

In my district 10 years ago, we started an organization called UNITE, Unlawful Narcotics Investigations, Treatment and Education, a holistic approach, and it works. We've put in jail about 4,000 pushers. We've got drug counselors in schools. We've got clubs in schools to entertain young people on nice things to do and the like, drug courts in every county. It works, but the problem persists.

Last week, I had the great honor and pleasure of helping host in Orlando, Florida, a drug summit on prescription drug abuse, almost a thousand people from 49 States and several foreign countries focusing on the problem. It's the second year we've done that, the second straight year. Mayor Bloomberg was there. The head of CDC was there, the head of FDA, heads of all sorts of Federal organizations, and we're determined to help wipe out this big killer in this country.

□ 1240

CELEBRATING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF KEVIN KRIGGER

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the horses line up in Churchill Downs for the running of the Kentucky Derby next month, all eyes in the U.S. Virgin Islands will be on young Kevin Krigger, a jockey from my home island of St. Croix, who will be riding the horse, Goldcents.

We're all proud of Kevin, who grew up in LaVallee and attended Central High School. Kevin always wanted to be a jockey and grew up in the sport, riding horses on our beaches and country roads, challenging anyone he could to a race.

Before he was recruited by other Virgin Islanders who race in the States, he was well known on the tracks of St. Croix, St. Thomas, and Tortola as a talent to watch. He proved himself riding on the west coast, in particular, at Emerald Downs in Seattle, Washington, before his historic win on Saturday at the Santa Anita Derby.

On Saturday, Kevin Krigger became the first African American to win the Santa Anita Derby. Last fall, he was the first African American jockey to win a million dollar race in Louisiana's Delta Jackpot. If he rides Goldcents to victory in the Kentucky Derby next month, he will become the first African American to do so since 1902.

Mr. Speaker, Kevin Krigger's family and fans in the Virgin Islands will be cheering wildly on the first Saturday in May. I congratulate his mother, Averil Simmonds, and his father, Albert Krigger, Jr. We're all proud of this young man and his accomplishments, and wish him Godspeed in this and all of his future endeavors.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, you can't spend more money than you bring in. That's a fairly simple concept, isn't it? But apparently not for Democrats who run the administration in Washington.

Under President Obama, we've had 4 years of government spending, each year spending over \$1 trillion more than we took in. That kind of spending is not only irresponsible, it's dangerous. It drives up the national debt, hurts families, neighbors, and our friends.

The time to rein in Washington spending is now, a concept so obvious it has become a cliché. House Republicans understand this. That's why we passed a responsible budget that keeps our taxes low and balances spending. That's more money in your family's pocket.

The President is going to introduce a budget that doesn't balance and tries to raise taxes again.

House Republicans know the way forward, a way forward to foster a healthier economy and help create jobs. It's time for the President to get serious about this issue as well.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 678, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION SMALL CONDUIT HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND RURAL JOBS ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 140 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 140

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 678) to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except: (1) those received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII dated at least one day before the day of consideration of the amendment; and (2) pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee

shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

This resolution provides for a modified open rule for the consideration of H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act, and provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

It makes in order all amendments which were preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and which otherwise comply with the rules of the House. So this modified open rule is very fair, it's a generous rule, and it will provide for a balanced and open debate on the merits of this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also pleased to stand before the House and support this rule, as well as the underlying legislation, H.R. 678, which is the long title I gave earlier.

I appreciate the hard work of the bill's chief sponsor, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), as well as the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), and of the subcommittee of jurisdiction, Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California, for allowing this bill to move forward from the committee and continuing the Natural Resource Committee's record, under Chairman HASTINGS' leadership, of furthering several important pieces of legislation which, if enacted, will greatly improve our Nation's energy policies and provide a responsible, balanced approach to further domestic energy development.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday we received the news that the economy had only added 88,000 jobs in the month of March. The percentage of unemployed Americans dropped, but that is almost entirely because thousands of workers have given up looking for jobs at all.

This slowdown is a warning to Congress, but we won't take it, I feel sure, since we've pretty much ignored it. Unless this majority reverses the spending cuts contained in the sequester, the health of our economy is only getting worse.

Months ago, economists were warning that the sequester will stall out our economy and lead to job loss, and as we can see by the March data, their predictions are beginning to come true.

With economic warning bells beginning to toll, one would expect Congress to make job creation our number one priority. But one would certainly be wrong because we haven't done that at all. Unfortunately, such expectations don't even come close.

Instead of working on legislation to grow our economy and to create some good-paying jobs, we are wasting valuable session time discussing yet another bill that went nowhere in the last Congress, and I predict will go nowhere in this one as well. But we seem to have the time to waste.

The majority has decided that erasing environmental regulations for hydropower companies is a better use of time than putting Americans back to work and to help families pay their bills.

Furthermore, the bill before us today is a solution in search of a problem that does not exist. Despite the rhetoric of the majority, small conduit hydropower projects are rarely delayed because of environmental regulations. In fact, from 2006 to 2010, 13 exemptions were completed in less than a year, and in 2011 there were nine exemptions that were granted in an average of 40 days.

In addition, changes within the last year have made the process even easier for hydropower developers. Under the new regulations by the Bureau of Reclamation, all a developer has to do to avoid a full environmental assessment is to get a simple, 1½ page form filled out with 15 boxes to check "yes" or "no." That is certainly not a burdensome regulation. All they have to do is check the box "yes" or "no," indicate the project is not in an especially sensitive area.

Most small conduit hydropower projects will easily pass this test because the reclamation sites are already developed. But despite what you may hear, there is little evidence that there is even a problem with hydropower regulation that needs to be solved.

Contained within today's legislation is a proposal to clarify the lines of authority between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. This is a worthwhile effort that would receive bipartisan support, and we made that very clear. Standing alone, though, this proposal could pass on suspension within a matter of minutes. That would, of course, leave us with nothing to do here today, so here we are.

During the debate in the Natural Resources Committee, the majority was given the opportunity to agree to the noncontroversial and bipartisan parts of the legislation and drop their partisan attacks on environmental safeguards.

□ 1250

Unfortunately, the majority has once again rejected this chance for produc-

tive compromise and chosen the partisan path. And as a result, we are here spending time debating another partisan bill that will not pass the Senate and turning our back on the pressing economic needs of this country.

I've said many times on the floor during rules debates that CBS News had estimated it costs \$24 million a week to run the Congress of the United States. And it has been embarrassing that we do so little work. But for millions of Americans, the luxury of the time that we take here is something they cannot afford.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the underlying legislation so we can get back to the task of growing our economy, repealing the sequester, and creating American jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), the sponsor of this piece of legislation, to explain why it is so necessary that we do this, even though on paper it seems like this problem is solved.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank Chairman BISHOP for yielding.

When we're talking about job creation in this country, I think it's worthy to note I just traveled through the Third Congressional District of Colorado visiting with people from Pueblo to Alamosa, Durango, Cortez, Montrose, Craig, Hayden, and Steamboat. One of the greatest challenges that they face is regulations coming out of Washington when it comes to job creation.

The fact of the matter is we're spending \$1.75 trillion per year for businesses to be able to comply with government mandates. Is it a sensible approach to be able to look at regulations that simply don't work and are inhibiting job creation and our ability to be able to achieve the most carbon-free, environmentally friendly legislation that we can have? That's hydropower. That is a sensible approach.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of House Resolution 140 and for an open discussion on how we're going to be able to work together to be able to promote clean, renewable hydropower development in rural America and create much-needed jobs in the process. At a time when our country needs to be able to focus on domestic energy production and job creation, hydropower can play a critical role in providing clean renewable energy while expanding job opportunities in some of our hardest hit rural communities.

Hydropower is the cheapest and cleanest source of electricity available

through modern technology. It's the highest source of non-carbon-emitting energy in the world and accounts for approximately 75 percent of the United States' total renewable electricity generation, making it the leading renewable energy resource of power. Canal-based hydropower can produce up to 1,400 megawatts of power in Colorado alone. Let's put this in perspective. This is the equivalent of the power produced by the originally designed output of the Glen Canyon Dam, just out of Colorado, not including the rest of the western United States.

Increased conduit hydropower serves a number of purposes: it produces renewable and emissions-free energy that can be used to pump water or sell electricity to the grid; it can offset diesel-generated pumps; it can generate revenue for the hydropower developer to help pay for aging infrastructure costs and water/power facility modernization; and it can create local jobs and generate revenue for the Federal Government.

As it stands, Federal regulations hinder this development on Federal projects and subject job creators to unnecessary requirements which can render small hydropower projects economically unfeasible. For this reason, I introduced H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act. This legislation authorizes power development at the agency's conduits to clear up multi-agency confusion and duplicative processes and reduces the regulatory costs associated with hydropower development.

H.R. 678, as passed by the Natural Resources Committee with bipartisan support, would eliminate the requirement of duplicative and unnecessary environmental analyses for projects on manmade facilities which already underwent a full environmental review at the time of their construction or when undergoing rehabilitation. The bill covers small hydropower generators installed on manmade pipes, ditches, and canals; and the renewable energy development promoted by the bill in no way impacts the natural environment. By streamlining this process, we can finally make these small conduit hydropower projects financially feasible and unleash private investment in clean energy that will reduce costs for ratepayers and increase tax revenue for the Treasury while putting people back to work.

I understand that some of my friends on the other side have reservations about this provision; and as I have made clear in the past, I'm open to working with my colleagues to be able to address their concerns with the NEPA provision. However, failure to address the existing regulatory uncertainty would negate one of the primary purposes of the bill and would ensure that the renewable energy development envisioned by the bill remains in limbo. I'm optimistic that discussing this issue openly will allay any concerns Members may have and allow us

to be able to arrive at a solution which ensures the implementation of a statutory framework that streamlines the project approval process and reduces costs.

I'm proud to have the support of the Family Farm Alliance, the National Water Resources Association, and the American Public Power Association, among others. I think the broad support this bill has seen among those most directly impacted indicates how close we are to making this renewable energy development a reality. I look forward to an open discussion on the merits of the bill, which I believe will speak for themselves.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time until my colleague is ready to close.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me take a moment just to give my impression of this particular bill, and then I'll be ready to close at that time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill which had a bipartisan vote in this body last time and a bipartisan vote in the committee, sent to the Senate, where an errant Senator was able to hold the process up. Fortunately, in this session, there is a new chairman of that committee in the Senate from the West who clearly understands the value and significance of hydroelectric power.

So I think that everyone in this body on both sides of the aisle can agree that our Nation is in great need of more energy. If we want to create real jobs, private sector jobs, there has to be a strong energy component to our ability to do that. Our Nation has tremendous amounts of energy that are locked away domestically in the forms of oil and gas and low sulphur and high-BTU coal reserves; but too often special interest groups and layers of bureaucracy have kept us from becoming more energy self-sufficient with these areas. And we're now seeing and feeling the results every time somebody tries to pay an electric bill.

This administration seems to be dragging its feet on energy development of everything from the Keystone Pipeline to the development of public lands. But there is also another source of energy that is presently being unused and can be put to good use without negatively impacting the environment. The energy resource is what we're addressing here in this particular bill. This bill deals with electricity that can be generated from hydro, a renewable energy resource that is very clean and helpful to the environment.

Numerous witnesses testified this year and last year that there is an uncertainty on the NEPA costs, which throw these projects into limbo and often render projects financially unfeasible and stifle private investment far beyond what has been able to be done. Thus, this is stifling what could be done to produce self-sufficiency in energy production. One witness from Arizona simply testified in

2011 that it would cost them \$20,000 to install this generator that would create energy in a Federal canal. Yet the NEPA analysis would cost them \$50,000 to check the boxes and do that simple paperwork, as we have heard about. The environmental paperwork in this case is almost three times the cost of the capital that you would put into the project. And it all is redundant since the NEPA analysis was done in the first place for the entire canal. This is a second project put in the same canal that has already gone through this process. It's a manmade canal.

Witnesses have testified this year that despite the Bureau of Reclamation's claim of its categorical exclusions and having a policy in place, not one project has utilized this project because of a potential legal uncertainty surrounding categorical exclusions.

□ 1300

As a result, there is no new development that has occurred, and the gentleman from Colorado's amendment will improve this particular situation. So, once again, let this be done.

This is not denying a NEPA review. NEPA has already been done on every one of these projects. This is saying you don't need to do the same thing a second time, which is simply redundant, it is silly, it's red tape, bungling by administrations that need not be there.

The choice is very simple in this particular bill: Either you can give the administration, the executive branch, the right to make these kinds of decisions on moving us forward, in which case the administration can make and can take away their decision at whim, in which case it invites litigation because of the uncertainty of an administrative policy, and also invites conflict within different administrative agencies. Or we can do what we're supposed to do and actually pass legislation to solve problems. The gentleman from Colorado's approach is simply allowing the legislature to make the decision, to institute what the policy will be and tell the agencies how they will proceed into the future. We can either have the legislature stand up and do our job and do it the right way or we can pass it all off and let the executive branch come up with regulations now which they could change and also are subject to the fear of litigation.

This is an easy thing to do. This bill actually should be a no-brainer. It will increase the energy production we have in the country, it will increase the ability of making sure that we have adequate water resources in the West, it will also give a needed boost of revenues to the canal companies, and it will create ultimately more jobs, especially with a cheap form of highly effective energy production.

This bill is reasonable, and it's understandable why it passed with a bipartisan vote last time. I hope it passes with a bipartisan vote again, and I hope we can recognize that this will move us forward.

Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time unless the gentlelady has other speeches that she has requests for.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, so I am prepared to close if my colleague is.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am prepared to close when you are.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, today's bill does nothing to address the pressing economic issues facing every American household and fails to stop the sequestration cuts that are threatening our economy as a whole. It's rather ambiguous. On one hand it gives; on the other hand it takes back away, but we'll get into that in the general debate.

Instead, today's legislation unnecessarily attacks environmental protections while doing nothing to create new jobs. Today's legislation includes a blanket waiver for all small conduit hydropower projects that generate less than 5 megawatts of power. The requirement is arbitrary and would fail to protect the environment. Environmental danger is not determined by the megawatts produced but whether the hydropower project is located where it is likely to do damage. A 1-megawatt project in the wrong location would be more harmful to the environment than a 6-megawatt project in the right location.

Perhaps most importantly, consideration of this legislation is taking up time that we could otherwise be using to repeal the sequester and create jobs. As I have mentioned repeatedly on the House floor, my colleague and ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, has appeared at the Rules Committee repeatedly offering legislation to repeal the sequester and reduce our deficit in a responsible way. The Rules Committee on at least three times has never even allowed it to come to the floor. Despite voting on hydropower legislation twice in the last 13 months, the majority has rejected Mr. VAN HOLLEN, who, as I said, is the ranking member on the Budget Committee, and his bill would save and create thousands of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 1426 from Representative TIM BISHOP of New York to roll back tax giveaways to big oil companies. The bill is known as the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous matter immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so that we can get back to trying to grow our economy and create American jobs,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me state a couple of things. Number one, this is a good rule. Therefore, you should vote for this rule. It is a fair and open rule—a fair and modified open rule. More importantly, it is a rule that will allow us to discuss a very good bill. This bill encourages energy production. We may think of these as small energy projects, but I am told that all these small projects already being held up in Colorado would create the amount of energy that comes from a large project like the Glen Canyon Dam. It's a large amount of energy that is clean energy that we will be producing. Number two, this bill gets rid of redundancy. It is not that we are doing away with environmental protection or a review for environmental protection. That environmental protection review has already been done. It is that we're simply saying for these small projects you don't need to do the same thing a second time and incur the cost, which is an amazing amount of cost, and potential litigation factors that go along with it.

If we do want to produce private sector jobs, and that is a worthy goal, you have to have energy to do it. This bill produces the energy which will be used to grow the economy to produce those jobs that we really want. That is why it is a bipartisan bill, and I expect a bipartisan vote on this particular bill. It's a good bill, and we should pass it today. This is a fair rule, and I urge its adoption.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 140 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1426) to disallow the deduction for income attributable to domestic production activities with respect to oil and gas activities of major integrated oil companies. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of

the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1426.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 190, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]
YEAS—236

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	McKinley
Alexander	Gardner	McMorris
Amash	Garrett	Rodgers
Amodei	Gerlach	Meadows
Bachmann	Gibbs	Meehan
Bachus	Gibson	Messer
Barber	Gingrey (GA)	Mica
Barletta	Gohmert	Miller (FL)
Barr	Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
Barton	Gosar	Miller, Gary
Benishek	Gowdy	Mullin
Bentivolio	Granger	Mulvaney
Billirakis	Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Neugebauer
Black	Griffin (AR)	Noem
Blackburn	Griffith (VA)	Nugent
Bonner	Grimm	Nunes
Boustany	Guthrie	Nunnelee
Brady (TX)	Hall	Olson
Bridenstine	Hanna	Palazzo
Brooks (AL)	Harper	Paulsen
Brooks (IN)	Harris	Pearce
Brown (GA)	Hartzler	Perlmutter
Buchanan	Hastings (WA)	Perry
Bucshon	Heck (NV)	Petri
Burgess	Hensarling	Pittenger
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Pitts
Camp	Holding	Poe (TX)
Campbell	Hudson	Pompeo
Cantor	Huelskamp	Posey
Capito	Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)
Carter	Hultgren	Radel
Cassidy	Hunter	Reed
Chabot	Hurt	Reichert
Chaffetz	Issa	Renacci
Coble	Jenkins	Ribble
Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Richmond
Collins (GA)	Jones	Rigell
Collins (NY)	Jordan	Roby
Conaway	Joyce	Roe (TN)
Cook	Kelly	Rogers (AL)
Costa	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Cotton	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Cramer	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita
Crenshaw	Kline	Rooney
Culberson	Labrador	Roskam
Daines	LaMalfa	Ross
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Rothfus
Denham	Lance	Royce
Dent	Lankford	Runyan
DeSantis	Latham	Ryan (WI)
DesJarlais	Latta	Salmon
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Scalise
Duffy	Long	Schock
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Ellmers	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Farenthold	Marchant	Sessions
Fincher	Marino	Shimkus
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Shuster
Fleischmann	Matheson	Simpson
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NE)
Flores	McCaul	Smith (NJ)
Forbes	McClintock	Smith (TX)
Fortenberry	McHenry	Southerland
Foxx	McIntyre	Stewart
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Stivers

Stockman	Wagner	Wilson (SC)
Stutzman	Walberg	Wittman
Terry	Walden	Wolf
Thompson (PA)	Walorski	Womack
Thornberry	Weber (TX)	Woodall
Tiberi	Webster (FL)	Yoder
Tipton	Wenstrup	Yoho
Turner	Westmoreland	Young (AK)
Upton	Whitfield	Young (FL)
Valadao	Williams	Young (IN)

NAYS—190

Andrews	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Green, Gene	Owens
Bass	Grijalva	Pallone
Beatty	Gutierrez	Pascrell
Becerra	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Blumenauer	Himes	Peters (MI)
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Honda	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bustos	Huffman	Quigley
Butterfield	Israel	Rahall
Capps	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Capuano	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rush
Cartwright	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kildee	T.
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kind	Sarbanes
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kuster	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Schneider
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Conyers	Lee (GA)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Levin	Scott, David
Courtney	Lewis	Serrano
Crowley	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Loeb	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Lofgren	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Lowe	Sires
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
DeGette	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
DeLauro	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Maffei	Takano
Deutch	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Tierney
Doyle	Matsui	Titus
Duckworth	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Edwards	McCollum	Tsongas
Ellison	McDermott	Van Hollen
Engel	McGovern	Vargas
Enyart	McNerney	Veasey
Eshoo	Meeks	Vela
Esty	Meng	Velázquez
Farr	Michaud	Visclosky
Fattah	Miller, George	Walz
Foster	Moore	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Moran	Schultz
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Gabbard	Nadler	Watt
Gallego	Napolitano	Waxman
Garamendi	Neal	Welch
Garcia	Negrete McLeod	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Nolan	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Castor (FL)	Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen
Hastings (FL)	Markey	

□ 1334

Mr. PASCARELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 142, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 142

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

(a) JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY.—The following Members are hereby elected to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, to serve with the chair of the Committee on House Administration and the chair of the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch of the Committee on Appropriations:

- (1) Mr. Harper.
- (2) Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania.
- (3) Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California.

(b) JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.—The following Members are hereby elected to the Joint Committee on Printing, to serve with the chair of the Committee on House Administration:

- (1) Mr. Harper.
- (2) Mr. Nugent.
- (3) Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania.
- (4) Mr. Vargas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 142.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF MR. SMITH OF NEBRASKA AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1175

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw Mr. ADRIAN SMITH of Nebraska as a cosponsor of H.R. 1175.

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

There was no objection.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION SMALL CONDUIT HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND RURAL JOBS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 678.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Pursuant to House Resolution 140 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 678.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1338

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 678) to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act.

Those of us from the Pacific Northwest know and understand the importance of hydropower and the significant role it plays in our economy. In my home State of Washington, hydropower produces 70 percent of our power, and it helps keep electricity rates low and affordable for our residents.

□ 1340

It is one of the cheapest and cleanest forms of electricity, and helps make other intermittent sources of renewable energy, like wind and solar, possible.

Yet too often, as is frequently the case with energy projects on Federal lands, the development of new hydropower gets caught up in bureaucratic red tape and regulations.

Today's bill, sponsored by our colleague from Colorado, Mr. TIPTON, would cut through that red tape to expand the development of small conduit hydropower. Specifically, it clears up Federal agency confusion by directly authorizing hydropower development at almost 47,000 miles of Bureau of Reclamation canals. It also streamlines the regulatory process for developing small canal and pipeline hydropower projects on existing Bureau of Reclamation facilities.