this country. I think they are performing for this Congress an extraordinary service by uniting on a bipartisan basis and kind of ringing the bell and saying, Hey, pay attention to what is happening here with this harbor maintenance tax and how we help our ports compete, as we see the Panama Canal come online and shipbuilding occurring in other countries like South Korea, for example, and China and Singapore

and lots of other places, and saying, Hey, America, wake up.

I feel some urgency to want to support the direction of their efforts, but, as with the chairman, it comes to where the offset is. It is true that, with harbor maintenance tax funds, \$185 million has been moved into the fund as a result of our efforts that the administration had not requested, so we as a subcommittee are moving in the right direction, but I am hoping that this might begin a conversation with our subcommittee and how we work with them on the harbor maintenance tax in a more effective manner. So I thank the chairman for yielding. They brought an important issue before us that we need to resolve more effectively.

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I thank my colleague from California for working with me on this. I am glad to hear the elevation that this issue is getting. In fact, on Monday I met with Andrie Shipping out of Muskegon, Michigan, in my district about this issue, among other issues regarding Great Lakes shipping.

I can tell you, though, that it seems to me as we passed the WRRDA bill just a short 7 weeks ago, as you pointed out, I was willing to compromise on that glide path. What I don't see currently is that glide path to the direction. We are, as you point out, nearly \$58 million below what was laid out in that WRRDA bill.

The chairman from Idaho has a very difficult job balancing all this, and he has pointed out that the nuclear energy program is the way that we are going to offset this. I will point out, though, that it is appropriated for \$899 million this year, a level that is \$36 million above the President's budget request, \$10 million above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level, and \$243 million above the level proposed by the House Appropriations Committee for fiscal year 2014. So it doesn't seem to me we are exactly raiding that when everybody has said that we are overfunding that portion of the bill, and it seems to me that this is a great way of impacting our economy to help create jobs and to help create the momentum to continue to move forward.

So with that, I just want to thank the committee for working towards a solution. I know that I, too, had signed on to Mr. BOUSTANY's bill earlier and have been a champion of this, and we are working towards a true solution on this.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and this critical maritime activity.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I stand to speak in favor of the Hahn amendment. I would like to commend the Appropriations Committee's efforts to increase the Army Corps of Engineers' budget.

In Texas, we have serious water and infrastructure needs. At the Port of Houston, which I represent, our need for operation and maintenance as well as construction money is significant. I greatly appreciate the committee's efforts to fund our needs by appropriating \$31 million, but this amount does not reflect the amount that is needed. The Port of Houston is the second-largest port in the country by tonnage. The Port of Houston ranks number one in foreign tonnage. In 2012, we expanded operations to include cruise ships.

For maintenance dredging operations alone, the Port of Houston requires more than \$70 million annually. The Port of Houston generates significant tax revenue both for the State and Federal Government. That is why I am a strong supporter of the Hahn amendment.

To meet the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century, the Port of Houston needs more than \$31 million from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

The Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) required that 67 percent of Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund fees be spent on related activities.

Unfortunately, this bill short changes the Port of Houston and many other ports around the country.

I support the Hahn amendment.

The funding shortfall significantly impacts the ability of the Port of Houston to receive larger ships and it is our job to help them meet those demands.

I ask that my colleagues support the Hahn amendment.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

(Mr. BENISHEK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Hahn-Huizenga amendment which would increase funding for the United States Army Corps of Engineers operations and maintenance account by \$57 million, a funding level that was established in the House-passed WRRDA bill. This funding is fully offset and is bipartisan in nature.

I am here today to support additional funding because my district—Michigan's First—urgently needs to address the backlog of projects on the book, from dredging to basic port maintenance to the Soo Locks, which are in desperate need of replacement. The backlog impacts jobs and our local economy in Northern Michigan.

I understand tough decisions must be made during these economic times, but Michiganders and all Americans depend on the Great Lakes for transportation of goods and services. I appreciate consideration of this amendment.

I ask for a "yes" vote from my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Huizenga-Hahn Amendment, which would increase funding for the United States Army Corps of Engineers Operations and Maintenance account by \$57.6 million, a funding level that was established in the House-passed WRRDA bill. This funding is fully offset, and is bipartisan in nature.

I am here today to support additional funding for the Army Corps O&M budget because my district—Michigan's First—is in urgent need of funding to address the backlog of projects on the books. From dredging to basic port maintenance, to the Soo Locks the needs in Northern Michigan are only getting worse. This backlog impacts jobs and our local economy. While \$57 million will certainly not suffice to meet the backlog on the Great Lakes, nor even begin to address a number of the other already authorized projects around the country, this represents a small step forward.

What types of projects are we talking about? In my district, we have the Soo Locks. The Soo Locks represent the primary point of passage for goods in the Great Lakes. Products travel on ships from all around the world through the Soo Locks, which are in desperate need of replacement. This is truly a national security issue, and the estimated cost for replacement is approximately \$580 million.

The inability to replace the Soo Locks leads has lead to light-loading and collisions at the entry point, which also increases annual maintenance costs. This is costly to taxpayers and the shipping industry, ultimately leading to higher costs for Northern Michiganders and all Americans who utilize goods that are transported through the Great Lakes.

The work done by the Army Corps impacts the economy and jobs not only in Northern Michigan, but around the world. Commodities transported on the Great Lakes Navigation System represent 10 percent of all U.S. waterborne domestic traffic. The 60 large and smaller federal commercial ports on the Great Lakes are linked in trade with each other, with Canadian ports, and with ports throughout the rest of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that tough decisions must be made during these economic times. However, Michiganders and all Americans depend on the Great Lakes for the transportation of goods and services.

I thank you for your consideration, as this amendment would work to support projects not only in my district, but across the country.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The Great Lakes are operating at 80 percent of capacity. It is costing us \$3 billion in annual business, jobs, growth, and income. The Hahn-Huizenga amendment would restore these funds and move our country forward economically.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote on this amendment. When our ports are strong, our country is strong.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the bipartisan amendment offered by my colleague Ms. HAHN from California and Mr. HUIZENG of Michigan, which would in-

crease the appropriation provided in the underlying bill for Army Corps operations and maintenance dredging of harbors by \$57.6 million. This amendment would fulfill the obligations made in the recently-enacted Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–121), an important one of them being the increase in expenditure of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund as a way to adequately address maintenance needs at our nation's ports and harbors.

Specifically, I support adoption of this amendment because it would position the Army Corps to be more responsive to the maintenance needs at Puerto Rico's six federally-authorized harbors, which are located in Arecibo, Fajardo, Mayagüez, Ponce, San Juan and Yabucoa. Through these harbors, Puerto Rico engages in domestic trade with U.S. states and territories and international trade with foreign countries. In 2012, the San Juan and Ponce harbors alone accounted for over 13 million tons in trade of commodities, making them some of the busiest ports in the United States. Access to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to maintain these harbors at their federally-authorized depth levels is crucial to the expanding \$103 billion trade industry in Puerto Rico. Maintenance and development of the harbors is essential to Puerto Rico's waterborne economy and its ultimate its viability as a commercial maritime waypoint hub between North and South America.

Additionally, I take this opportunity to note that the underlying bill includes an appropriation of \$800,000 specifically for maintenance dredging of the harbor in San Juan—which ranked as the 52nd busiest port in the nation in 2012 in terms of tonnage of total cargo handled. I also appreciate the Committee's expressed concern in its report accompanying the bill about the accessibility of navigation maintenance funds for small, remote and subsistence harbors and waterways across the United States. I believe the Army Corps should review its criteria for allocating harbor maintenance funds in order to develop a more reasonable and equitable allocation for small, remote or subsistence harbors. The current criteria results in those ports with the heaviest cargo traffic being allocated funding from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. The criteria presents a paradoxical situation in that harbors that are not maintained to their federally-authorized depth become less available and less attractive over time to the berthing of maritime vessels. As a consequence, the diminishing number of port calls reduces cargo volume, which in turn makes the harbor less likely to receive maintenance funding. If the overall Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund allocation criteria are not realigned to better account for maintenance needs at smaller harbors, designing a separate budgeting mechanism or criteria to address these needs would be warranted.

In Puerto Rico, for example, although the San Juan Harbor has been given regular maintenance attention in recent years and the harbor in Arecibo recently received maintenance dredging as a result of sediment build-up associated with a hurricane, the island's four other federally-authorized harbors have received minimal to no HMTF funds for much-needed maintenance dredging. Potential improvements to these harbors would be beneficial to the economic revitalization of some of Puerto Rico's 44 coastal municipalities. For

these reasons, I support the renewed call for the Army Corps to update Congress on its review of criteria used for determining which navigation projects at harbors across the United States are funded.

In closing, I urge adoption of this amendment. It is through increased expenditure in 2015 by the Army Corps of Engineers of funds available through the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund that the domestic economy will be strengthened, and that our constituents who rely upon the free, timely and safe flow of goods at our nation's ports will be supported. This amendment gives us an opportunity to better ensure operations at the nation's federally-authorized harbors—including the harbors in Puerto Rico—can reach their full capacity.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, the President's 2015 budget request cuts O&M funding by 28 percent, reflecting an overall \$1 billion cut in the Corps of Engineers' civil works budget from the levels set in the fiscal year 2014 omnibus budget bill.

While I appreciate the House Appropriations' mark of \$44 million above the fiscal year 2014 level, more must be done to help ensure our waterways are properly maintained.

This is especially true with the Water Resources conference report, which allows for 100 percent of the funds generated by the cargo tax to be utilized for harbor maintenance and dredging by the year 2025. We need to help bridge this gap now, as nearly 1,000 Federal ports and harbors have not been adequately maintained, and are dredged to their authorized depths and widths only 35 percent of the time.

The amendment myself and my colleague from Louisiana are coauthoring directs \$1 million from the Department of Energy's administrative offices and directs \$1 million to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' operation and maintenance accounts.

The purpose of the funding redirection is to make strategic and justified

investments in our Nation's port and waterway infrastructure, such as the Calcasieu Ship Channel. For example, Port of Lake Charles officials announced yesterday that vessel traffic is expected to increase by more than 50 percent over the next 5 years and double within the decade. With more than \$67 billion worth of capital investments in southwest Louisiana, the increased channel use is attributed to expanded operations of existing terminals and the construction of several proposed facilities.

Mr. Chairman, we need to work to provide the resources to maintain and dredge these vital navigation and shipping channels.

□ 1515

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chair, first of all, I want to compliment Chairman SIMPSON on all the work he has done on this bill, but also the work he has done with me to plus up the harbor maintenance account and the funds available for dredging. It is critically important.

I am very proud to stand with my colleague from Louisiana in support of this very important amendment. As my colleague expressed, the President's fiscal year '15 budget creates even more of a shortfall.

We have got a significant backlog in harbor maintenance. This is going to hurt American competitiveness. In fact, roughly \$3 billion worth of coastal navigation operations and maintenance work could be done if the funds that are collected for this were actually made available to be used for it.

Louisiana is a leading State in trade, international trade, with three of our top ten ports that conduct trade in goods and energy.

More U.S. merchandise travels by ocean-going vessels than by airplanes, trucks, freight trains, and pipelines combined. That is why these funds are critical for American competitiveness, and that is why they are really important in facilitating U.S. foreign trade.

Our waterways are vital economic pathways for our Nation's commerce and the ability to move American goods to these foreign markets. Hundreds of thousands of jobs depend on this—jobs in Louisiana and across the United States. This infrastructure is vital.

Our amendment would take a modest step. It would redirect \$1 million from the Department of Energy's administrative offices to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers operations and maintenance account. I believe this was a simple, strategic, and commonsense approach to help prioritize necessary maintenance and move us in the right direction.

The Federal Government has the principal responsibility for maintenance of these harbors and shipping channels. Let's make sure that the Corps has the tools to do the job with the money that is collected for that

job. The President failed to do that in his budget request. We can make that change now.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 25, after “expended,” insert “of which such sums as are necessary to carry out the study authorized in section 6002 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014;”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chair, earlier this year, there was a bill that authorized the Corps' projects that was passed in the House and the Senate and signed into law. It also included into that a study that would allow the Corps of Engineers to be able to evaluate their projects.

As simple as this may be, the Corps of Engineers has a tremendous number of things on their inventory that they are doing operation and maintenance for. The study required them to be able to go through all the different projects that they have nationwide and just do a simple evaluation of which projects met the simple focus of the Corps of Engineers and which projects might not meet the central focus. It allowed them to be able to make a simple determination of what, if you will excuse the pun, are the core projects of the Corps.

There are projects that are all over the country. There may be boat ramps, picnic pavilions, or in Oklahoma we have a place called Lake Optima that was a lake built in the 1970s that has never had more than 5 percent water in it. It was a project that did not work effectively as it was originally planned but the Corps still has to maintain because it is on their inventory.

This study would allow them to be able to look at all of their inventory and develop what is the core focus of that. This amendment just ensures that the Corps would have the money necessary to be able to fulfill that study.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REGULATORY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary for administration of laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands, \$200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

For expenses necessary to clean up contamination from sites in the United States resulting from work performed as part of the Nation's early atomic energy program, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For expenses necessary to prepare for flood, hurricane, and other natural disasters and support emergency operations, repairs, and other activities in response to such disasters as authorized by law, \$28,000,000, to remain available until expended.

EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the supervision and general administration of the civil works program in the headquarters of the Corps of Engineers and the offices of the Division Engineers; and for costs of management and operation of the Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity, the Institute for Water Resources, the United States Army Engineer Research and Development Center, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers Finance Center allocable to the civil works program, \$178,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, of which not to exceed \$5,000 may be used for official reception and representation purposes and only during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation provided in this title shall be available to fund the civil works activities of the Office of the Chief of Engineers or the civil works executive direction and management activities of the division offices: *Provided further*, That any Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies appropriation may be used to fund the supervision and general administration of emergency operations, repairs, and other activities in response to any flood, hurricane, or other natural disaster.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Page 59, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a simple amendment to save precious taxpayer resources and to reduce the amount of money spent on paying inefficient bureaucrats with a history of mismanagement and disorganization.

Specifically, my amendment reduces net outlays for the administration of the Army Corps of Engineers by \$1 million from the fiscal year 2014 level, which reduces the budget authority in this bill for the Corps' administration by 2.25 percent. The Corps of Engineers received an overall increase of \$25 million in the bill above the fiscal year 2014 level.

While I can support more funds going to worthwhile projects, I take issue when the Corps continually receives the budget request level for administrative officials who fail to curb their bad behavior and competently perform their jobs.

I would like to read a quick excerpt from the committee report for this bill that highlights some of the continued mismanagement from within the Corps of Engineers:

The Corps of Engineers has suffered several significant failings in recent years that have resulted in cost increases for projects, such as the massive cost escalation associated with the Olmsted Locks and Dam project.

In some cases, the administration has not requested authorization increases in time for the Congress to act before projects experience delays.

The committee enacted new requirements in fiscal year 2014 intended to address these problems, but to date—5 months after enactment—the Corps has not complied with the committee's directions.

In addition, the committee notes that the Corps still has not submitted a complete work plan for fiscal year 2014 nor complied with several other oversight initiatives necessary to safeguard taxpayer dollars.

Another blatant example of the administrative ineptitude within the Corps is the agency has now been working on one chief's report for a particular project in Arizona for 5-plus years now. Throughout the country, this is the norm and not the exception to the rule. This failure to perform even the most simple of tasks drives up the costs of projects and leads to projects not being completed in a timely manner.

Due to frustrations with these delays, Congress was forced to enact a provision that recently passed WRRDA that requires Chiefs' reports to be completed within 3 years.

Let me provide another example of mismanagement by the Corps in Arizona.

An important flood control project was initially estimated by the Corps to cost roughly \$24 million. Now, several years past the deadline for completing this project, the total cost estimate for the project exceeds more than \$100 million. I realize projects have issues sometimes, but this is a clear example of failed leadership within the agency. Unfortunately, mismanagement has become prevalent in the Corps for quite some time now. Several years ago, former Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle, a Democrat from South Dakota, said the Corps is "one of the most incompetent and inept organizations in all the Federal Government."

One final example of significant malfunction within the Corps' administration was cited by the Government Accountability Office. The GAO had nothing but negative things to say about a Corps study justifying a \$332 million project in the Delaware River. GAO found that the study "was based on miscalculations, invalid assumptions, and outdated information." GAO found that projected benefits for this project were nearly 75 percent fraudulent.

With an almost \$18 trillion debt that continues to grow, it is irresponsible to throw more money at a department that cannot manage its own affairs. My amendment does not reduce funding for important projects. Again, my amendment simply reduces net outlays for incompetent Corps of Engineers bureaucrats from the fiscal year 2014 level.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman and Members, I rise to oppose the amendment because it doesn't make any sense to me to make it harder for the Corps to do its job when we know they have backlogs in projects of over \$60 billion. We are increasing funding for the Corps to try to meet the needs of States like Arizona—and the other 49 States as well—and there seems to be no shortage of complaints about the Corps' response time on project issues because they can't get their work done because they don't have enough money to complete their projects.

This gentleman may be unaware that oversight funding has already been cut by \$4 million from the current year. We are giving the Corps more project money to try to deal with their backlog; but then if we don't have proper oversight, we are going to dig the hole deeper. We need to have the resources in order to complete the projects.

The amendment, in a way, is pennywise and pound-foolish because it reduces Federal oversight of more than \$5 billion. The problem with the Corps historically has been that every Member has projects that they want completed, but we don't have the money to do it. If you are going to cut the legs out of staff that are there to do the job, it is going to make it much more difficult to manage the money. It is like trying to send an army into battle and not giving them the weapons to do it or creating all these barriers to completion.

We need to turn around and allow the Corps to resolve the projects that are on the books—there are no new starts in this bill—and give them the staff to do the job and to get it done and to get it done well and within budget, not stretch it out. The reason these projects are stretched out over the years: they simply don't have the money. To put the infrastructure in the ground, whether it is Arizona, Ohio, or California, they are just short-changed at every end. We make it really difficult for them.

I think the gentleman is well-intended. He wants to get the work done. I want to get the work done. I don't think that the amendment actually leads us to that end. Respectfully, we

would oppose the amendment and ask our colleagues to join us.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE
ARMY FOR CIVIL WORKS

For the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works as authorized by 10 U.S.C. 3016(b)(3), \$2,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BILIRAKIS

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced to \$0)”.

Page 59, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support increased accountability of the Army Corps of Engineers.

I thank, of course, Chairman ROGERS and Chairman SIMPSON for their work on this appropriations bill and leadership to ensure scarce taxpayer dollars are well spent.

My amendment seeks to strike all funding for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

Under current law, fringe groups are allowed to, for the cost of a postage stamp, Mr. Chair, file lawsuits against any infrastructure project needing a clean water permit that they spot in the Federal Register. This is outrageous. These lawsuits and the fear of them have stopped a number of worthy projects that were necessary for local governments to protect their constituents.

The Corps' failure to defend the public safety is because of a serious lack of leadership by the Corps, in my opinion. One such project in Pasco County, Florida, my Congressional District, is the Ridge Road extension, a much-needed route for hurricane evacuation.

□ 1530

For over two decades, this project has been in the permitting process because of the bureaucratic paper shuffling and duplicative environmental studies. During this time of scarce tax-

payer dollars and economic uncertainty, we have pending infrastructure projects that can create jobs and protect the public, but the Corps often drags out the application process to push the applicant to drop their application out of fear that the agency will have to engage in litigation. These lawsuits are solely to kill worthy public safety projects, in my opinion, and not based on the merits of the projects.

I note this bill's committee report, which says that, “the committee is concerned that the administration has not been taking congressional direction seriously,” in regards to these permit projects.

There is clearly a serious leadership problem at this agency. This is an opportunity for the administration to act and ensure the public is protected.

The committee report also includes encouragement from the committee “to keep in mind the public safety aspects of the project when considering permit applications and to pursue ways to shorten review times, including by performing reviews currently and eliminating duplicative reviews to the maximum extent practicable.”

I call the Corps to work with the communities across the country and approve these needed public safety projects to prevent needless loss of life. With reassurances from Chairman SIMPSON that the committee will continue to encourage the Corps to prioritize public safety projects, I would consider withdrawing the amendment at this time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would assure the gentleman that we share his concerns, and in fact, if you look at the underlying bill, we have reduced funding for the ASA's office by 60 percent, or \$3 million, because of the same concerns we have that you are expressing and that Mr. GOSAR expressed before you. It is a concern that all of us have. We will work with you to make sure that we address this.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Reclaiming my time, thanks for giving me those assurances. This is very important for public safety purposes. Our constituents need evacuation routes in case there is a hurricane or any kind of disaster.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF
ENGINEERS—CIVIL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. (a) None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that—

(1) creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds are denied or restricted by this Act;

(4) reduces funds that are directed to be used for a specific program, project, or activity by this Act;

(5) increases funds for any program, project, or activity by more than \$2,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or

(6) reduces funds for any program, project, or activity by more than \$2,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less.

(b) Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to any project or activity authorized under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, section 208 of the Flood Control Act of 1954, section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960, section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962, section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968, section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, or section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992.

(c) The Corps of Engineers shall submit reports on a quarterly basis to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing all the funds reprogrammed between programs, projects, activities, or categories of funding. The first quarterly report shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 102. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to award or modify any contract that commits funds beyond the amounts appropriated for that program, project, or activity that remain unobligated, except that such amounts may include any funds that have been made available through reprogramming pursuant to section 101.

SEC. 103. None of the funds in this Act, or previous Acts, making funds available for Energy and Water Development, shall be used to award any continuing contract that commits additional funding from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund unless or until such time that a long-term mechanism to enhance revenues in this Fund sufficient to meet the cost-sharing authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662) is enacted.

SEC. 104. The Secretary of the Army may transfer to the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service may accept and expend, up to \$4,700,000 of funds provided in this title under the heading “Operation and Maintenance” to mitigate for fisheries lost due to Corps of Engineers projects.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act making appropriations for Energy and Water Development for any fiscal year may be used by the Corps of Engineers to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations in effect on October 1, 2012, pertaining to the definitions of the terms “fill material” or “discharge of fill material” for the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act making appropriations for Energy and Water Development for any fiscal year may be used by the Corps of Engineers to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations and guidance in effect on October 1, 2012, pertaining to the definition of waters under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), including the provisions of the rules dated November 13, 1986, and August 25, 1993, relating to such jurisdiction, and the guidance documents dated January 15, 2003, and December 2, 2008, relating to such jurisdiction.

SEC. 107. As of the date of enactment of this Act and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the Army shall not promulgate or enforce any regulation that prohibits an individual from possessing a firearm, including an assembled or functional firearm, at a water resources development project covered under section 327.0 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), if—

(1) the individual is not otherwise prohibited by law from possessing the firearm; and

(2) the possession of the firearm is in compliance with the law of the State in which the water resources development project is located.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

For carrying out activities authorized by the Central Utah Project Completion Act, \$9,874,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$1,000,000 shall be deposited into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$1,300,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for necessary expenses incurred in carrying out related responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2015, of the amount made available to the Commission under this Act or any other Act, the Commission may use an amount not to exceed \$1,500,000 for administrative expenses.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The following appropriations shall be expended to execute authorized functions of the Bureau of Reclamation:

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For management, development, and restoration of water and related natural resources and for related activities, including the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of reclamation and other facilities, participation in fulfilling related Federal responsibilities to Native Americans, and related grants to, and cooperative and other agreements with, State and local governments, federally recognized Indian tribes, and others, \$856,351,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$25,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and \$6,840,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund; of which such amounts as may be necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund: *Provided*, That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriation under this heading: *Provided further*, That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities that can be financed by the Reclamation Fund or the Bureau of Reclamation special fee account established by 16 U.S.C. 6806 shall be derived from that Fund or account: *Provided further*, That funds contributed under 43 U.S.C. 395 are available until expended for the purposes for which the funds were contributed: *Provided further*, That funds advanced under 43 U.S.C. 397a shall be credited to this account and are available until expended for the same purposes as the sums appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided herein, funds may be used for high-priority projects which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1706.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I would like to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their hard work and collaboration on this bipartisan and important bill.

I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 4923, the Energy and Water Appropriations Act, to provide additional, critical resources for Bureau of Reclamation environmental restoration projects that address or improve public health conditions.

The Bureau of Reclamation is responsible for managing, developing, and restoring our Nation's waters to support the interests of the American public. Mr. Chairman, I can think of fewer efforts more in the public interest than protecting the public's health.

Across the West, the Bureau helps water districts develop recycled water technology to provide safe irrigation water for crops, provides engineering assistance for restoration efforts, and monitors water quality so that communities can take preventative action to protect the environment and public health.

There are many examples in our Nation, and I will give just a couple.

In southern California, in the Coachella Valley, the Bureau of Reclamation plays a large role in protecting public health by monitoring and helping restore the water equality of the Salton Sea. For several decades now, deteriorating water quality and reduced water inflows have made the Salton Sea a threat to southern California residents, and eventually the sea could threaten public health in cities all across southern California.

As the sea dries and the water level recedes, exposed lake bed will release windblown contaminants containing selenium, arsenic, and pesticides. Exposure to these contaminants has been shown to increase the number and severity of asthma attacks; decrease the growth and development of lung function in school-age children; and increase the risk of cardiac disease, heart attacks, and mortality in adults.

Already, exposed lake bed on the southern portion of the sea has had an impact on local air quality, with rates of pediatric asthma-related hospitalizations in the region far above the national average. As an emergency medicine physician, I have seen firsthand the effects of poor air and water quality.

The public health danger to families and children from the Salton Sea is very real, and to help address the exposed lake bed in the southern portion

of the sea, a partnership has put together the Red Hill Bay project to cover over 700 acres of exposed lake bed with clean water. These shallow pools will cover the dangerous contaminants in the lake bed, preventing them from becoming airborne and threatening the surrounding communities.

The Bureau of Reclamation supports projects like Red Hill Bay all across the Western United States, working with local stakeholders who recognize the value of ensuring our waters are well managed.

For example, in my neighboring district, California's 42nd District, the Bureau of Reclamation assisted in helping to mitigate public health concerns and water quality issues at Lake Elsinore. Lake Elsinore, like the Salton Sea, has faced chronic challenges related to water level and water quality. Algae blooms from the lake caused public health concerns, and even took the life of a child.

A collaboration between local governments, local water districts, and the Bureau of Reclamation came together to establish a supply of recycled water to maintain water levels and installed aerators to reduce algae blooms and prevent fish die-offs by keeping oxygen levels high.

Lake Elsinore now supports many local businesses, has a flourishing tourism industry, and is safer for residents to enjoy all the benefits the lake has to offer, including swimming and water sports.

My amendment would provide additional resources towards many Bureau water projects throughout the Nation that will protect the public's health. The health of the American people must be put above politics, and I urge my colleagues to come together to support my amendment.

I reserve 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 to support the gentleman's amendment and to say that he has worked so hard in the interest of maintaining both public health and restoration of the environment related to the Salton Sea. Unless you have actually seen the Salton Sea and the changing nature of the ecosystem in southern California, you can't imagine how enormous that challenge is. From the very first day he was elected, Mr. RUIZ was talking to us about the needs of that particular part of our country.

I know that polluted agricultural runoff had something to do with what has happened to the Salton Sea. The changing nature of rainfall has transformed it.

I think about the Sea of Azov in Russia and how dangerous that has become to the surrounding environment. We face the same challenge here in our country.

I know it is difficult to resolve this issue, and it will take many years, because it didn't just take one year for

the sea to become a wasteland, really, and the surrounding communities so affected.

I just want to thank the gentleman for his leadership and for keeping us and your part of America on the right course. You are very talented and very caring. I just wanted to stand in support of your efforts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000) (increased by \$3,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment which allocates \$3 million for water conservation and delivery.

The funding for this amendment is taken directly from the underlying bill’s \$56 million appropriation to the Bureau of Reclamation for water projects. The amendment directs \$3 million of this sum specifically for water conservation and delivery projects.

The Bureau of Reclamation water conservation delivery fund provides critical assistance to Western areas of the country. In the arid West, water is our life. These projects improve water supply quality, address water shortage issues, improve conservation measures, and stabilize water supplies. These are projects like the Arkansas Valley Conduit, with over 100 miles of pipelines serving dozen of communities with clean, abundant, and affordable water.

In the Western United States, water is an economic driver. In order to attract more economic growth, either in business or agriculture, every industry in the West is dependent upon an ample and safe water supply.

This amendment will allow the Bureau of Reclamation more flexibility to continue with these types of projects while simultaneously improving public health and improving the environment. Also, these projects are critically important during drought years so that water is appropriately allocated for both municipal and agriculture uses.

The water conservation and delivery line in the Bureau’s budget has been previously used for the California Central Valley Project, Washington State’s Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project, the Arkansas Valley Conduit in Colorado, and the Lewiston Orchard Project in the chairman’s home State of Idaho.

I urge support of the amendment, and I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), the coauthor of this amendment, and I thank him for leadership on issues relating to water in the State of Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague (Mr. GARDNER) for yielding to me and for his partnership in this critical matter.

As you know, water is the lifeblood of the Western United States and absolutely critical to the health of our communities and our local economies. In order to meet federally mandated water quality standards across the West, the Bureau of Reclamation water conservation and delivery fund is essential.

In Colorado, as is the case throughout the West, we have similar needs to be able to move forward with engineering design work on the authorized features of existing Reclamation projects. This amendment will provide the Bureau of Reclamation the flexibility it needs to be able to allocate funds to advance and complete ongoing work that will provide efficient delivery of water from an existing multipurpose Reclamation project as authorized by Congress in 1962.

□ 1545

Among the eligible projects within the water conservation and delivery fund is, in my district, the Arkansas Valley Conduit. It is the final component of the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, which is a water diversion and storage project in the lower Arkansas Valley.

Once constructed, the conduit will deliver clean drinking water to families, producers, and municipalities throughout southeastern Colorado.

By directing \$3 million of this sum specifically for water conservation and delivery projects, the Bureau of Reclamation can proceed with ongoing work on water supply delivery projects at a more efficient pace to be able to reach our shared goals in meeting increased water demands by developing and maximizing clean water supplies.

It is our hope that Reclamation prioritizes these projects and resolves the water shortages that exist in the West while enhancing our regional development and promoting our job growth.

Mr. GARDNER. Again, I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his leadership. He is another Western lawmaker who has done tremendous good for our Western States when it comes to water conservation delivery efforts.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. NOEM

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,000,000)”.

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentlewoman from South Dakota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota.

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the chairman and the ranking member and all of the committee staff for their hard work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important things during the appropriations process is making tough decisions and identifying priorities that need funding. One area that is specifically important is providing water throughout the country, including in rural areas.

In my State and across the West, there are critical water infrastructure projects that are waiting to be funded. They were promised to be funded by the Federal Government years ago, and construction is underway on many of these projects.

Many communities have put in more than their fair share of funding. The States have done so as well. The only entity that has failed to follow through on that commitment is the Federal Government.

Water is one of our most basic needs, and we need to ensure that we have safe and affordable drinking water across this country.

For rural areas, it is also a jobs issue. Without the completion of rural water projects, businesses aren’t able to create much-needed jobs, and local economies suffer. Unfortunately, year after year, the funding for these projects continues to decline under the President’s budget requests.

We have the opportunity here today to make some meaningful progress on these projects and ensure that the Federal Government follows through on its previous commitments. Even with my amendment, the funding for rural water projects is still below what it was for fiscal year 2014.

My bill increases the funding for rural water projects, and it does not increase net budget outlays. We need to support critical infrastructure and essential access to water, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this amendment, as well as the chairman for allowing us to have this debate.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. In the appropriations process, we must prioritize funding for necessary projects and balance those with spending reductions to reduce the national debt.

In Montana, we depend on a steady supply of water to irrigate our crops, to water our livestock, and to provide energy through hydropower—a renewable resource.

The struggle for clean water continues to create health challenges for Indian Country and nearby communities, in addition to making economic development more difficult.

Without this critical funding for Rocky Boy's-North Central Mountain Rural Water System and the Fort Peck Reservation-Dry Prairie Rural Water System, thousands of Montanans in rural communities could go without quality water accessibility.

The President's budget requests for these critical projects continue to decline each year, while prioritizing other accounts that are not related to the basic needs of our rural communities.

Mr. Chairman, every year that we wait to delay the funding of these essential projects, the more expensive construction, operation, and maintenance become.

For instance, the Fort Peck project's reduced funding levels have doubled the authorization period, and inflation has nearly doubled the overall cost of construction, but the projected savings is still \$11 million.

However, overhead will consume the projected savings on the project to date and will encroach upon the authorized construction ceiling.

The CBO has just scored this amendment. This decreases the net budget outlays. Passing this amendment is the responsible stewardship of tax dollars and is important to rural communities.

It is also a nonpartisan issue. Funding these projects is supported by the entire Montana delegation—both Republicans and Democrats—and last year, a similar amendment passed by voice vote. I urge the support of this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentlelady's amendment, and I do so for several reasons.

First of all, the renewable energy accounts, where the funds are taken from, have already been reduced by \$113 million from the prior fiscal year.

Frankly, those accounts are part of our future—of our future energy security for the country and, as I said in my opening statement, of the preservation of our liberty.

With over 40 percent of our energy resources being imported, there is no higher priority than for us to diversify our energy portfolio and to reclaim our own economic and energy security. Further reduction in those accounts will have a detrimental impact not just in Montana, but across this country.

In addition, the amendment, as I understand it, reduces Departmental administration by \$6 million. Given my colleague's frustration with the De-

partment's pace on many activities, including on the approval of our LNG export efforts, this seems to be a case of, really, making it much more difficult for the Department to do its job.

Let me put on the record again that, just since 2003, in the last decade, our country has spent \$2.3 trillion on importing foreign petroleum. This is a vast shift of wealth, and thousands upon thousands—literally millions of jobs—are evaporating from our country.

Bloomberg New Energy Finance reports for 2030 that the market outlook estimates that renewables will command over 60 percent of the \$7.7 trillion of power investment that is going to be made someplace.

When we think about our country's future, we must be vigilant, and we must be smart. We must be engaged in those markets because, if we aren't, we see what China is doing and we see what Russia is doing.

We have to pay attention. We can't rob Peter to try to pay Paul. Any water project, whether it is in Montana or whether it is in Ohio, is largely a public project, and you have to make money in the market to pay for it.

Reasserting ourselves and becoming leaders in energy, rather than importers of energy, is where America needs to head. I think this takes us in the wrong direction.

We should be leading investment in these technologies, not further eroding their capacity for our country, because other countries will displace us, and they are doing so.

Now, in terms of rural water projects in the Bureau of Reclamation, those water projects already will receive \$21 million above the administration's request, so it is not like our subcommittee isn't doing its job.

Frankly, our part of America gets much less attention than the West does, in terms of rural water investment. We have a 50-50 match in our part of the country.

We don't have anything like the Bureau of Reclamation, and we have to compete in the Midwest for those precious dollars. We don't have enough, but we manage to move along as best we can.

I think that we have done what we can in our bill for rural water, and I really would take objection to the gentlelady's efforts to try to further cripple those renewable energy accounts that are going to help to create America's new future and to lead us toward energy independence and toward a re-assumption of our liberties. I would hope that she would find another way to achieve her objectives.

I think I must also offer the comment that, as we look toward the West and its water needs, because of what is happening in the environment, we may be at a point in America's history at which we have to put our dollars where it makes the most sense, and if development is occurring in areas that are already water short or that are becom-

ing desert—where the desert is growing and where literally nature can't provide what it did, maybe, 100 years ago—I think we have to manage the public dollars more wisely.

I oppose the gentlelady's amendment. I hope that we can find a different way to meet her genuine concerns.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, a couple of facts to follow up on the gentlelady's comments.

What we are trying to do is to get clean drinking water to individuals, to people, where the Federal Government has failed to follow through on commitments that it has made previously.

The reason that we have already plussed up some of these dollars is that the President's budget requests have been so low over the last few years, so we have had to do that in order to try to meet the need. Water projects still, even if my amendment is adopted, will receive less than they did in 2014.

I certainly understand your concerns, as I am a supporter of an all-of-the-above American energy supply as well, but we have people waiting for clean drinking water. That should be a priority, and this amendment should be adopted.

Last year, it was voice adopted because everybody recognized the importance of making sure that people in this country could get clean drinking water. They at least should have that basic privilege.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask for everyone's support on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND
For carrying out the programs, projects, plans, habitat restoration, improvement, and acquisition provisions of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, \$56,995,000, to be derived from such sums as may be collected in the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund pursuant to sections 3407(d), 3404(c)(3), and 3405(f) of Public Law 102-575, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to assess and collect the full amount of the additional mitigation and restoration payments authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102-575: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for the acquisition or leasing of water for in-stream purposes if the water is already committed to in-stream purposes by a court adopted decree or order.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For carrying out activities authorized by the Water Supply, Reliability, and Environmental Improvement Act, consistent with plans to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, \$37,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which such amounts as may be necessary to carry out such activities may be transferred to appropriate accounts of

other participating Federal agencies to carry out authorized purposes: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for the Federal share of the costs of CALFED Program management: *Provided further*, That CALFED implementation shall be carried out in a balanced manner with clear performance measures demonstrating concurrent progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the Program.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of policy, administration, and related functions in the Office of the Commissioner, the Denver office, and offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation, to remain available until September 30, 2016, \$53,849,000, to be derived from the Reclamation Fund and be nonreimbursable as provided in 43 U.S.C. 377: *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted as policy and administration expenses.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, \$500,000 is hereby permanently rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles, which are for replacement only.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. (a) None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that—

- (1) creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity;
- (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by this Act;

(4) restarts or resumes any program, project or activity for which funds are not provided in this Act, unless prior approval is received from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate;

(5) transfers funds in excess of the following limits:

(A) 15 percent for any program, project or activity for which \$2,000,000 or more is available at the beginning of the fiscal year; or

(B) \$300,000 for any program, project or activity for which less than \$2,000,000 is available at the beginning of the fiscal year;

(6) transfers more than \$500,000 from either the Facilities Operation, Maintenance, and Rehabilitation category or the Resources Management and Development category to any program, project, or activity in the other category; or

(7) transfers, when necessary to discharge legal obligations of the Bureau of Reclamation, more than \$5,000,000 to provide adequate funds for settled contractor claims, increased contractor earnings due to accelerated rates of operations, and real estate deficiency judgments.

(b) Subsection (a)(5) shall not apply to any transfer of funds within the Facilities Operation, Maintenance, and Rehabilitation category.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term “transfer” means any movement of funds into or out of a program, project, or activity.

(d) The Bureau of Reclamation shall submit reports on a quarterly basis to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing all

the funds reprogrammed between programs, projects, activities, or categories of funding. The first quarterly report shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit until development by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of California of a plan, which shall conform to the water quality standards of the State of California as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to minimize any detrimental effect of the San Luis drainage waters.

(b) The costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the costs of the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program shall be classified by the Secretary of the Interior as reimbursable or nonreimbursable and collected until fully repaid pursuant to the “Cleanup Program—Alternative Repayment Plan” and the “SJVDP—Alternative Repayment Plan” described in the report entitled “Repayment Report, Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, February 1995”, prepared by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. Any future obligations of funds by the United States relating to, or providing for, drainage service or drainage studies for the San Luis Unit shall be fully reimbursable by San Luis Unit beneficiaries of such service or studies pursuant to Federal reclamation law.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ENERGY PROGRAMS

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for energy efficiency and renewable energy activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$1,789,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$150,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$112,686,000)”.

Page 21, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$165,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentlewoman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to boost the energy efficiency initiatives across America that have a proven return on investment for taxpayers.

This amendment is paid for by reducing—but not by eliminating—accounts that do not have the same return on investment for taxpayers.

The appropriation in the bill for energy efficiency and renewable energy is

\$112 million below the 2014 appropriated level, and it is \$528 million below the budget request.

Now, I wish we could meet the budget request this year, but, colleagues, we should at least restore the money back to last year's levels, which is still a very modest investment in energy efficiency and renewable energy for America.

The funds tied to energy efficiency and renewable energy fuel jobs across America in advanced manufacturing and clean energy.

□ 1600

These investments in energy efficiency help make our businesses more competitive compared to businesses all across the globe. In addition, energy efficiency reduces the cost for consumers—wouldn't that be revolutionary, to put some money back into the pockets of our neighbors in this day and age—and has the added benefit of providing cleaner air.

Back home in Florida, I have noticed so many local governments investing in better lighting and energy efficiency. So this even has the potential to lower property taxes for our neighbors back home.

Mr. Chairman, we are on the cusp of a technological revolution when it comes to energy and energy efficiency. Look at what is happening all across America. We have a very diverse portfolio. But this budget today is skewed a little bit. It chops energy efficiency and renewable energy that has sufficient great potential to create jobs and it is a little too heavy on some of the fossil fuel areas.

I will suggest an area that my Republican colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee criticized during a committee meeting not too long ago, and that was the carbon capture and sequestration. Compare the return on investment right now provided in this bill for the multimillion-dollar amount we are putting into carbon capture that is not proven compared to what we could achieve on the return on investment on energy efficiency for our neighbors, for our businesses, and for jobs. So, therefore, this amendment will shift a little bit, not all, from those technologies and put it into a place where it works—energy efficiency.

I appreciate Ranking Member KAPTUR's vision. She understands that this is our future, this is a job creator. I appreciate her work and Chairman SIMPSON's work on the appropriations bill.

I ask for an “aye” vote on the Castor amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, while I share my colleague's support for energy efficiency programs, the bill funds EERE, the Energy Efficiency portfolio, at \$26 million above last year's level,

with targeted increases for weatherization assistance and advanced manufacturing.

What we did in this bill, actually, was refocus some of the administration's requested increases in the renewable energy arena to where we actually use energy. Coal, oil, and natural gas provide 82 percent of the electricity in this country, of the energy used in this Nation's homes and businesses, 82 percent. Reducing the fossil energy research—they are studying things like how heat can more efficiently be converted into electricity in a cross-cutting effort with the nuclear and solar energy programs, how water can be more efficiently used in power plants, and how coal can be used to produce electrical power.

The amendment would also reduce funding for a program that ensures we use our Nation's fossil fuel resources as well and as cleanly as possible. In fact, if we increased the efficiency of our fossil fuel plants by just 1 percent, we could power an additional 2 million households without using a single additional pound of fuel from the ground.

That is the research we are doing in the fossil energy area. That is where we would take the money out of, the area where most of our electricity is produced from, and shift it to an area, while important, doesn't produce nearly as much energy as the other areas in this bill.

So, while I understand what the gentlelady is trying to do, we have actually increased the energy efficiency budget, as I said, by \$26 million above last year, and we will continue to work on that.

I would oppose this amendment and ask my colleagues to vote against it.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MARCHANT). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WENSTRUP

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,421,000)".

Page 23, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$15,000,000)".

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,540,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I rise to follow through on a promise the American Government made to the people in my district and across the country to fund nuclear cleanup projects at cold war enrichment facilities. This amendment would direct \$15 million to the Uranium Enrichment

Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.

At the height of the atomic age, the government began enriching uranium in our arms race against the Soviet threat. One of these facilities is the Portsmouth plant in Pike County, Ohio. Today, half a century later, it needs to be decommissioned and cleaned up, a task that has been entrusted to the Department of Energy.

Like other DOE projects, Portsmouth is largely funded through uranium sales. Since the price of uranium has dropped significantly since Fukushima, additional funding is necessary to make up for the loss of revenue.

The community cannot move forward without an adequate cleanup. The people of Pike County and the region worked extremely hard for the national security interests of this country. Unfortunately, we, the Federal Government, seem to be running from them in their time of need. This community is held hostage, unable to develop their economy and their land until the cleanup is complete. Delaying the cleanup punishes a community that answered our Nation's call, and now our Nation is willing to walk away from them, leaving a radioactive and chemical contamination.

Without adequate funding, the Federal Government is leaving a massively contaminated site right in the heartland of our country. A delay in funding for fiscal 2015 only means a higher cost to the government in future years.

The success of the environmental management work at the Portsmouth plant is critical to the Pike County area and the entire region. We are talking about good, honest, hardworking Americans, and we are standing in their way by undercutting the project's funding and leaving a contaminated cold war facility in the heart of their community.

In an effort to minimize wasteful delays, unnecessary layoffs, and job loss, our amendment would provide \$15 million for this fund, completely paid for by offsets in the bill from less crucial administrative and energy accounts. This amendment prioritizes funding for an actual, existing, ongoing project that employs hundreds of hardworking Ohioans and keeps important environmental management work on schedule.

I acknowledge and appreciate the committee's work to include \$15 million in funding for this project, but the bottom line is this is far short of the needed \$65 million more to continue the cleanup project in a timely manner. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. With each delay, the cost goes up.

Our Nation benefited from the work conducted in Pike County, and now they are being left out and endure more uncertainty from Washington. This site must be cleaned up. It is an environmental imperative and an economic imperative, and it is the right thing to do.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WENSTRUP. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. So I understand, where are you taking the \$15 million from?

Mr. WENSTRUP. The \$15 million is coming from renewable energy accounts and less crucial administrative accounts.

Ms. KAPTUR. Could I offer the opinion that, if the gentleman found different offsets, this Member, as an Ohioan, would be very interested in supporting the workers in Portsmouth and in that region of Ohio which are so devastated.

At the moment, I can't do that because I don't agree with the offsets, but I wanted to place the opinion on the Record. And I thank the gentleman very much for his efforts on behalf of the State of Ohio and that region of Ohio.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Reclaiming my time, you know, renewable is not an option for this area of America until it is cleaned up, and waiting costs more and it paralyzes a large portion of Ohio.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I understand what the gentleman is trying to do. The gentleman's amendment would increase appropriated funds to Portsmouth by another \$15 million. Because of the overall reductions that were necessary in the Department of Energy's environmental cleanup programs, we balanced these reductions across all cleanup sites so that no one site is targeted.

I certainly understand the gentleman's concerns about the site, and this bill provides strong support for Portsmouth. Despite the fact that funding at most sites is going down, the bill actually boosts funding for the site by \$37 million above the fiscal year 2014 and \$15 million above the budget request.

However, I can't support further increases to compensate for the Department's off-budget uranium transfers, which our subcommittee has criticized for years. The Department has been transferring stockpiles of uranium to generate cleanup funds for the site, a practice the Government Accountability Office has determined to be illegal and which could be further held up in fiscal year 2015 due to recent litigation.

The Department's reliance on its uranium transfers has inappropriately circumvented the appropriations process, has adversely impacted our domestic uranium mining and conversion industry, and is now creating further problems as the market price of uranium continues to drop.

I am also concerned about the amendment's offsets, particularly the

cut to EERE, which is \$113 million below the budget request. The last amendment, by Ms. CASTOR, proposed increasing EERE by taking money out of fossil energy. I opposed that. It wasn't because I don't like EERE. It was because I didn't like where they were taking the money from. This would take money out of EERE that is already reduced \$113 million from last year, which I also oppose.

So I must oppose this gentleman's amendment and urge Members to do the same.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I wanted to make a point on this particular Portsmouth facility and the Department of Energy's seeming inability to help communities transition. Whether it is coal-fired utilities and the issues that coal country faces in general or here you have a facility that is important in the Nation's defense looking back and looking forward, and so many times it just seems that when technologies change, when situations change, the local people who have invested their lives just get spit out.

I just wanted to put that statement on the Record, because I know the Department of Energy is listening today, and we have the ability in this country to transition communities. Maybe in places like Portsmouth we should be doing more on renewables, because America is going to need renewables; and maybe there is a way the Department of Energy could be more creative, whether it is natural gas, whether it is storage of certain material and so forth. But to put all those people out of work, without a plan, without a transition plan, it is like, you know, the private sector giving them the pink slip at Christmas. That is when they always give them the pink slips, right before Christmas. It is so heartless. Here you have a community that is going to be heavily affected.

So I just wanted to say on the Record, Mr. Chairman of the full committee, that I just feel that the Department has been a bit laggard, and I would hope that they could work with us in a more constructive way. I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, and he is very well-intentioned as he comes to the floor today. I just wish I could do more to convince the Department to help him.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, I agree with the gentlelady's comments.

I should say, it is not Portsmouth's or the gentleman from Ohio's fault that they have been using uranium transfers to fund this. It is not the people who are working there; it is not their fault. It is the Department's fault, and we have raised concerns for years that that is inappropriate and illegal. We knew that it was going to come to this when those uranium transfers couldn't be made anymore be-

cause of the price of uranium and other things, and it is the result of the choice of the Department to fund this by using the uranium transfers. Unfortunately, it has come to what we predicted would be a problem when we started raising these concerns with the Department.

So, while I understand what the gentleman is doing and sympathize with what the gentleman is doing and will be willing to work with him to see what could be done as we move this bill forward, I do have to oppose the amendment as it currently exists.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 60 seconds to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by Dr. WENSTRUP. This much-needed amendment will blunt the job losses that are coming to the hardworking men and women who are currently working to try and clean up that Atomic Energy Commission plant there in Piketon.

I understand the committee's attempts, and I appreciate the committee's attempts. Unfortunately, the \$15 million that they have put in this appropriation is still not enough to stop the hundreds of layoffs that will come if nothing more is done, nor is it enough to keep this critical cleanup project on track so that the property can be developed to create more jobs to replace the ones that are going to be lost anyway.

□ 1615

That is why this amendment is so necessary. It reroutes money from renewable and overhead costs to pay for the cleanup work that we promised to the Piketon, Ohio, folks; and we ought to stay with that. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$111,641,000)".

Page 21, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$161,879,450)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman

from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This legislation asks the simple question: Will we look forward, as a country, as to where we draw our energy resources, toward cleaner, more renewable sources? Or will we continue to look backwards toward dirtier fossil fuels that will harm our environment? Do we want to be a part of a 21st century energy policy? Or do we want to be a part of a 20th century energy policy?

My amendment increases the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, or EERE, R&D funding levels by \$111.6 million above what is in the bill. The offset comes from the fossil energy R&D in an amount necessary to make the outlays in my amendment budget-neutral.

The request from the majority exceeds the White House's request for fossil fuel R&D but cuts the request for EERE. This increase in EERE would bring the funding levels back to fiscal year 2014 level and help ensure that, at the very least, we are not moving backwards in our work towards energy security.

My colleagues across the aisle, instead, are seeking to cut this forward-looking program by \$111 million. Reducing funding for EERE on top of the cuts that it suffered last year is incredibly shortsighted, not to mention it is done at the expense of protecting the fossil fuel industry which is already doing pretty all right, if you ask me.

I find it hard to believe that any of us actually have a problem with supporting efforts to become more energy efficient. The only reason I can think of that anyone would support any cuts to EERE would be a dislike on the part of some for the term "renewable energy."

By increasing energy efficiency in our homes, at our businesses, and through developing advanced models and methods of manufacturing, we will save money, we will improve productivity, and create new good-paying jobs here the United States. And, most importantly, yes, we can reduce emissions from power plants that are contributing to global climate change and leave an Earth that is much healthier for our children.

One great example of this is that EERE is partnering with Colorado State University to provide small- and medium-sized manufacturing companies no-cost energy assessments. More than 650 energy assessments have been done to date, with an average of \$30,000 in energy savings per assessment. I would say that programs like this are worthy of a sustained support and that \$5.6 billion in savings has been found across the country. EERE's manufacturing program is also enabling us to become a world leader in making new energy technologies.

So the choice is clear: we can accept this massive cut to EERE and risk becoming a net importer of next-generation energy technologies, or we can do what America has always done, and we can look forward, and we can make the needed investments to help us become a net exporter of these next generation technologies.

EERE supports all types of innovative and potentially groundbreaking research in solar, wind, geothermal, and water technologies. Given how abundant these resources are, from the sun in the southwest to the wind in the plains to the numerous rivers and potential for tidal power, we would be foolish to pull back on the potential for using these environmentally sustainable resources for power on a larger scale.

The greatest challenge today with the renewables is that when the sun is not shining and wind is not blowing, it is very hard to harness those energies. However we are very, very close to closing that gap, and EERE goes a very long way to bridging that gap.

They are also helping to pioneer research into advanced combustion engines that will drastically increase gas mileage, with EERE funding, in traditional cars, saving taxpayers countless amounts of money even as they remove harmful emissions from the atmosphere.

EERE R&D can help our Nation transform the way that we generate and use energy. This cut that is proposed by the majority is unnecessary, ill-conceived, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to restore the funding level of fiscal year 2014.

Appropriations is about priorities, and priorities reflect values. America has always looked forward. And we should not look anywhere but forward when it comes to where we receive America's energy needs.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the gentleman from California's comments, I have to say that you can oppose this amendment and still like renewable energy, in contradiction to the gentleman's statement.

I rise to oppose this amendment that would increase funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy by \$112 million using the fossil energy account, again, as an offset.

This year, funding for EERE is \$1.789 billion, \$113 million below last year and \$528 million below the budget request. It is still \$1.789 billion. It is not like we are eliminating EERE. They still have a substantial amount of money in that account. They have much more in that account than they have in the fossil energy account or that they have in the nuclear energy account.

This is a modest 6 percent cut from the robust funding level included in

last year's omnibus appropriation bill and slightly below the fiscal year 2013 level presequester. Put another way, there is nearly \$1 billion more than last year's House bill.

The funding that the recommendation provides is focused on three main priorities, where he is trying to take money out of the fossil energy account: helping America's manufacturers compete in the global marketplace; supporting the Weatherization Assistance Program; and addressing future high gas prices. These are areas with broad bipartisan support. We simply cannot afford to increase funding in this bill by diverting funds from research to fossil energy.

Fossil fuels, as I said during the last couple of amendments, such as coal, oil, and natural gas provide for 82 percent of the energy used by this Nation's homes and businesses and will continue to provide for the majority of energy needs for the foreseeable future. It is folly to believe that renewable energies are going to replace the base load that much of this produces for our energy needs in the future.

But renewable energies are an important part of an all-of-the-above energy strategy that we have in this country. But it is not renewable energies that are going to replace all of the fossil energies that we have. So we need to do research into the fossil energies, too, and what they do.

If we increase the efficiency of our fossil fuel plants, as I said earlier, by just 1 percent, we could power an additional 2 million households without using a single additional pound of fuel from the ground. That is energy efficiency. That is the research we are focusing on with funding this program. Therefore, I must oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I appreciate the gentleman from Idaho and his comments.

I would just ask that the majority's reasoning for—and I understand tough budgetary priorities have been made—but to reduce EERE's budget but to increase the fossil R&D budget, maybe if you could explain the reasoning behind an increase in fossil but a decrease in renewables?

Mr. SIMPSON. As I said, we tried to refocus the request from the administration to those areas that actually produce the energy. Eighty-two percent, as I said during my statement, is produced by coal, oil, and natural gas. That is where we do the majority of our research.

I am not saying we shouldn't do anything in the renewable energies. I love renewable energies. I don't believe that they are going to replace the majority of our base load.

And, as the gentleman said, you have got real problems when the sun isn't shining and you are using solar energy.

You have got real problems if you are trying to address the base load. That means, when you turn on the switch, the power actually comes on and the light goes on. If you are trying to replace that base load and the wind isn't blowing, you have got no wind power. But they are a very important and vital part of our energy mix. But we are trying to put the research into those areas that produce most of the electricity while still maintaining research into those areas that are important for the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,789,000,000)".

Page 19, line 13, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$150,000,000)".

Page 59, line 20, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,789,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike all of the funding for the Department of Energy's Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy program. This program, under the Department of Energy, allows the government to invest millions of taxpayer dollars in high-risk research and development schemes for "green energy" projects to the tune, as we have heard already, of over \$1.7 billion.

The government should not be subsidizing the research and development initiatives of individual companies. Competition and innovation have been key aspects of private sector success from day one in the energy sector and other parts of our economy, and the government should not take the role of a private investor.

For example, the EERE program facilitated a \$2.5 million grant to Massachusetts-based TIAX LLC to work with Green Mountain Coffee to reduce the energy used in roasting coffee beans. The program has also allowed for millions of dollars to large chemical and auto companies, such as providing a subsidy to Ford Motor Company to develop a new sheet metal forming tool.

I have nothing against those companies, but why should the government

be picking and choosing winners and losers?

Every business has a bottom line which, in and of itself, is a direct incentive for developing methods for becoming more energy efficient and innovative. By subsidizing this small sector of the energy economy, which includes renewables such as solar and wind, and allows for such focuses as the weatherization of houses, we are essentially allowing DOE to spend millions of taxpayer dollars on unconventional energy initiatives and projects that place taxpayer dollars at risk and that are not likely to produce a return on investment.

We, as a Congress, have continuously stated the need for an all-of-the-above energy strategy but continued investment into the EERE program focuses on a small portion of a largely unproductive portion of the energy sector at the expense of the more traditional energy sources, such as fossil fuels and nuclear, that we have a proven, reliable track record on.

□ 1630

With regard to the national energy policy, the committee report even highlights the President's failure to adequately focus our resources on an all-of-the-above energy strategy stating that "his fiscal year 2015 budget request, like its predecessors, instead seems more ideological than practical," cutting "this country's most important energy sources in order to increase funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs."

It goes on to say that:

As attractive as renewable energy may be, it will supply only a mere fraction of this country's energy needs over the next 50 years, and it presents considerable challenges to the Nation's existing electric power grid, given its increasing variability and uncertainty from supply and demand changes.

At a time when our economy continues to recover and many Americans continue to struggle to make ends meet, including paying their energy bills, we must focus on reasonable energy strategies that allow for the most affordable and reliable energy resources for consumers and businesses alike.

I am pleased that the committee has made reductions to this account in general. However, I believe that eliminating the energy efficiency and renewable energy program altogether under the Department of Energy will achieve all of our goals, while allowing savings to go towards the very important goal of reducing the deficit of this Nation.

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

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman very much for allowing me this privilege.

I just wanted to rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and to say that one of the reasons we have a budget deficit is because we have an energy deficit. We have had an energy deficit for over a quarter century—well over three decades now—and every year, the average family in our country puts out over \$2,800 now, just for gasoline for their automobiles.

There were those who said we shouldn't incentivize the ethanol industry. Now, about 10 percent of every tank full of gasoline has ethanol in it, and that has reduced our imports. If you look at the hemorrhage from this country of over \$10 trillion over the next quarter century with oil being \$100 a barrel and you look at what is happening to the middle class in our country because we aren't energy independent, we had better be serious about changing the composition of energy production in this country because it is part of the major problem we face in lack of robust economic growth.

You can't import economic growth; you have to produce economic growth. One of the major ways we can produce economic growth in this country is to invent a future different from the past, so I completely oppose the gentleman's amendment because you are going to increase the Federal deficit because economic growth will not increase at the level that it should be.

It has been slowly creeping forward with the weight of two wars on our backs over the last decade or so, but you can't kill the future.

In Alabama especially, you have that major Huntsville operation with all those NASA facilities and all those subcontractors, and there are parts of Alabama that are doing very well as a result of Federal investment, but don't hurt the rest of the country on the energy front because you have some perspective about why we might have a deficit.

We have a deficit because we are not inventing the future fast enough, and we are importing too much of what we should be making here at home.

So I appreciate the courtesy in allowing me to place this on the RECORD. We can't kill renewable energy. We can't kill the future. We have got to be able to invent it and to cut off these imports and to begin to produce our way forward again in this country. I view it as our chief strategic vulnerability.

So I appreciate the gentleman wants to do something good in terms of reducing the deficit. The best thing we can do is to invent our way forward and create new energy sources for this country, including the renewables.

Don't kill the future. Oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I would respectfully yield the time that has been yielded to me back to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I also oppose the amendment. While I opposed increasing

EERE funding in previous amendments, I am also opposed to eliminating EERE.

When you look at the traditional energy sources that we use, the government has done research into the fossil fuels, into nuclear energy, into fracking, into other things, and hydrocarbons because they are important.

It is not the companies that we try to pick winners and losers from, but it is the technology that we try to do the research into, to try to advance certain technologies and help technologies become more efficient for the consumers to use.

We are trying to make automobiles more fuel efficient. We are trying to do work to make a SuperTruck that is much more fuel efficient.

I guess it could be argued whether the government should do any research at all. Years and years ago, a lot of those things used to be done by private companies, when you had the Bell Labs and other types of things like that.

Those aren't done anymore by companies because they are much, much too expensive for companies to do, but they are good for our economy.

You could make the argument that we really shouldn't have put any money into space research and putting a man on the Moon—that should have been done by a private company—yet the American economy and the world has benefited greatly from the investment that American taxpayers made into NASA. The same is true with the fuels that we use.

While we have tried in this bill to refocus what the administration had proposed, which was huge increases for renewable energies that produce a minority—a small amount—of energy compared to the others, we have tried to refocus that appropriation to where it more accurately reflects the actual energy used, the percentage of the actual energy used.

That doesn't mean that we can completely eliminate EERE and renewable energies. As I said previously, I like renewable energies. I think they are cute. They provide a small portion of our overall energy demand, and I don't see that increasing a whole lot because they can't address the base load needs of our energy demand in this country, but they are going to be a very important part of an overall energy strategy.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully disagree with the gentlewoman. The reason we have a deficit problem is because we are spending money we don't have, and this is a clear example of where we are spending money we don't have.

Even under the most optimistic projections for this year, we are going to run a \$400-plus billion deficit, and we have got to start cutting in areas that may be good things or nice things, things we would like to do. We have got to start prioritizing our spending, and this is one place we can start.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge this House to adopt this amendment, to make a concrete step forward in reducing our deficit and not favoring certain companies in our economy over the others.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

Mr. COHEN. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, which should be at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,340,000)”.

Page 21, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with Mr. SCOTT PETERS of California. Mr. PETERS and I both have an interest in saving money—and this amendment would save \$5 million—and in putting our money wisely in research on renewable energies which saves individuals money—individual citizens money—and protects our environment and using that money, instead of putting the money in the budget to do research on coal and fossil fuels that contribute to global warming and a threat to our environment.

The fact is the Department of Energy's energy efficiency program has been effective. This would increase it by \$10.3 million. This program is underfunded already in the bill, and it would take \$15 million from funds that are in the budget for coal research and development—\$15 million that are in excess of the President's budget request.

The Department of Energy's energy efficiency programs partner with private industry, small business, and academics to facilitate research, development, and deployment of innovative energy efficiency technologies in manufacturing, buildings, and homes.

In this collaboration with these different stakeholders, they have determined the best practices that can be found and then put into commercial use, resulting in energy-saving advancements that create jobs and give businesses competitive advantages with foreign competitors.

Increasing energy efficiency is often done in ways that the individual cit-

izen benefits in their home by saving money by more energy-efficient devices and appliances.

We work on these in the Energy Department now, and they finalized new efficiency standards for more than 30 household and commercial products. These include dishwashers, refrigerators, water heaters—just the general stuff you have got in your kitchen and your home.

Because of the Energy Department's new efficiency standards, consumers are estimated to save more than \$400 billion—\$400 billion for our constituents, consumers—and we will be cutting greenhouse emissions by 1.8 billion metric tons through 2030. That is a lot of help to our environment and a whole lot of help to our constituents in saving money.

Just as an example, walk-in coolers and freezers, the rules that have been proposed will yield \$37 billion in savings, while cutting 159 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. That is the equivalent of taking 30 million cars off the road.

As the cost of energy continues to pose a burden on the American consumers' wallets—our voters, our taxpayers, our constituents—and costs them more money and extreme weather causes climate change which threatens the fauna and the flora, our property and way of life, we need to find ways to reduce energy consumption and decrease those adverse affects upon our environment.

Mr. Chairman, we need to redouble our efforts at this point on renewable energy and energy efficiency, and the efforts by this amendment would save money—\$5 million for the budget, energy deficit reduction—it would protect our environment by having more research on energy efficiency standards, save our consumers and constituents money, and protect our environment at the same time, and yet not have us invest needlessly in fossil fuels, which is the opposite direction we should be going.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment and show their vote for fiscally conservative, sound budget deficit reduction programs, as well as protect the environment and be concerned about the effects on the pocketbook of our individual consumers.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. The amendment would increase funding for the Office of Electrical Delivery and Energy Reliability by \$10 million, using funds from fossil energy as an offset.

We have already had conversations about taking funds out of where we create most of our energy. Some of the things that are done in fossil energy—and while the gentleman speaks passionately about the environment, fossil

energy also is doing the research into sequestration and carbon capture technology.

Now, I don't suspect that we are going to stop using fossil energy in the near future. In fact, if you looked at the predictions of the Department of Energy of what the percentage of fossil energy—what percentage of the energy is going to be used by fossil energy—be created by fossil energy 20 years from now, it is pretty close to what it is now.

So it is important that we do some things environmentally, like carbon capture and sequestration, and we need to do some research into that. You are taking money out of an account that would do that. I don't think that is a wise thing for us to do.

While I share my colleague's support for the electrical grid, that is why this bill before us already provides a \$13 million increase for the Office of Electrical Delivery and Energy Reliability above last year—or a 9 percent increase over the last year.

That is the largest percentage increase of any of the other applied energy programs within this bill—the largest increase.

□ 1645

The bill prioritizes programs within OE that keep our electrical grid safe and secure, including \$47 million for cybersecurity and \$16 million for infrastructure security, which will provide \$8 million for a strategic operations center to better respond to emergencies.

While I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do, I have already spoken of the important investments that our fossil energy research does for our economy and our electrical prices; therefore, I oppose the gentleman's amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this and other amendments challenging NETL and the fossil fuel research, I would oppose.

I would oppose because NETL is providing us the doorway—the pathway for energy independence. In the past, it has been funded by over \$700 million. This administration, in the last 4 or 5 years, has seen that erode down.

Thanks to the appropriators, they have been putting that number back up again to what is appropriate, so it is a big difference, but we have already made a cut from \$700 million down to \$590-some million. We are talking about a huge cut that has already occurred.

What we have to understand is this facility, just in the sponsor of this amendment, there are 24 projects, \$27 million being spent in his State, to be able to take care of 300 jobs that are at risk.

More importantly, what they are doing in these research laboratories

across the country—they are trying to find ways to have carbon capture, for example. If we truly want to reduce our carbon footprint, we need to spend it through the Department of Energy in their laboratories.

They are doing chemical looping. They are trying to develop ways of reducing our carbon footprint by energy-efficient high turbines for boilers to make energy from our coal and natural gas and steam. They are trying to find ways to improve it.

These are things NETL is working with. They are trying to find ways of fracking the gas, so we get more gas out of the ground than we are getting right now. Instead of 15 or 20 percent, we would get 25 or 30 percent.

So NETL has a terrific track record. We have some of the best scientists and physicists in the country trying to improve energy efficiency, and we have already cut their budget by over \$100 million in the last few years.

This is not a time, Mr. Chairman, to be cutting their budget and challenging them even further. If we are going to reach this, I want them be able to reach internally to do the things that will give us energy independence.

It is not a time to poke an eye at these hardworking people and what they have done. This is a time to continue the funding and continue this. If we are going to get energy independence, this is a way to do it, so I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment and any others that further erodes the power of NETL to do their job.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to close by saying that one day—one day, this House will see that we need to have more and more money put into research on energy efficiency and renewables and not into fossil fuel.

I feel a cold wind coming from the South, and I realize that today is not that day, but one day, one day. I feel a chill coming, and I don't want anyone else to get a cold.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,789,000,000)”.

Page 19, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$150,000,000)”.

Page 20, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$717,000,000)”.

Page 21, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$593,000,000)”.

Page 21, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$120,000,000)”.

Page 59, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,099,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman

from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires energy companies of all kinds to fund their own research and development programs, rather than continuing to require taxpayers to subsidize this activity to the tune of \$3.1 billion.

If we are serious about an all-of-the-above energy policy, we have got to stop using taxpayer money to pick winners and losers in the energy industry and start requiring every energy technology to compete on its own merits.

For too long, we have suffered from the conceit that politicians can make better energy investments with taxpayer money than investors can with their own money. It is this conceit that has produced a long line of scandals, best illustrated by the Solyndra fiasco.

This research doesn't even benefit the common good by placing these discoveries in the public domain. Any discoveries, although they are financed by the public, are owned lock, stock, and barrel by the private companies that received these public funds.

Public costs, private benefit—that is called corporate welfare. That is what these energy subsidies amount to.

My amendment protects taxpayers from being forced into paying the research and development budgets of these companies. It gets government out of the energy business and requires all energy companies and all energy technologies to compete equally on their own merits and with their own funds.

Last year, when we debated similar amendments, we heard about all of the technological breakthroughs financed by the Federal Government, from railroads to the Internet, and we heard promises of future breakthroughs from this massive expenditure of Federal funds.

Well, I freely recognize that, if you hand over billions of dollars of public subsidies to private business, those particular private businesses will do very well. I freely recognize that some of these dollars will produce breakthroughs that will then be owned by these private companies, and they will do extremely well.

What the advocates of these subsidies fail to consider is the vast dilemma between the seen and the unseen, the immediate effects that you can clearly see and the unintended effects that cannot be seen.

In this case, what we don't see clearly is the opportunity cost of these subsidies. Investors, using their own money, are very focused on making investments based on the highest economic return of these dollars. Politicians, using other people's money, make investment based on the highest political return of these dollars. This is the principal difference between Apple computer and Solyndra or between FedEx and the post office.

These public subsidies, in effect, take dollars that would have naturally flowed into the most effective and promising technologies and diverts them into those that are politically favored.

Dollar for dollar, this minimizes our energy potential, rather than maximizing it. For example, hydraulic fracking—it has revolutionized the fossil fuels industry. It offers us the very real potential of becoming energy independent.

Well, after the 1973 oil embargo, the Federal Government began heavily subsidizing research on this technology. How did it work out? According to CNN:

Between 1978 and 2000, the Federal Government spent about \$1.5 billion on oil and gas production research, much of it on extracting fuel from shale, according to a 2001 report from the National Academy of Sciences, but the process remained expensive, and research faded as oil prices came back down in the 1980s. By the 1990s, private industry began to step back into the business with new technologies with lower costs, leading to today's boom.

We were told last year that the little companies don't have the capital to develop their big ideas. Well, that is why there are private investors who can accurately evaluate those ideas and invest in the best of them.

Government investment doesn't do that very well or efficiently, and it is time we had done with it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I rise to oppose the amendment. This year, the committee continues its responsibility to reduce government spending, and we have worked tirelessly to that end. The bill cuts energy efficiency and renewable energy by \$113 million below last year's level and \$528 million below the budget request.

The fossil and nuclear energy programs received modest increases of \$31 million and \$10 million, respectively. The increase to fossil energy will support research into how heat can be more efficiently converted into electricity, how water can be more efficiently used in power plants, and how coal can be used to produce electrical power through fuel cells.

The increase to nuclear energy will accommodate a \$10 million increase to support base physical and cybersecurity activities at the Idaho National Laboratory to protect the Nation's nuclear energy materials and a range of national security programs at the NNSA, Homeland Security, and other Federal agencies.

Although my colleague asserts that the amendment would keep the government from intervening in the private markets, these applied energy programs are strategic investments for our energy independence.

I appreciate my colleague's desire to reduce the size of government, but this

amendment goes too far by eliminating strategic investments we make for our own future.

I, therefore, oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. It is quite astounding that somebody from the State of California—a State that exists because of Federal investments through the entirety of its existence—would even come forward with an amendment like this. For someone from Ohio, it is very unusual to see this.

Let me just say that, in opposing this amendment, I wish to offer the perspective that America can't live in the past, that, in fact, when one looks at what we are enduring because of our dependence on energy that is imported, there is no greater imperative than for us to unhook from imports.

As I look at the gentleman's amendment, it is actually very destructive. You actually destroy our future. America is not innovating at the level that we should in renewables. We have a burgeoning solar industry, but China has captured it. She steals the patents. She steals the innovation, and we don't do much about it.

You take money from fossil programs. I don't have all of the scientific answers, but I know that a piece of our future relies on access that we have here in the ground.

The energy portfolio and the research portfolio of the Department of Energy is critical. The reason we have the horizontal drilling technologies—those weren't developed outside by some humanitarian group. They were developed by the American people's investment in drilling technologies, which have now given us a gas boom that will help us transition to a new energy future because the gas won't last forever, but at least we have the possibility of becoming independent here at home again.

I find the gentleman's amendment very backward-looking; and I would say, for someone from the State of California, if you look at the Bureau of Reclamation, if you look at all of the benefits that have accrued to the State of California and your own presence inside this 50-State Union, it is because of the investment in energy and water that you even exist.

So for you to come forward—and it may be a well-intentioned amendment, but to try to destroy the future of innovation through your amendment in the primary arena of imports—imported petroleum, which we have to unhook from and become energy independent—to me, is just astounding.

□ 1700

We live in very different universes—that is clear through your amend-

ment—but there is no greater strategic imperative than for this country to become energy independent here at home. Our liberty depends on it. If you go back over the last 25 years and look at where our soldiers have died, it is very clear we are not independent.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think it is backward looking. I think that it fails to move America into a new energy future. I oppose this amendment with full gusto.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I forgive my friend from Ohio for not being up on California history. The fact is California exists because it had the freedom to develop its vast natural resources. It is government intervention that has caused this economy to decline dramatically.

Both of my friends miss the point. Government simply doesn't make these investments as wisely as private investors who are using their own money. Private investors invest to the highest economic value of a dollar; politicians invest to get the highest political return.

The gentlewoman is correct in one respect: California is the home of Solyndra and many, many other failed government investments in recent years. It is the private investors who took up the research on hydraulic fracturing after government investments failed that have produced the technologies that are giving us the economic boom in States like North Dakota that actually have the freedom to develop their resources on public lands.

It is simply a question of efficiency, a question of waste, and a question of right and wrong. Let's stop picking winners and losers in the marketplace and let the investors use their own money to make these research and development decisions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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:

An amendment by Mr. MCALLISTER of Louisiana.

An amendment by Ms. HAHN of California.

An amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

An amendment by Mr. WENSTRUP of Ohio.

An amendment by Mr. SWALWELL of California.

An amendment by Mr. BYRNE of Alabama.

An amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCALLISTER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 132, noes 284, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 371]

AYES—132

Amash	Graves (GA)	Posey
Amodel	Graves (MO)	Price (GA)
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Rahall
Bachus	Guthrie	Ribble
Barr	Hahn	Rogers (AL)
Benishek	Harper	Rohrabacher
Bentivolio	Harris	Rokita
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Roskam
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Ross
Black	Hudson	Rothfus
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Royce
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Rush
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Ryan (WI)
Bridenstine	Hunter	Sanford
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins	Scalise
Broun (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Schock
Bucshon	Jones	Schweikert
Byrne	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Cantor	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Sessions
Chabot	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Chaffetz	Lankford	Shuster
Clawson (FL)	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Collins (GA)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Marchant	Southerland
Cook	Massie	Stivers
Cotton	McAllister	Stockman
Cramer	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman
Crawford	McClintock	Thornberry
Daines	McMorris	Tiberi
Davis, Rodney	Rodgers	Wagner
DeSantis	Meadows	Walorski
Duffy	Messer	Wenstrup
Duncan (SC)	Mica	Westmoreland
Farenthold	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Fincher	Mullin	Williams
Fleming	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Neugebauer	Womack
Franks (AZ)	Nugent	Woodall
Garrett	Palazzo	Yoder
Gibbs	Paulsen	Yoho
Gingrey (GA)	Peterson	Young (AK)
Gohmert	Petri	Young (IN)
Gowdy	Poe (TX)	
Granger	Pompeo	

NOES—284

Barber	Brady (PA)	Capps
Barletta	Braley (IA)	Capuano
Barrow (GA)	Brooks (IN)	Carson (IN)
Barton	Brown (FL)	Carter
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Cartwright
Beatty	Buchanan	Castor (FL)
Becerra	Burgess	Castro (TX)
Bera (CA)	Bustos	Chu
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Cicilline
Bishop (NY)	Calvert	Clark (MA)
Blumenauer	Camp	Clarke (NY)
Bonamici	Capito	Clay

Aderholt	Grimm	Nunnelee
Amodei	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Campbell	Issa	Perlmutter
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Gowdy	McCarthy (NY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1737

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

Messrs. PERRY, YOUNG of Indiana, BENTIVOLIO, and JORDAN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 104, noes 316, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 373]

AYES—104

Amash	Guthrie	Perry
Bachmann	Hartzler	Petri
Bentivolio	Hensarling	Pittenger
Bilirakis	Holding	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Poe (TX)
Black	Huelskamp	Polis
Blackburn	Hultgren	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Ribble
Bucshon	Issa	Rice (SC)
Burgess	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Coble	Jones	Royce
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	King (IA)	Salmon
Cook	Kingston	Sanford
Cooper	Labrador	Scalise
Cramer	Lamborn	Schweikert
Daines	Lankford	Scott, Austin
DeSantis	Long	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Duffy	Lummis	Smith (MO)
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Stockman
Ellmers	McCaul	Stutzman
Flores	McClintock	Tipton
Foxx	McHenry	Wagner
Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Wenstrup
Garrett	Messer	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Williams
Gosar	Mulvaney	Woodall
Gowdy	Neugebauer	Yoder
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Yoho
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Griffith (VA)	Pearce	

NOES—316

Bachus	Boustany	Capito
Barber	Brady (PA)	Capps
Barletta	Braley (IA)	Capuano
Barr	Bridenstine	Cárdenas
Barrow (GA)	Brooks (AL)	Carson (IN)
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Carter
Bass	Brown (FL)	Cartwright
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Cassidy
Becerra	Buchanan	Castor (FL)
Benishek	Bustos	Castro (TX)
Bera (CA)	Butterfield	Chaffetz
Bishop (GA)	Byrne	Chu
Bishop (NY)	Calvert	Cicilline
Blumenauer	Camp	Clark (MA)
Bonamici	Cantor	Clarke (NY)

Clawson (FL)	Johnson (GA)
Clay	Johnson (OH)
Cleaver	Jolly
Clyburn	Joyce
Coffman	Kaptur
Cohen	Keating
Cole	Kelly (IL)
Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)
Connolly	Kennedy
Conyers	Kildee
Costa	Kilmer
Cotton	Kind
Courtney	King (NY)
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)
Crenshaw	Kirkpatrick
Crowley	Kline
Cuellar	Kuster
Culberson	LaMalfa
Cummings	Lance
Davis (CA)	Langevin
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)
Davis, Rodney	Larson (CT)
DeFazio	Latham
DeGette	Latta
Delaney	Lee (CA)
DeLauro	Levin
DelBene	Lewis
Denham	Lipinski
Dent	LoBiondo
Deutch	Loeb
Diaz-Balart	Lofgren
Dingell	Lowenthal
Doggett	Lowey
Doyle	Lucas
Duckworth	Lujan Grisham
Edwards	(NM)
Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray
Engel	(NM)
Enyart	Lynch
Eshoo	Maffei
Esty	Maloney,
Farenthold	Carolyn
Farr	Maloney, Sean
Fattah	Marino
Fincher	Massie
Fitzpatrick	Matsui
Fleischmann	McAllister
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)
Forbes	McCollum
Fortenberry	McDermott
Foster	McGovern
Frankel (FL)	McIntyre
Frelinghuysen	McKeon
Fudge	McKinley
Gabbard	McMorris
Gallego	Rodgers
Garamendi	McNerney
Garcia	Meehan
Gardner	Meeks
Gerlach	Meng
Gibbs	Mica
Gibson	Michaud
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary
Granger	Miller, George
Grayson	Moore
Green, Al	Moran
Green, Gene	Mullin
Griffin (AR)	Murphy (FL)
Grijalva	Murphy (PA)
Gutiérrez	Nadler
Hahn	Napolitano
Hall	Neal
Hanna	Negrete McLeod
Harper	Noem
Harris	Nolan
Hastings (FL)	Nunes
Hastings (WA)	O'Rourke
Heck (NV)	Olson
Heck (WA)	Owens
Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Higgins	Pascarell
Himes	Pastor (AZ)
Hinojosa	Paulsen
Holt	Payne
Honda	Peters (CA)
Horsford	Peters (MI)
Hoyer	Peterson
Huffman	Pingree (ME)
Huizenga (MI)	Pocan
Israel	Posey
Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Jeffries	Quigley

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt	Grimm
Amodei	Hanabusa
Campbell	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	McCarthy (NY)
	Nunnelee
	Pelosi
	Perlmutter
	Richmond

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1741

Mr. PITTENGER 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. WENSTRUP

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 112, noes 309, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

AYES—112

Amash	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Bachmann	Hultgren	Rooney
Bachus	Hunter	Roskam
Barr	Issa	Ross
Benishek	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Bilirakis	Jolly	Ryan (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Jones	Ryan (WI)
Boustany	Jordan	Sanford
Brady (TX)	Joyce	Scalise
Bridenstine	Kaptur	Schock
Broun (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Byrne	Kingston	Scott, Austin
Cantor	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Latta	Sessions
Chaffetz	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Collins (GA)	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Collins (NY)	Massie	Smith (TX)
Conaway	McAllister	Southerland
Cook	Meadows	Stivers
Cramer	Messer	Stockman
Daines	Mica	Stutzman
Duffy	Miller (FL)	Terry
Duncan (SC)	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	Mullin	Tiberi
Ellmers	Flores	Tipton
Flores	Franks (AZ)	Turner
Foxx	Garrett	Wagner
Franks (AZ)	Gibbs	Walberg
Garrett	Gingrey (GA)	Walorski
Gohmert	Gohmert	Weber (TX)
Gosar	Gowdy	Wenstrup
Gowdy	Graves (GA)	Westmoreland
Graves (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Whitfield
Graves (MO)	Guthrie	Williams
Griffith (VA)	Harris	Yoder
	Hastings (WA)	Yoho
	Hudson	
	Huelskamp	

NOES—309

Amodei	Brady (PA)	Cárdenas
Barber	Braley (IA)	Carson (IN)
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Carter
Barrow (GA)	Brooks (IN)	Cartwright
Barton	Brown (FL)	Cassidy
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Castor (FL)
Beatty	Buchanan	Castro (TX)
Becerra	Bucshon	Chu
Bentivolio	Burgess	Cicilline
Bera (CA)	Bustos	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Calvert	Clawson (FL)
Black	Camp	Clay
Blackburn	Capito	Cleaver
Blumenauer	Capps	Clyburn
Bonamici	Capuano	Coble

Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer

Huffman
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Campbell
Carney
Grimm

Hanabusa
Johnson, E. B.
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee

Pelosi
Perlmutter
Richmond

□ 1745

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 245, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 375]

AYES—172

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer

Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—245

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta

Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishke
Bentivolio

Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)

Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna

Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson

Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt
Bilirakis
Campbell
Carney
Clark (MA)

Foster
Grimm
Hanabusa
Johnson, E. B.
McCarthy (NY)

Nunnelee
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Richmond
Tierney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1749

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the

gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110, noes 310, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

AYES—110

Amash	Garrett	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Olson
Bachus	Gohmert	Palazzo
Bentivolio	Goodlatte	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Gowdy	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Black	Hall	Pompeo
Blackburn	Harris	Posey
Boustany	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Ribble
Bridenstine	Holding	Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Huelskamp	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Royce
Byrne	Hunter	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Hurt	Salmon
Cassidy	Issa	Sanford
Chabot	Jenkins	Scalise
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Schweikert
Clawson (FL)	Jones	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Kingston	Sessions
Cook	Labrador	Smith (MO)
Cotton	LaMalfa	Southerland
Cramer	Lankford	Stockman
Daines	Long	Stutzman
DeSantis	Lummis	Thornberry
DesJarlais	Marchant	Walberg
Duffy	Massie	Weber (TX)
Duncan (SC)	McAllister	Wenstrup
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Westmoreland
Farenthold	McHenry	Williams
Fincher	Meadows	Wilson (SC)
Fleming	Messer	Woodall
Flores	Miller (FL)	Yoder
Fox	Mullin	Yoho
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	

NOES—310

Amodei	Chu	Dingell
Barber	Cicilline	Doggett
Barletta	Clark (MA)	Doyle
Barr	Clarke (NY)	Duckworth
Barrow (GA)	Clay	Edwards
Barton	Cleaver	Ellison
Bass	Clyburn	Ellmers
Beatty	Coble	Engel
Becerra	Coffman	Enyart
Benishek	Cohen	Eshoo
Bera (CA)	Cole	Esty
Bishop (GA)	Collins (NY)	Farr
Bishop (NY)	Connolly	Fattah
Blumenauer	Conyers	Fitzpatrick
Bonamici	Cooper	Fleischmann
Brady (PA)	Costa	Forbes
Braley (IA)	Courtney	Fortenberry
Brooks (IN)	Crawford	Foster
Brown (IN)	Crenshaw	Frankel (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Buchanan	Cuellar	Fudge
Bucshon	Culberson	Gabbard
Bustos	Cummings	Gallego
Butterfield	Davis (CA)	Garamendi
Calvert	Davis, Danny	Garcia
Camp	Davis, Rodney	Gardner
Capito	DeFazio	Gerlach
Capps	DeGette	Gibbs
Capuano	Delaney	Gibson
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Gosar
Carson (IN)	DelBene	Granger
Carter	Denham	Graves (MO)
Cartwright	Dent	Grayson
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Green, Al
Castro (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Green, Gene

Griffin (AR)	Matheson	Ryan (OH)
Griffith (VA)	Matsui	Sánchez, Linda
Grijalva	McCarthy (CA)	T.
Guthrie	McCaul	Sanchez, Loretta
Gutiérrez	McCollum	Sarbanes
Hahn	McDermott	Schakowsky
Hanna	McGovern	Schiff
Harper	McIntyre	Schneider
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Schock
Hastings (WA)	McKinley	Schrader
Heck (NV)	McMorris	Schwartz
Heck (WA)	Rodgers	Scott (VA)
Herrera Beutler	McNerney	Scott, David
Higgins	Meehan	Serrano
Himes	Meeks	Sewell (AL)
Hinojosa	Meng	Shea-Porter
Holt	Mica	Sherman
Honda	Michaud	Shimkus
Horsford	Miller (MI)	Shuster
Hoyer	Miller, Gary	Simpson
Huffman	Miller, George	Sinema
Hultgren	Moore	Sires
Israel	Moran	Slaughter
Johnson Lee	Murphy (FL)	Smith (NE)
Jeffries	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Smith (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Jolly	Neal	Speier
Joyce	Negrete McLeod	Stewart
Kaptur	Noem	Stivers
Keating	Nolan	Swalwell (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Nugent	Takano
Kelly (PA)	Nunes	Terry
Kennedy	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Kildee	Owens	Thompson (MS)
Kilmer	Pallone	Thompson (PA)
Kind	Pascarell	Tiberi
King (IA)	Pastor (AZ)	Tierney
King (NY)	Payne	Tipton
Kinzinger (IL)	Pearce	Titus
Kirkpatrick	Perry	Tonko
Kline	Peters (CA)	Tsongas
Kuster	Peters (MI)	Turner
Lamborn	Peterson	Upton
Lance	Pingree (ME)	Valadao
Langevin	Pitts	Van Hollen
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Vargas
Larson (CT)	Poe (TX)	Veasey
Latham	Polis	Vela
Latta	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lee (CA)	Quigley	Visclosky
Levin	Rahall	Wagner
Lewis	Rangel	Walden
Lipinski	Reed	Walorski
LoBiondo	Reichert	Walz
Loeb sack	Renacci	Wasserman
Lofgren	Rigell	Schultz
Lowenthal	Roby	Waters
Lowe y	Rogers (KY)	Waxman
Lucas	Rogers (MI)	Webster (FL)
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Welch
Lujan Grisham	Rooney	Whitfield
(NM)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (FL)
Luján, Ben Ray	Roskam	Wittman
(NM)	Ross	Wolf
Lynch	Rothfus	Womack
Maffei	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth
Maloney,	Ruiz	Young (AK)
Carolyn	Runyan	Young (IN)
Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	
Marino	Rush	

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt
Campbell
Carney
Grimm
Hanabusa
Johnson, E. B.
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Richmond
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1753

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 97, noes 321, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

AYES—97

Amash	Graves (GA)	Pompeo
Bachmann	Hall	Posey
Bentivolio	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Holding	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Ross
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Byrne	Jones	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Jordan	Salmon
Chaffetz	Kingston	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	LaMalfa	Scalise
Coble	Lankford	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Long	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Marchant	Sessions
Cotton	Massie	Smith (MO)
Cramer	McAllister	Stockman
Daines	McClintock	Stutzman
DeSantis	McHenry	Thornberry
DesJarlais	Meadows	Walberg
Duffy	Messer	Weber (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Duncan (TN)	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Farenthold	Neugebauer	Williams
Fincher	Flores	Palazzo
Fleming	Fox	Perry
Flores	Franks (AZ)	Petri
Fox	Garrett	Pittenger
Franks (AZ)	Gohmert	Pitts
	Gowdy	

NOES—321

Amodei	Cleaver	Fortenberry
Bachus	Clyburn	Foster
Barber	Coffman	Frankel (FL)
Barletta	Cohen	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Cole	Fudge
Barrow (GA)	Collins (NY)	Gabbard
Barton	Connolly	Gallego
Bass	Conyers	Garamendi
Beatty	Cooper	Garcia
Becerra	Costa	Gardner
Benishek	Courtney	Gerlach
Bera (CA)	Crawford	Gibbs
Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw	Gibson
Bishop (NY)	Crowley	Gringrey (GA)
Black	Cuellar	Goodlatte
Blumenauer	Culberson	Gosar
Bonamici	Cummings	Granger
Boustany	Davis (CA)	Graves (MO)
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Grayson
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Green, Al
Brooks (AL)	DeGette	Green, Gene
Brooks (IN)	Delaney	Griffin (AR)
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Griffith (VA)
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Grijalva
Buchanan	Denham	Guthrie
Bucshon	Dent	Gutiérrez
Bustos	Deutch	Hahn
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Calvert	Dingell	Harper
Camp	Doggett	Harris
Cantor	Doyle	Hartzler
Capito	Duckworth	Hastings (FL)
Capps	Edwards	Hastings (WA)
Capuano	Ellison	Heck (NV)
Cárdenas	Ellmers	Heck (WA)
Carson (IN)	Engel	Herrera Beutler
Carter	Enyart	Higgins
Cartwright	Eshoo	Himes
Cassidy	Esty	Hinojosa
Castor (FL)	Farenthold	Honda
Castro (TX)	Farr	Horsford
Chu	Fattah	Hoyer
Cicilline	Fincher	Huffman
Clark (MA)	Fitzpatrick	Hunter
Clarke (NY)	Fleischmann	Hurt
Clay	Forbes	Israel

Issa	Meehan	Schiff
Jackson Lee	Meeks	Schneider
Jeffries	Meng	Schock
Johnson (GA)	Mica	Schrader
Johnson (OH)	Michaud	Schwartz
Jolly	Miller (MI)	Scott (VA)
Joyce	Miller, Gary	Scott, David
Kaptur	Miller, George	Serrano
Keating	Moore	Sewell (AL)
Kelly (IL)	Moran	Shea-Porter
Kelly (PA)	Mullin	Sherman
Kennedy	Murphy (FL)	Shimkus
Kildee	Murphy (PA)	Shuster
Kilmer	Nadler	Simpson
Kind	Napolitano	Sinema
King (IA)	Neal	Sires
King (NY)	Negrete McLeod	Slaughter
Kinzinger (IL)	Noem	Smith (NE)
Kirkpatrick	Nolan	Smith (NJ)
Kline	Nugent	Smith (TX)
Kuster	Nunes	Smith (WA)
Labrador	O'Rourke	Southerland
Lamborn	Owens	Speier
Lance	Pallone	Stewart
Langevin	Pascrell	Stivers
Larsen (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Swalwell (CA)
Larson (CT)	Paulsen	Takano
Latham	Payne	Terry
Latta	Pearce	Thompson (CA)
Lee (CA)	Peters (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Peters (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Lewis	Peterson	Tiberi
Lipinski	Pingree (ME)	Tierney
LoBiondo	Pocan	Tipton
Loeback	Poe (TX)	Titus
Lofgren	Polis	Tonko
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Lowe	Quigley	Turner
Lucas	Rahall	Upton
Luetkemeyer	Rangel	Valadao
Lujan Grisham	Reed	Van Hollen
(NM)	Reichert	Vargas
Luján, Ben Ray	Renacci	Veasey
(NM)	Rigell	Vela
Lynch	Roby	Velázquez
Maffei	Rogers (AL)	Wagner
Maloney	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Carolyn	Rogers (MI)	Walorski
Maloney, Sean	Rooney	Walz
Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Wasserman
Matheson	Roskam	Schultz
Matsui	Rothfus	Waters
McCarthy (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
McCaul	Ruiz	Webster (FL)
McCollum	Runyan	Welch
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Whitfield
McGovern	Rush	Wilson (FL)
McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	Wittman
McKeon	Sánchez, Linda	Wolf
McKinley	T.	Womack
McMorris	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth
Rodgers	Sarbanes	Yoho
McNerney	Schakowsky	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Campbell	Holt	Perlmutter
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Davis, Rodney	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Grimm	Nunnelee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1757

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. MARCHANT, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for

other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SUPPORTING KNOWLEDGE AND INVESTING IN LIFELONG SKILLS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 803) to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 6, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

YEAS—415

Amodei	Coble	Foxx
Bachmann	Coffman	Frankel (FL)
Bachus	Cohen	Franks (AZ)
Barber	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Barletta	Collins (GA)	Fudge
Barr	Collins (NY)	Gabbard
Barrow (GA)	Conaway	Gallego
Barton	Connolly	Garamendi
Bass	Conyers	Garcia
Beatty	Cook	Gardner
Becerra	Cooper	Garrett
Benish	Costa	Gerlach
Bentivoglio	Cotton	Gibbs
Bera (CA)	Courtney	Gibson
Bilirakis	Cramer	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Gohmert
Bishop (NY)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Crowley	Gosar
Black	Cuellar	Gowdy
Blackburn	Culberson	Granger
Blumenauer	Cummings	Graves (GA)
Bonamici	Daines	Graves (MO)
Boustany	Davis (CA)	Grayson
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Green, Al
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Green, Gene
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Griffin (AR)
Bridenstine	DeGette	Griffith (VA)
Brooks (AL)	Delaney	Grijalva
Brooks (IN)	DeLauro	Guthrie
Brown (FL)	DelBene	Gutiérrez
Brownley (CA)	Denham	Hahn
Buchanan	Dent	Hall
Buchson	DeSantis	Hanna
Burgess	DesJarlais	Harper
Bustos	Deutch	Harris
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Byrne	Dingell	Hastings (FL)
Calvert	Doggett	Hastings (WA)
Camp	Doyle	Heck (NV)
Cantor	Duckworth	Heck (WA)
Capito	Duffy	Hensarling
Capps	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler
Capuano	Edwards	Higgins
Cárdenas	Ellison	Himes
Carson (IN)	Ellmers	Hinojosa
Carter	Engel	Holding
Cartwright	Enyart	Holt
Cassidy	Eshoo	Honda
Castor (FL)	Esty	Horsford
Castro (TX)	Farenthold	Hoyer
Chabot	Farr	Hudson
Chaffetz	Fattah	Huelskamp
Chu	Fincher	Huffman
Ciilline	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga (MI)
Clark (MA)	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Clarke (NY)	Fleming	Hunter
Clawson (FL)	Flores	Hurt
Clay	Forbes	Israel
Cleaver	Fortenberry	Issa
Clyburn	Foster	Jackson Lee

Jeffries	Miller (MI)	Schneider
Jenkins	Miller, Gary	Schock
Johnson (GA)	Miller, George	Schrader
Johnson (OH)	Moore	Schwartz
Johnson, Sam	Moran	Schweikert
Jolly	Mullin	Scott (VA)
Jordan	Mulvaney	Scott, Austin
Joyce	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David
Kaptur	Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Keating	Nadler	Serrano
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Sessions
Kelly (PA)	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Kennedy	Negrete McLeod	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Neugebauer	Sherman
Kilmer	Noem	Shimkus
Kind	Nolan	Shuster
King (IA)	Nugent	Simpson
King (NY)	Nunes	Sinema
Kingston	O'Rourke	Sires
Kinzinger (IL)	Olson	Slaughter
Kirkpatrick	Owens	Smith (MO)
Kline	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
Kuster	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
Labrador	Pascrell	Smith (TX)
LaMalfa	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)
Lamborn	Paulsen	Southerland
Lance	Payne	Speier
Langevin	Pearce	Stewart
Lankford	Perry	Stivers
Larsen (WA)	Peters (CA)	Stutzman
Larson (CT)	Peters (MI)	Swalwell (CA)
Latham	Peterson	Takano
Latta	Petri	Terry
Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (CA)
Levin	Pittenger	Thompson (MS)
Lewis	Pitts	Thompson (PA)
Lipinski	Pocan	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Loeback	Polis	Tierney
Lofgren	Pompeo	Tipton
Long	Posey	Titus
Lowenthal	Price (GA)	Tonko
Lowe	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Lucas	Quigley	Turner
Luetkemeyer	Rahall	Upton
Lujan Grisham	Rangel	Valadao
(NM)	Reed	Van Hollen
Luján, Ben Ray	Reichert	Vargas
(NM)	Renacci	Veasey
Lummis	Ribble	Vela
Lynch	Rice (SC)	Velázquez
Maffei	Rigell	Visclosky
Maloney,	Roby	Wagner
Carolyn	Roe (TN)	Walberg
Maloney, Sean	Rogers (AL)	Walden
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
Marino	Rogers (MI)	Walz
Matheson	Rohrabacher	Wasserman
Matsui	Rokita	Schultz
McAllister	Rooney	Waters
McCarthy (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
McCaul	Roskam	Weber (TX)
McClintock	Ross	Webster (FL)
McCollum	Rothfus	Welch
McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Wenstrup
McGovern	Royce	Westmoreland
McHenry	Ruiz	Whitfield
McIntyre	Runyan	Williams
McKeon	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
McKinley	Rush	Wilson (SC)
McMorris	Ryan (OH)	Wittman
Rodgers	Ryan (WI)	Wolf
McNerney	Salmon	Woodall
Meadows	Sánchez, Linda	Yarmuth
Meehan	T.	Yoder
Meeks	Sanchez, Loretta	Yoho
Meng	Sanford	Young (AK)
Messer	Sarbanes	Young (IN)
Mica	Scalise	
Michaud	Schakowsky	
Miller (FL)	Schiff	

NAYS—6

Amash	Duncan (TN)	Massie
Broun (GA)	Jones	Stockman

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Campbell	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
Carney	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond
Grimm	Nunnelee	

□ 1805

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.