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

NAYS—190

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

NOT VOTING—5

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

□ 1334

Mr. PASCRELL 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 gentlewoman 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 gentlewoman 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.

Mr. Chairman, I want to stress the point that these new projects will only be at existing facilities. These existing man-made facilities have already gone through extensive environmental review when they were initially built. Requiring duplicative reviews on existing facilities only imposes unnecessary delays and, thus, administrative costs.

I realize that the Bureau of Reclamation has come up with its own version of streamlining since we considered this bill in the last Congress, but it's only a theoretical version of streamlining since it has never been used in the 6 months after it was created. This bill simply streamlines the regulatory and administrative process so that water users can be free to develop hydropower at the Federal canals they already operate and maintain.

This bill will help generate thousands of megawatts of clean, cheap, abundant hydropower and, thus, will bring in new revenue to the Federal Government and, more importantly, Mr. Chairman, create new American jobs. Best of all, we can do this at no cost to the American taxpayer. This is exactly the type of commonsense proposal that Republicans support as part of the all-of-the-above energy plan. Hydropower must be part of the solution. Families and small businesses rely on access to affordable electricity, and this bill is a simple way to lower prices by expanding production on one of the best forms of clean, renewable energy.

Mr. Chairman, nearly identical legislation passed the House last Congress with bipartisan support. I hope the House will once again do so today, and that the Senate will take action on this job-creating energy bill.

I want to thank particularly members of the Natural Resources Committee Mr. TIPTON of Colorado, Mr. GOSAR of Arizona, and Mr. COSTA of California for their tremendous work on this bill and for being strong champions of small-scale hydropower production.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the general premise of this bill but oppose the legislation as is due to the inclusion of the NEPA waiver.

Today we are debating H.R. 678, a bill that should be noncontroversial. In fact, it should have already been enacted into law. We all agree that adding small conduit hydropower projects is a great idea—no, it's really a wonderful idea—and H.R. 678 could have easily been passed through the House with overwhelming bipartisan support. But, unfortunately, my esteemed colleagues on the other side have chosen to turn this noncontroversial bill into a partisan fight over ideology by waiving compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, for Federal conduit projects.

As my colleague from Washington indicated, it means jobs. It means the addition of clean energy. It means all of those things, but to the exclusion of NEPA. As the gentleman mentioned, H.R. 678 would amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and, thus, would facilitate and expand the private development of small conduit hydropower at the Bureau of Reclamation facilities. The legislation seeks to accomplish several goals, the most important of which is authorizing reclamation to develop and increase power at most of those facilities.

H.R. 678 also includes a provision that waives NEPA for all conduit projects generating less than 5 megawatts. The bill waives NEPA, which is on page 4, lines 14 to 18, even though the Bureau of Reclamation has implemented a categorical exclusion on their own accord to apply to small conduit projects. You may call it theoretical, but it has only been there 6 months, and it takes government a long time to get the word out to those parties. The waiver of NEPA in this bill is unnecessary, since Reclamation has already implemented this guidance through this categorical exclusion. The legislation seeks to solve a NEPA problem that does not exist. Unfortunately, some Members on the other side of the aisle have characterized the waiver of NEPA as ''the main purpose of this legislation.''

The waiver in this bill is the exact same waiver that Republicans put into the nearly identical bill last Congress. Just like the last time, the Senate will not pass it, and the bill will again expire in the Senate. This is totally unnecessary. This is not what anyone on this side of the aisle wants to see happen, and we would support the bill without the NEPA waiver.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this legislation and ask my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this legislation on the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the so-called streamlining that the Bureau has pledged to do and has done has produced no new projects for reasons that were made very clear to our Subcommittee on Water and Power by numerous witnesses. NEPA is at the heart of the problem. As the chairman said, the Bureau of Reclamation operates 47,000 miles of pipelines and canals that have already undergone extensive environmental review. By installing small generators in the existing pipelines, we could add the equivalent generating capacity of major hydroelectric dams, meaning millions of dollars of new revenue to the government, millions of watts of new, clean, cheap electricity, and all the jobs these projects would produce.

The gentlelady has said that she supports the objective and is willing to do everything that she can to help except by getting government out of the way. The Federal bureaucracy has made it cost prohibitive for people to install these small generators in these existing canals and pipelines. Rather, they force them to conduct crushingly expensive environmental reviews, navigate time-consuming bureaucratic mazes, pay exorbitant administrative fees, and risk the uncertainties of endless internal review and external litigation. These bureaucratic obstacles often cost more than the projects themselves and turn sensible, economic electricity projects into cost-prohibitive farces.

As proposed to be amended, this bill requires the Bureau to categorically exclude the installation of these small, hydroelectric generators in existing facilities that have already undergone environmental review. It designates the central office within the Bureau to provide uniform guidance on processing applications. It establishes a sensible and streamlined process to determine development rights. And it ensures that installation of hydrogenerators will not disrupt existing water operations.

Mr. Chairman, think about the implications just to farming as one example. Some irrigation districts are forced to use diesel generators to pump water to their fields. You put hydroelectric generators in existing canals and pipes, and they become virtually self-sustaining, while reducing reliance on other sources of electricity that do produce air emissions.

It is truly mystifying that a Nation plagued by prolonged economic stagnation, chronic unemployment, and increasingly scarce and expensive electricity would adopt a willful and deliberate policy obstructing the construction of these inexpensive and innocuous generators in already-existing facilities. Even FERC, a bastion of regulatory excess, agrees that these studies are unnecessary when conducted on similar non-Federal facilities.

I believe this bill is a model for the future. I hope that similar regulatory reforms will soon be extended to other Federal and non-Federal facilities.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member, Congresswoman NAPOLITANO, for her efforts on this legislation, Chairman DOC HASTINGS, as well as the chair of the subcommittee, TOM MCCLINTOCK, and the author of this measure, Congressman TIPTON, for trying to bring folks together.

□ 1350

Mr. Chairman, people from every walk of life are looking to Congress today to see if we can come together to deal with any of our problems, whether they be big, small, or in between. I rise today to support legislation, I think, that does that. This isn't the biggest

legislation we'll deal with this year, nor is it the smallest; but it's something that will help America's energy policy.

Our bipartisan bill would amend the Reclamation Act, as has been stated, of 1939, to create a permanent process for how local irrigation districts and water agencies develop this very valuable, renewable, carbon-free energy at our reclamation facilities. And as we're putting together an energy policy that uses all-of-the-above, this becomes an important part.

H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act, is a bipartisan bill that puts existing resources and knowledge we already have to expand one of the most important tools in our Nation's energy toolbox. Let me repeat that: one of the most important tools in our Nation's energy toolbox.

Hydropower is the single largest source of clean, sustainable energy and has been powering our country for over 100 years throughout the land. When most people think about hydropower, of course, they think about the big projects, Hoover Dam and other modern engineering marvels.

However, the beauty of this hydropower legislation is it can also be used on much smaller scaled, reliable projects in which we already have the infrastructure in place. Every day, water flows thousands of miles through canals, pipes and ditches across this country. I know—I happen to represent one of those places, the great San Joaquin Valley, in which we have a vast network of dams and reservoirs and canals that provide that water for those who most need it, our cities and our farms.

We have an old saying: where water flows, food grows. Every day we miss valuable opportunities to utilize this resource's full potential. This bill changes that.

This water could easily be harnessed to provide low-cost, renewable energy to American families and help add to the increment of energy that we need in this country.

Currently, small conduit hydropower is largely untapped and underutilized; and it's also, obviously, a clean-energy opportunity. The greatest barrier to unleashing the next generation of hydropower is not technological, because we have made great progress on the technological side. Unfortunately, it's regulatory.

Currently, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, otherwise known as FERC, maintains jurisdiction over small projects like those that I am talking about.

Serving on the Natural Resources Committee, I've heard from folks across the country say that these regulations are too costly and too difficult to navigate. Obtaining an exception from FERC's permitting rules can take up to 6 months and cost nearly $50,000 for a local water district to pursue. That's unnecessary, and it's also a waste of valuable resources.

Our bipartisan bill, again, would amend the Reclamation Act of 1939 to create a permanent process for how local irrigation districts and water agencies develop this very valuable, renewable, carbon-free resource for reclamation facilities.

By streamlining the process, the irrigation districts would be empowered to develop small conduit hydropower at no cost to the taxpayers. These projects typically are 5 megawatts and less.

Harnessing the power of water already flowing through reclamation facilities would stimulate rural economies, reduce pumping costs for farmers who face those pumping costs every year.

I am proud to stand with my colleagues who are supporting this legislation. I want to thank Congressman TIPTON for this effort, because it helps us take advantage of existing facilities that are already in place to provide additional resource of power where we need it.

If we want to strengthen our energy portfolio, let's start with the low-hanging fruit. This is low-hanging fruit.

Let me just give you some numbers. In California there are 20 small hydro projects, should this legislation become law, that would be available to this process. Let me underline that: 20 projects in California that would qualify.

In the Nation, the Bureau of Reclamation has determined that there are 373 projects throughout the country that potentially would qualify should this legislation become law.

The bill does just that. I urge your support for H.R. 678.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), the sponsor of this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank Chairman HASTINGS for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 678 is a commonsense piece of legislation to foster clean, renewable energy development, create rural jobs in America, and to do so without taxpayer cost, while returning revenues to the U.S. Treasury and, by all measures, should be considered low-hanging fruit, as our fellow Member has just noted, for congressional action.

There's been a lot of discussion on both sides of the aisle about the need to be able to pursue an all-of-the-above strategy. Hydropower, as the cleanest and most abundant natural energy source, should be at the forefront of any comprehensive natural energy policy.

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 into the grid; it can generate revenue for the irrigation district to be able to help pay for aging infrastructure costs and facilitate modernization; and it can create local jobs and generate revenue to the Federal Government.

It's as simple as this poster demonstrates, as easy as putting a portable generator into moving canal water.

Many irrigation districts and electrical utilities seek to develop hydropower on Bureau of Reclamation pipes, ditches and canals; but regulatory uncertainty and the threat of unnecessary bureaucratic requirements stand in the way.

This legislation seeks to remove duplicative environmental analysis where doing so will considerably reduce costs for hydropower developers, while retaining the analysis necessary to protect valuable natural resources.

While the Bureau of Reclamation has recently begun to inventory facilities suitable for small conduit hydropower generation and develop directives and standards to help promote that end, for far too long, duplicative review for small hydropower projects on existing, manmade facilities rendered these projects financially unfeasible, and significant uncertainty still remains.

The generating units covered by H.R. 678 would be installed on entirely manmade waterways which have already received a full environmental review when they were built or rehabilitated. Any transmission associated with these projects that would result from the passage of this bill must still undergo full environmental review where they impact the environment. To require a lengthy review for dropping a small generator into a pipe simply defies logic, and we cannot pursue an all-of-the-above energy strategy if we continue business as usual.

In addition to creating regulatory certainty and removing duplicative processes, this legislation authorizes power development at the agency's conduits to clear up multi-Federal agency confusion and further reduces the regulatory costs associated with hydropower development. This provision of the bill will provide the necessary statutory authority to be able to reduce litigation that the agency is sure to seek under the current framework which relies on broad authorities that do not specifically authorize hydropower development.

This legislation ensures the continued use of the Bureau facilities, primarily for water supply and irrigation, and protects the interests of those maintaining and operating these facilities by offering them the first right of refusal to take advantage of small conduit energy development projects.

Non-Federal operators know the details of the facilities best and are locally invested. As a result, it's only logical to offer them the first opportunity to develop this energy on facilities that they maintain.

Additionally, those irrigation districts with preexisting arrangements with the Bureau or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for water delivery and hydropower development will not be disturbed by this bill.

I'm proud to have the support of the Family Farm Alliance, the National Water Resources Association, the American Public Power Association, and the National Hydropower Association, among others.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be able to make this public law and to start putting rural America back to work and developing clean, renewable energy.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I agree with my colleague, except some of those projects were built in 1902 and through the 1970s. I think we do need NEPA protection.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

□ 1400

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I would like to thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Madam Chair, I rise to object today to the consideration of this bill and rather propose that we stand in this House and we consider Mr. HOYER's Make It In America package. We can come together and focus on real solutions that will get our economy moving again, and we should take up Mr. HOYER's Make It In America package because it will strengthen our economy and create non-outsourceable jobs at home, here in America. The Make It In America package includes bills like mine, H.R. 1022, the Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2013 that will help secure America's place as a leader in science and technology with a 21st century workforce.

What are rare Earth elements? Well, these are 17 chemical elements—elements that, prior to coming to Congress and learning about how they affect our economy, I couldn't point out at pistol point—that are very critical to making cell phones, to making our electric cars, and also to making our antimissile systems. Despite the name, they are very abundant in our country and they can be extracted in an environmentally safe manner.

So what's the problem? Well, today, 97 percent of rare Earth elements are extracted and exported from China. Eighty percent of rare Earth magnets and almost 100 percent of related metal production are coming from China. In 2010, China temporarily cut off rare Earth supplies to Japan, the European Union, and the United States, highlighting the potential consequences to the United States for relying so heavily upon China for rare Earth production that is so crucial and critical to what we can create here in America.

My district includes northern Silicon Valley, home of silicon chip processing, home of the technology boom, home of the Internet, and also home of many advanced manufacturing production sites. H.R. 1022, the Securing Energy Critical Elements in American Jobs Act of 2013 aims to help reduce our dependence on China for these critical elements and instead make it here in America. But in order for us to do this, we need to invest in developing our technical workforce here at home.

Currently, the United States lacks the necessary technical expertise to ensure a reliable supply of energy critical elements. My bill, H.R. 1022, enlists the talents of our university students and encourages them to develop the technical expertise necessary to secure America's access to these elements. We need to ensure that the best and brightest minds in our area and our country have the tools and support they need to support America's access to energy critical elements. H.R. 1022 will promote collaboration and research opportunities in the fields of energy-critical elements for students at higher institutions, and coordination of Federal agencies to promote a stable supply of energy-critical elements.

We also have in my congressional district what's called the ''Tri-Valley,'' or, as I like to call it, the ''I Valley,'' or the ''Innovation Valley.'' This area also would rely upon energy-critical elements. And as the ranking member said, we have an opportunity today to work in a bipartisan fashion. Unfortunately, I do not see us doing that. So I would conclude by asking that we come together.

Also, in my bill there's a loan guarantee for companies with new processing and refining technologies. The Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2013 will help to spur private investment in companies on the forefront of this critical field. It's very important that we have the Federal Government at the very inception, in the beginning, providing the research and Federal funding. But most important is to get it out into private industry. And that's what this bill calls upon.

So, again, I urge my colleagues to stop wasting time with partisan bills like this today. Instead, let's come together to train and secure a 21st century workforce. Let's harness our own resources. Let's Make It In America, and we can help all Americans make it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, before I yield time to the gentlelady from Wyoming, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I find the gentleman's argument on the other side rather striking because he's talking about American-made jobs and another piece of legislation not associated with this. And I would just point out, what could be more American-made jobs than putting hydropower facilities on American soil? That creates jobs. That's what this bill is all about.

And the second point, the gentleman mentioned the rare Earth issue that we have. Last Congress, we passed legislation here so we could utilize the known rare Earth supplies we have in this country, and it was the other body, controlled by the gentleman's own party, that didn't act on it. And he sounds like it is a big, big issue now. I suspect we may have, Madam Chairman, that legislation again in front of us, and I would hope that we could elicit the gentleman's support when that bill comes to the floor.

With that, Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), a valuable member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I rise in support of H.R. 678, of which I'm an original cosponsor, and I want to thank Representative TIPTON, Chairman MCCLINTOCK, and Chairman HASTINGS for their hard work on this bill, which unlocks significant hydropower development potential in my home State of Wyoming.

Congress and the Bureau of Reclamation have over the years created hundreds of canals and pipelines to serve water uses in the West. Most of these conduits were never envisioned as power sources because the technology wasn't there or it wasn't yet cost-effective. But technology has changed, and now it's feasible to harness and channel the energy byproduct of these water flows. The Bureau of Reclamation has identified 373 conduits in the West with hydropower potential. Wyoming leads the States with 121 of these sites and is second only to Colorado in terms of the potential energy output. In Wyoming alone, the estimated potential is 82 million kilowatt hours annually from a clean, renewable energy source. Unleashing this potential, while still protecting the environment and end water users, is what this bill is all about.

First, H.R. 678 eliminates bureaucratic confusion by expressly authorizing the Bureau to oversee hydropower development in its conduits.

Second, it directs the Bureau of Reclamation to exempt small hydropower projects from duplicative environmental paperwork requirements. We're talking about placing small power generators in canals and ditches where the ground has already been disturbed. Fences have gone up. Environmental analysis has been conducted, sometimes multiple times because of the Bureau's contract renewals with some water users. Requiring duplicative environmental analysis on preexisting conduits makes no sense, provides no environmental benefit, and imposes more costs and bureaucratic uncertainty on potential developers.

Third, the bill protects water supply and delivery as the primary and fundamental priority for these conduits, whose vital mission will not be disrupted.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, jobs-creating bill.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentlewoman from California has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CARDENAS. I thank the gentlewoman for giving me the opportunity to speak on this matter.

H.R. 678 could easily be a bipartisan, noncontroversial bill. But Republicans insist on including an unnecessary provision to waive environmental review. It sets the wrong precedent. Nearly 100 days have passed since the 113th Congress has been sworn in, and not one bill has been brought to the floor that would have a measurable effect of reinvigorating our manufacturing sector. In fact, quite the opposite has happened.

Democrats have announced the Make It In America initiative to focus on four areas to help our economy grow. In order to strengthen the economy, this Congress must: adopt and pursue a comprehensive manufacturing strategy; promote the export of U.S. goods; encourage innovation; and train a 21st century workforce. In addition to these four core components, we must work together to address the equally important task of getting our small business owners access to capital they so desperately need. Without capital, our businesses are stagnant, cannot invest in their own growth, and will not hire that unemployed person who has been searching for a job for months.

We must do more to get the financial institutions back to lending in this country. Now it's up to Republicans and Democrats to work together to enact and pass Make It In America legislation and help secure America as the world leader when it comes to job creation and when it comes to innovation. When it comes to hydropower, it's very important for us to understand yes, we need more hydropower, yes, we need innovation, yes, we need to make sure the small and large hydropower actually moves forward. But doing it at the expense of the environment by waiving environmental review is just not the right way to do it.

□ 1410

Many people in these Chambers speak constantly of making sure that we don't put things on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. Every time we waive environmental review, every time that we don't do things carefully, we move in a direction where it takes sometimes a year or 2 or 3 to go in the wrong direction, it takes decades for us to correct those environmental problems.

So environmental review should be part of the process and, yes, it should be streamlined and, yes, we need to make sure that we do things in a fashion that does put people back to work, but we have to do it carefully and responsibly.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), another valuable member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, Chairman HASTINGS.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation and Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act of 2013. This legislation was one of Representative TIPTON's and my top priorities in the Natural Resources Committee last Congress, so I am pleased to join him again as an original cosponsor and appreciate that the House is taking up the legislation so quickly in the 113th Congress.

Our country is failing to fully tap its hydroelectric power generation potential. The Federal Government owns over 47,000 miles of canals, laterals, drains, pipeline and tunnels throughout the West that are perfectly suitable for hydropower production, but hardworking irrigators and power providers in our districts, already operating and maintaining this infrastructure on behalf of the Federal Government, cannot install hydropower generators because government regulations and bureaucratic confusion are making it cost prohibitive.

H.R. 678 will clear away these bureaucratic obstacles that stand between our Nation and thousands of megawatts of clean, cheap, abundant, and reliable hydroelectricity. The resulting development will create jobs in rural communities hit hardest by the recession, increase our country's renewable energy portfolio, and even generate revenue for the Federal Treasury.

The Members of this body opposing this legislation claim it could cause harm to the environment. To be clear, this bill only allows for development on existing irrigation canals and ditch systems, not free-flowing rivers and streams. These conduits have been in place for years, do not contain any endangered wildlife or fish, and were subject to environmental analysis at the time of construction or rehabilitation.

On the poster to my left is a clear example of what we are talking about. Folks, it's concrete. It's been sitting here with running water. I don't see the need and I hope you don't see the need for a NEPA environmental assessment. This canal is in the western part of my congressional district. We have miles of this type of infrastructure throughout the State, including the Central Arizona Project. It provides my constituents with the water necessary to live in the desert and even grow a good portion of this Nation's produce.

The experts on the ground say we are sitting on a hydropower gold mine waiting for the needed clarifications and streamlining that will cut costs and make this program more attractive. There are over 26 locations just like this one in my State alone—mostly in Yuma, Pinal, and western Maricopa Counties—that are suitable for this development. The Agri-Business Council of Arizona believes its members could produce enough low-cost clean energy to power nearly 5,000 homes simply by installing these small hydropower generators. That is a huge economic impact for the small rural communities these irrigators serve. They would provide a real economic boost and lower energy costs.

There are many solutions to our Nation's energy crisis, but hydropower is clearly part of our all-of-the-above plan. It already accounts for about 75 percent of this country's total renewable electricity generation, and we haven't even begun yet.

Early this Congress, the House unanimously passed the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act, which promotes development on privately owned infrastructure. We should do the same today on Congressman TIPTON's and my legislation that does the same for publicly owned infrastructure.

Congress would be doing the American people an injustice if we didn't move swiftly on this bill. Hydropower must be an integral component of the long-term all-of-the-above energy strategy in Arizona and for our Nation, and this bill will allow rural western communities to play a major role in that future. I will continue to work with Congressman TIPTON to ensure that this bill not only passes the House this year but gets through the Senate and is sent to the President's desk for his signature. Folks, it is that simple: commonsense utilization of infrastructure we already have.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chairman, I am glad that there are some visual effects here. It is important. But I don't know how all the canal and for the release, were there any levee issues. So it is important to have a NEPA review.

I would now like to yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman TAKANO.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentlelady from my own home State of California for yielding time.

Madam Chair, this bill is something that Democrats could support if proper environmental review were not made a problem. I really believe this Congress needs to get back to getting serious about discussing how we're going to put our country back to work.

The national unemployment rate is 7.6 percent, and in my own district it's nearly 11 percent. The Congress should be focused on putting Americans back to work. Democrats have a plan. It's called Make It In America. This plan, put together by Mr. HOYER from Maryland, addresses the most pressing crisis that our Nation faces, the jobs crisis, and it will put Americans back to work. It has four main points:

Number one, adopt and pursue a national manufacturing strategy;

Number two, promote the export of American goods;

Number three, encourage manufacturers to bring jobs and innovation back to America;

Number four, train and secure a 21st century workforce.

We have the tools at our disposal to do these things.

The legislation that I have introduced that is a part of the Make It In America plan is called the Jobs Skills for America's Students Act. It encourages partnerships between employers and educational institutions. Employers who participate are able to receive a $2,000 tax credit per student participating in a qualified technical training and skills program, with a total credit amount cap of $10,000 per year.

Many of America's fastest growing industries, industries that will benefit from the Make It In America plan, like advanced manufacturing and clean energy, require a highly skilled workforce. These industries struggle to find workers who possess the technical training that they require. The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that 600,000 manufacturing jobs remain unfilled due to a lack of qualified candidates. Just today, we learned from the Department of Labor that there are 3.9 million job openings in America, the most in almost 5 years. Many of these jobs are unfilled because of the lack of training.

The Job Skills for America's Students Act partners key industries with community colleges and other programs to offer students the opportunity to obtain the training they need to thrive in the field of their choice. To grow our middle class and create a workforce for the future, we must close the skills gap and we must make training affordable and effective.

I urge my Republican colleagues to work with Democrats to pass each piece of the Make It In America legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another member of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Chairman HASTINGS, thanks to you and to Mr. TIPTON for the opportunity to speak in support of H.R. 678 today. This bill reflects an issue that is of true importance to my home State of Montana.

You know, when most people think of our rivers and waterways in Montana, they think of celebrities like Brad Pitt standing in the Little Blackfoot River casting for trout in the movie ''A River Runs Through It.''

Back in Montana, we rely on our rivers and our natural resources as an important part of our way of life. However, I'm here today to focus on a very significant benefit of our waterways, and that's hydropower. Our waterways help power our homes, they irrigate our farms and ranches, and they water our livestock. In Montana, about a third of our energy comes from hydropower, generating 1,100 megawatts per year. To put this in perspective, 1 megawatt will power nearly 600 homes. Six of Montana's 10 largest generating plants run on hydroelectric power. But we're not here to talk about streams and rivers; we're here to talk about man-made canals and manmade waterways.

The Bureau of Reclamation has constructed 32 such projects in Montana, and with the improved ability to harness the energy of moving water in conduits, the Rural Jobs Act would allow each of these projects to generate more than 26 million kilowatts per hour of power. There is no reason red tape should tie up that much alternative energy potential.

This bill will help lower energy costs, create Montana jobs, and provide our Nation with a sustainable, renewable source of energy. This is common sense. I believe that H.R. 678, the Rural Jobs Act, is important for our country, and I strongly support its passage.

□ 1420

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LAMALFA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, once in awhile a bill comes through that even makes great sense in Washington, D.C., and this is a really commonsense measure. I live on a farm in northern California where I'm surrounded by canals and ditches and water moving all about in my daily life in producing rice, and so there's all these opportunities we would have on installations like that. But we're talking today about Bureau installations to put renewable power in place that, according to this chart here, would affect many, many States with many installations and provide many American jobs.

The opportunities of this bill, just putting the bureaucracy and the red tape aside, for a commonsense measure to take advantage of an opportunity to do something that, on the heels of March Madness here, really, installations would be no harm, no foul. These facilities already exist. It would be easy to put in place. If we could put aside the red tape of NEPA requirements, it would be unnecessary.

As I drive up and down my canals and my ditches, again, no harm, no foul here. We're looking at an easy installation that would be a very valuable thing for, where I come from in California, a renewable energy portfolio, which is 33 percent kicking in. It's pretty hard to find renewable energy, especially when most of those sources are required to be solar or wind.

Hydropower is a very important component in my part of the State here. We have so much water that we can take advantage of to produce, why aren't we doing it in the commonsense areas?

H.R. 678—and I commend the chairman and Mr. TIPTON for bringing this bill forward. This is, again, something that's going to be very positive for rural America, for our renewable energy portfolio, which is affecting, I think, a lot of the country these days, because renewable energy in most cases is very expensive. So the same people that are saying we can't do this without NEPA, the same people that are saying we can't have fracturing, which is bringing very cost-effective electricity to many, many Americans now, the same people that want to remove hydroelectric dams in my part of the district in northern California are now wanting to oppose a commonsense measure like this.

Sometimes I just don't get it, but this one here is really an opportunity to move forward with opportunity for our rural States, for rural areas to produce these projects with American know-how and more American jobs. We hear a lot about that here today. Let's put Americans to work with commonsense, reachable measures that are environmentally sound and certainly good for our economy.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, may I inquire how many minutes we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. May I inquire of my colleague how many other speakers he has?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am prepared to close general debate if the gentlelady is prepared to close.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I am. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, as I've said before, this is a good bill with one bad provision in it, and that is the NEPA waiver that is not needed. It is not good environmental policy, and it is not good energy policy.

NEPA is not just red tape. It is a chance for the Federal Government to consider alternatives, to listen to not only the opponent, but get input from everybody impacted and to consider any possible impacts to the area.

At the appropriate time, I will offer an amendment to fit the one flaw in this bill. I hope my amendment is adopted and we'll send this to the Senate for passage.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This debate has been rather interesting, because it sounds like on the floor there is widespread support for the concept of this bill. And why shouldn't there be? After all, there are 47,000 miles of canals and ditches that could be utilized for energy production.

There seems to be one problem, and that problem revolves around NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, which was put in place, by the way, in 1969. I'm not going do say there's a direct correlation between NEPA and the lack of Bureau of Reclamation projects, but it is very interesting that most of the great projects that were built in the West were built prior to NEPA.

There were environmental statutes on the book, Madam Chairwoman, back then, and they are all satisfied. I happen to live in central Washington. There are two great projects in central Washington—the Columbia Basin Project and the Yakima River Project; in total, probably over a million acres of irrigated land.

Here is the truism, Madam Chairwoman. What we are talking about are our facilities where water is running through them, water is running downhill. We all know that water running downhill creates a certain amount of energy. All we want to do is capture that energy. With the prior chart that the gentleman from California put up, most of the States that will benefit by this are from the West. That means that we can make the desert bloom even more in the West if we utilize these facilities.

Finally, I just want to make one other observation. My good friend from California was saying that, okay, this is like a bill we had last year. We passed it; the Senate didn't do anything. Well, I would just remind the gentlelady, and she should know this, and I know she does, we are two distinct bodies, the House and the Senate. If they have a different view, for goodness sake, pass something. If it's different than our view, then we'll figure out how to come together. But to simply say, this is a good piece of legislation but we don't like NEPA, therefore, don't pass it because the Senate won't take it up, is not doing our job.

Madam Chairman, this is a good piece of legislation. There are some amendments that will be following. We can get into more detail on those. But I urge my colleagues to support passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act, of which I am a cosponsor, and I want to thank Mr. TIPTON for his efforts.

Expanding access to clean, affordable, reliable energy is one challenge facing our Nation today. And while visionaries are looking for solutions, outdated bureaucracy is stifling innovation.

Though its environmental impacts are negligible, small hydropower development remains a financial challenge.

By exempting small hydropower from NEPA requirements, this bill substantially reduces administrative costs and could help stimulate the economy of rural America at no cost to taxpayers.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chair, this bill, like hydropower legislation I introduced last Congress, is limited in scope.

We're not talking about waiving environmental regulations for large, new infrastructure projects; we're talking about streamlining the process of developing clean, renewable energy on existing conduits.

According to a Bureau of Reclamation's March 2012 report on conduit hydropower development, more than 30 irrigation sites in my home State of Nebraska contain more than 5,000 kilowatts of potential hydropower development.

This bill empowers local irrigation districts to produce emissions–free energy which could be used by producers or sold to help pay for aging infrastructure costs.

There are no government mandates and no hidden costs, Mr. Chair.

Sustainable, affordable energy is critical to growing our economy and this is commonsense policymaking.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 678

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION.

Section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts to furnish water'' and inserting the following:

''(1) The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts to furnish water'';

(2) by striking ''(1) shall'' and inserting ''(A) shall'';

(3) by striking ''(2) shall'' and inserting ''(B) shall'';

(4) by striking ''respecting the terms of sales of electric power and leases of power privileges shall be in addition and alternative to any authority in existing laws relating to particular projects'' and inserting ''respecting the sales of electric power and leases of power privileges shall be an authorization in addition to and alternative to any authority in existing laws related to particular projects, including small conduit hydropower development''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) When carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall first offer the lease of power privilege to an irrigation district or water users association operating the applicable transferred work, or to the irrigation district or water users association receiving water from the applicable reserved work. The Secretary shall determine a reasonable time frame for the irrigation district or water users association to accept or reject a lease of power privilege offer.

''(3) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall not apply to small conduit hydropower development, excluding siting of associated transmission on Federal lands, under this subsection.

''(4) The Power Resources Office of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be the lead office of small conduit hydropower activities conducted under this subsection.

''(5) Nothing in this subsection shall obligate the Western Area Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, or the Southwestern Power Administration to purchase or market any of the power produced by the facilities covered under this subsection and none of the costs associated with production or delivery of such power shall be assigned to project purposes for inclusion in project rates.

''(6) Nothing in this subsection shall alter or impede the delivery and management of water by Bureau of Reclamation facilities, as water used for conduit hydropower generation shall be deemed incidental to use of water for the original project purposes. Lease of power privilege shall be made only when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the exercise of the lease will not be incompatible with the purposes of the project or division involved, nor shall it create any unmitigated financial or physical impacts to the project or division involved, and shall be on such terms and conditions as in the judgment of the Secretary in consultation with the appropriate irrigation district or water users association, will adequately protect the planning, design, construction, operation, maintenance, and other interests of the United States and the project or division involved.

''(7) Nothing in this subsection shall alter or affect any existing agreements for the development of conduit hydropower projects or disposition of revenues.

''(8) In this subsection:

''(A) CONDUIT.—The term 'conduit' means any Bureau of Reclamation tunnel, canal, pipeline, aqueduct, flume, ditch, or similar manmade water conveyance that is operated for the distribution of water for agricultural, municipal, or industrial consumption and not primarily for the generation of electricity.

''(B) IRRIGATION DISTRICT.—The term 'irrigation district' means any irrigation, water conservation, multicounty water conservation district, or any separate public entity composed of two or more such districts and jointly exercising powers of its member districts.

''(C) RESERVED WORK.—The term 'reserved work' means any conduit that is included in project works the care, operation, and maintenance of which has been reserved by the Secretary, through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

''(D) TRANSFERRED WORK.—The term 'transferred work' means any conduit that is included in project works the care, operation, and maintenance of which has been transferred to a legally organized water users association or irrigation district.

''(E) SMALL CONDUIT HYDROPOWER.—The term 'small conduit hydropower' means a facility capable of producing 5 megawatts or less of electric capacity.''.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those received for printing in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose dated at least 1 day before the day of consideration of the amendment and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate.

Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who submitted it for printing or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, strike lines 14 through 18, and insert the following:

''(3) The Bureau of Reclamation shall apply its categorical exclusion process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to small conduit hydropower development under this subsection, excluding siting of associated transmission facilities on Federal lands.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chairwoman, I offer this amendment in response to the concerns of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and at the request of the broad range of irrigation districts, water conservation and conservancy districts, and public utilities that are supporting this bill and this commonsense amendment. I'm pleased to have the support of my Democratic colleague JIM COSTA on this effort and the support of the National Hydropower Association, the Family Farm Alliance, the National Water Resources Association, and the American Public Power Association.

This amendment removes the NEPA waiver in the bill and instead codifies the application of the Bureau of Reclamation's categorical exclusion process under the National Environmental Policy Act for small hydropower projects covered by this bill.

This alternative provision would still ensure streamlining the approval process for clean renewable energy and help provide certainty for investors and job creators, while providing flexibility to the Bureau to adjust to changing circumstances moving forward. By advancing these projects under the Bureau's categorical exclusion process, we ensure that all of the elements in that process are retained, including agency discretion for examining extraordinary circumstances. In addition, the amendment specifically mentions codifying the categorical exclusion process for small conduit hydropower.

This is an approach that is supported by Trout Unlimited in its March 19, 2013 letter, which states:

> Congress should direct BOR to create a categorical exclusion for small conduit hydropower.

That's exactly what this amendment does.

The use of a categorical exclusion for small conduit hydropower development can mean the difference between private investment in a public good with a multitude of benefits, and unreasonable financial costs and lengthy delays that lead to untapped potential.

My hope is that this amendment, which is broadly supported by the diverse range of groups invested in the bill who are committed to ensuring continued environmental protection, will assuage any reservations about this effort to promote clean renewable energy and allow us to be able to move forward united in our support.

□ 1430

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIPTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. I think it adds a great deal to all the work that you and your bipartisan cosponsors had put into this, and I support the amendment.

Mr. TIPTON. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to Tipton amendment No. 3 for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We are glad to see the author of the legislation recognizes that in developing conduit hydropower projects, NEPA is not the problem and that the flat NEPA waiver included in the base bill is not good policy.

We also welcome the apparent realization that insisting on an unwarranted and unwise NEPA waiver has been the anchor that has held this bill back and prohibited this largely noncontroversial measure from becoming law.

But to be clear, this amendment only tweaks language that should be removed from the bill entirely. The Tipton amendment circles around the edge of the problem while my amendment, which I'll offer in a few minutes, solves the problem by removing the waiver completely so we can move forward and support the bill.

Better yet, if the waiver is removed, there is no need for the artificially low cap on the size of these projects contained in the base bill, which is why my amendment will increase the cap from 5 to 15 megawatts. The Tipton amendment does nothing to raise the cap on these projects.

The Tipton amendment is a significant step in the right direction for the bill's sponsor, and we will not oppose it and will work with the sponsor and Senate to perfect the language. However, my amendment, which we'll see momentarily, is better energy policy and better environmental policy. The amendment is a start, this particular amendment, but I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my amendment to really fix this legislation.

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Chair, the legislative process is a two way street. It's about listening and incorporating the concerns of our colleagues to improve a bill. This amendment does just that.

Environmental review is important, but it needs to be an appropriate level of review for the project involved. On these types of projects, there isn't much chance of damage, so there shouldn't be much cost involved for review.

Reclamation recognizes this and has made great strides in easing the way for small hydro development on the agency's projects. However, potential legal conflicts have prevented them from fully implementing this process.

This amendment would bridge the legal gap and clarify questions that have kept the Bureau from moving forward. Specifically, the amendment would codify the steps Reclamation is already taking to ease the way for responsible small conduit hydropower development while also resolving potential litigation concerns.

This is a commonsense amendment that has been endorsed by American Rivers, Trout Unlimited, the Family Farm Alliance, the National Water Resources Association, and the National Hydropower Association.

I urge you to support this amendment and support the underlying bill.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I rise to offer the Napolitano amendment identified as amendment No. 1 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> Page 4, strike lines 14 through 18 (and redesignate subsequent provisions accordingly).
>
> Page 7, line 13, strike ''5'' and insert ''15''.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, my amendment is very simple. It would strike the NEPA, known as the National Environmental Policy Act, waiver and give the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, the authority to apply Reclamation's directives and standards for lease of power privilege projects, which is known as LOPP.

The Bureau of Reclamation on its own accord has applied a categorical exclusion, known as CE, to small conduit hydropower projects. In fact, their CE went even further. It can be used to expedite a wide variety of low-impact hydropower projects built on Reclamation's water infrastructure. The main point of the legislation is to clarify that Reclamation has jurisdiction over the development of conduit projects on Reclamation facilities.

As I have mentioned before, the sponsor's amendment only tweaks the language that should be removed from the bill entirely. The Tipton amendment tinkers around the edge of the problem while my amendment solves the problem by removing the waiver completely.

As a compromise, my amendment also increases the megawatt limitation from 5 to 15 megawatts for small conduit hydro projects. This would allow for more power to be created at those existing facilities. Without the NEPA waiver, the agency can utilize its own categorical exclusion, which has no megawatt limitation, and therefore makes the cap on this legislation arbitrary. The NEPA waiver is unnecessary, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my amendment.

Let me point out that it is my understanding that there have been some projects built under the current—not the CE—that have taken a lot more time and have been costly. And with a categorical exclusion, there will be a cut not only in the cost but in time because it only involves staff and the cost will be diminished.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I just want to make a point because at the end of the general debate, I brought up the issue of NEPA that everybody says this is a wonderful bill except this part. Of course, the gentlelady's amendment strikes the NEPA waiver, which I pointed out again at the end of the general debate there seems to be somewhat cause and effect of having NEPA and having projects go forward.

But here is the important point on this, Madam Chairman, from my point of view: this bill deals with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Reclamation that built ditches and conduits out of concrete generally. Again, I spoke of the Columbia Basin Project in my district and the Yakima Project in my district, and virtually all of the ditches are concrete. That means that the land has already been disturbed in order to put these facilities in place.

What the gentleman from Colorado's bill does is simply put a power source within the existing ditches that have gone through environmental review. Why, for goodness' sakes, would you have to jump through more hoops, unless you wanted to slow the process down? Why you'd want to do that, I don't know, because the end result of this is probably less expensive energy. It's certainly American jobs, and it probably adds to a growing economy. Yet there seems to be some idea that only NEPA can save us from all of that.

Well, I reject that, and that's why I oppose the gentlelady's amendment because it would waive that requirement.

Once again, Madam Chairman, this is on existing facilities that have gone through environmental review. It doesn't need to jump through that hoop one more time.

With that, I urge opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chairman, we've heard talk today about creating American jobs on American soil to be able to create American energy. No bill better achieves that end than H.R. 678.

The Napolitano amendment, by striking the provision altogether that she is offering, will allow no alternative to be able to streamline the projects' approval process, and this amendment literally will ensure that small investment in small hydropower projects would not be able to be achieved. I think it's important to note we're spending $1.750 trillion per year in regulatory costs in this Nation.

Now, are all regulations bad? No, they aren't. But redundant regulations which drive up costs, which inhibit our ability to be able to create jobs to be able to put Americans back to work and to be able to create clean, affordable energy should not stand in the way.

Let's put Americans back to work. Let's work together.

The purpose of my amendment is to be able to reach a reasonable compromise between the two opposing ideas in regards to the NEPA provision on manmade projects. As Chairman HASTINGS just ably noted, these are manmade ditches. We have no impediment that's going to be looked at when it comes to endangered species, be it fish or wildlife. This has already gone through the desired process of environmental review. So does it make good common sense to say that an area that's been reviewed that was made by men does not have to go through an additional review process in order to be able to create those jobs and to be able to create American energy? I think that's a sensible approach for us to be able to pursue.

With that, I would urge opposition and defeat of the Napolitano amendment.

Let's get this job done and let's truly work to get Americans back to work.

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

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

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chairman, this amendment strikes the NEPA exclusion for small hydroelectric projects. That's the principal point of the bill.

As the Subcommittee on Water and Power has repeatedly been told, it is precisely this process that has doubled the cost of small hydro projects simply making them cost prohibitive. This is akin to having a full environmental review done when you build your home and then having to do it all over again when you want to install a microwave in your kitchen.

□ 1440

One witness testified that installing 15 very small hydropower units on a nearby Bureau of Reclamation canal system would cost over $450,000, or $30,000 per unit, for additional NEPA reviews that would ultimately conclude that there is no environmental impact.

That means the paperwork costs would be greater than the actual capital cost of the hydropower units. No one in his right mind would invest in a project with this kind of requirement. It simply makes no sense, and that's the primary reason conduit hydropower development is not happening.

It is true that the Bureau of Reclamation instituted a new NEPA Categorical Exclusion for small hydroelectric projects back in September of 2012, but 6 months later, this new policy has resulted in precisely zero new projects moving forward. Even if projects were moving forward today, this is only an administrative change and could be changed back at any time.

In addition, an expert witness who happens to be a litigator testified to our subcommittee that the current administrative process is full of legal holes that could be exploited by those wanting to stop these projects. Investors need certainty, and that requires a statutory and not an administrative fix.

I appreciate and support the gentlelady's effort to allow the Bureau to consider units with 15 megawatts, but I would remind her that zero projects times 15 megawatts still equals zero electricity. Indeed, there are practically no projects in this range to begin with, which makes the amendment somewhat disingenuous. Even if there were, if the current regulatory scheme isn't allowing 5-megawatt units, it certainly won't allow 15-megawatt units. That's the problem.

Mr. TIPTON's bill provides an automatic exclusion from this duplicative and destructive NEPA requirement. The gentlelady's amendment takes it back out again. That's not constructive and it's not helpful.

To assure us that one supports small hydropower but opposes the automatic exclusion in Mr. TIPTON's bill reminds me of Leo Tolstoy's observation when he said:

> I sit on a man's back, choking him and making him carry me, and all the while, I assure him and anyone who will listen that I am sympathetic for his plight and I am willing to do everything I can to help—except by getting off his back.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> Page 4, line 4, insert ''(A)'' after ''(2)''.
>
> Page 4, lines 8 and 10, strike ''work'' and insert ''conduit''.
>
> Page 4, line 13, after ''offer'' insert ''for a small conduit hydropower project''.
>
> Page 4, after line 13, insert the following:
>
> ''(B) If the irrigation district or water users association elects not accept a lease of power privilege offer under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall offer the lease of power privilege to other parties in accordance with this subsection.''.

Page 4, line 21, after ''hydropower'' insert ''policy and procedure-setting''.

Page 5, line 18 strike ''involved, and'' and all that follows though line 25 and insert the following ''involved. The Secretary shall notify and consult with the irrigation district or water users association operating the transferred conduit before offering the lease of power privilege and shall prescribe terms and conditions that will adequately protect the planning, design, construction, operation, maintenance, and other interests of the United States and the project or division involved.''.

Page 6, after line 4, insert the following:

''(8) Nothing in this subsection shall alter or affect any existing preliminary permit, license, or exemption issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under Part I of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792, et seq.) or any project for which an application has been filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as of the date of the enactment of the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act.''.

Page 6, line 5, strike ''(8)'' and insert ''(9)''.

Page 6, strike lines 14 through 20, and insert the following:

(B) IRRIGATION DISTRICT.—The term ''irrigation district'' means any irrigation, water conservation or conservancy, multicounty water conservation or conservancy district, or any separate public entity composed of two or more such districts and jointly exercising powers of its member districts.

Page 6, line 21, strike ''WORK'' and insert ''CONDUIT''.

Page 6, line 22, strike ''work'' and insert ''conduit''.

Page 7, line 3, strike ''WORK'' and insert ''CONDUIT''.

Page 7, line 4, strike ''work'' and insert ''conduit''.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chairwoman, I offer this amendment to provide technical corrections and to eliminate drafting inconsistencies between this year's bill and its counterpart in the 112th Congress.

This amendment reflects changes sought by the Bureau of Reclamation with respect to definitions, to more accurately cover intended matters and properly coincide with existing law and Bureau regulations. Furthermore, the amendment clarifies that nothing in the bill affects existing arrangements between irrigation and water districts and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As you say, I think this is a technical amendment. It adds to the bill, and I support it.

Mr. TIPTON. With that, Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. The gentleman's amendment makes technical changes that staff has brought to our attention, and it addresses a few of the administration's concerns.

The amendment clarifies that the projects already permitted under FERC would not see any regulatory uncertainty with this bill's passage. We are also in agreement with the amendment changes that require greater consultation with irrigation districts and water user associations prior to the approval of the Lease of Power Privilege.

We have no objections to this technical 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. TIPTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 232, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

AYES—189

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

NOES—232

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

Woodall	Yoho	Young (FL)
Yoder	Young (AK)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bass	Hastings (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Castor (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Walz
Collins (NY)	Lynch	
Franks (AZ)	Markey	

□ 1514

Messrs. HENSARLING, LAMALFA, STEWART, and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, and Messrs. DOGGETT and CICILLINE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 94, H.R. 678, Agreeing to the Amendment, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, 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. 678) to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 140, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I'm opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Garamendi moves to recommit the bill H.R. 678 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. MAKE IT IN AMERICA.

Any lease of power privilege offered pursuant to this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall require, to the extent practicable, that all materials used for conduit hydropower generation be manufactured in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I suspect that, Mr. Speaker, all of us would want to see more jobs in America. The great American manufacturing sector over the last 20 years has lost about 9 million jobs. Twenty-five years ago, no one throughout this world would doubt that the greatest manufacturing Nation in the world was America. Twenty-five years later, and 9 million jobs having been lost, America has lost its preeminence—or is about to lose its preeminence. It would seem to me it's our job here as representatives of the American public and the American economy to do everything we possibly can to rebuild and reestablish the great American manufacturing sector, to do everything we can to restore to America those 9 million middle class jobs that have been lost to outsourcing, to our companies moving overseas, and to some rather impractical and rather foolish laws that have been passed and are on the books.

□ 1520

There is something we can do today with this bill. This bill, while seeming to be small, ought to be our very first step this session to make sure that in every piece of legislation we pass there would be an incentive, an obligation, or an advantage for American manufacturers.

Small hydro, who's to care about small hydro? Well, there are four businesses in America that would care a great deal about small hydro. In New Mexico, the Elephant Butte Irrigation District develops low-cost small hydro. Canyon Hydro in Deming, Washington, manufactures and produces small hydro. NATEL Energy Company in Alameda, California, manufactures small hydro programs. And James Leffel & Company in Springfield, Ohio, manufactures the machinery for small hydro. This bill would provide an opportunity for these four American companies to build these small hydro projects, made in America, made by Americans.

The amendment that I'm proposing simply says, in addition to what is in this bill, that we add a simple paragraph that says:

In all practical purposes, the machinery that is to be constructed and used in these projects shall be made in America by American workers.

One small step, but a necessary step, and one step along the way to rebuilding the American manufacturing sector.

We can do this. There are those who say that, well, we're not making it. Well, we are making it. And when we write laws that require that it be made in America, guess what? Things are made in America.

In that stimulus bill—whatever you may think it, good or bad—there was a provision written in that Amtrak was to have some new locomotives. Someone put in an additional sentence that said these must be 100 percent made in America. Siemens, the German company, came forward and said: We can do that. And in Sacramento, California today, a half-billion-dollar contract is being executed for numerous electric locomotives for Amtrak, 100 percent American made.

We can establish the policies to make it in America and to rebuild the great American manufacturing sector. We ought to be using all of our tax money whenever we purchase something to be made in America. If we're going to subsidize solar panels or wind turbines or even hydro projects, then let it be American manufacturers that get that money—to be made in America. Simple, but it's up to us. It's up to 435 of us.

What is to be our policy? Are we going to encourage American manufacturing with something as simple as this amendment, or are we simply going to shrug our shoulders and ignore the fact that 9 million American manufacturing jobs have been lost? Are we to ignore our responsibility to bring those jobs back here? I don't think there's one of us among the 435 of us here, Mr. Speaker, that would say: not to worry, let it be. No, I think all of us, Mr. Speaker, would want to bring the American manufacturing jobs back.

This amendment—which would be the final amendment to the bill and which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee—this amendment, if adopted, would proceed immediately to passage and give to American workers a small but significant opportunity to have a well-paying middle class job and once again America being the undisputed leader in manufacturing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, during the course of debate today, it was mentioned several times—which of course is true—that virtually identical legislation passed in the last Congress with bipartisan support. I find it rather ironic that the author of this motion to recommit last year voted for this bill without the motion to recommit language in it. So I think we have some common ground and we're making some progress, and I thank the gentleman for his vote on that.

But let's talk about what this bill does. This bill takes existing American facilities, like irrigation ditches, and says, my goodness, water running downhill has a sense of energy to it; we ought to somehow capture that energy. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) says: Why don't we put turbines in there and create American energy? Wonderful idea. So that's what this bill

is all about. Nothing in this bill prevents anything that the gentleman is proposing in his motion to recommit.

But I will just close by saying what this bill really does and what the essence of what we're talking about here today. This bill creates American jobs and American energy at no cost to the taxpayer. What else is there to say? Vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. The gentleman had 5 minutes to make his case. No, I will not yield to the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 226, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—194

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

NAYS—226

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

NOT VOTING—11

Amodei
Bass
Castor (FL)
Collins (NY)
Cramer
Hastings (FL)
Kinzinger (IL)
Lynch
Markey
Ros-Lehtinen
Walz

□ 1536

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 95, H.R. 678, On Motion to Recommit with Instructions, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 7, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—416

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

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

NAYS—7

Dingell
Johnson (GA)
Levin
Maloney, Carolyn
Moore
Sires
Smith (WA)

NOT VOTING—8

Castor (FL)
Collins (NY)
Cramer
Hastings (FL)
Lynch
Markey
Ros-Lehtinen
Walz

□ 1546

Messrs. PALLONE, POCAN, SWALWELL of California and Ms. DUCKWORTH changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 96, H.R. 678, On Passage, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–3)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Thanks to the hard work and determination of the American people, we have made significant progress over the last 4 years. After a decade of war, our brave men and women in uniform are coming home. After years of recession, our businesses have created over six million new jobs. We buy more American cars than we have in 5 years, and less foreign oil than we have in 20 years. Our housing market is healing, our stock market is rebounding, and consumers, patients, and homeowners enjoy stronger protections than ever before.

But we know that there are millions of Americans whose hard work and dedication have not yet been rewarded. Our economy is adding jobs—but too many people still cannot find full-time employment. Corporate profits have skyrocketed to all-time highs—but for more than a decade, wages and incomes have barely budged.

It is our generation's task to reignite the true engine of America's economic growth—a rising, thriving middle class. It is our unfinished task to restore the basic bargain that built this country—the idea that if you work hard and meet your responsibilities, you can get ahead, no matter where you come from, no matter what you look like, or whom you love.

It is our unfinished task to make sure that this Government works on behalf of the many, and not just the few; that it encourages free enterprise, rewards individual initiative, and opens the doors of opportunity to every child across this great Nation.

A growing economy that creates good, middle class jobs—this must be the North Star that guides our efforts. Every day, we should ask ourselves three questions as a Nation: How do we attract more jobs to our shores? How do we equip our people with the skills they need to get those jobs? And how do we make sure that hard work leads to a decent living?

This Budget seeks to answer each of these questions.

Our first priority is making America a magnet for new jobs and manufacturing. After shedding jobs for more than 10 years, our manufacturers have added more than 500,000 jobs over the past 3 years. Companies large and small are increasingly deciding to bring jobs back to America.

To accelerate this trend, the Budget builds on the success of the manufacturing innovation institute we created in Youngstown, Ohio last year, and calls for the creation of a network of 15 of these hubs across the Nation. In these innovation hubs, businesses will partner with universities and Federal agencies to turn regions around our country into global centers of high-tech jobs.

The Budget also includes new initiatives to support manufacturing communities, including a new tax credit to strengthen their ability to attract investments and jobs. And it expands my Administration's SelectUSA initiative to help draw businesses and investment from around the world to our shores.

If we want to make the best products, we also have to invest in the best ideas. That is why the Budget maintains a world-class commitment to science and research, targeting resources to those areas most likely to contribute directly to the creation of transformational technologies that can create the businesses and jobs of the future.

No area holds more promise than our investments in American energy. The Budget continues to advance my ''all-of-the-above'' strategy on energy, investing in clean energy research and development; promoting energy efficiency in our cars, homes, and businesses; encouraging responsible domestic energy production; and launching new efforts to combat the threat of climate change.

Modeled after my successful Race to the Top education reform effort, the Budget includes a new Race to the Top energy efficiency challenge for States, rewarding those that implement the most effective policies to cut energy waste. And it establishes a new Energy Security Trust funded by royalty revenue from oil and gas leases to support initiatives to shift our cars and trucks off oil, cutting our Nation's reliance on foreign oil.

Over the last 4 years, we have begun the hard work of rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure. We have built or improved over 350,000 miles of road and more than 6,000 miles of rail. And we have repaired or replaced over 20,000 bridges. But to compete in the 21st Century economy and become a magnet for jobs, we must do more. We need to repair our existing infrastructure, and invest in the infrastructure of tomorrow, including high-speed rail, high-tech schools, and self-healing power grids. These investments will both lay the foundation for long-term economic growth and put workers back on the job now.