

Wasserman	Waxman	Womack
Schultz	Welch	Yarmuth
Waters	Wilson (FL)	Young (AK)
Watt	Wolf	

NOT VOTING—24

Barber	Horsford	Pastor (AZ)
Beatty	Hoyer	Polis
Campbell	Hunter	Salmon
Castor (FL)	Kirkpatrick	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (NY)	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	McIntyre	Shimkus
Garcia	Negrete McLeod	Sinema
Gosar	Nolan	Young (FL)

1855

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 315 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DAINES) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, 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. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 761, NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-147) on the resolution (H. Res. 292) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2609.

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

1900

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 22, line 9.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Mr. SWALWELL of California (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, which would transfer \$1 million to the Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, or EERE, from administrative funds.

I recently organized a letter, joined by almost 80 of my colleagues, calling for robust and sustained funding for this crucial program. EERE's research, development, and deployment programs focus on three major fields: renewable electricity generation; sustainable transportation; and energy-saving homes, buildings, and manufacturing.

This program plays a key role in advancing America's all-of-the-above energy strategy, and we must set priorities and make smart, strategic decisions about Federal funding. This is the only way to ensure that this country is prepared for whatever changes the markets may experience.

And I thank our ranking member for yielding me the time and allowing me to speak about the amendment, and I appreciate her comments about either you look backward or you look forward or you act forward when it comes to how we get our energy supply. She has talked on the floor today and articulated that our country right now faces a trade deficit, and she's right.

Every month, by about \$40 billion, we are importing more goods and services than we are exporting. In many cases, that is because of the crude oil that we have to import month after month after month because we are not meet-

ing our own energy needs. And the United States, at our peak production, optimal peak production, we only have about 3 percent of the world's crude oil. However, our country, our consumers, our people, we consume about 22 percent of the world's crude oil.

There's a supply problem in this country. We need to not drill our way out of this but invent our way out of this, innovate our way out of this, and the EERE program allows us to do that.

Unfortunately, this bill consolidates the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy within DOE and funds the combined programs at about \$983 million. The result is a cut to these programs of \$971 million below fiscal year 2013.

I am honored to serve as ranking member on the Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Energy because I believe that the Federal Government has a role to play in encouraging energy innovation in this country. This bill does just the opposite by gutting the EERE program. Instead of innovating our way out, rather than drilling our way out, we are doing the opposite. We gut crucial EERE funds.

As Washington bickers, our competitors are pulling out all of the stops to capitalize on the booming clean energy program. By cutting the EERE program so drastically now, we all but ensure that the United States will miss out on scientific discoveries that could change the world and transform our economy.

With scientific research, nothing is guaranteed, and so we need to be willing to take risks. Scientific progress, after all, has never been a straight line. I come from the bay area, which includes Silicon Valley, where risk-taking is critical to the region's economy. Taking risks means sometimes you will not succeed, but scientific progress requires us to continue to take risks and invest in the future. Only by taking risks and charging forward, as our ranking member continues to emphasize, can we ever hope to reach goals which today may seem out of reach.

The United States should be leading the world in the search for better, safer, more affordable energy. Instead, we have a bill before us that makes unacceptable, shortsighted cuts to EERE. While my amendment does not close the gap by any means, it is a signal to our scientists and engineers that we support renewable energy.

An overreliance on a limited range of fuel technologies and finite resources is shortsighted. Our strength lies in our ability to transition to a new, cleaner, more sustainable and more innovative source of energy. We must be competitive and not let ourselves get behind, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

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

This amendment offers, as he said, a \$1 million gesture of support for renewable energy, energy reliability and efficiency activities in the Department of Energy. It would increase funding by \$1 million using the departmental administration as its offset.

While I support my colleague's good intention, what he calls his signal gesture of support, we simply cannot afford to increase energy efficiency and renewable energy by diverting funding from other essential activities. Therefore, I oppose the amendment and urge others to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, let me say that the gentleman's amendment takes a step in the right direction. It is a modest step, but one that signals a view towards the horizon that is ahead of us, and I rise in support of his very responsible amendment that would make an investment in our future and move to a more diversified energy portfolio. It does nick an account, our administrative account, which is a bit troubling, but it is not at the level that some of the prior amendments today did, so I support the gentleman's amendment.

I thank him for all of the time he spent on the floor today waiting his turn. Talk about a gentleman of the House, you surely are. So I want to thank Congressman SWALWELL for his leadership and for trying to take a step toward the future in offering his amendment today. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Swalwell amendment.

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

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$731,600,000)".

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$362,329,000)".

Page 23, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$450,000,000)".

Page 23, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$115,753,000)".

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,543,929,000)".

Mr. MCCLINTOCK (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I applaud the committee's decision to cut the failed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy program by half. My amendment simply completes the very good work of the committee and cuts it by the other half, along with similar subsidies that we provide to nuclear and fossil fuel industries, saving an additional \$1.5 billion.

If we're serious about an all-of-the-above energy policy, we have got to stop using taxpayer money to pick winners and losers based on their political connections and, instead, require every energy company to compete on its own merits as decided by the customers it attracts by offering better products at lower cost and by the investors it attracts, as well.

For too long we've suffered from the conceit that politicians can make better energy investments with taxpayer money than investors can make with their own money. It is this conceit that has produced the continuing spectacle of collapsing energy scandals epitomized by the Solyndra fiasco. At least Solyndra was funded from a loan program in which the public has a chance to get some of its money back when these dubious schemes go bankrupt.

My amendment eliminates direct spending that funds research and development and commercialization projects for politically favored firms, money that taxpayers have no chance of recovering after it's spent.

Let me emphasize that any breakthroughs financed with the research and development money paid by the taxpayers under these programs does not go into the public domain, where everyone can benefit. These innovations, if there are any, are financed by taxpayers and yet are owned, lock, stock, and barrel, by the private companies. This is a gift of public funds, pure and simple.

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

This amendment cuts all such subsidies.

About half go to fossil fuel and nuclear industries, which are capable of doing very well on their own, and

about half goes to the so-called alternative energy technologies. We've been told for years, of course, that's necessary to nurture these new and promising programs, but they are not new and they are not promising. Photovoltaic cells, for example, were invented in 1839; and in nearly 175 years of technological research and innovation and billions of dollars of taxpayer subsidies, we have not yet invented a more expensive way to generate electricity, so we hide its true cost to consumers through subsidies taken from their taxes.

Nor is there any earthly reason why taxpayers should be forced to serve as the R&D program for General Motors or any other company or technology. The actual research and development should be paid for by the companies that will profit from these long-promised breakthroughs. And if they're not willing to finance them with their own money, we have no business forcing our constituents to finance them with theirs.

All we have accomplished with these programs is to take dollars that would have naturally flowed into the most effective and promising technologies and diverted them into those that are politically favored. This misallocation of resources not only destroys jobs in productive ventures, it ends up minimizing our energy potential instead of maximizing it and destroying our wealth instead of creating it.

Let every energy technology rise or fall on its own merits. If the technology is promising, it doesn't need our help; and if it isn't promising, it doesn't deserve our help.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

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

The amendment would eliminate all renewable energy and energy efficiency activities, fossil energy activities, and severely reduce funding for nuclear energy in favor of deficit savings. And, of course, the committee has done a lot; we have done a lot of cutting. We are way below the 2008 level. I think we have made a commitment in our committee to reduce spending and contribute to reducing the deficit.

Nuclear energy research does keep American innovation at the forefront of the technology that we invented. I think we need to continue that leadership.

Fossil energy, whether people like it or not, provides 82 percent of our Nation's energy needs, and we need to find ways to refine and make it even more productive.

Lastly, renewable energy addresses high gas prices and helps America's manufacturers compete in the global marketplace. Maybe not all of those activities are imperative, but renewable energy is part of that equation,

and our bill supports diversity of energy supply. Therefore, I oppose the amendment and urge Members to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for raising opposition to the amendment. I'm glad he gave me a few moments, Madam Chair, to slow down a bit before I would comment on the amendment.

□ 1915

The author of the amendment would probably want to take a few steps more. To carry out the full intent of what he's proposing would be to eliminate all subsidies for everything. Then where would we be?

I suppose if we're going to be consistent in this, if we were to adopt this amendment, we ought to go to the oil and gas industry and eliminate all of the subsidies that they have, which are tax breaks, direct subsidies, by reducing their taxes to the tune of well over \$10 billion a year. Probably not a bad idea. And then to go on, as the chairman of the committee has suggested, to take on all of the other subsidies.

Where would we be?

It's a long history of America, dating back, really, to the Founding Fathers, in which Alexander Hamilton presented to the Congress, at the request of George Washington, a plan on manufacturers in which was stated a policy then and carried forward ever since that time, some 230-plus years, in which the Federal Government has been directly involved in the development of the American industries.

For example, at that time, Alexander Hamilton suggested that the Federal Government ought to support the development of roads, ports, and canals, and, in fact, one not far from here received that assistance, the Potomac Canal. And ports were built, eventually lighthouses were put up, all of them to benefit commerce.

Abraham Lincoln subsidized, with the consent of Congress and the Senate, the Transcontinental Railroad that has helped the gentleman's State of California, and my State of California.

There's a long, long history of America in which the Federal Government has directly, indirectly, subsidized the creation of industry. We went to the Moon, but we created enormous numbers of businesses as a direct result. And in the gentleman's pocket is an iPhone or some other device that was directly subsidized by the Federal Government.

Now, if you want to go back and simply forget about progress, then carry out this amendment to its fullest extent. I don't think any of us want to go there.

I'd ask for a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. And I listened to the gentleman's arguments, and I just want to point something out. The gentleman is saying that private industry will do this in any case.

I have been very engaged in our part of the country with the local companies and inventors that are trying to lead America into the future. And what's interesting about the start of some of these new technologies is, many of these inventors don't have the deep pockets of huge multinational corporations.

And when smaller, high-tech companies start out, maybe these inventors have 10, 20, 30 patents to their name, sometimes they launch from a cooperative effort with a university base. They don't have the funds to do the kind of basic research that's necessary to move their technology forward. They need the help of entities like the Department of Energy.

And so it just doesn't happen by magic that one moves a technology forward. Most businesses don't have the interest or the funding to put into this direct research, basic research. So, for example, with solar, which is something our region of the country knows quite a bit about because it spun off of the glass industry, just getting seven layers of material to adhere takes incredible effort.

If you are a small inventor, if you are a smaller company, I defy you to roll steel so thin, and then find adherents to go with it that will hold electrical charges, and then to invent the electrical materials that go through there.

And by golly, over the last 30 years, they have done it. They have brought the cost of panels down to a competitive rate. Where we are now is storage capacity, moving the electricity from those plates to storage systems that will actually be more efficient, and then onto the grid.

So please don't say that the work that they go through, the Americans who really do invent our future, who often are blocked by the people that sit in this Chamber and can't even imagine what they are up against technologically, don't think that what they do doesn't matter.

And while they're doing this, what do they face, just in the solar industry?

The Chinese dumping 2 million panels globally and pushing down the price, a country that's a Communist country, whose economy is a Marxist market system, a Leninist market system.

And we ask our individual inventors to compete with that, and we do nothing to help them out?

By golly, I'd fight for these Americans any day of the year because I know the next generation will be more independent than today's generation

because of what they are doing, and I will do anything in my power to help them.

That is the role of the Government of the United States, to lift up those who are trying to make this country free again and separate us from those countries and those interests that don't share our political values.

And so I want to be a champion for those who are out there fighting for the future. And they're not all big multinationals who have these deep pockets they can just reach into, but they're individual Americans who are taking what they've learned in their company.

And they can't finance it alone. Banks won't necessarily do it because the technology isn't fully developed. They need a partnership. And we're the one partnership at the Federal level that can help lift their technology and bring it forward. I'm proud of them.

And, sir, I oppose your amendment. I think it's a well-intentioned amendment. But you know what?

It doesn't lead us forward, and it really doesn't help those inventors and those companies around this country who are leading us into the future.

I ask the membership to oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I think that, in many ways, this amendment—and I give credit to its author—encapsulates a debate that's going on, not only between the parties, but in America.

It's premised on a narrative that is utterly ahistorical. It is a false narrative. If it's worth doing, the private sector will do it. That flies in the face of 237 years of this Republic's history.

George Washington understood that. He understood that there were investments only the Federal Government could make, and he made them.

Thomas Jefferson, an advocate for small government, also understood that. He subsidized the Rogers and Clark expedition that opened up the West and created an enormous enterprise for science.

Mr. GARAMENDI mentioned the 37th Congress and Abraham Lincoln. In the middle of the worst catastrophe this country's experienced, a civil war, that Congress understood that we had to make investments as a Federal Government if this country was going to prosper and grow, and allowed the private sector to take up where we left off.

And that's why they invested in the Transcontinental Railroad. That's why they created the Homestead Act. That's why they created the United States Department of Agriculture. That's why they created the land grant college/university system.

The idea that the private sector can do it, we don't need to do it—well, the

Internet was 100 percent a Federal investment. It was called DARPANET, and it stayed a Federal investment for 25 years, until the commercial application was clear, and then it went private. Whatever we invested in DARPANET was worth every penny in how it's transformed American life.

GPS, entirely a Federal investment, not a private sector investment. And it's the private sector that's understood the commercial applicability.

That's the partnership that has characterized all of our history, not some of it. And to substitute a false narrative for that involvement will guarantee that the Chinese will clean our clock in the next generation.

I sat here hours ago and listened to our Republican colleagues from Washington and Tennessee say, without fear of understanding their own contradiction, we need the Federal Government to clean up these nuclear sites, not the private sector, the Federal Government.

This isn't just a bad amendment. This is about a profound philosophical disagreement about the future role of the Federal Government.

Investments have returns. Not all spending is the same, and we need to be enhancing investments in this bill, not cutting them back, if we want to hand over to the next generation a competitive America that still helps provide a shining light upon a hill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Mr. PETERS of California (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Madam Chair, 2 years ago, on September 8, 2011, San Diego and much of southern California, Arizona, and parts of Mex-

ico suffered a huge electric power failure. This was the biggest electric power failure in the history of California.

Millions of people were left without electricity when a 500-kilovolt high-voltage transmission line from Arizona to California failed, knocking a major nuclear power plant offline. The electricity outage led to school and business closures, flight cancellations, suspended water service, and dark traffic lights.

And when the power goes out, it's not just our lights that are affected. In the heat without air-conditioning, we're putting the health of our seniors and vulnerable populations at risk of health failures. So the risks to public safety and health increase, and economic disruptions can be hard to recover from.

We are putting greater load on our grid each day, and the grid faces also threats to its cybersecurity. In addition, we've seen extreme weather events wreak havoc on the grid. DOE is making great strides to strengthen our grid and make it more resilient to all threats, and we need to protect this critical infrastructure.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended \$80 million for electricity delivery and energy reliability, which is a cut of \$32.49 million from FY '13 levels. My amendment would increase electric delivery and energy reliability by \$10 million, with an equal offset reduction to the DOE's Departmental Administration account. This increase will strengthen the electric grid and provide greater power reliability for all Americans.

And the amendment would support the research and technology to improve grid strength and reliability. These are more important investments than this particular Departmental Administration account.

This is spending reduction in the long run. The cost of energy outages are much greater than what we put in to modernizing and strengthening the grid. Every dollar that we put towards making our infrastructure more resilient yields \$4 in future savings.

When power goes out, there are huge economic costs. Our modern world can't function and perform business transactions without electricity, and we need to ensure that the power's there. If it goes out, we need to make sure that it gets back on quickly.

A better grid will save taxpayers money. A better, smarter, more modern grid will lead to fewer outages, getting power back faster, and savings in costs.

Madam Chair, I ask for the support of my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I rise to oppose the gentleman's

amendment. The amendment would increase Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability and Efficiency by \$10 million using, once again, as others have before him, the Departmental Administration account as an offset.

As I said earlier, our allocation did make for some tough choices. One thing we know is that you can't operate a Department of Energy unless you have staff doing oversight and doing the tough work of reviewing contracts to make sure the money we give them is well spent.

So with all due respect, I have to oppose the gentleman's amendment. We cannot divert more money from the essential department activities.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1930

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

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERLMUTTER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$15,000,000)".

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Mr. PERLMUTTER (during the reading). Madam Chair, I move to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. To the ranking member and the chairman of the subcommittee, thank you for your work. H.R. 2609 appropriates \$30.4 billion for fiscal year 2014 for the Energy Department and Federal water projects, which is \$4.1 billion below the President's request and \$6.3 billion, or 17 percent, below the enacted level for 2013.

The reductions in H.R. 2609 undermine America's strategic energy investments and remove vital funding for laboratories such as the National Renewable Energy Lab in Golden, Colorado. Facilities such as NREL are leading proponents in energy research and innovation. The clean energy market has grown exponentially from \$1 billion a year to \$211 billion per year over the past decade. This number continues to grow.

Congress should be funding facilities which help to bring next-generation renewable technologies to market. These

technologies are not only helping local energy entrepreneurs but are also helping business owners drive down energy costs.

The Energy Systems Integration Facility, otherwise known as ESIF, located at the National Renewable Energy Lab, is a perfect example of this kind of partnership. ESIF is the Nation's only facility to model on a megawatt scale how clean energy technologies such as wind and solar interact on the electrical grid with traditional energy sources such as coal and natural gas. The facility is aimed at overcoming generation transmission distribution and end-use challenges to support a cleaner, affordable, and more secure U.S. energy mix, including research into next-generation building technologies, microgrids, energy storage batteries, and utility-scale renewable energy.

As the cost of clean energy technologies continues to come down, seamless and efficient grid integration will help make these resources and products even more affordable. Funding for programs like ESIF and labs like the National Renewable Energy Lab is good for our utilities and our consumers. It's good for our economy, and it's good for energy security. Yet the majority continues to believe that cuts to our Energy Department will provide us a brighter future. I say, No way.

Lastly, while I believe the funding in the entirety of this bill is wholly inadequate, I cannot allow our energy investments to be reduced to rubble. My amendment would transfer \$15 million to the Office of Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability and Efficiency, with an equal offsetting reduction from the Production Support for the W76(-1) Life Extension Program under the Weapons Activities account.

While I appreciate the committee's attempt to support the National Renewable Energy Lab, the proposed funding of \$31 million is \$15 million below the budget request. Thus, my amendment seeks to fully fund the Facilities and Infrastructure line item. The committee recommends to the House we fund \$345 million for Production Support, which is an additional \$23.5 million over the administration's request. The administration sites a lower level of funding from fiscal year 2013 to 2014 due to the completion of a modern manufacturing floor process. So what the committee has done is raise \$23.5 million over the President's request. I'm asking that that be backed up by \$15 million so that the National Renewable Energy Lab and EERE is increased by \$15 million.

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

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

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

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

amendment would increase funding for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability and Efficiency activities of the Department of Energy by \$15 million using Weapons Activities within the Nuclear National Nuclear Security Administration as an offset. While I and I think all the committee members support the programs championed by my colleague, we simply cannot afford to increase efficiency and renewable energy activities by diverting funding from inherently Federal responsibilities. The focus and primary responsibility of the Department of Energy is indeed to make sure that we have a modern nuclear weapons stockpile, even if we don't need to use it. It has to be verified by the Secretary to the President. So this would divert funds from that essential mission.

I oppose the amendment, urge Members to do likewise, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I am quite reluctant to shift funds from the weapons accounts to other purposes within the Department. But I rise in support of this gentleman's amendment. Congressman PERLMUTTER of Colorado has made a reasonable proposal here. I agree with his interest in advancing our work in renewable energy technologies.

In working with the Department, we also know the incredible cost overruns that we see occur year after year after year in these nuclear weapons accounts. I think that the gentleman's amendment is a modest amendment. I think it signals movement in the proper direction for our country.

It also says to those managing our nuclear weapons accounts that we're paying attention to the fact that you probably wasted more money and have not done oversight on your contracts more than almost any other department in the Government of the United States.

The need for investment in new energy technologies is important to the country. I think the gentleman has done something that I think moves us down the road of new technology and takes a very modest amount from the weapons accounts, and my own position generally supports the administration's efforts not to touch the weapons accounts unless we do so within the context of nuclear arms reduction negotiations. But the amount of funds that you are transferring, I think, is very, very reasonable, and therefore I wish to support you in your amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to support the Perlmutter amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$15,500,000)".

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,500,000)".

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. I have wracked my brain to try to find a Democratic amendment that the distinguished Republican manager could support, and I know I have hit upon it. It's a low-impact amendment, modest in the extreme, but with high payoff and gravy: a \$3 million net savings, according to the scoring.

As we've learned time and time again, Madam Chairman, from weather disasters and other emergencies, having a reliable and resilient energy structure is absolutely vital to national security, our economy, and to the stability of the community. I appreciate the committee acknowledging in its report the current strain being placed on our aging power infrastructure and the need for more modern, efficient systems. In fact, I and other members of the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Caucus have been advocating for increased Federal investments to meet those very needs for some time.

The Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Research and Development account—a mouthful, I admit—which supports the very technologies that will help modernize our power grid, unfortunately, is cut in this bill by 50 percent. I'm offering, as I said, this simple, modest, commonsense amendment I know will appeal to the Republican manager by transferring a mere \$15.5 million from the Nuclear Weapons Activity Account, which received a \$98 million increase above last year. This also would reduce outlays actually by \$3 million, according to the CBO.

One of the energy-efficient initiatives that has a proven track record of improving power reliability, reducing electric costs, and creating jobs is combined heat and power, for example. It provides simultaneous production of electricity and heat from a single fuel source such as natural gas, biomass, coal, or oil.

During conventional power generation, up to two-thirds of the energy from the fuel used to generate power is lost as wasted heat. In contrast, combined heat and power systems capture that thermal heat that would otherwise be lost, making these systems twice as efficient. Thanks to that onsite generation, there's less risk of

power disruption and improved efficiency.

We've already seen the success of such systems. When Superstorm Sandy knocked out power to 8.5 million residents in the Northeast, including the distinguished Republican manager's home State of New Jersey, those facilities with combined heat and power systems had working electricity and heat. South Oaks Hospital on Long Island, for example, which includes a nursing home and an assisted living center, was able to maintain power during the storm and its aftermath. Similarly, during Katrina, Mississippi Baptist Medical Center was the only hospital in the Jackson, Mississippi, area to remain 100 percent operational during and after the hurricane.

Combined heat and power systems are currently used across the Nation and generate 82 gigawatts of electricity. That's about 9 percent of the total. That's the equivalent of 130 coal plants. Analysts say we can double that figure; and with the lower price of natural gas and new interest from the States that have suffered from natural disasters, the timing is ripe. These investments not only lead to a more efficient use of power but they also help create jobs. It's estimated that for each gigawatt of combined heat and power capacity, we can expect more than 2,000 jobs to be created.

The Federal Government has supported deployment of combined heat and power systems primarily in the manufacturing sector; but we need to expand that success to commercial and residential settings, especially after the experiences of Katrina and Sandy.

This is, as I said, a simple, common-sense amendment largely crafted to try to help the Republican manager find a Democratic amendment he can enthusiastically support.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me say it may be the relative lateness of the hour, but I welcome the comity with which you put forward your amendment.

May I just say for the record that having handled the Hurricane Sandy supplemental, I can make you aware that our power was off in our very modern part of northern New Jersey for the vast number of my constituents for over 2½ weeks. Even despite the best minds in the Nation, some of which still circle around the remains of Bell Laboratories, we still didn't get it right. But having said that, I appreciate your intent and your good humor.

Our primary focus has been national defense and nuclear security. I don't think this is the time when we should be taking away from that modernization project, which is important and something which has to be certified in

terms of being reliable to the President by the Secretary of Energy.

So I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I just want to briefly extend support to the Connolly amendment for the same reason as in the prior amendment offered by Mr. PERLMUTTER. And though I generally support nuclear security issues in the context of arms reduction talks, this is a modest amendment. It is a \$15.5 million transfer from the weapons account, where we have seen huge cost overruns.

□ 1945

I think it's important to send a little smoke signal their way that we're paying attention and to support the cause of renewable energy in the Connolly amendment. I would urge my colleagues to support it and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$145,000,000)".

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Page 23, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$40,000,000)".

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$55,000,000)".

Mr. TONKO (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. First, I would like to thank Representative WELCH and Representative SABLAN for working with me on this amendment, and I thank the gentlelady from Ohio for the opportunity to chair the amendment in the House.

Madam Chair, this bill would be fine if we were still living in the 1950s, in a world where we had few energy limita-

tions, no knowledge of the fact that burning fossil fuels would alter the chemistry of our atmosphere and the trajectory of our Earth's climate. We lived in a world where energy was much more affordable and a world where the United States was the dominant economic and manufacturing power. It was also a time when there were two nuclear powers, and we believed that nuclear weapons were a guarantee of security.

Well, it is not the 1950s, and this bill does not meet our present or future needs. The overall funding level is too small, and the funding distribution reflects the wrong priorities. Our amendment addresses just two of the important programs that are grossly underfunded in this bill: the Weatherization Assistance Program and the State Energy Program.

Energy is a significant part of families' budgets, and its cost is especially burdensome for low-income families and the elderly who live on fixed incomes. Burning fossil fuels generates emissions that are leading us into a much warmer future and one with unstable, unusual weather patterns. We cannot afford to reduce our support of energy efficiency.

Our amendment provides additional funds in the Energy Efficiency account to raise the funding for the State Energy Program from the \$12 million in the bill to \$50 million. In addition, it provides an increase of \$107 million for the Weatherization Assistance Program to restore this program to \$184 million, a level that will provide benefits to homeowners across this country.

The Weatherization Assistance Program is the largest residential efficiency program in the Nation. The sequestration and low allocation for fiscal year 2013 have put this important program at risk in many of our States.

The demand has not gone away. Individual consumers are still faced with significant energy bills, and those who are elderly or disabled or whose income is not sufficient to make investments in weatherization themselves rely heavily on this program for assistance.

The amendment also restores funds for the State Energy Program. SEP is a cost-shared program, a partnership between the Federal Government and the States. The State Energy Program enables States to assist with the development of energy efficiency and renewable energy projects, such as improving the efficiency at our hospitals and our schools, working with utilities and energy service companies to install clean energy and energy efficiency projects, and supporting private sector energy innovations through business incubators and job training.

Each dollar of SEP funding produces significant returns. A study by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory found that every dollar of SEP Federal funds are leveraged by \$10.71 of State and private funds and results in \$7.22 in energy cost savings.

The modest investments we have made in these two programs have paid

for themselves many times over throughout the country. They have produced benefits in the form of better insulated, more comfortable homes, jobs, savings on energy bills, product improvements, and greater energy security.

We continue to ignore problems, neglect our infrastructure, and disinvest in our communities at our peril. These programs make a modest but important contribution to job creation and energy security. I urge you to support this amendment and keep the important work done through these programs moving forward.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey may state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read.

The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

The object being increased has first year outlays of \$72,500,000. The objects being decreased have decreased first year outlays of \$71,250,000, leading to a net outlay increase of \$1,250,000.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill—as argued by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations—it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

Mr. TAKANO (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I would ask that the reading continue.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2014 Energy and Water appropriations bill to increase funding for the Vehicles Technologies Program. My amendment increases funding for the Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency account by \$20 million to fully fund the Zero Emission Cargo Transport grant program.

The Vehicle Technologies Program is an important asset in the effort to decrease the impact of high gas prices on American drivers by investing in technologies that make vehicles more fuel efficient and less harmful to air quality. One critical piece of this program is the Zero Emission Cargo Transport grant program that helps to incentivize zero emission goods movement, especially in areas with high air pollution and traffic congestion, such as my district in Riverside, California, which is a logistics hub for southern California. I believe these funds are better spent reducing our emissions, improving air quality, and investing in energy-efficient technologies.

The bill does take from the National Nuclear Security Administration’s account, which is funded at \$11 billion. The modest reduction we’re asking in that account to fully fund this program is an investment we believe is wise. More efficient freight will save money, create jobs, and make products cheaper. Cleaner air improves quality of life and lowers the cost of health care.

If we pay for this today by decreasing spending on our bloated nuclear weapons programs, we will see major savings down the road. This is a smart investment, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

As I said on other occasions, ensuring adequate funding for the modernization of our nuclear weapons stockpile is our highest priority in our Energy and Water Development bill. This amendment unacceptably strikes funding for these very critical national security investments, and therefore I oppose the amendment and ask others to do as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$40,000,000)”.

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$40,000,000)”.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2014 Energy and Water appropriations bill to increase funding for the Department of Energy’s Weatherization Assistance Program.

My amendment increases funding for the Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability and Efficiency account by \$40 million to ensure we provide adequate weatherization assistance.

The Weatherization Assistance Program provides much-needed funding that enables low-income families, homeowners with disabilities, and seniors to permanently reduce their energy bills, making their homes more energy efficient.

For 36 years, the Weatherization Assistance Program has provided weatherization services to more than 7.3 million low-income households. The energy conservation efforts promoted through this program have helped our country reduce our dependence on foreign oil, while lowering the cost of energy for families in need.

This program benefits households across the Nation, from my district in Riverside, California, where temperatures can rise to over 100 degrees Fahrenheit in the summer, to the Northeast, where it is below freezing in the winter.

The Weatherization Assistance Program has helped reduce the energy bills for America’s neediest families by hundreds of dollars, which can be used to purchase more groceries, daily necessities, and child care.

The reduction in funding for nuclear weapons means that a larger investment can be made in our Weatherization Assistance Program to help American families reduce their energy costs. The underlying bill provides more than \$11 billion for the National Nuclear Security Administration. I believe the modest reduction of \$40 million to the nuclear weapons account is money that is better spent on programs like the Weatherization Assistance Program. It supports jobs, businesses, homeowners, and reduces our energy dependence.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Again, our committee's priorities are well known. The modernization of our nuclear stockpile is a national security issue. We need to continue to make those investments.

I oppose the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NUCLEAR ENERGY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for nuclear energy activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not more than 10 buses and 2 ambulances, all for replacement only, \$656,389,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as may be necessary shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, to be made available only to support the high-level waste geological repository at Yucca Mountain: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$87,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2015, for program direction: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be made available to affected units of local government, as defined in section 2(31) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101(31)), to support the Yucca Mountain high-level waste geological repository, as authorized by such Act: *Provided further*, That funds derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund may be transferred to "Independent Agencies—Nuclear Regulatory Commission—Salaries and Expenses" to support the Yucca Mountain high-level waste geological repository license application.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 26, line 12, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, my amendment builds on the committee's work in support of scientific research and development within the Department of Energy.

More than 30 years have elapsed since Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and over that same time, technology and scientific knowledge have evolved significantly. However, Congress still clings to outdated technology and policy prescriptions to address today's nuclear waste issues.

The fact, Mr. Chair, is that sticking our country's highly radioactive nuclear waste in a hole in the ground for perpetuity is a 21st century solution.

□ 2000

Instead, we must encourage the use of 21st century technology to address this issue.

My amendment redirects the \$25 million designated for the Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Geological Repository into the High Energy Physics program within the Department of Energy's Office of Science for the development of a 21st century solution to this problem.

The High Energy Physics program is currently researching and developing ways to use accelerator technology to reduce the toxicity of nuclear waste, transforming it into a more stable, less hazardous form.

According to a report released by the Department of Energy, "The United States, which has traditionally led the world in the development and application of accelerator technology, now lags behind other Nations in many cases, and the gap is growing." The report concludes that "to achieve the potential of particle accelerators to address national challenges will require a sustained focus on developing transformative technological opportunities, accompanied by changes in national programs and policy."

Other countries have already made significant investments in the research and development of accelerator technology that will help make long-term storage facilities, like the facility supported in this bill, obsolete. It is time that the United States begins to make up the ground it is losing to the rest of the world when it comes to accelerator technology and begin focusing on 21st century solutions to deal with nuclear waste.

For Nevada, the site of Yucca Mountain and the State with one of the highest unemployment rates in the country, this 21st century solution has the potential to create countless new high-paying R&D jobs utilizing existing regional technology capabilities. We cannot allow our Nation to continue falling further behind other developed countries in fully funding and implementing these types of projects—21st century solutions that are critical to maintaining our Nation's economic and technological superiority.

I urge my colleagues to embrace the future of nuclear waste disposal and support my amendment to help create jobs and restore the United States role as a leader in science and technology development, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

First of all, while I appreciate the concerns that he has raised about the Office of Science, just for the record, the Office of Science has been funded at \$32 million above the current post-sequester levels, so they have plenty of money.

I rise, more importantly, on the second issue. This money comes from \$25 million that we've set aside to address Yucca Mountain where we, as taxpayers, have put well over \$12- to \$15 billion of investment as a repository for high-level nuclear waste. We understand the dynamics of the State and resistance on the part of many there, but we also know that if we are ever to recoup that investment in the future, since consumers and taxpayers pay for that facility, that we are going to need some money to reopen Yucca Mountain.

I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment, urge others to do so as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nevada is on to a very, very important issue here: What are we going to do with spent nuclear fuel? Our current light water reactors consume maybe 3 percent of the energy in the nuclear fuel. You can reprocess it once and you get another 3 percent, and so now you've got 93, 92 percent, or 94 percent, of the energy that you now consider as waste, in this case to be permanently stored at Yucca Mountain.

We actually have a 20th century solution. We spent some \$10- to \$12 billion on it in the '60s, '70s, '80s, and in 1993 we put that solution aside. We need to bring that solution back into place, and the gentleman's amendment would further us in dealing with this issue of spent nuclear fuel. It is not a waste; it is an extraordinary asset, and it's one that we should be utilizing. In doing so, we can dispose of it through multiple recyclings, all of which has been proved by the United States, readily available today.

We need to take it out of the closet, put it back on the front burner, and use the accelerator technologies in our reactors to adequately dispose of these very dangerous wastes. In doing so, we can not only dispose of the total longevity, we can take it from a couple of hundred thousand years down to a couple of hundred years of dangerous radioactive emissions.

We need to move on this. The gentleman's amendment allows us to do that.

It solves a major problem that the entire world has. Spent nuclear fuel is an international problem.

The United States Government in the 1960s recognized this as a problem, set out to solve it, did solve it with what is known as the integral fast reactor—integral fast reactor. That is the accelerator reactor integral in that the reprocessing is a metallurgic process, not an aqueous process that can only be used once. This can be used multiple times, and in so doing eliminate much of the problem that we have with spent nuclear fuels.

I urge an “aye” vote on this very, very important amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of this amendment as well, which would strike language from the bill that mandates more wasteful spending on the defunct Yucca Mountain project and would redirect the funding to the Office of Science High Energy Physics program to support research in reducing nuclear waste.

The bill requires that DOE spend \$25 million on activities at Yucca Mountain, located less than 100 miles from one of the Nation’s most popular tourist destinations.

Now, let me remind you that the Department of Energy has already wasted \$15 billion on this project with nothing to show for it but a big hole in the ground in the desert. In fact, had the Department of Energy not terminated the Yucca project in 2010, we would be throwing away at least another \$67 billion with no guarantee that the project would ever be completed or functional.

All of this, let me remind you again, despite findings by the GAO that over the past 20 years the proposed site has suffered from gross mismanagement, faulty science and research, and contract violations. Even more troubling to the people of Nevada and those living along the transportation route, questions about the safety and design of the site and its impacts on the surrounding environment and populations have never, never been satisfactorily addressed.

Yet, while cutting ARPA-E, which is vital to our competitiveness in the global economy, stripping investments in energy efficiency, and renewable energy development, this legislation mandates that millions be squandered in an effort to restart a boondoggle that has been doomed from the start.

Now, why, I ask you, are we throwing good money after bad ideas? We should not be turning back the clock, we should be moving forward. So I would say to my colleagues, please support this amendment. It will eliminate economic waste and allow Congress instead to have a proper discussion about how to dispose of the Nation’s nuclear waste.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN’s opposition to the Heck amendment.

We have heard quite a bit of rhetoric on the floor the last 10 minutes about Yucca Mountain, and I understand my colleagues from Nevada’s opposition to a project in their State or their district that was somewhat unilaterally sited there. I will accept that the process by which Yucca Mountain was initially chosen was a political process and was not done the way the original Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 said it should be done.

Having said that, we have collected about \$30 billion over the last 30-some-odd years from ratepayers whose electricity is generated by safe, efficient, clean nuclear power—\$30 billion. We have spent upwards of \$20 billion drilling a tunnel in Yucca Mountain, studying the geology, the hydrology, the environment. My understanding is that the tunnel is completed.

In 2010, unilaterally, the Obama administration decided to shut the project down. It is debatable whether they did that legally or not.

Having said that, the bill that’s coming out of the Appropriations Subcommittee, all it does is allocate money that has already been collected to go ahead and finish the site review at Yucca Mountain to determine whether it is, in fact, a safe place to store high-level nuclear waste.

Now, keep in mind that we have over 100 operating nuclear reactors around the country today, and the waste that they generated is stored onsite—stored onsite. There’s good security. Most of it is stored in what are called “wet pools.” Almost everybody agrees that that’s not a long-term solution.

I think the Congress on a bipartisan basis can agree that we ought to go ahead and finish the review of the Yucca Mountain site—\$25 million does it. It has also allocated some funding in the bill to help the local government entities out there. Let’s finally put this thing to rest.

The gentleman’s amendment is well intentioned, but we need a centralized high-level repository. As of now, the most likely place is at Yucca Mountain. We have spent billions—billions of dollars—on that site. Let’s spend another \$25 million and finish the job.

I join Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN in opposing the Heck amendment and hope the House also does that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

While I understand our colleague’s position, our Nation has spent upwards of \$10- to \$15 billion on Yucca Mountain as a repository.

When we first voted on Yucca Mountain many years ago, I opposed it. Now our Nation has made this enormous investment and one does question whether we know what we are doing and whether what we are left with is a monument to wasted resources.

Admittedly, the court cases have not been finalized. The former Secretary of Energy has stated many times that the administration would follow any direction that resulted from ongoing litigation. The bill provides funds should that eventuality occur.

At a minimum, we should learn if the licensing process can work. It was not that many years ago that completing the licensing process was the stated plan of the Department.

So again, I reluctantly oppose the amendment being offered tonight. America has to reach a decision about what we do with spent nuclear waste. I think this amendment takes us in the wrong direction at this time.

We also respect the sensitivities of the people of Nevada. They have a right to have their voices heard in this process. But as a country, we have to recognize the amount of money that’s been spent by taxpayers from all of the States and the need that we have at these power plants and facilities to process this material.

I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment in hopes that we can reach agreement as a country on this important issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 2015

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 25, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an important

amendment that would provide a \$5 million increase in funding for the Department of Energy Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup account.

My amendment is offset by reducing a small portion of funds for nuclear energy research programs. I believe this offset is appropriate because the contamination that must be cleaned up was directly caused by past Department of Energy nuclear energy research programs.

In the past, inadequate safety protocols and lax environmental standards resulted in severe soil and groundwater contamination at sites across the Nation. The DOE Office of Environmental Management is responsible for cleaning up 107 sites across the country whose areas are equal to the combined area of Rhode Island and Delaware. A few of these sites the DOE is responsible for cleaning up include: the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee, of which we've spoken today; the Santa Susana Field Laboratory in California, which is adjacent to my district and to many of my constituents impacted by this facility; the Brookhaven National Laboratory in New York; and the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico.

The President's fiscal year 2014 budget requested \$212 million for environmental remediation and site cleanup. However, this bill provides only \$194 million for these environmental cleanup activities.

I understand that the Energy and Water Subcommittee was forced to make difficult choices due to an inadequate budget allocation. However, I believe that the cleanup of these sites should be a top priority. We should not continue to fund new nuclear energy research while communities across the country are told to wait for the cleanup of our past mistakes.

For instance, the Energy Technology Engineering Center, which is part of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory, is highly contaminated due to a partial nuclear meltdown of a sodium reactor in 1959. This partial nuclear meltdown, which was covered up until 1989, contaminated the soil and groundwater in the entire area and has resulted in cancer clusters among nearby residents and my constituents. In fact, many of those who worked at the facility or who lived nearby died due to illnesses caused by the widespread nuclear fallout of the 1959 meltdown. Cleaning up the soil and groundwater contamination at Santa Susana and at other sites across the country is our responsibility to our constituents who suffer from the effects of these past mistakes.

My amendment simply increases this cleanup account by \$5 million for a total of \$199 million, which is still below the \$212 million requested by the President.

I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment to increase funds for the Department of Energy Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup account. As I conclude, I believe it is

critically important that Congress provide funding to clean up areas contaminated by past Department of Energy activities and mistakes. I urge Members to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read.

The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill: Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup outlays at 65 percent, an increase in outlays of \$3,250,000; and nuclear energy outlays at 55 percent, a decrease in outlays of \$2,750,000, resulting in a net increase in outlays of \$500,000.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair at this time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard? If not, the Chair will rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill—as argued by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations—it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chair, I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes had it.

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), \$450,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$115,753,000 shall be available until September 30, 2015, for program direction: *Provided further*, That for all programs funded under Fossil Energy appropriations in this Act or any other Act, the Secretary may vest fee title or other property interests acquired under projects in any entity, including the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$29,000,000)”.

Page 26, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$127,000,000)”.

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$98,000,000)”.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

H.R. 2609 seems to decimate funding for the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy programs.

In reading the bill, it appears that the bill cuts ARPA-E funding by some \$215 million—that's 81 percent—effectively terminating this program. At the same time, the bill provides \$98 million in additional funds for nuclear weapons activities, and it even provides \$29 million beyond the President's budget request for fossil fuels energy and research development. My amendment would shift that extra funding to fund ARPA-E and continue important investments in innovation that keep our Nation globally competitive.

ARPA-E is modeled after the successful Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, which helped develop global positioning systems and stealth fighter technologies. Since 2009, ARPA-E has helped fund 275 innovative energy technology projects, and we are beginning to see the positive benefits. ARPA-E projects have doubled energy density for rechargeable lithium-ion batteries and have developed microbes to use hydrogen and carbon dioxide to make liquid transportation fuel. The many important innovations made possible by ARPA-E have resulted in millions of dollars of economic activity in the private sector.

In my district in North Carolina, the Research Triangle Institute in Durham has developed technologies to dramatically reduce the cost of carbon capture to coal-fired power plants. This valuable technology will increase our energy efficiency, reduce climate change, and create jobs. RTI has also received funding to enhance economic and energy security by converting biomass resources, such as leaves and corn husks, into transportation fuel. They have developed some of these fuels already and intend to test them at a local military facility in the very near future.

Mr. Chairman, we can all agree that we must remain globally competitive in energy industries to continue to create the jobs of the future. ARPA-E provides critical funding for new technologies, which will strengthen our

economy and lead us to energy sustainability. Eliminating the ARPA-E program will harm our competitiveness and will cost jobs in emerging energy industries, so I urge my colleagues to yield to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment. His amendment would increase funding for ARPA-E by \$127 million, using offsets from weapons activities and our Fossil Energy account.

While I support the ARPA-E program personally, we simply cannot afford to divert funds from our highest priorities, which are the nuclear weapons modernization program. The Fossil Energy account has been cut already, and I don't think it should sustain any further cuts, so I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

For expenses necessary to carry out naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities, \$14,909,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, unobligated funds remaining from prior years shall be available for all naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

For necessary expenses for Strategic Petroleum Reserve facility development and operations and program management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), \$189,400,000, to remain available until expended.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

For necessary expenses for Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve storage, operation, and management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Energy Information Administration, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for non-defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.),

including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$194,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REED

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$18,956,000)".

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,478,000)".

Page 31, line 1, after the second dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,478,000)".

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment involving the Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup programs for America.

What I seek to do with this amendment is to increase this line by \$19 million. I recognize the hard work of the subcommittee and of the subcommittee chairman in addressing the fiscal needs of our country and in reducing the overall spending in this appropriations bill. In regard to this line in particular, it is presently scheduled, as proposed, to be reduced by \$42 million. I recognize the fiscal crisis that we face in America, but this amendment reestablishes \$19 million to that line because it is a wise investment.

It is a wise investment because of sites such as that in my district, the West Valley Demonstration facility, which is dealing with the issue of non-defense environmental waste cleanup. By reestablishing this \$19 million, it has been reported to our office that, essentially, what we will save in the long term is approximately \$262 million over the next 5 years. That is because of the positive steps that these facilities have made. With a significant reduction in spending, as proposed by the subcommittee and under the proposed legislation, that positive progress will cease, and what we will end up doing is making larger investments over a longer period of time to recover and clean up this nuclear waste that is at these facilities across America.

I would like to note, Mr. Chairman, that we have worked in a bipartisan manner on this bill. My colleague from New York, BRIAN HIGGINS, has helped our office, working hand in hand with us on this effort—as well as with Mr. MATHESON from Utah and BILL JOHNSON on our side of the aisle—to try to come together and just make a wise, commonsense investment while recognizing the fiscal difficulty that we face across America.

I applaud our subcommittee chairman for the work that he has done in regard to this bill, and I ask our subcommittee chairman to support this amendment as well as for all fellow Members on both sides of the aisle to stand with this amendment in a commonsense way in order to save taxpayer dollars in the long term and, at

the same time, get rid of a true problem, which is this non-defense nuclear waste that is now located at facilities across America. With that, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HIGGINS. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment, which seeks to adequately fund the Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup program. Our amendment ensures that nuclear cleanup sites get the funding they need to protect communities, including western New York, from radioactive contamination.

The West Valley Nuclear Waste Reprocessing plant, established in response to a Federal call to reprocess spent nuclear fuel, has since ceased operations, leaving behind more than 600,000 gallons of high-level radioactive waste. To say this is a public safety and environmental hazard is a massive understatement.

□ 2030

We have already seen a leak develop into a plume of radioactive groundwater. And if this radioactive waste makes its way into the Great Lakes, the environmental and economic implications would be devastating.

It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to not let funding shortfalls delay further cleanup. For West Valley alone, further delays would add an additional \$30 million in maintenance costs per year. Like paying a minimum on a credit card, not committing adequate funding only delays progress and adds cost.

I am proud to join my friend and colleague, Congressman TOM REED, on this very important issue, and I urge bipartisan support for this important amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to commend both gentlemen for offering this amendment, and also Congresswoman BROWNLEY for being down on the floor on the same subject of nondefense cleanup.

As I can't speak for the chairman, I think that we share a concern for cleaning up these sites. I think one of the problems with the amendment is the offsets from departmental administration and the office of the administrator. I think you're calling attention to a very important unaddressed issue in our country. From coast to coast, we have these sites that need to be cleaned up. I think the problem with this amendment is where the money is being taken from, from our standpoint, departmental administration. There have been other nicks to that diminishing account as we've gone through

the bill today, and I truly have heard the concerns expressed by the gentleman from New York that we are not adequately investing in cleaning up contaminated sites not just in New York, but in California and Ohio and other places around our country.

Without question, the chairman was given an inadequate allocation, and the choices he made on levels of funding were for the most part very thoughtful. I think it's fair to say that overall this bill is truly inadequate in meeting the needs of the Nation. We talked about that earlier today. And these accounts are among those that are terribly underfunded.

We keep picking off the bones of this spine, and there aren't sufficient funds to go around. So I'm very torn on the gentleman's amendment, and I am quite concerned about cleaning up these sites. If we could find other offsets, I would probably be very favorably inclined; but I am very concerned about where the Members have identified funding, and I am very constrained to support it because of that.

But I do want to thank the gentlemen for offering their amendment, and hopefully we can find a better solution working together in the weeks ahead.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would advise the Member that we have not read to that point yet.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND
DECOMMISSIONING FUND

For necessary expenses in carrying out uranium enrichment facility decontamination and decommissioning, remedial actions, and other activities of title II of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, \$545,000,000, to be derived from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, to remain available until expended.

SCIENCE

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for science activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and purchase of not more than 25 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including one law enforcement vehicle, one ambulance, and one bus, \$4,653,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$174,862,000 shall be available until September 30, 2015, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF
GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$158,309,900)".

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$158,309,900)".

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce funding for basic energy science research by cutting 10 percent out of its \$1.5 billion budget. It would apply those funds to the spending reduction account.

Basic energy science is a worthy goal to explore fundamental phenomena and create scientific knowledge to keep our technologies and ideas on the global, leading edge. However, it is not the Federal Government's function to act as a venture capitalist for science theory research. I believe that this endeavor is instead best left to our world-renowned universities and private institutions.

My amendment does not stop this research. It would simply put it on balance with the reductions that have already been applied in the bill to our present energy resources.

In this bill, general science is cut by only 5 percent, while research on fossil fuels and nuclear energy is cut by 17 percent and 14 percent respectively.

We're in an economic emergency, Mr. Chairman. Our Nation is facing an economic meltdown, and Federal dollars are very scarce. As we face this huge budget deficit together, we've got to look at every option available to meet the challenges of doing more with less.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

His amendment would cut \$158 million from the Office of Science within the Department of Energy in favor of deficit savings. I should say for the record we cut approximately \$220 million from last year's number. So we've substantially reduced this account.

Let me just say, too, that the basic science program within the Department conducts research with a staggering potential for benefits for our Nation. Cutting the program further, which is what he seeks, threatens our long-term energy security, hurts American scientists and industry, and I think to some extent blemishes our credibility as a worldwide leader in basic science programs.

I therefore oppose this amendment, urge others to do likewise, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I will say he has been very consistent today. But if we get off the subject of this bill just for a second and we think about every single chamber of commerce that talks to us, every single economic growth team that exists around this country, what do they tell us? They tell us we need to invest in STEM—science, technology, engineering, and math—because America is falling behind.

In fact, in the immigration debate, what are they asking us for? They're asking us for more visas to bring in people from other countries who have all the requisite skills that we don't have, where we can't provide enough scientists, enough engineers, enough specialists to the marketplace for the companies that want to surge ahead.

So for the gentleman to be suggesting that we reduce our science accounts even more flies in the face of reality. The science account is \$223 million below this year's level and \$500 million below the budget request. Innovation is an area where we as a Nation should be leading, and reducing investment in basic science risks world leadership. We are already at the edge.

Investment from publicly funded research yields a 20 percent to 67 percent return. With that kind of return, we should be investing more in science so that we produce the requisite talent that we need to meet the needs of the future, not the past. We can't ride on past laurels. We have to be producing the new knowledge, new innovation that can produce answers for us, certainly in the fields of energy where America is truly in deep deficit and having to import so many of the resources that propel this economy forward.

I can't imagine why the gentleman is proposing this. But in the areas of science, engineering, math, and technology, we have to measure up. If you look at a nation like China, with billions of people producing all those engineers, you don't have to be a rocket scientist to understand that we better open our eyes to what we need to do here at home. All you have to do is look at our negative energy accounts to understand that we're falling behind and that these investments in science are for the sake of the Nation and the future.

Daniel Webster's quote up there on the wall tells us to develop the resources of our land and calls us forth to do something really great in our time and generation. To not invest in science, to not invest in the future really takes America backwards.

So I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment, would urge my colleagues to do so, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF
FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$223,000,000)”.

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$223,000,000)”.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my anxiousness is probably perpetuated by the 6 hours that I've sat here waiting to offer this amendment.

That said, over the Fourth of July holiday, when persons working with me sent me the summary of the Rules Committee and I read that we were taking \$233 million out of science, I most immediately contacted people working with me and asked if they would prepare an amendment that may very well cause some of the membership to feel a remedy.

Let me say most immediately, Mr. Chairman, that Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member KAPTUR, I have newfound appreciation not just for them, but for all appropriators in working within the framework that they have been given. And certainly my amendment does not address either of them or their respective staffs who are deserving of extraordinary commendations on both sides for having done the best you can with what you have. I appreciate that.

Today, I offer a modest amendment that makes a profound statement about our country's priorities.

Federally supported basic research at the Department of Energy has helped to lead the development of lithium ion batteries, digital recording technology, communications satellites, and water-purification techniques, among other vital and incredible advances. I might add, some of this work would not be done by the private sector. It may come as a surprise to some to know that some of the research that led to Google came out of the National Science Foundation.

Many of my Republican colleagues' insistence on cutting everything except defense spending ignores the realities of our modern world. China, South Korea, and Australia are but three examples that are increasing their percentage of their GDP that's spent on research.

If we continue to cut, cut, cut, pretty soon we're going to cut ourselves right out of the equation in innovation and technology. Yet this bill provides \$223 million, 5 percent less than the fiscal year 2013 enacted levels, and \$500 million, 10 percent less than the administration's request for basic scientific research.

The amendment that I'm offering restores basic science research to the enacted levels, and it offsets this change with funds from the \$7.7 billion appropriated for nuclear weapons, which is an increase of \$98 million, 1 percent over the enacted level. The Congressional Budget Office says that this amendment has zero impact on budget

authority and actually reduces 2014 outlays by \$22 million.

Bombs will not end our dependence on foreign fossil fuel. Bombs don't stop trains and underground pipelines from exploding around this country. Bombs don't prevent oil from washing up on our beaches. And bombs certainly won't put food on the tables of working poor Americans.

□ 2045

Mr. Chairman, our country has real needs. Adequately funding basic research is one of them. Basic research will help to ensure that our country continues to be a world leader in research and development, keeping jobs where they belong, here in America.

We can no longer afford to spend money on weapons programs that were conceived in the Cold War era. We don't need more bombs. We need to fund programs that will help move this Nation forward and spur economic growth. Congress can and should do better.

I want to cite one specific in particular. The B61 life extension program is a perfect example of misplaced Republican priorities. The B61 is the oldest bomb in our nuclear arsenal—almost as old as I am. The committee recommended \$561 million, \$23.7 million above the budget request for the B61 program.

The Senate version assumes a cheaper adjustment, the “triple alt,” than this bill. That still extends the program for 10 years. That assumption alone would save \$191 million and almost restore research funding to the enacted levels by itself.

Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to yield my time because I waited so long, but I will yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment, but let me salute the gentleman from Florida for his patience—I know he has been in the Chamber at least 5 or 6 hours waiting for his mark in this bill so he could get up—and also for the kind words, but most especially those directed towards our staff, which, as you know, have been dealing with an open rule, which is part of our process here, and juggling quite a few amendments which continue to come over the transom and will be coming over the transom all night. Indeed, I wanted to thank you for that recognition.

I do oppose the amendment because it would increase funding for the Office of Science, not because I don't support the Office of Science, but it would hit our National Nuclear Security Administration's weapons activity account. I do support the basic science programs championed by our colleague. We worked hard in our committee to prioritize basic science. As I said ear-

lier, this bill actually increases the Office of Science's budget by \$32 million above the current post-sequester level, but we still make national defense the first priority in our bill, and so I oppose this amendment and urge others to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank Congressman HASTINGS for working with us and obviously participating in these debates for the entire day today. He is such an able and well-intentioned Member. His brilliance continues to inspire all of us on many issues, including this one.

I wanted to just say that I agree with the gentleman's intent in offering this amendment. And as I've said many times today, the allocation we were given as a subcommittee is simply insufficient to meet all of the needs that the Nation has certainly in this area of science.

The gentleman is correct that there is a \$223 million—which is not insignificant—reduction from 2013 levels. So as we look to the future, there is less emphasis on science. I agree with the gentleman's intent. I wish we could restore all those dollars this evening.

I would also say that there's a constraint on us because we know that the President very much wants to engage in nuclear weapons reduction talks with other nations around the world, and I think it is important that he be able to negotiate from a position of strength. That is one of the reasons that the chairman and I are working so very hard to allow him to achieve the ultimate objective of nuclear arms reduction. So to take dollars from those accounts at this level really does create a bit of a pressure for us that would cause me to oppose the gentleman's amendment at this time. But I do so very reluctantly and with full understanding of what he is trying to achieve, and I want to thank him very much for waiting the entire day to offer this very, very important amendment that I hope some day to be able to support.

I urge my colleagues to consider however they may wish to vote on this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000,000)”.

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000,000)”.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to present an amendment that addresses an imbalance in our efforts to promote the long-term economic and national security interests of the United States.

This amendment reverses the deep and harmful cuts to the Department of Energy’s Office of Science and balances this by a corresponding reduction—amounting to 6 percent—in the nuclear weapons production and life extension accounts.

The greatest long-term threat that our country faces on both the military and economic fronts is the threat of losing our role as world leaders in innovation in science and technology. Nothing is more crucial to preserving that role than the fundamental and applied scientific research, at both universities and national laboratories, supported by the DOE Office of Science. This appropriations bill would cut funding for the Office of Science by \$500 million below the President’s request for the next fiscal year.

As a physicist who worked at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory for over 20 years and collaborated with universities and other national labs all over the United States, I understand the productivity and the potential of the Department of Energy’s national lab system and the wide range of basic scientific research that they support.

The Office of Science is responsible for supporting university-based research, but it also supports basic research facilities that are too big for any single company or university to develop.

The Chicago area that I represent is home to a number of scientific centers, including Fermilab, Argonne National Laboratory, and university-based centers. The economic impact of Argonne and Fermilab in Illinois alone is estimated to be more than \$1.3 billion annually, and there are thousands of good-paying jobs that are supported by those investments.

Our national labs are a critical research tool to academics and industry alike. For example, Eli Lilly conducts nearly half of its drug discovery research in conjunction with the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne.

The Office of Science is also home to one of the Department’s newest ventures, the innovation hubs, which seek to discover and develop the next generation of energy delivery. Programs like the Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, headquartered at Argonne, and the Fuels from Sunlight Hub, headquartered at the California Institute of Technology, bring together multiple teams of researchers who are working to develop energy advance-

ments that have the potential to transform our energy systems.

The Office of Science also invests in fusion, a safe, clean, and sustainable energy source that has the scientific potential to provide the United States with energy independence and a nearly limitless zero-emissions energy supply.

Currently, the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory is building the most powerful fusion facility of its type in the world. Through the Office of Science’s Biological and Environmental Research programs, we have become world leaders in biofuels research. This research is laying the foundation for a revolution in biofuel production that will help to lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

Study after study has shown that there are few investments that government can make that provide as high a return on investment as scientific research and development. The cuts proposed by Republicans in this underlying bill will have a wide-ranging impact, both to the local economy in Illinois and to our national economy. And with wages as a percentage of our economy at a record low, it is not time to retreat and to stop investing in American innovation. We need to maintain a competitive advantage now more than ever.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today because we must continue to invest in American innovation and to fully fund the research and development conducted through the DOE Office of Science.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment, but I do salute the gentleman for his work at the Fermilab, one of the finest labs in the Nation. Obviously, we appreciate his knowledge, and I would salute his contributions to science during his career before he came here.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I oppose his amendment. A cut of this magnitude to the weapons activities would seriously endanger our ability to carry out the modernization work that I talked about earlier, and so I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. I would actually like to respond a little bit about the offset for this amendment. This amendment is offset by reducing the \$7.7 billion budget for the NNSA nuclear weapons account by \$500 million. This is a 6.5 percent reduction.

I want to make it clear that the intent of this amendment is not to reduce the large amount of high-quality

research that goes on in NNSA-supported programs; but a large fraction of the funding in this account goes to production and future production facilities for weapons systems that serve no clearly defined strategic purpose in today’s geopolitics, or they go to programs for which the cost estimates, the project management, or both have come under repeated criticism when they come under external independent review.

To take two examples, the underlying bill funds the B61 life extension program at \$23 million more than requested. This program has ballooned in cost, from \$4 billion 2 years ago to over \$10 billion. A recent independent cost estimate commissioned by the Pentagon called even this estimate into question.

Another example is the overall size of the nuclear weapons stockpile. We have, today, more than 5,000 nuclear weapons. Even if the United States and Russia were to cut our arsenals by a factor of 10, our countries would still have significantly more nuclear weapons than our nearest competitors. The reason you spend money on nuclear deterrence is to deter rational actors and to reassure our allies.

To those who oppose this 6 percent cut, I would ask: Is there any example of a rational actor who would not be adequately deterred by a stockpile of, for example, 1,000 deployed and deployable nuclear weapons? Is there any one of our allies who would not consider our ability to release, say, 10 percent of that arsenal in retaliation to an attack on them to be a sufficient ability to respond? Yet we are redesigning production facilities and spending money on them when the strategic quantities required to be produced have not been established.

Earlier this year, the GAO added that NNSA was:

again included on GAO’s high-risk list in recognition of the potential for vulnerabilities to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement in contract administration and management of major projects.

And the cost remains uncertain. From the text of this very Energy and Water Committee report accompanying this bill:

The committee notes that the full extent of the consequences of the NNSA’s project management problems, especially at the largest of the NNSA’s construction projects, is still coming to light. As the administration gains a more complete understanding of cost increases and construction delays, it must take the lead to determine whether a new long-term budget plan is needed to meet the Nation’s strategic objectives.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), and I rise belatedly to support the amendment of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) as well.

Let me speak from the layman's perspective, although I served for a number of years on the Science Committee and presently serve on Homeland Security, which many of us know that when we deal with the issues of national security, we're dealing with technology, we're dealing with science. In essence, we secure this Nation by being victors of science.

Let me use layman's terms. Let me use what children are studying in their classrooms, maybe Alexander Bell, maybe they're studying Albert Einstein, but maybe they are studying and admire the Nation's astronauts.

For a number of years, I served, as I said, on the Science Committee and the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, and I could see how science permeated not only what we do here on Earth, but obviously space science. It seems to me, although I appreciate the heavy lifting of the chairman and the ranking member of this subcommittee on making determinations and going forward, what is America if we cannot invest in science?

□ 2100

Science is the job creator of the 21st century and the centuries beyond. Science provides jobs by creating new technology, new discoveries, and I, frankly, believe that it is suffering—that we have to subject America to the drastic cuts in science, the drastic cuts that will result in less research in labs, less private research, less teaching on science, and less growth and expansion on scientific inventions and obviously productivity.

So I would hope that, as the gentleman from Illinois has explained, it is a minute aspect of the funding source, and that we could balance our weaponry needs with the idea of advancing science. That's what I see these amendments as doing, both Mr. HASTINGS' and Mr. FOSTER's, attempting to not allow America to take a back seat or a second-class position on research and science.

It is clear that our best days are in front of us, and that America has grown and advanced because we have allowed the genius of science to be able to promote, not only our democracy, but our creativity and the curers of diseases, and also the finding of technology and the creation of invention that have made the quality of life better. That's what science is; it is human, it is humanity.

And so I would ask my colleagues to consider the amendment.

I rise to support science. I think it is valuable, I think it is important. And I think this is a difficult challenge for our committee, for this committee, but I do think that, as we proceed, we need to find a way to increase the funding for science, for us to be able to go forward in the greatness of this Nation in many, many ways.

But science has been a way that America has proven her greatness because we've allowed those with talent

and opportunity to be able to share that talent in advancing the quality of life, not only for Americans, but humankind.

I'd ask my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—
ENERGY

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities authorized by section 5012 of the America COMPETES Act (42 U.S.C. 16538), \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$329,000,000)".

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$329,000,000)".

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment together with Mr. POLIS. We've heard discussion repeatedly about the value of science. But if we back up a few moments, we also need to understand our values as Representatives of this Nation.

There's been an interesting subset of debates here over the last several hours and, on the one hand, it's the issue of, we must maintain our nuclear weapon superiority, and the committee has taken up that value, that goal, and has put a lot of money into that area while moving money out of the science.

Unfortunately, the committee couldn't take a larger view of the overall budget and the appropriations and deal with, perhaps, the fact that we're spending \$82 billion in Afghanistan this year and maybe move some of that money over into these accounts. But that wasn't possible.

But if you stand back and take a look at what has happened throughout the course of this day, you'll see that there have been repeated efforts on the part of the Democrats to rebuild the science, the research budget of the United States.

This appropriation bill simply decimates that budget, that critical investment in today and tomorrow, and in the economy of the future. Our ability to deal with climate change, our ability to deal with energy, are just

stripped, gutted and actually set aside as a result of this appropriation bill.

The Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, a \$2 billion reduction, 73 percent, ARPA-E, the subject of this amendment, a \$329 million reduction, an 87 percent reduction. The Office of Science, 25,000 researchers across this Nation are likely to be laid off, thousands of research projects will simply not be funded. They will simply die on the vine.

The Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, an \$80 million reduction. It goes on and on.

This is so backward, this is so backward. What this Nation needs to do is to build its research capabilities, build its science. We do not need to build more bombs. But yet, that's what we are doing here.

This amendment replaces the \$329 million dollar cut to the ARPA-E program, a program that has actually created many new opportunities, which my colleagues will be discussing here in the next few moments, but a program based upon the Defense Department's DARPA program, that has, through arguments that we've heard over the last several hours, developed extraordinary technology that has now found its way into the world's economy, for example, the Internet.

We really must restore this money, and we must restore the science budget and research budget for the Department of Energy. We can't fail. If it's a choice between building more nuclear weapons and replacing our nuclear weapons or creating tomorrow's economy, it's a simple choice.

But this bill doesn't do that. It deals with yesterday. Yes, we're going to need nuclear weapons, but not 5,500 of them. We don't need to rebuild all of them. We don't need to spend \$7.7 billion on that enterprise while gutting the research and the science future of this Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, you know, the funding priorities of this bill are simply upside down. This bill prioritizes nuclear weapons funding over research for innovative technologies that will lead to energy independence and launch a future for sustainable energy and job growth in our country.

This bill before us underfunds programs that not only will grow our Nation's clean energy sources but also will promote jobs and emerging technologies and maintain critical infrastructure. At the same time it makes the cut in the ARPA-E program that you've heard so much about here today, the bill increases weapons activities by \$97.7 million above the 2013 enacted level.

As I mentioned earlier in my Rules Committee discussion time, this past

February I had the privilege of meeting with an ARPA-E project team from my district in Colorado, a joint project between the University of Colorado at Boulder and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, which demonstrated significant energy yield improvements and cost reduction potential in solar photovoltaic power systems.

The team leaders were very excited about the challenges in clean energy, and there are examples of projects like this which ARPA-E has helped fund, and would not even exist without ARPA-E, across our country that are leading and will lead to countless benefits for consumers and for our national energy security.

But despite the success of ARPA-E, which was even acknowledged by the subcommittee chair and ranking committee member before our Rules Committee yesterday, the underlying bill disproportionately cuts from clean energy programs, 81 percent cuts, while bolstering wasteful spending for weapons.

We need to restore the ARPA-E funding to the President's budget levels. That's why Mr. GARAMENDI and I are offering this amendment to provide \$329 million in funding to ARPA-E. This amendment is offset with a corresponding cut to the NNSA Weapons Activities account.

This amendment provides an amount of support that ARPA-E needs to ensure that our country keeps moving towards energy independence and can sustain job growth.

I strongly encourage my colleague on both sides of the aisle to support the Garamendi-Polis amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment. This amendment would unacceptably strike funding for NNSA's weapons activities by \$325 million in order to increase funding for ARPA-E at the Department of Energy.

I am supportive of ARPA-E, but a reduction of this magnitude in the National Nuclear Security Administration's Weapons Activities account would seriously affect their ability to ensure the continued reliability of our weapons.

These weapons have to be certified by the Secretary of Energy to the President, our Commander-in-Chief. The Secretary's ability to do that would be hurt by cuts of this magnitude.

And for this, and other reasons, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment, along with my colleague, Representative WOODALL of Georgia, and my colleague, Representative POLIS of Colorado. It would increase funding for the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, otherwise known as ARPA-E.

The bill provides only \$50 million for ARPA-E, a reduction of \$215 million, or 81 percent, from fiscal year 2013. Moreover, the bill would reduce ARPA-E by 87 percent compared to the 2014 budget request.

This amendment would increase the funding by \$20 million, with the increase offset by a reduction in the Department Administration account. This is a very modest investment for an agency whose work has the potential to remake our economy.

While the amendment would leave us a long way short of where the funding for this program should be, as well as where it is in the Senate bill and in the President's budget, passing it would send a strong signal that there's bipartisan support for this kind of research.

In 2011, I offered a similar amendment to restore funding to ARPA-E, which was adopted by a bipartisan majority in the House.

Started in 2009, ARPA-E is a revolutionary program that advances high-potential, high-impact energy technologies that are too early for private sector investment. This is an innovative agency modeled on DARPA, which has spearheaded incredible breakthroughs in the Defense Department, with both military and civilian applications.

ARPA-E was created to bring that same kind of innovative thinking to the energy sector. That includes a focus on high-risk, high-reward R&D and a quick-moving culture made up of experts who stay for just a few years to ensure that new ideas are continually being brought forward. Its philosophy, much like a tech startup, is to hire the best technical staff and then hire the managers and leadership that can get the most out of them.

As the committee report notes, ARPA-E works on "developing energy technologies whose development and commercialization are too risky to at-

tract significant private sector investment but are capable of significantly changing the energy sector to address our critical economic and energy security challenges."

That's a great description of ARPA-E, and I'd ask the House to consider whether it sounds like something we should be cutting by 81 percent.

Mr. Chair, there are cuts I can support in this bill, but a cut to our investment in new generations of energy technology is shortsighted in the extreme.

As we cut spending to return the budget to balance, we must not cut those programs that are vital to our economic future and our national security. ARPA-E is just such an agency. Even if we cannot make the investment the President called for in his budget, let's at least not destroy an agency that is pointing the way toward a more energy-secure future.

Cutting programs like ARPA-E so severely is akin to shutting them down completely. No agency can absorb an 81 percent cut to its budget in a single year, but even less so an agency that relies on attracting elite scientists and engineers.

Energy is a national security issue, it's an economic imperative, it's a health issue, and it's an environmental issue. And to invest in the kind of cutting-edge research that's going on at ARPA-E is exactly the direction we need to go.

We want to lead the energy revolution. We don't want to see that leadership go to China, India or any other nation. But if we're serious about it, we need to invest in cutting edge research, and that means ARPA-E.

Our competitiveness in a global economy where we have to compete with labor that costs a fraction of what American workers costs depends on research and development.

□ 2115

I can't understand why we'd want to give away that big advantage. So I urge support for this amendment to support cutting-edge investments in our energy future, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. I know my colleague from Georgia will be speaking on this shortly. I appreciate him and Representative SCHIFF working on this amendment, and I will be very brief to voice my support for Congressman WOODALL and Congressman SCHIFF in their efforts to restore some of the funds in ARPA-E.

As we discussed, the underlying bill cuts ARPA-E by 81 percent. We live in times of fiscal austerity. We have the sequestration. We know it's time for cuts. Eighty-one percent is clearly singling it out.

What this amendment does is restores \$20 million in funding to ARPA-

E. Even \$20 million goes a long way when we're talking about ARPA-E. We're talking about early-stage investments. It could be \$500,000, \$1 million, \$2 million—very high leverage, very high return. And \$70 million is not enough to fund the program. But, yes, it will make great strides even at this funding level, because investment in early-stage companies is all about risk-taking. That's why the government has a critical role in promoting innovation and making sure that we do the basic research to even get it ready for tech transfer, to get it ready for venture capital, to get it ready for the private sector to commercialize it. In order for ARPA-E to be successful, investors need to see that the government is willing to invest in risky, but high-reward, projects that can truly alter the course of energy independence for our country.

So I strongly salute Representatives Woodall and Schiff for bringing forward this amendment. I encourage my colleagues to adopt this as a step forward, and I deeply appreciate everybody on both sides of the aisle who said great things about the ARPA-E project and how it can help lead to energy independence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOODALL. I also want to thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Colorado for their enthusiasm about this important project. The amendment that my colleague from California is bringing forward is modest in scope. I'll say to my colleagues who want to see spending reduced, we're talking about the difference between an 81 percent cut, as is in the chairman's mark today, to a 74 percent cut, if we add this \$20 million back in. It's a modest number, but it's an important number because the committee could only do what the committee could do. And I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman. I know he is committed to this research.

I hate to hear folks describe the commitment to advancement, Mr. Chairman, the commitment to next-generation technologies as a Republican or a Democrat commitment. I think it's an American commitment. It's certainly a House commitment, and it's one that the chairman and the ranking member tried their best within their allocations to satisfy.

What are you going to take the money away from, Mr. Chairman? Look at what we're dealing with in this appropriations bill. We're talking about nuclear security. We're talking about environmental cleanup. We're talking about uranium enrichment, decontamination, and decommissioning. The choices we have here are tough choices. And the amendment that's before us now, knowing that we want to

put the money where it's going to do the most good, says let's take the money out of administration. That's not to say that there doesn't have to be administration. That's not to say phones don't have to be answered and electricity doesn't have to be turned on. But when you have to make tough choices, the one that the gentleman from California is asking us to make today is: Are we going to invest in the bureaucracy or are we going to invest in that opportunity to make tomorrow so much more different than today?

If my colleagues haven't had a chance, look at those project teams like the one my colleague from Colorado mentioned and what they are researching. Mr. Chairman, I come from coal-burning country. And the work that ARPA-E is doing on carbon sequestration could change the debate about American energy independence forever.

ARPA-E isn't working on what is going to happen tomorrow. They're working on what's going to happen in the next generation; what is it going to be that changes the debate forever. Those are the kinds of ideas that this \$21 million will support.

Mr. Chairman, it's the commitment to fundamental research, the commitment to game-changing ideas that is a bipartisan commitment. It's one that goes from coast-to-coast, from north to south, and on both sides of the aisle.

Again, I'm grateful to the gentlelady from Ohio and the chairman from New Jersey for all they have done to try to support these accounts. It is my great hope that my colleagues here in the House will support the gentleman from California's amendment and we'll get this \$20 million plus-up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. I rise in support of the Schiff amendment, which makes sure that we continue investing in quality energy research programs that will benefit the United States.

Energy innovation, research and development are essential for our country, especially if we truly want to move forward with reducing our energy dependence on fossil fuels. One important component of this goal is the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, or ARPA-E. Since 2009, ARPA-E has funded over 275 potentially transformational energy technology projects. Many of the research projects are occurring in my own State of California.

These companies, national labs, and educational institutions are working on items that will greatly benefit the energy security of our country. Some projects include Distributed Power Flow Control Using Smart Wires for Energy Routing; Low-Cost Biological Catalyst to Enable Efficient CO₂ Capture; Large-Scale Energy Reductions

Through Sensors, Feedback, and Information Technology; Highly Dispatchable and Distributed Demand Response for the Integration of Distributed Generation; and Carbon Nanotube Membranes for Energy-Efficient Carbon Sequestration.

Our Nation faces significant energy challenges in the years ahead, both from a production and reliability standpoint, but also from the effects of climate change. Climate change's effects include severe storms, sea level rise, and the extremely poor air quality that continually plagues California's Central Valley. We must become more energy efficient, reduce the release of CO₂ and other harmful greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, and improve our electric grid and its ability to meet peak demands. ARPA-E projects aim to solve these problems and at the same time will help reduce blackouts, reduce energy costs, and improve both environmental and public health.

ARPA-E initiatives help facilitate future private investments by helping companies reach their potential in the early stages. In fact, the American Energy Innovation Council, which consists of some of America's largest companies, like Lockheed Martin and Microsoft, has called for ARPA-E to be funded at 10 times the proposed level. Unfortunately, the bill today provides only \$50 million for ARPA-E, which is \$215 million less than what was enacted the last fiscal year and \$329 million less than the President's request.

ARPA-E project successes have attracted more than \$450 million in private investments. It's this return on investment that must be continued, not cut back. The Schiff amendment aims to correct this error in the underlying bill.

The only reason I can think of to reduce ARPA-E funding is to help prop up fossil fuel industries, and that's going to get us more global warming and cause us more problems. We need to reduce global warming. Global warming is a threat to our national security. We need to fight it. ARPA-E is going to give us the tools to do that.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE 17 INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN
GUARANTEE PROGRAM

Such sums as are derived from amounts received from borrowers pursuant to section 1702(b)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 under this heading in prior Acts, shall be collected in accordance with section 502(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided*, That, for necessary administrative expenses to carry out this Loan Guarantee program, \$22,000,000 is appropriated, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided further*, That \$22,000,000 of the fees collected

pursuant to section 1702(h) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16512(h)) shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account to cover administrative expenses and shall remain available until expended, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0: *Provided further*, That fees collected under section 1702(h) in excess of the amount appropriated for administrative expenses shall not be available until appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Department of Energy shall not subordinate any loan obligation to other financing in violation of section 1702 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16512) or subordinate any Guaranteed Obligation to any loan or other debt obligations in violation of section 609.10 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES
MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM

For administrative expenses in carrying out the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program, \$6,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF
GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced to \$0)”.

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,000,000)”.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates the remaining funding for the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan program, transferring \$6 million to the Spending Reduction Account. Since 2008, the U.S. Government has been in the business of lending money to build cars that no one wants to buy. For instance, \$50 million went to the Vehicle Production Group for natural gas minivans. That company failed. Meanwhile, \$190 million went to Fisker Automotive to make electric cars that catch on fire. For instance, the Karma, Fisker’s hybrid-electric luxury sedan, which cost around \$100,000 apiece, was recalled to fix a hose connection that allowed coolant leaks into the battery chamber, causing an electrical short. Fortunately, no one was hurt before production was ended. Unfortunately, taxpayers got back only a fraction of the payout.

Mr. Chairman, I’m 100 percent supportive of the automobile industry producing more fuel-efficient automobiles. However, there’s simply no good reason that the Federal Government should be subsidizing billion-dollar companies at a time when our Nation is broke. It is time that we begin to reverse this disturbing trend of energy loan programs for companies and let the automobile industry succeed or fail in the marketplace on its own merits. We have to stop these kinds of subsidies, particularly in these hard times when our Nation is in an economic emergency.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. While I appreciate the gentleman’s position on the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan program—and certainly some of his knowledge of the program is entirely accurate—the elimination of this funding would hurt Federal oversight of the more than \$8 billion in loans already given. As our committee report states, there are no new applications for this program, and the Department of Energy doesn’t expect any. The committee recommendation includes the \$6 million as a reasonable amount to provide oversight and direction to the existing loan portfolio, and no more.

So I must oppose the gentleman’s amendment in order to ensure proper oversight of taxpayers’ funding that’s already out there in the form of loans, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$30,000, \$187,863,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): *Provided*, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total \$108,188,000 in fiscal year 2014 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95-238, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$79,675,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,200,000)”.

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

□ 2130

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to add my appreciation to the committee’s work. It’s tough work. It’s important work because this is how we serve the American people.

I ask my colleagues to discuss with me—or follow my discussion on the importance of the amendment that I offer because it is an amendment that takes its funding from a source of funding that has been discussed previously, and that is the Atomic Energy Defense Activities, National Nuclear Security Administration. But it does take these moneys and it uses them in a very constructive manner. It is moneys to maintain for environmental justice that go to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, minority-serving institutions, tribal colleges, and other organizations. This is imperative in preserving sustainability and growth of a community and environment.

Mr. Chairman, that is the intent, the simple intent, that alongside of the important work of this appropriation of the Energy and Water there is a constant need to be assured that our communities are protected. Let me cite just a few examples as we proceed.

Many of us understand the recent tragedy that occurred—not in this country, but recently occurred in Canada where areas were wiped out. This is an important highlight for what environmental justice is all about.

Many of us have heard in the years past of the Buffalo Creek disaster. This is what environmental justice does; it is to fund programs that are vital to ensuring that minority groups are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environment and the continued preservation of their homes.

But it goes further. It is underserved areas. It is as much important to preserve areas in Appalachia, in the Delta, in places where poor communities cannot, if you will, represent themselves. Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and our citizens can improve their surroundings.

What better group than Historically Black Colleges, minority-serving institutions that include Hispanic-serving institutions and tribal colleges; why are they the best to move in that direction? Primarily because they communicate with those underserved communities.

Funds that would be awarded to this important cause would increase youth involvement in STEM fields and also promote clean energy, weatherization cleanup, and asset revitalization. These improvements will provide protection to our most vulnerable groups.

Many people believe environmental justice has to do with lawsuits. It has to do with outreach and information.

This is simply a small program that allows the Department of Energy to focus on this constituency and ensure the coverage and the protection.

This program provides better access to technology for underserved communities. Together, the Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture distributed access to information which generates a recognition of protecting the environment. Community leaders are able as well to participate in environmental justice.

In our communities, in urban areas, there's a need for environmental justice. Again, what better institutions than those institutions that draw their population from the communities, that draw their population from the reservations or from the communities that our Native Americans are engaged in?

So I ask my colleagues to look at this program, look at the, if you will, fiscal responsibility that I've utilized in drawing from the program to invest in environmental justice. It's a fair way to give resources to these vital institutions that, to be frank with you, Mr. Chairman, they don't have the resources, but they do good work.

Texas Southern University had an environmental justice clinic located in Houston in the 18th Congressional District. But let me be very clear, this is not an earmark. These are resources that can be used by the Department of Energy that will respond to this broad depth of universities, Historically Black Colleges, tribal institutions, minority-serving—which include, of course, the Hispanic-serving institutions.

Let me quickly say that since 2002, the Tribal Energy Program has also funded 175 energy projects. But again, this is limited to environmental justice. I believe this is an effective utilization of these funds and would ask my colleagues to ensure that we have the funds to ensure the good work of these particular entities.

Let me conclude by asking my colleagues to support the education of our young people in the environmental protection area that enhances the communities from which they have come, making America better. I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I must oppose the gentlelady's amendment. This is, though, a very important program, and I support it, our committee supports it. But this program is primarily funded within the Office of Legacy Management. That office receives substantive funding in this bill under the account for other defense activities.

Funding for the Legacy Management increases \$3.4 million over fiscal year 2013. The Office of Legacy Management

is the correct office to provide stewardship for the legacy sites. They are the experts. And I am happy to help ensure that this very important program receives support within available funding for Legacy Management.

I look forward to working with Ms. JACKSON LEE to support this program as we move on through the appropriations process, but I oppose the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to yield to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady, and I thank my good friend from New Jersey. But I do want to cite that nearly 10 years ago, President Clinton produced Executive Order 12898, thereby highlighting the importance of not only giving greater attention to our underserved communities, but also how we can help our citizens by educating them on the areas in which they live. That falls under the particular account that I'm utilizing, and I would therefore like to go forward in this instance.

Let me just be very appreciative of my good friend, the chairman of this subcommittee, and the ranking member. I am very appreciative of how difficult it is under sequester. But what I would say is that these entities—Historically Black Colleges, minority-serving and tribal colleges—in the course of what we're trying to do, these resources, added to what the gentleman has already indicated, the \$3.2 million, \$3.4 million is meager in what they could do with protecting communities, educating communities about their environmental needs.

So that's environmental justice. It is expanding the reach so that communities are far more protected than those that we've seen.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady for bringing this issue before us during this debate.

You know, when I look at the executives that come and appear before our subcommittee from the Department, I would have to say that the gentlelady brings a very important concern to our subcommittee.

I would not say that if I look at those who have come, they are completely representative of our country. So I'm not sure that the consciousness exists at the highest level for assuring that all communities in America are engaged in the activities of the Department.

I don't know—I heard the chairman, and there is a concern about which accounts have been included in the gentlelady's amendment. I would hope that, as this legislation moves forward, we could find a way to accomplish the gentlelady's objectives in a way that would not raise concerns on the other side.

So I think that she has really brought an important proposal before us here, and I would hate to see that it would not be considered simply because a wrong account has been identified, for example. So I would just like to remain open to the gentlelady's proposal in a manner in which it could be considered and ultimately approved.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentlewoman yield for a moment if you still have time?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me sort of clarify, because the chairman has made a point about a certain area where it is referencing Historically Black Colleges. They are referencing several areas. I am speaking specifically to environmental justice, which is represented in the Departmental Administration account. So I'm focusing on the important work that these colleges can do as it relates to educating our poor, impoverished communities and communities of which they have a direct ability to communicate with.

I will tell you, bringing forth environmental experts out of these jurisdictions—tribal colleges, minority-serving, and Historically Black—is a great asset to improving the quality of life of all Americans. So I would ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

So mine is one of the references. There are many references where Historically Black Colleges are, but this is specifically dealing with environmental justice.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would also say to the gentlelady that in many communities that are contaminated around this country and have problems, oftentimes they are in neighborhoods and places where people who are minority, who are tribal, people who are not necessarily represented broadly within the Department live. So I think that we have to be conscious in all parts of the Department, that there should be an inclusivity.

So I think that the gentlelady has done a service, as always, by raising our consciousness to all of the activities of the Department and that they be sensitive to all parts of America, including environmental justice. So I would hope that as we move forward, we could find a way to support the gentlelady's concerns.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF
GEORGIA

□ 2145

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,500,000)”.

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$9,500,000)”.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the appropriations for the Department of Energy’s salaries and expenses by \$9.5 million and place that amount in the spending reduction account. When combined with the reduction included in the underlying bill, this amount would represent a 25 percent cut from current levels.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that this may seem somewhat drastic. However, I’ve spoken again and again today about the fiscal emergency facing our country.

There are legitimate constitutional functions of the Federal Government which must be funded, particularly those that relate to our national defense. Yet even those functions are facing cuts—deep cuts. This means that prioritization is necessary so that we may determine our wants versus our needs.

We need to open up access to new sources of energy. We need to stop being dependent on foreign oil. The Department of Energy has done very little to further either of these goals. In fact, according to its original purpose of being stood up, it has been a dismal failure.

Certainly, there are advances to be made in current technology. But in the here and now, we know that we are sitting on vast resources that are so tied up in red tape it could be decades before they could come to fruition.

The House has passed several bills—and will continue to pass bills—to lighten the Federal burden and bring true energy freedom to this country. But the Senate and the administration disagree with us. They would rather throw millions upon millions towards new sources of clean energy, some of which have turned into highly publicized wastes of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Chairman, we need to prioritize developing the resources that we have now. Unfortunately, the Department of Energy has proven time and again it is out of touch with the needs of our country. The bureaucrats responsible for putting the Solyndras of the world above traditional sources of energy pull in more than \$100,000 a year on average, all the while doing little to lighten costs for American families. In fact, despite a supposed hiring freeze, the Department of Energy’s Web site, right now today, is currently advertising 31 job openings paying over \$105,000 per year.

This is ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, and it must stop.

My amendment would force the Department of Energy to reevaluate its priorities and put our current needs first rather than hoping that new, clean sources of energy will pan out eventually.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, our bill had many competing priorities with a low allocation, and I appreciate my colleague’s commitment to finding more savings in the bill. He is ever persistent, and I salute his willingness to challenge us each year on the floor when we do this energy and water bill, and we are not the only bill where he makes these challenges.

However, the Department Administration account in our recommendation was already suffering a \$49 million cut from last year’s level. Earlier amendments that we did this afternoon and this evening have taken another \$60 million. There is not a lot of money left to run the department.

While some may want to close down the department, the department has some pretty incredible responsibilities in terms of nuclear safety and national defense and things that relate to clean-ups and things of this nature. If they had to respond—if you will pardon the expression—to some of the emergencies that we might have as a Nation, and we know our deficit is an emergency situation, they might not be able to respond on our behalf.

Therefore, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman’s amendment.

I kind of think back to the movie Titanic. There is one scene where the captain—evidently the captain—comes out on the deck just about as the Titanic is going to hit the iceberg. I can remember the blank look on his face and thinking what had he been doing before all this happened. We saw the tragedy that occurred. Sometimes if you don’t have captains in the pilot house you can really run aground, you can really have trouble.

Already, the majority this evening has cut—I think we are down to \$146 million in administration in the Department of Energy, a vast department. That kind of level of cut is going to cause big mistakes. There will be accounting mistakes, there will be contracts that won’t be overseen. In a way, you are seeding a very bad future for the management of the funds that we do vote for here tonight.

I think the gentleman, perhaps, isn’t really familiar with everything the Department does. You can come down here and be kind of cavalier and propose amendments, but in the end, we can’t absorb these cuts at the Department because you’re going to have problems that are caused by no captains being at the helm.

I think that’s really a big mistake, because this Department has to manage over \$30 billion—billion dollars—of tax dollars on the energy and water front. These are big contracts, they are major projects that are undertaken by this Department, and to act otherwise is to really, I think, perform naively.

I think the gentleman has an objective, but I really think that he is going to cause great harm to the Republic by this amendment. Obviously, I oppose it, urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$42,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed one ambulance, \$7,675,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$23,700,000)”.

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$23,700,000)”.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment with my friend from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Our amendment is very straightforward. It simply cuts the \$23.7 million from the B61 nuclear bomb not requested by the Department of Energy.

The National Nuclear Security Administration requested a 45 percent increase for a gold-plated upgrade plan for the B61 nuclear bomb. The committee provided the 45 percent increase in funding for a portion of the most expensive \$10 billion upgrade plan. Then they provided an additional \$23.7 million. Our amendment simply cuts these additional funds provided beyond what the agency requested.

Let me back up for a minute and explain what the \$560 million in this bill is actually going to pay for. At a time when we are slashing funds for research at the NIH, failing to fund our crumbling infrastructure, and underinvesting in our children's education, we are increasing funding to keep hundreds of nuclear bombs in operation that we will never use.

The Cold War is over. Mr. Chairman, I thought today that I was back in a "Twilight Zone" episode—well, they're all like this—where you woke up in the morning and it is 50 years earlier—it's 1963. The Cold War is still raging.

Despite the fact that security experts of all political stripes, including conservatives Henry Kissinger and George Shultz, have called for deep cuts to our outsized nuclear stockpile.

General Cartwright, former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said the "military utility" of the B61 is "practically nil."

As the U.S. and Russia work to reduce their nuclear stockpiles and shift funds to meet today's threats, the B61 in Europe will be one of the first weapons cut. Just last month in Berlin, the President stated that he wants to "seek bold reductions in tactical weapons," aka the B61, in Europe.

My friends on the other side of the aisle claim they want to reduce the deficit. I agree, but if we are actually going to reduce spending, everything has to be on the table, including defense. This amendment is a tiny, thoughtful cut to an outsized nuclear budget for weapons that do little to keep us safe.

I hope my colleagues will join me in cutting funds not requested by the Department of Energy for nuclear upgrades not needed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. QUIGLEY for bringing forward this important amendment. There has been growing concerns, in fact, raised by the Air Force's 2008 Blue Ribbon Review regarding the effectiveness and vulnerabilities of the B61s.

The B61 bomb was originally developed and placed in Europe during the Cold War for Cold War-era threats. Today, according to General James Cartwright, former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the military utility of the B61 is "practically nil." Let me repeat that: According to General James Cartwright, the military utility of the B61 is practically nil.

Despite the lack of utility, the price tag continues to rise. As it rises, some

of our allies, like Germany, have called for the B61s to be removed from their borders. There is no reason that we should spend more and more taxpayer dollars on programs that aren't even needed or wanted by our NATO allies and don't contribute to our national security.

These missiles are a kind of saving opportunity that we need to take advantage of. Given our fiscal restraints, we need to ensure that taxpayer dollars are not wasted on programs that don't protect our national security.

This amendment is simple: it cuts the B61 program back to the agency's own request level, saving \$23.7 million. To me, this is about as much of a no-brainer of a cut that we can find. Let's do it.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on the Quigley-Polis amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

Our bill provides \$560 billion for the B61 Life Extension Program, \$23.7 million above the request.

I understand there are concerns about the cost of the refurbishment of the B61 and the committee shares those concerns. As a result, this bill contains a provision that requires that NNSA provide a full analysis of the alternatives that were considered. But failing to move forward without the full support of the B61 refurbishment will put that program even further behind what is already a tight schedule.

The Government Accountability Office conducted a study of the B61 Life Extension Program in 2011 and reported there was no room left in the refurbishment schedule. If the Life Extension Program slips further behind, there will be gaps in the United States commitment to our NATO allies.

In fiscal year 2012, NNSA performed a full cost estimate for the B61 refurbishment, and the Department of Defense Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation validated those costs. This was the most comprehensive and accurate performed by the NNSA on a life extension to date—aka the administration was behind the most comprehensive and accurate report on the program to date—and the costs, by everybody's admission, were admittedly staggering.

Those costs were ultimately verified and provided to the committee in a cost report. The amount of funding in this bill is consistent with that cost report and provides \$23.7 million above the amount requested, which fell slightly short of the validated figures.

The National Nuclear Security Administration explained the shortfall

away by stating they would find unspecified "efficiencies in the program," hence the additional money.

While I do support a concerted effort that will lower the cost of this program to the taxpayer, we never received any plan on how the NNSA—aka the administration—proposes to find savings. This is not the first time this has happened.

The administration has as a stated goal to reduce the overall cost of the W76 Life Extension Program. The Department of Energy's inspector general reported there was no credible plan to make savings and that the lower funding levels being requested would simply lead to delays in the refurbishment.

We cannot allow the B61 Life Extension Program to be further delayed given the important role it serves in providing a nuclear umbrella to our allies.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to agree with what the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the subcommittee, has just said, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, we have debated similar concepts recently and we rejected them. This would be harmful to our national security. The reason, besides what the chairman from New Jersey has already said, these weapons are forward deployed in Europe to support NATO and are employed also by U.S. strategic forces in the continental United States.

If we do not extend the life of the B61, here is what the Department of Defense has said:

Failure to fully fund the B61 Life Extension Program will be viewed by NATO and other allies as a weakening in the overall U.S.-extended deterrence commitment, potentially prompting certain allies to pursue their own nuclear program.

Unless you want other countries in the world to start their own nuclear programs from scratch to develop their own weapons systems, increasing proliferation, then you want to reject this amendment, because that will potentially be the result if the U.S. deterrence is weakened. That's what this amendment does.

It is important that we do the Life Extension Program also because under New START, which this country entered into recently with Russia, it was determined that we would be upgrading the remaining weapons. We are making dramatic reductions in the amount of the nuclear weapons in our stockpile, so those that remain have to be more reliable or we made a bad deal.

To make sure that those remaining weapons are more reliable we do the Life Extension Programs. The B61

weapons we are talking about are 30 years or more old. They are degrading. They are using sometimes obsolescent parts, so they are not as secure as they could be. We need to do the Life Extension Program for that reason as well.

For all these reasons, I would ask that we strongly oppose and reject this amendment.

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

□ 2200

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I respect and have enjoyed this thoughtful debate that we've had in the last few minutes about this issue, particularly because it raises critical issues about our relationships with our NATO allies, but let's look at the big picture here.

The 2010 START Treaty with Russia, which passed the Senate in 2009, requires that Russia and the United States reduce their stockpiles to a maximum of 1,550 nuclear weapons by 2018. Let's look at what people are talking about now, people we respect.

General James Cartwright, retired vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former commander of the U.S. nuclear forces; Richard Burt, a former chief nuclear arms negotiator; Chuck Hagel, current Secretary of Defense; Thomas Pickering, a former ambassador to Russia; and General John J. Sheehan, a former senior NATO official, all issued a report noting that the United States' nuclear deterrence could be guaranteed with 900 nuclear weapons.

According to General Cartwright:

The world has changed, but the current arsenal carries the baggage of the Cold War . . . What is it we're really trying to deter? Our current arsenal does not address the threats of the 21st century.

Let's talk about our NATO allies.

Steve Andreasen, the Director for Defense Policy and Arms Control on the National Security Council, recently argued:

Wouldn't it be more reassuring and wiser burden-sharing to spend this money on weapons and capabilities that are more relevant to the threats NATO faces today? Indeed, why would allies be reassured by an investment that provides no real military capability and no modicum of deterrence beyond that already provided by the U.S., Britain, and France, each of which has nuclear arsenals capable of obliterating any adversary?

The biggest concerns for NATO right now include threats from Mali and Syria, nuclear proliferation and terrorism. The B61 can do nothing to address those threats.

I close by reminding us that four great American statesmen—George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn—argued for the elimination of these short-range nuclear weapons designed to be forward

deployed—that is, the B61—in their landmark 2007 op-ed.

Ms. KAPTUR. In reclaiming my time, I would like to lend support to the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois.

His amendment would cut funding from the weapons account in the amount that was added to the President's budget request for the B61. In these tight fiscal times, all programs must find efficiencies, and the \$23.7 million was the amount that the administration estimated could be achieved for this activity.

So I want to thank the gentleman very much for his efforts and for waiting all day. We have to proceed in order.

I know it's excruciatingly difficult for such an athlete, like yourself, with all that pent-up energy and drive, to have to wait until this late in the evening, but we thank you for the contribution you have made in many ways, including in offering this amendment tonight.

I ask my colleagues to support his efforts, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment by Mr. SWALWELL of California.

Amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. PETERS of California.

Amendment by Mr. PERLMUTTER of Colorado.

Amendment by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment by Mr. HECK of Nevada.

Amendment by Mr. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 241, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

AYES—168

Bass	Frankel (FL)	Napolitano
Beatty	Fudge	Neal
Becerra	Gabbard	Nolan
Bera (CA)	Gallego	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	Pallone
Bishop (NY)	Gibson	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Grayson	Payne
Bonamici	Green, Al	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Bralley (IA)	Gutiérrez	Peters (CA)
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Peters (MI)
Brownley (CA)	Hanabusa	Pingree (ME)
Bustos	Hastings (FL)	Pocan
Butterfield	Higgins	Polis
Capps	Himes	Price (NC)
Capuano	Hinojosa	Quigley
Cárdenas	Holt	Rahall
Carney	Honda	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Richmond
Cartwright	Israel	Royal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Rush
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes
Ciilline	Johnson, E. B.	Schakowsky
Clarke	Keating	Schiff
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Schneider
Cleaver	Kennedy	Schrader
Clyburn	Kildee	Schwartz
Cohen	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Kind	Scott, David
Conyers	Kuster	Serrano
Cooper	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Crowley	Latham	Sires
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Levin	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lewis	Takano
DeFazio	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Loeb sack	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Lowenthal	Tierney
DeLauro	Lowey	Titus
DelBene	Lynch	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney,	Tsongas
Dingell	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Doggett	Markey	Vargas
Doyle	Matsui	Veasey
Duckworth	McGovern	Velázquez
Edwards	McNerney	Walz
Ellison	Meeks	Waters
Engel	Meng	Watt
Enyart	Michaud	Waxman
Eshoo	Miller, George	Welch
Esty	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Farr	Moran	Yarmuth
Fattah	Murphy (FL)	
Foster	Nadler	

NOES—241

Aderholt	Blackburn	Cassidy
Alexander	Bonner	Chabot
Amash	Boustany	Chaffetz
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Coble
Andrews	Bridenstine	Coffman
Bachmann	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Barletta	Broun (GA)	Conaway
Barr	Buchanan	Cook
Barrow (GA)	Bucshon	Cotton
Barton	Burgess	Cramer
Benishek	Calvert	Crawford
Bentivolio	Camp	Crenshaw
Billirakis	Cantor	Cuellar
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Culberson
Black	Carter	Daines

Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn

NOT VOTING—25

Barber
Campbell
Cole
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Heck (WA)
Horsford
Hoyer

□ 2228

Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. POSEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN)

Lance
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Westrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—25

Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 256, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

AYES—158

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Hurt
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Camp
Cantor
Kingston
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cotton
Crawford
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCauley
McClintock
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxy
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger

NOES—256

Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Clarke
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)

DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kuster
Lance
Langevin

NOT VOTING—20

Barber
Campbell
Esty
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Heck (WA)

□ 2232

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

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

Stated against:
Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 317, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 213, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

AYES—201

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

Waters
Watt

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Holt
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Heck (WA)
Horsford

Waxman
Welch

NOES—213

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
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson

NOT VOTING—20

Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon

Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 115, noes 300, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—115

Amash	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Bachmann	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Hall	Pompeo
Bentivolio	Harris	Posey
Billirakis	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Radel
Blackburn	Hudson	Ribble
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Rokita
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Cantor	Jones	Royce
Carter	Jordan	Sanford
Chabot	Kingston	Scalise
Chaffetz	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Coble	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Latta	Shuster
Conaway	Long	Smith (MO)
Cotton	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Massie	Southernland
Culberson	McClintock	Stewart
Daines	McHenry	Stockman
DeSantis	Meadows	Stutzman
Duffy	Messer	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	Mica	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	Miller (FL)	Tipton
Farenthold	Miller (MI)	Turner
Fleming	Mullin	Upton
Flores	Mulvaney	Valadao
Fox	Neugebauer	Wagner
Gohmert	Palazzo	Walberg
Gowdy	Paulsen	Walden
Granger	Perry	Walorski
Graves (GA)	Petri	Weber (TX)
Graves (MO)	Pittenger	Wenstrup
		Westmoreland
		Whitfield
		Williams
		Wilson (SC)
		Wittman
		Wolf
		Womack
		Woodall
		Yoder
		Yoho
		Young (AK)
		Young (IN)

NOES—300

Aderholt	Butterfield	Cramer
Alexander	Calvert	Crenshaw
Amodei	Camp	Crowley
Andrews	Capito	Cuellar
Barletta	Capps	Cummings
Barr	Capuano	Davis (CA)
Barrow (GA)	Cárdenas	Davis, Danny
Barton	Carney	Davis, Rodney
Bass	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Beatty	Cartwright	DeGette
Becerra	Cassidy	Delaney
Benishek	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Bera (CA)	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Bishop (GA)	Bishop (GA)	Denham
Bishop (NY)	Cicilline	Dent
Black	Clarke	DesJarlais
Blumenauer	Clay	Deutch
Bonamici	Cleaver	Diaz-Balart
Bonner	Clyburn	Dingell
Boustany	Coffman	Doggett
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Doyle
Braley (IA)	Cole	Duckworth
Brooks (IN)	Connolly	Edwards
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Ellison
Brownley (CA)	Cook	Ellmers
Buchanan	Cooper	Engel
Bucshon	Costa	Enyart
Bustos	Courtney	Eshoo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2235

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

Stated against:
Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 318, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski

LoBiondo
Loeb
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neom
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Polis
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—19

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Heck (WA)
Horsford

Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2239

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

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

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 223, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

AYES—191

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
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
Gibson

NOES—223

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta

Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens

Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)

Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Rogers (KY)
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kieme
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Daines
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
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)

NOT VOTING—20

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Grijalva
Heck (WA)

Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)

□ 2242

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERLMUTTER
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) on which further proceedings

were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 238, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

AYES—177

Bass	Gabbard	Nolan
Beatty	Gallego	O'Rourke
Becerra	Garamendi	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Gibson	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Hanabusa	Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Polis
Bustos	Himes	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Quigley
Capps	Holt	Rahall
Capuano	Honda	Rangel
Cárdenas	Huffman	Richmond
Carney	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Ruiz
Cartwright	Jeffries	Rush
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Clay	Kennedy	Schneider
Cleaver	Kildee	Schrader
Clyburn	Kilmer	Schwartz
Cohen	Kind	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Kuster	Scott, David
Conyers	Langevin	Serrano
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Crowley	Levin	Sires
Cummings	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Speier
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Lowenthal
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Lowey
DeGette	Lynch	Maloney,
Delaney	Lynch	Carolyn
DeLauro	Maloney,	Carolyn
DelBene	Carolyn	Marky
Deutch	Marky	Matsui
Dingell	Matsui	McCollum
Doggett	McCollum	McDermott
Doyle	McDermott	McGovern
Duckworth	McGovern	McIntyre
Duncan (TN)	McIntyre	McNerney
Edwards	McNerney	Meeks
Ellison	Meeks	Meng
Engel	Meng	Michaud
Enyart	Michaud	Miller, George
Eshoo	Miller, George	Moore
Esty	Moore	Moran
Farr	Moran	Murphy (FL)
Fattah	Murphy (FL)	Nadler
Foster	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Fudge	Neal	Young (AK)

NOES—238

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Camp
Alexander	Black	Cantor
Amash	Blackburn	Capito
Amodei	Bonner	Carter
Andrews	Boustany	Cassidy
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Bachus	Bridenstine	Chaffetz
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Coble
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Coffman
Barrow (GA)	Broun (GA)	Cole
Barton	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Benishkek	Bucshon	Collins (NY)
Bentivolio	Burgess	Conaway
Bilirakis	Calvert	Cook

Cotton	Kingston	Ribble
Cramer	Kinzinger (IL)	Rice (SC)
Crawford	Kline	Rigell
Crenshaw	Labrador	Roby
Cuellar	LaMalfa	Roe (TN)
Culberson	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
Daines	Lance	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Rodney	Lankford	Rogers (MI)
Denham	Latham	Rohrabacher
Dent	Latta	Rokita
DeSantis	LoBiondo	Rooney
DesJarlais	Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Long	Roskam
Duffy	Lucas	Ross
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Rothfus
Ellmers	Lujan Grisham	Royce
Farenthold	(NM)	Runyan
Fincher	Luján, Ben Ray	Ruppersberger
Fitzpatrick	(NM)	Ryan (WI)
Fleischmann	Lummis	Sanchez, Loretta
Fleming	Maffei	Sanford
Flores	Maloney, Sean	Scalise
Forbes	Marchant	Schock
Fortenberry	Marino	Scott, Austin
Foxx	Massie	Smithus
Frelinghuysen	Matheson	Sensenbrenner
Gardner	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions
Garrett	McCaul	Shuster
Gerlach	McClintock	Simpson
Gibbs	McHenry	Slaughter
Gingrey (GA)	McKeon	Smith (MO)
Gohmert	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Goodlatte	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Gowdy	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Granger	Meadows	Southerland
Graves (GA)	Meehan	Stewart
Graves (MO)	Messer	Stivers
Green, Gene	Mica	Stockman
Griffin (AR)	Miller (FL)	Stutzman
Griffith (VA)	Miller (MI)	Swalwell (CA)
Grimm	Miller, Gary	Terry
Guthrie	Mullin	Thompson (PA)
Hall	Mulvaney	Thornberry
Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Tiberi
Harper	Neugebauer	Turner
Harris	Noem	Upton
Hartzler	Nugent	Valadao
Hastings (WA)	Nunes	Vela
Heck (NV)	Nunnelee	Wagner
Hensarling	Olson	Walberg
Herrera Beutler	Owens	Walden
Holding	Palazzo	Walorski
Hudson	Paulsen	Wasserman
Huelskamp	Pearce	Schultz
Huizenga (MI)	Perry	Weber (TX)
Hultgren	Peterson	Westrup
Hurt	Petri	Westmoreland
Issa	Pittenger	Whitfield
Jenkins	Pitts	Williams
Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	Wittman
Jones	Posey	Wolf
Jordan	Price (GA)	Womack
Joyce	Radel	Woodall
Kelly (PA)	Reed	Yoder
King (IA)	Reichert	Yoho
King (NY)	Renacci	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Barber	Hoyer	Schweikert
Campbell	Hunter	Shimkus
Franks (AZ)	Kirkpatrick	Sinema
Garcia	McCarthy (NY)	Webster (FL)
Gosar	Negrete McLeod	Young (FL)
Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	
Horsford	Salmon	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2246

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 242, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

AYES—174

Bass	Fudge	Neal
Beatty	Gabbard	Nolan
Becerra	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Bera (CA)	Gibson	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	Pascarell
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	Payne
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Bonamici	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Hahn	Peters (MI)
Brown (FL)	Hanabusa	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Pocan
Bustos	Heck (WA)	Polis
Butterfield	Higgins	Price (NC)
Capps	Himes	Quigley
Capuano	Hinojosa	Rahall
Cárdenas	Holt	Rangel
Carney	Honda	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Israel	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Rush
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Clay	Keating	Schiff
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Schneider
Clyburn	Kennedy	Schrader
Cohen	Kildee	Schwartz
Connolly	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Kind	Scott, David
Cooper	Kuster	Serrano
Costa	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Sires
Davis (CA)	Levin	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lewis	Speier
DeGette	Lipinski	Takano
Delaney	Loeb sack	Thompson (CA)
DelLauro	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lowey	Tierney
Deutch	Lynch	Titus
Dingell	Maloney,	Tonko
Doggett	Carolyn	Tsongas
Doyle	Marky	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Matsui	Vargas
Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Veasey
Edwards	McDermott	Velázquez
Ellison	McGovern	Visclosky
Engel	McNerney	Walz
Enyart	Meeks	Walters
Eshoo	Meng	Watt
Esty	Michaud	Waxman
Farr	Moore	Welch
Fattah	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	
Fudge	Napolitano	

NOES—242

Aderholt	Boustany	Coffman
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Cole
Amash	Bridenstine	Collins (GA)
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)
Andrews	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Bachmann	Broun (GA)	Cook
Bachus	Buchanan	Cotton
Barletta	Bucshon	Cramer
Barr	Burgess	Crawford
Barrow (GA)	Calvert	Crenshaw
Barton	Camp	Cuellar
Benishkek	Cantor	Culberson
Bentivolio	Capito	Daines
Bilirakis	Carter	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT)	Cassidy	Denham
Black	Chabot	Dent
Blackburn	Chaffetz	DeSantis
Bonner	Coble	DesJarlais

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 250, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

AYES—166

Bass	Frankel (FL)	Moran
Beatty	Fudge	Murphy (FL)
Becerra	Gabbard	Nadler
Bera (CA)	Gallego	Napolitano
Bishop (NY)	Garamendi	Neal
Blumenauer	Gibson	Nolan
Bonamici	Grayson	O'Rourke
Brady (PA)	Green, Al	Pallone
Bralley (IA)	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Brown (FL)	Grijalva	Payne
Brownley (CA)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Bustos	Hahn	Perlmutter
Butterfield	Hanabusa	Pingree (ME)
Capps	Hanna	Pocan
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Polis
Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	Price (NC)
Carney	Higgins	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Himes	Rahall
Cartwright	Hinojosa	Royal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Holt	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Honda	Rush
Chu	Huffman	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cicilline	Israel	Sarbanes
Clarke	Jackson Lee	Schakowsky
Clay	Jeffries	Schiff
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Schneider
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Schrader
Connolly	Keating	Schwartz
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Kennedy	Scott, David
Costa	Kildee	Serrano
Courtney	Kilmer	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Kind	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Kuster	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Sires
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Speier
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Takano
Delaney	Levin	Tierney
DeLauro	Lewis	Titus
DelBene	Lipinski	Tonko
Deutch	Loeb sack	Tsongas
Dingell	Lowenthal	Van Hollen
Doggett	Lowey	Vargas
Doyle	Lynch	Veasey
Duckworth	Maloney,	Vela
Edwards	Carolyn	Velázquez
Ellison	Markey	Visclosky
Engel	McCollum	Walz
Enyart	McDermott	Waters
Eshoo	McGovern	Watt
Esty	McNerney	Waxman
Farr	Meeke	Welch
Fattah	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Michaud	Yarmuth
Foster	Moore	

NOES—250

Aderholt	Capito	Fincher
Alexander	Carter	Fleischmann
Amash	Cassidy	Fleming
Amodei	Chabot	Flores
Andrews	Chaffetz	Forbes
Bachmann	Clyburn	Fortenberry
Bachus	Coble	Fox
Barletta	Coffman	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Cole	Gardner
Barrow (GA)	Collins (GA)	Garrett
Barton	Collins (NY)	Gerlach
Benishek	Conaway	Gibbs
Bentivolio	Cook	Gingrey (GA)
Bilirakis	Cotton	Gohmert
Bishop (GA)	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Crawford	Gowdy
Black	Crenshaw	Granger
Blackburn	Cuellar	Graves (GA)
Bonner	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Boustany	Daines	Griffin (AR)
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Griffith (VA)
Bridenstine	Denham	Grimm
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Guthrie
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Hall
Broun (GA)	DesJarlais	Harper
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Bucshon	Duffy	Hartzler
Burgess	Duncan (SC)	Hastings (WA)
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Heck (NV)
Camp	Ellmers	Hensarling
Cantor	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler

Holding	Meehan	Ruppersberger
Hudson	Messer	Ryan (OH)
Huelskamp	Mica	Ryan (WI)
Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Hultgren	Miller (MI)	Sanford
Hurt	Miller, Gary	Scalise
Issa	Miller, George	Schock
Jenkins	Mullin	Scott, Austin
Johnson (OH)	Mulvaney	Sensenbrenner
Johnson, Sam	Murphy (PA)	Sessions
Jones	Neugebauer	Shuster
Jordan	Noem	Simpson
Joyce	Nugent	Slaughter
Kaptur	Nunes	Smith (MO)
Kelly (PA)	Nunnelee	Smith (NE)
King (IA)	Olson	Smith (NJ)
King (NY)	Owens	Smith (TX)
Kingston	Palazzo	Southerland
Kinzinger (IL)	Paulsen	Stewart
Kline	Pearce	Stivers
Labadador	Perry	Stockman
LaMalfa	Peters (CA)	Stutzman
Lamborn	Peters (MI)	Swalwell (CA)
Lance	Peterson	Terry
Lankford	Petri	Thompson (CA)
Latham	Pittenger	Thompson (MS)
Latta	Pitts	Thompson (PA)
LoBiondo	Poe (TX)	Thornberry
Lofgren	Pompeo	Tiberi
Long	Posey	Tipton
Lucas	Price (GA)	Turner
Luetkemeyer	Radel	Upton
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Rangel	Valadao
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Reed	Wagner
Lummis	Reichert	Walberg
Maffei	Renacci	Walden
Maloney, Sean	Ribble	Walorski
Marchant	Rice (SC)	Wasserman
Marino	Richmond	Schultz
Massie	Rigell	Weber (TX)
Matheson	Roby	Wenstrup
Matsui	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Williams
McClintock	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (SC)
McHenry	Rohrabacher	Wittman
McIntyre	Rokita	Wolf
McKeon	Rooney	Womack
McKinley	Ros-Lehtinen	Woodall
McMorris	Roskam	Yoder
Rodgers	Ross	Yoho
Meadows	Rothfus	Young (AK)
	Royce	Young (IN)
	Runyan	

NOT VOTING—18

Barber	Hoyer	Salmon
Campbell	Hunter	Schweikert
Franks (AZ)	Kirkpatrick	Shimkus
Garcia	McCarthy (NY)	Sinema
Gosar	Negrete McLeod	Webster (FL)
Horsford	Pastor (AZ)	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2257

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 81, noes 325, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—81

Amodei	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Becerra	Heck (NV)	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Holt	Pascarell
Bishop (NY)	Honda	Payne
Bishop (UT)	Huffman	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Israel	Pocan
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Polis
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Chu	Jones	Ryan (OH)
Clarke	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Conyers	Levin	Scott, David
Crowley	Lewis	Serrano
DeFazio	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lofgren	Speier
Doggett	Lowenthal	Takano
Duckworth	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Tierney
Ellison	Engel	Titus
Engel	Enyart	Tonko
Eshoo	Eshoo	Tsongas
Foster	Foster	Vargas
Frankel (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Velázquez
Garamendi	Garamendi	Wasserman
Grayson	McDermott	Schultz
Grijalva	McGovern	Waters
	McKeon	Waxman

NOES—335

Crenshaw	Heck (WA)
Cuellar	Hensarling
Culberson	Herrera Beutler
Cummings	Higgins
Daines	Himes
Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Davis, Danny	Holding
Davis, Rodney	Hudson
Delaney	Huelskamp
DeLauro	Huizenga (MI)
DelBene	Hultgren
Denham	Hurt
Dent	Issa
Bentivolio	Jeffries
Bera (CA)	Jenkins
Bilirakis	Johnson (OH)
Black	Johnson, Sam
Blackburn	Jordan
Bonamici	Joyce
Bonner	Kaptur
Boustany	Keating
Brady (PA)	Duncan (SC)
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Bralley (IA)	Ellmers
Bridenstine	Esty
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold
Brooks (IN)	Farr
Broun (GA)	Fattah
Brown (FL)	Fincher
Brownley (CA)	Fitzpatrick
Buchanan	Fleischmann
Bucshon	Fleming
Burgess	Flores
Bustos	Forbes
Butterfield	Fortenberry
Calvert	Fox
Camp	Frelinghuysen
Cantor	Fudge
Capito	Gabbard
Capps	Gallego
Cárdenas	Gardner
Carney	Garrett
Carson (IN)	Gerlach
Carter	Gibbs
Cassidy	Gibson
Castor (FL)	Gingrey (GA)
Castro (TX)	Long
Chabot	Gohmert
Cicilline	Goodlatte
Clay	Gowdy
Cleaver	Granger
Clyburn	Graves (GA)
Coble	Graves (MO)
Coffman	Griffin (AR)
Cole	Griffith (VA)
Collins (GA)	Grimm
Collins (NY)	Guthrie
Conaway	Hall
Cook	Harper
Cooper	Harris
Costa	Hartzler
Cotton	Hastings (WA)
Courtney	Heck (NV)
Cramer	Hensarling
Crawford	Herrera Beutler

Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messner
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel

NOT VOTING—18

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Horsford

Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velasco
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

□ 2301

Messrs. DUNCAN of South Carolina and MORAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. LEE of California and Ms. CLARKE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 266, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]
AYES—150
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeke
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—266

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barietta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes

NOT VOTING—18

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Horsford

Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schwartz
Scott, Austin
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2304

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 273, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

AYES—143

Bass
Beatty
Becerra

Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)

Bralley (IA)	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell	Matheson	Posey	Smith (NJ)
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Payne	McCarthy (CA)	Price (GA)	Smith (TX)
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Pelosi	McCaul	Radel	Southerland
Butterfield	Himes	Perlmutter	McClintock	Rahall	Stewart
Capps	Holt	Pingree (ME)	McHenry	Reed	Stivers
Capuano	Honda	Pocan	McIntyre	Reichert	Stockman
Carney	Huffman	Polis	McKeon	Renacci	Stutzman
Carson (IN)	Hultgren	Price (NC)	McKinley	Ribble	Swalwell (CA)
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Quigley	McMorris	Rice (SC)	Terry
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Rangel	Rodgers	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard	McNerney	Rigell	Thompson (PA)
Ciilline	Johnson, E. B.	Rush	Meadows	Roby	Thornberry
Clarke	Jones	Sánchez, Linda T.	Meehan	Roe (TN)	Tiberi
Cleaver	Keating	Sarbanes	Meng	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky	Messer	Rogers (KY)	Tsongas
Connolly	Kennedy	Schiff	Mica	Rogers (MI)	Turner
Conyers	Kildee	Schneider	Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Upton
Cooper	Kind	Schrader	Miller (MI)	Rokita	Valadao
Crowley	Kuster	Schwartz	Miller, Gary	Rooney	Vela
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz	Miller, George	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)	Mullin	Roskam	Wagner
Davis, Danny	Lee (CA)	Scott, David	Mulvaney	Ross	Walberg
DeFazio	Levin	Serrano	Murphy (PA)	Rothfus	Walden
DeGette	Lewis	Shea-Porter	Neugebauer	Royce	Walorski
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sherman	Noem	Ruiz	Wasserman
DelBene	Loeb sack	Sires	Nugent	Runyan	Schultz
Deutch	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)	Nunes	Ruppersberger	Weber (TX)
Dingell	Lowe y	Speier	Nunnelee	Ryan (OH)	Wenstrup
Doggett	Maloney,	Takano	Olson	Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland
Duckworth	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)	Owens	Sanchez, Loretta	Whitfield
Edwards	Markey	Thompson (CA)	Palazzo	Sanford	Williams
Ellison	Matsui	Tierney	Paulsen	Scalise	Wittman (SC)
Engel	McCollum	Titus	Pearce	Schock	Wolf
Enyart	McDermott	Tonko	Perry	Schock	Womack
Eshoo	McGovern	Van Hollen	Peters (CA)	Scott, Austin	Woodall
Farr	McGovern	Vargas	Peters (MI)	Sensenbrenner	Yoder
Fattah	Meeks	Veasey	Peterson	Sessions	Yoho
Foster	Michaud	Velázquez	Petri	Sewell (AL)	Young (AK)
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Walz	Pittenger	Shuster	Young (IN)
Fudge	Moran	Waters	Pitts	Simpson	
Garamendi	Murphy (FL)	Watt	Poe (TX)	Slaughter	
Grayson	Nadler	Waxman	Pompeo	Smith (MO)	
Grijalva	Napolitano	Welch		Smith (NE)	
Gutiérrez	Neal	Wilson (FL)			
Hahn	Nolan	Yarmuth			
Hahn	O'Rourke				
Hanna	Pallone				

NOES—273

Aderholt	Crawford	Harris	Barber	Hoyer	Salmon
Alexander	Crenshaw	Hartzler	Campbell	Hunter	Schweikert
Amash	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)	Franks (AZ)	Kirkpatrick	Shimkus
Amodel	Culberson	Heck (NV)	Garcia	Kirkpatrick	Sinema
Andrews	Daines	Hensarling	Gosar	McCarthy (NY)	Webster (FL)
Bachmann	Davis, Rodney	Herrera Beutler	Horsford	Negrete McLeod	Young (FL)
Bachus	Delaney	Hinojosa		Pastor (AZ)	
Barletta	Denham	Holding			
Barr	Dent	Hudson			
Barrow (GA)	DeSantis	Huelskamp			
Barton	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)			
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Hurt			
Bentivolio	Doyle	Israel			
Bilirakis	Duffy	Issa			
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins			
Black	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)			
Blackburn	Ellmers	Johnson, Sam			
Bonner	Esty	Jordan			
Boustany	Farenthold	Joyce			
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Kaptur			
Bridenstine	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)			
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Kilmer			
Brooks (IN)	Fleming	King (IA)			
Broun (GA)	Flores	King (NY)			
Buchanan	Forbes	Kingston			
Buschon	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)			
Burgess	Fox	Kline			
Bustos	Frelinghuysen	Labrador			
Calvert	Gabbard	LaMalfa			
Camp	Gallego	Lamborn			
Cantor	Gardner	Lance			
Capito	Garrett	Langevin			
Cárdenas	Gerlach	Lankford			
Carter	Gibbs	Latham			
Cassidy	Gibson	Latta			
Castro (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo			
Chabot	Gohmert	Lofgren			
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	Long			
Clay	Gowdy	Lucas			
Clyburn	Granger	Luetkemeyer			
Coble	Graves (GA)	Lujan Grisham			
Coffman	Graves (MO)	(NM)			
Cole	Green, Al	Luján, Ben Ray			
Collins (GA)	Green, Gene	(NM)			
Collins (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Lummis			
Conaway	Griffith (VA)	Lynch			
Cook	Grimm	Maffei			
Costa	Guthrie	Maloney, Sean			
Cotton	Hall	Marchant			
Courtney	Hanabusa	Marino			
Cramer	Harper	Massie			

NOT VOTING—18

Barber	Hoyer	Salmon
Campbell	Hunter	Schweikert
Franks (AZ)	Kirkpatrick	Shimkus
Garcia	McCarthy (NY)	Sinema
Gosar	Negrete McLeod	Webster (FL)
Horsford	Pastor (AZ)	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2307

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$14,000,000)".

Page 30, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$16,546,000)".

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for the work they've done on this bill; but I especially want to thank the Appropriations Committee staff for helping me fine-tune this amendment very quickly at the last minute.

My amendment transfers \$60 million from the International Material Protection and Removal Activities within the Global Threat Reduction Initiative to a program that will help secure our nuclear materials here at home. This year's budget request included funding for a project to construct a security perimeter around the Nevada National

Security Site. Additionally, this funding was authorized by this House when we voted to pass H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act of 2014. However, the bill under consideration fails to provide funding for this critical project.

I agree that we must work with other nations to ensure their nuclear material does not fall into the wrong hands, and applaud the committee's efforts on this front. However, we should not neglect priorities to secure nuclear material on our own soil while providing \$20 million in excess of what was requested to help foreign countries secure their nuclear materials.

I'm simply requesting we transfer a relatively small sum—\$16 million out of a total \$2.1 billion—from a portion of the bill that provides funding to other countries to secure their nuclear materials and instead use that money to secure our own facilities containing nuclear materials. This funding will be used for the DAF/Argus project, which will provide a state-of-the-art perimeter intrusion detection and assessment system at the Nevada National Security Site's Device Assembly Facility.

As I mentioned, this project is a priority for the Nevada National Security Site and was included in the President's budget request and authorized by this House just last month. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which will prioritize national security concerns here at home while still providing adequate funding to ensure nuclear material in other countries does not fall into the hands of those who wish to do us harm.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in reluctant opposition to the gentleman's amendment and I salute, obviously, his desire to protect all of our nuclear sites. I certainly share the gentleman's concern for the security of nuclear weapons infrastructure.

The security incursion at Y-12 in Oak Ridge in July of 2012 revealed some disturbing problems with Federal oversight that directly impacted the effectiveness of the protective forces. In particular, a botched security upgrade project caused an excessive number of false alarms, which distracted the security forces. And poor maintenance practices meant the security cameras where the protesters entered the high-security area were not working.

There is also a second security upgrade project at Los Alamos that was installed incorrectly. The National Nuclear Security Administration is still working on getting that project back on track.

We need to be able to upgrade our security systems, but I have concerns that taking on a third project in 2014 will lead to more problems.

□ 2315

Our report has directed NNSA to wait a year before starting the project at Nevada. Given the problems, I feel this is the most prudent path forward and will give the administration some time to implement the reforms that are so urgently needed in security oversight and project management. So I must reluctantly oppose the amendment at this time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. While the amendment is a modest one in terms of the funding in the account, which is over \$400 million, I cannot support further cuts in this program.

The budget already has cut \$16 billion from the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, and that means nuclear material that exists globally in places that we know we need to remove it. So even though the gentleman's amendment is well intended, I think that we can't predict the consequences of this in terms of what we face globally to remove this material.

I think it's very important to recognize that there are some unfriendly actors on the face of this Earth. And we want to remove material as best as possible, working with others around the world, as the program indicates, to reduce global threats that might result from those who shouldn't have this material in the first place.

So I don't think that this is moving us in the right direction globally. I don't really think it's necessary. I thank the gentleman for bringing it to the attention of the body, but I think that nonproliferation in general is \$600 million below last year's activities when you compare it to past accounts.

So I think that this is not in the best interest of the country and not in the best interest of national security. So I oppose the gentleman's amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$13,072,000)".

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$13,072,000)".

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I'm offering an amendment that will reduce the funding level for the W76 by \$13 million, back down to what the agency requested.

The W76 is a 1970s-era submarine-launched ballistic missile that was first introduced into the stockpile by the Navy in 1978. This bill actually increases funding by \$13 million to increase funding levels above those required by the New START Treaty.

If the New START Treaty levels are in effect, it requires us to have 1,550 nuclear weapons—plenty to deter any nuclear threat, plenty to obliterate any enemy, plenty to end life on Earth as we know it. Even if we were to reduce our stockpile to 1,000 nuclear weapons, the Arms Control Association stated that it would save over \$39 billion. Now, this amendment doesn't even come close to going that far, but this puts that in perspective. If we reduced our number of nuclear weapons from 1,500, enough to obliterate any enemy and destroy life as we know it on Earth, to 1,000, enough to obliterate any enemy and end life as we know it on Earth, it would save \$39 billion. This amendment very simply reduces funding by \$13 million, back to what the agency itself requested. It doesn't detract from nuclear preparedness at all.

These missiles are a continuing relic of Cold War policies that spend billions of taxpayer dollars every year. And it's a great opportunity for Congress to save taxpayer money while maintaining our national security. In fact, the current bill actually spends millions more than the military needs, and passage of my amendment will encourage a focused, agile, lean military policy.

In fact, a total of \$1.8 billion is projected to be spent on W76 by 2016. That's a lot of money to support a very dated set of preparedness. My amendment makes a small dent in that by reducing the funding back to what the agency itself has requested.

When we have these kinds of opportunities to maintain our national security and create savings for our country and reduce our budget deficit, we need to take it.

Hans Kristensen of the Federation of American Scientists has argued that while the W76 is important for national security, we could "probably reduce the refurbishment production by half and still retain enough W76 warheads on the submarines for a credible retaliatory capability." Again, my amendment doesn't even come close to the marker that was set by Hans Kristensen. It simply returns funding to the level that the agency itself has asked for and reduces funding by \$13 million.

The GAO has been critical of the cost, schedule, and risk involved with the W76 program. It is an area that is ripe for a relatively minor cut like this, which will help reduce our budget deficit by \$13 million.

My amendment would create \$13 million in savings for taxpayers while

maintaining our national security. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

The primary goals of the extension program extends the life of the original warheads from 20 to 60 years, addresses the aging issues, and refurbishes the system in a managed fashion. However, all these goals are accomplished under the funding levels that have been requested by the agency. And yet here in Congress, we're second-guessing the agency's own funding requirements and saying let's give you more money, take a few million more, take a few million more—a few million more while we cut ARPA-E, a few million more while we cut science programs, a few million more while we shortcut our own Nation's renewable energy future. And yet here's a few million more, \$13 million more than an agency is even requesting, to maintain nuclear deterrents at the level of 1,550 nuclear weapons, and maintaining these particular W76 warheads from the 1970s, deployed by submarines, that we don't even need the \$13 million to accomplish.

So, again, I think this is some commonsense savings. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this smart cut, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The W76 life extension program is a critical ongoing program to extend the life of that warhead. This warhead supports the mission of our Navy's ballistic missile submarines, the most survivable leg of our nuclear deterrent.

Our nuclear deterrent posture relies heavily on this Navy mission, but the President's budget request proposed to cut production of the W76 by nearly 20 percent. I'm very concerned that these reductions to the W76 were proposed without fully explaining the force structure implications or the impacts to national security.

Therefore, this bill restores full funding for the W76 to the levels previously provided to the committee last year in the NNSA's last acquisition report. Even the Department of Energy's inspector general provided a report that stated that the National Nuclear Security Administration's plans to try to reduce costs of the ongoing W76 program would not be achieved. That IG concluded the NNSA would need additional funds above the request to stay on track with their production requirements. This bill resolves those funding problems by increasing funding \$13 million above the request.

I strongly oppose the gentleman's 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. POLIS).

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$2,100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Energy may make available from funds provided under this heading in this Act not more than \$48,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out domestic uranium enrichment research, development, and demonstration activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$48,000,000)".

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$48,000,000)".

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, at a time when the Federal Government is having to make tough, painful choices on how to prioritize taxpayer dollars, this Congress has yet to learn the lessons of the past as to where we waste the most money. In fact yet again this year, as in so many years past, the bill before us insists on throwing good money after bad. It's time to put an end to that wasteful habit.

This amendment would strike \$48 million from the Nuclear Nonproliferation account, which is an earmark for a bailout to a failing uranium enrichment company, the United States Enrichment Corporation, known as USEC. This \$48 million would be put towards deficit reduction.

Look, opponents of the amendment are going to claim that this money is necessary, vitally necessary, for national security when, in fact, that could not be further from the truth. In fact, the question of whether the United States Enrichment Corporation is truly necessary for our national security needs is actually being reviewed right now by the Government Accountability Office, which is expected to release a report on both the national security question as well as the economics of sending further taxpayer dollars to the United States Enrichment Corporation.

Because the report is pending, it is in the best interests of hard-earned taxpayer dollars that we suspend any further aid to USEC until we have more information as to what the company is

doing with the money that it is receiving.

Indeed, the United States Enrichment Corporation is so poorly run that, last May, the New York Stock Exchange threatened to delist USEC due to its desperate financial health. Articles over the years have documented USEC's financial woes, including the near-monthly collapse of its stock prices. During the June shareholders meeting just a few weeks ago, 80 percent of USEC's shareholders voted to approve a reverse stock split due to its rock-bottom share prices. It's shocking to most observers that the company has avoided bankruptcy thus far, and it's only done so because of the continued bailout by Congress year after year in the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

As if USEC's financial troubles were not enough, just last month the company filed a Federal lawsuit against the United States for more than \$38 million. This House is contemplating giving \$48 million to USEC; they've got a lawsuit for \$38 million.

Two decades ago, Congress created, by charter, the United States Enrichment Corporation, believing that USEC could better run the uranium enrichment facilities than the government itself. But by now, it should be intuitively obvious to the casual observer that Congress was wrong.

Since its inception, USEC has squandered billions of dollars in Federal bailouts, running its operations to near insolvency because of poor decisions. Yearly, they come to the Congress and the executive branch, hat in hand, begging for millions of dollars in bailouts to continue operation sites that are technologically out of date.

It is time that the Federal Government stop the endless bailouts to a failing enterprise.

Moreover, USEC has been a bad-faith actor in its negotiations with the uranium mining industry, which provides the needed raw materials to be enriched at these facilities. And what motivation does USEC have to negotiate in good faith with the miners when it knows that if it doesn't get everything it wants from the miners it can simply go to the Department of Energy and receive a handout, time and again, either in the form of a direct cash payment or in the form of spent uranium tails?

The Department of Energy has had a longstanding agreement with the uranium mining industry not to dump more than 10 percent of the market's worth of uranium in handouts to USEC at any given time. Yet it has become increasingly clear that the Department of Energy is willing to ignore that agreement and provide any bailout that USEC requests or desires.

This betrayal of the mining industry threatens thousands of jobs across the western United States—States like Texas, Nevada, New Mexico, Illinois, and Wyoming, to name a few. Arguments that USEC is the only facility that can supply tritium to the Depart-

ment of Defense ignores the plain language of the Washington Treaty and the U.S.-India Nuclear Agreement, known as the 123 Agreement.

□ 2330

The Department of Energy has in its possession enough highly enriched uranium and tritium to last for 15 years, costing hundreds of millions of dollars less than the continued bailouts that USEC is currently receiving from the country.

It is time that Congress stood up against the continual bailouts of a failed business model. Propping up one failed company at the expense of an entire industry is not how we should operate in Congress. Let's end the bailout, let's return the money to the Treasury, let's give the hardworking taxpayer a break. It is time we did the right thing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. This is the final year of funding to a project to construct a limited number of centrifuges in order to demonstrate this technology can provide a domestic capability for enriching uranium. This capability is needed to ensure adequate supplies of enriched uranium for our defense needs.

Domestically enriched uranium is needed to supply tritium for the nuclear weapons stockpile and will eventually be needed to fuel the nuclear reactors on board our submarines and aircraft carriers. Even though we have found a way to supply all our needs for the next few years, there is still no plan on how we will fulfill our defense requirements after the limited amount of fuel has been expended.

In every future scenario, we will ultimately need to make an investment to ensure unencumbered enriched uranium is available. There is no reason to cut off funding for a project that is showing progress.

The total cost of this project was originally estimated to cost \$300 million, but the project is proceeding extremely well, it remains on budget, and is on schedule for completion this December. Because of these and other expected cost savings from uranium transfers, the overall cost to the taxpayer has been reduced and could be reduced further.

The bill provides the Department with special reprogramming authority to fund the final \$48 million installment, instead of direct funding. Providing the Department with flexibility on how to fulfill its portion of the cost-sharing agreement could reduce the overall costs of the program if that same progress continues and the full funding amount is not ultimately needed.

This is a responsible approach that meets our defense needs while potentially saving taxpayer dollars.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

First of all, the American centrifuge project is the only source of domestic enriched uranium—the only source. I think that is important for us to understand America is fighting for its manufacturing future on many fronts, including this one.

One needs enriched uranium in order to make tritium. Tritium is essentially for our nuclear weapons complex and enriched uranium is necessary for commercial operations. This single facility is really important because our country is running out of what we would call “U.S. flag material,” material that can be used for these distinct purposes.

As Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN has said, this program is currently on schedule and within budget. That is in stark contrast to some of the other programs that we’ve been trying to get control of in our subcommittee.

While foreign-owned facilities exist, and there are some in this Chamber who represent those facilities, there is a true need for a domestic supplier. The program in question was proposed by the Department of Energy to meet crucial national security and non-proliferation needs, and DOE has certified completion of two of the five program technical milestones. There are remaining three and they, as the chairman has said, are scheduled for completion in December and are completely on track.

This is an important program, I would say an essential program, to our country. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend from Texas.

First and foremost, my opposition to this amendment is about national security. Since the 1940s, the United States has had a U.S.-owned and -operated uranium enrichment entity in place. This allows the U.S. to control its uranium stockpile, to be a signatory to nuclear weapons treaties, and make sure that we do not rely solely on foreign-owned companies for our uranium needs.

This amendment would put this streak of nearly 70 years in jeopardy if it were to pass and would leave the

U.S. without any domestic producer of enriched uranium.

Some will say that we can rely on a foreign-owned company in New Mexico to supply our uranium needs. First, the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of State have made it clear that we will never be able to rely on a foreign-owned company for our nuclear weapon triggers, to fuel our nuclear military fleet, or for any other national security purpose, period, end of story.

Even if we could rely on a foreign-owned company for these purposes, I have serious concerns about this company. This company in question is the former employer of AQ Khan, the man responsible for giving away nuclear secrets to North Korea, Iran, and Pakistan. The company did not have the controls in place to safeguard their secrets. As we now know, Pandora’s box was opened because of AQ Khan and the lack of oversight of this company.

How can we now consider giving them sole control of our country’s uranium enrichment process? This would put our national security at risk if we ever changed our laws to allow foreign-owned outsourcing of uranium enrichment.

Furthermore, if this amendment passes, it will likely cost the taxpayers billions more in the long-run. The United States Enrichment Corporation is a publicly-owned corporation that has invested and will invest billions of private sector money into developing new and improved enrichment technology. If USEC is not able to finish their research program and goes belly up, the Federal Government will be forced to start a new enrichment program from scratch and spend hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars to start up its own uranium enrichment program.

So we can either spend \$40 million plus now and leverage billions of dollars of private investment, or we can be here a year from now appropriating billions of dollars more. I will take \$40 million today over billions of dollars tomorrow any day.

In addition, the taxpayer is protected from failure of this research program. The Department of Energy is both the owner of the intellectual property of the centrifuge machines and even of the machines themselves. DOE will be able to recoup any taxpayer money that goes into the project. But make no mistake: if this project is stopped, DOE will have to spend billions more of taxpayer money to get the project up to scale as opposed to billions of dollars coming from the private sector.

Finally, this amendment, if passed, would be a jobs killer. The American Centrifuge Project currently employs over 1,000 people in multiple States. Furthermore, the project utilizes over 160 American supplier companies in at least 28 States. All of that would go away if this amendment were to pass.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that a similar amendment was

offered last year on the Energy and Water appropriations bill with my friend from Texas and the new Senator from Massachusetts, ED MARKEY. It was easily defeated because of all of these very same reasons. Nothing has changed in the last year.

I urge all of my colleagues to again defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I join with the chairman and ranking member, a fellow Ohioan, in opposition to this amendment.

I strongly oppose the gentleman from Texas’ amendment, as it would seriously undermine our national security.

Specifically, this amendment would strike a provision providing the Department of Energy with the authority to use existing funds for domestic uranium enrichment technology development. Let me emphasize that there is no direct funding in the bill for the project. The provision simply provides the authority to transfer existing funds from other Department of Energy programs.

In the last Congress, as we have previously spoken, the Congress beat two amendments that were offered that were similar, both with strong opposition to these amendments.

According to the National Nuclear Security Administration, in the near future, the United States will need a fully domestic source of unrestricted enriched uranium, based on domestically-developed technology, to support the nuclear weapons program and Navy nuclear reactors program.

The United States is prohibited from seeking this material internationally. Regardless of the agreements, the United States must never rely on foreign companies for such a critical component of our nuclear deterrent. Simply stated, we need U.S.-owned domestic supply of enriched uranium, and the use of a foreign supplied material would violate these long-standing policies and agreements.

This has been defeated twice before, and this is really simple. It has been defeated because this is a critical component of our nuclear deterrent. Do we want to depend on foreign or do we want to have a domestic source? Congress has twice said it would be crazy to jeopardize our nuclear deterrent and rely on foreign sources. Congress should again for the third time defeat this amendment because we need to rely on domestic in protecting the United States nuclear deterrent.

I urge my colleagues to once again oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This funding, which supports our Nation's domestic uranium enrichment capabilities, is vital for our national security and our energy security and independence. The RD&D program, located in Piketon, Ohio, is the cornerstone for a domestic source of enriched uranium.

American Centrifuge is necessary to support our national defense program needs, including supporting tritium production requirements for the U.S. nuclear stockpile. USEC has received no bailouts. It is inaccurate and misleading to use this politically-charged term in connection with an important national and energy security technology. I strongly believe that American Centrifuge is too important to our Nation's national and energy security to abandon now.

It is vital that the United States maintain a domestic technology to provide enriched uranium for national security purposes.

We must have a U.S.-owned domestic supply of enriched uranium. With the closure of the 1950s-era Paducah enrichment plant, American Centrifuge is the only available technology to meet the Nation's future national security needs for enriched uranium.

Thankfully, we don't have to rely on foreign sources. The RD&D program is within budget and on schedule for completion by December 2013. This funding is not an earmark, as it was included in the budget request and there is no direct funding in the bill for the project. The provision simply provides the authority to transfer existing funds from other DOE programs.

The Burgess amendment would remove the final piece of funding needed to complete the RD&D program, shutting down operations and essentially wasting the \$200 million that has already been spent.

I urge you to support domestic uranium enrichment technology and oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 6, strike the colon and all that follows through "activities" on line 11.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, this is a continuation of the previous amendment. I was advised by the Parliamen-

tarian it had to be split into two parts. So not to belabor the issue because of the lateness of the hour, the first amendment that was just voted on will remove the funding. This removes the language from the bill, the words "provided that the Secretary of Energy may make available from funds provided under this heading in this act not more than \$48 million for the purposes of carrying out domestic and uranium enrichment research development and demonstration activities."

It is apparently necessary to remove that language as a separate amendment. It could not be included in a single amendment. So this is a continuation of the discussion that we just had.

Recognizing the lateness of the hour, I will yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2345

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Following the doctor's lead, for the reasons I opposed this amendment the last time, I oppose this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, the committee has done a considerable amount of work on one of the very expensive facilities we have in the nuclear arena. This is the MOX facility in South Carolina.

In the current report language, the committee deals with the problem that this facility has. It's over budget, isn't going anywhere, will ultimately produce a product that nobody wants. So what I'm trying to do with this amendment is to take this thing one step further in order to try to find a solution to this very, very expensive problem. If I might just quote the committee's report here:

Despite the influx of additional funding, the NNSA has been unable to recover its

schedule and is now facing another \$2.8 billion in additional costs. Instead of its fulfilling its responsibility to address these rising costs through reforming its management of the project and conducting an independent cost estimate to quantify these cost increases, the NNSA wrote "TBD"—which I suspect means "to be determined"—in its budget justification and removed all project funding from its 5-year plan while it carries out a strategic pause.

This program is in deep trouble, and it is a hole into which the U.S. taxpayers continue to pour money. I am pleased that the committee is taking steps, but I'd like the bill to take an additional step, and that's what this amendment does. Let me explain what it is all about.

Technically, the bill takes \$1 million from the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation and reinserts the same amount into that account. This is done in order to avoid a point of order. The legislative intent of the amendment is therefore to remove the \$1 million from the funding from the MOX facility at the Savannah River site and then direct the NNSA to instead use these funds for:

One, an independent report to analyze the potential cost-effective alternatives for plutonium disposition, including a detailed assessment of technologically feasible costs; and, two, a study examining whether there are other potential uses for the facilities already built and for the Savannah River site more generally.

While not legally binding, the Agency should comply with this legislative intent if this amendment is adopted.

The amendment is consistent with an amendment that I offered earlier with regard to the NDAA, and the language would be similar. I would urge the adoption of this. We really need to try to figure out the very best way to deal with this sinkhole of taxpayer money.

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

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

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

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

Our bill supports the most responsible path forward for dealing with this ongoing and troubled project.

The National Nuclear Security Administration has stated it is conducting a strategic pause to pursue other alternatives to the MOX plant in light of what are very large cost increases. However, it has not provided any information on what new alternatives are available which have not already been exhaustively considered. While there are considerable and valid concerns about the project's management and cost growth, the United States must fulfill its end of the plutonium disposition agreement, and more delays will only raise costs.

It is time for the Department of Energy to fix these issues and to get back

on track with meeting its commitments. There is no value in prolonging this study into fiscal year 2014.

I urge Members to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Let me just say that I normally agree with the gentleman from California on many issues. On this particular one, we will part company, but I certainly appreciate his commitment.

In the report, we state that we provide no additional funding to continue studying the alternatives to the MOX plant and that the NNSA has not described any alternatives which have not already been exhaustively considered or which are likely to resolve in any substantial cost savings to justify this pause, particularly with no permanent nuclear waste repository available after the Department's decision to unilaterally terminate Yucca Mountain.

So there are reasons for the MOX facility. We have made an enormous investment in it, and thousands of jobs are at stake. I am very sorry that we have to part company on this, but I have the highest respect for you and your work.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I appreciate the respect. You and the chairman have made a very good argument for my amendment, and I thank you for that.

My amendment doesn't do anything that you're not already trying to do. It simply gives some more specific direction to the Department, specifically to seek outside analysis of the alternatives that might be available.

Clearly, the Department has not been successful in running this project, and they are not in the process of seeking outside help. They're going to try to do it inside. I think that would be a mistake. There are people out there—there are companies and there are actually researchers outside—who could provide that outside view of what's going on.

Secondly, there are other ways of dealing with this problem. This is an aqueous process that's being used there, and it simply isn't working. There are other ways of disposing of the plutonium and of the highly enriched uranium that are proven to work—I discussed this earlier this day—and we need to study whether that can be used at this facility. We're not talking about jobs. We are actually talking about making this facility work and possibly using a different technology, but we really need to have somebody outside take a look at this whole thing.

Both you and the ranking member and the chair have adequately explained why my language should be adopted. I thank you for the committee's looking at this thing in a very hard, structured way. It has to be dealt with.

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL REACTORS

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for naval reactors activities to carry out the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition (by purchase, condemnation, construction, or otherwise) of real property, plant, and capital equipment, facilities, and facility expansion, \$1,109,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$43,212,000 shall be available until September 30, 2015, for program direction.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator in the National Nuclear Security Administration, including official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$12,000, \$382,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 46, line 15 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed one sport utility vehicle, three lube trucks, and one fire truck for replacement only, \$4,750,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$280,784,000 shall be available until September 30, 2015, for program direction.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses, necessary for atomic energy defense, other defense activities, and classified activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$830,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$122,734,000 shall be available until September 30, 2015 for program direction.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93-454, are approved for con-

struction of, or participating in the construction of, a high voltage line from Bonneville's high voltage system to the service areas of requirements customers located within Bonneville's service area in southern Idaho, southern Montana, and western Wyoming; and such line may extend to, and interconnect in, the Pacific Northwest with lines between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest, and for John Day Re-programming and Construction, the Columbia River Basin White Sturgeon Hatchery, and Kelt Reconditioning and Reproductive Success Evaluation Research, and, in addition, for official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$5,000: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2014, no new direct loan obligations may be made.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, including transmission wheeling and ancillary services, pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, and including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500, \$7,750,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, up to \$7,750,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southeastern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$78,081,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500 in carrying out section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the Southwestern Power Administration, \$45,456,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), up to \$33,564,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southwestern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014

appropriation estimated at not more than \$11,892,000: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$42,000,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That, for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7152), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500; \$299,919,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$292,019,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), and section 1 of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1939 (43 U.S.C. 392a), up to \$203,989,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Western Area Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation estimated at not more than \$95,930,000, of which \$88,030,000 is derived from the Reclamation Fund: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$230,738,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

For operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams, \$5,330,671, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund of the Western Area Power Administration, as provided in section 2 of the Act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of that Act and of 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$4,910,671 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services from the Falcon and Amistad Dams shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the hydroelectric facilities of these Dams and associated Western Area Power Administration activities: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received

during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation estimated at not more than \$420,000: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2014, the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration may accept up to \$865,000 in funds contributed by United States power customers of the Falcon and Amistad Dams for deposit into the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund, and such funds shall be available for the purpose for which contributed in like manner as if said sums had been specifically appropriated for such purpose: *Provided further*, That any such funds shall be available without further appropriation and without fiscal year limitation for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission for the sole purpose of operating, maintaining, repairing, rehabilitating, replacing, or upgrading the hydroelectric facilities at these Dams in accordance with agreements reached between the Administrator, Commissioner, and the power customers.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$3,000, \$304,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$304,600,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 2014 shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this account, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 2014 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 301. (a) No appropriation, funds, or authority made available by this title for the Department of Energy shall be used to initiate or resume any program, project, or activity or to prepare or initiate Requests For Proposals or similar arrangements (including Requests for Quotations, Requests for Information, and Funding Opportunity Announcements) for a program, project, or activity if the program, project, or activity has not been funded by Congress.

(b)(1) Unless the Secretary of Energy notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 3 full business days in advance, none of the funds made available in this title may be used to—

(A) make a grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling \$1,000,000 or more;

(B) make a discretionary contract award or Other Transaction Agreement totaling in excess of \$1,000,000, including a contract covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation;

(C) issue a letter of intent to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B); or

(D) announce publicly the intention to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the first business day of each quarter a report detailing each grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling less than \$1,000,000 provided during the previous quarter.

(3) The notification required by paragraph (1) and the report required by paragraph (2) shall include the recipient of the award, the amount of the award, the fiscal year for which the funds for the award were appropriated, the account and program, project, or activity from which the funds are being drawn, the title of the award, and a brief description of the activity for which the award is made.

(c) The Department of Energy may not, with respect to any program, project, or activity that uses budget authority made available in this title under the heading "Department of Energy—Energy Programs", enter into a multiyear contract, award a multiyear grant, or enter into a multiyear cooperative agreement unless—

(1) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award; or

(2) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement includes a clause conditioning the Federal Government's obligation on the availability of future year budget authority and the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 3 days in advance.

(d) Except as provided in subsections (e), (f), and (g), the amounts made available by this title shall be expended as authorized by law for the programs, projects, and activities specified in the "Bill" column in the "Department of Energy" table or the text included under the heading "Title III—Department of Energy" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act.

(e) The amounts made available by this title may be reprogrammed for any program, project, or activity, and the Department shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 30 days prior to the use of any proposed reprogramming which would cause any program, project, or activity funding level to increase or decrease by more than \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, during the time period covered by this Act.

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

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

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

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

(g)(1) The Secretary of Energy may waive any requirement or restriction in this section that applies to the use of funds made available for the Department of Energy if compliance with such requirement or restriction would pose a substantial risk to human health, the environment, welfare, or national security.

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of any waiver under paragraph (1) as soon as practicable, but not later than 3 days after

the date of the activity to which a requirement or restriction would otherwise have applied. Such notice shall include an explanation of the substantial risk under paragraph (1) that permitted such waiver.

SEC. 302. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be available to the same appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Available balances may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 303. Funds appropriated by this or any other Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2014 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 304. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for the construction of facilities classified as high-hazard nuclear facilities under 10 CFR Part 830 unless independent oversight is conducted by the Office of Health, Safety, and Security to ensure the project is in compliance with nuclear safety requirements.

SEC. 305. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to approve critical decision-2 or critical decision-3 under Department of Energy Order 413.3B, or any successive departmental guidance, for construction projects where the total project cost exceeds \$100,000,000, until a separate independent cost estimate has been developed for the project for that critical decision.

SEC. 306. Section 20320 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007, Public Law 109-289, division B, as amended by the Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007, Public Law 110-5, is amended by striking in subsection (c) "an annual review" after "conduct" and inserting in lieu thereof "a review every three years".

SEC. 307. None of the funds made available by this or any subsequent Act for fiscal year 2014 or any fiscal year hereafter may be used to pay the salaries of Department of Energy employees to carry out the amendments made by section 407 of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

SEC. 308. Notwithstanding section 307 of Public Law 111-85, of the funds made available by the Department of Energy for activities at Government-owned, contractor-operated laboratories funded in this or any subsequent Energy and Water Development appropriation Act for any fiscal year, the Secretary may authorize a specific amount, not to exceed 4.5 percent of such funds, to be used by such laboratories for laboratory directed research and development.

SEC. 309. Notwithstanding section 301(c) of this Act, none of the funds made available under the heading "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science" may be used for a multiyear contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement of \$1,500,000 or less unless the contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award.

SEC. 310. Not later than June 30, 2014, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a tritium and enriched uranium management plan that provides—

(a) an assessment of the national security demand for tritium and low and highly enriched uranium through 2060;

(b) a description of the Department of Energy's plan to provide adequate amounts of

tritium and enriched uranium for national security purposes through 2060; and

(c) an analysis of planned and alternative technologies which are available to meet the supply needs for tritium and enriched uranium for national security purposes, including weapons dismantlement and down-blending.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that section of the bill? Hearing none, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 311. (a) The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than December 1, 2013, a report which provides an analysis of alternatives for each major warhead refurbishment program that reaches Phase 6.3, including—

(1) A summary of the overall cost, scope, and schedule planning assumptions for the major refurbishment activity;

(2) A full description of alternatives considered prior to the award of Phase 6.3;

(3) A comparison of the costs and benefits of each of those alternatives, to include an analysis of trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives against each alternative considered;

(4) An assessment of the risks, costs, and scheduling needs for each military requirement established by the Department of Defense and/or any requirement established to enhance safety, security, or maintainability;

(5) Identification of the cost and risk of critical technology elements associated with each refurbishment alternative, including technology maturity, integration risk, manufacturing feasibility, and demonstration needs; and

(6) Identification of the cost and risk of capital asset and infrastructure capabilities required to support production and certification of each refurbishment alternative.

(b) The Secretary of Energy or the Secretary's designee shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that—

(1) No less than three feasible and distinct alternatives are considered prior to the award of milestone Phase 6.3 for any major warhead refurbishment program; and

(2) Appropriate trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives have been made to ensure that the program is affordable when considering the per unit cost and the total acquisition cost in the context of the total resources available during the period covered by the most recent stockpile stewardship and management plan and the future-years nuclear security plan submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made.

(c) In this section, the term "major warhead refurbishment program" includes all nuclear weapons life extension programs, alterations, and modifications carried out for the life cycle management of the nuclear weapons stockpile, and all non-routine nuclear weapons stockpile activities that are estimated to cost over \$1,000,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, beginning on line 16, amend section 311 to read as follows:

SEC. 311. The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees (as defined in 10 U.S.C. 101(a)(16)) not later than December 1, 2013, a report that provides an analysis of alternatives for each major warhead refurbishment program that reaches Phase 6.3, including—

(1) a summary of the overall cost, scope, and schedule planning assumptions for the major refurbishment activity;

(2) a full description of alternatives considered prior to the award of Phase 6.3;

(3) a comparison of the costs and benefits of each of those alternatives, to include an analysis of trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives against each alternative considered;

(4) an assessment of the risks, costs, and scheduling needs for each military requirement established by the Department of Defense or any requirement established to enhance safety, security, or maintainability;

(5) identification of the cost and risk of critical technology elements associated with each refurbishment alternative, including technology maturity, integration risk, manufacturing feasibility, and demonstration needs; and

(6) identification of the cost and risk of capital asset and infrastructure capabilities required to support production and certification of each refurbishment alternative.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a noncontroversial amendment, worked out jointly with the minority and the authorizing committees.

It would amend the existing section 311 to require only the report on analysis of alternatives for major weapons programs to be submitted to both the authorizers and appropriators. This is a change requested by the authorizers, and I am happy to be able to include it. I ask that this amendment be supported.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. We have no objection to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, notwithstanding 40 U.S.C. 14704, and for necessary expenses for the Federal Co-Chairman and the Alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission, for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$70,317,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100-456, section 1441, \$29,915,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading,

\$850,000 shall be made available to procure Inspector General services from the Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Delta Regional Authority and to carry out its activities, as authorized by the Delta Regional Authority Act of 2000, notwithstanding sections 382C(b)(2), 382F(d), 382M, and 382N of said Act, \$11,319,000, to remain available until expended.

DENALI COMMISSION

For expenses of the Denali Commission including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment as necessary and other expenses, \$7,396,000, to remain available until expended, notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 306(g) of the Denali Commission Act of 1998: *Provided*, That funds shall be available for construction projects in an amount not to exceed 80 percent of total project cost for distressed communities, as defined by section 307 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (division C, title III, Public Law 105-277), as amended by section 701 of appendix D, title VII, Public Law 106-113 (113 Stat. 1501A-280), and an amount not to exceed 50 percent for non-distressed communities.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Northern Border Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, \$1,355,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be available for administrative expenses, notwithstanding section 15751(b) of title 40, United States Code.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 59, line 9 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

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

SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, \$250,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, including official representation expenses (not to exceed \$25,000), \$1,043,937,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated herein, not more than \$9,500,000 may be made available for salaries, travel, and other support costs for the Office of the Commission, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which, notwithstanding section 201(a)(2)(c) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 584(a)(2)(c)), the use and expenditure shall only be approved by a majority vote of the Commission: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$920,721,000 in fiscal year 2014 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: *Pro-*

vided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2014 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation estimated at not more than \$123,216,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be for university research and development in areas relevant to their respective organization's mission, and \$5,000,000 shall be for a Nuclear Science and Engineering Grant Program that will support multiyear projects that do not align with programmatic missions but are critical to maintaining the discipline of nuclear science and engineering.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$11,105,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$9,994,000 in fiscal year 2014 shall be retained and be available until September 30, 2015, for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2014 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation estimated at not more than \$1,111,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100-203, section 5051, \$3,400,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR
ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION
PROJECTS

For necessary expenses for the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act, \$1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That any fees, charges, or commissions received pursuant to section 106(h) of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (15 U.S.C. 720d(h)) in fiscal year 2014 in excess of \$2,402,000 shall not be available for obligation until appropriated in a subsequent Act of Congress.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—INDEPENDENT
AGENCIES

SEC. 401. The Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission may not terminate any program, project, or activity without a majority vote of the Commissioners of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission approving such action.

SEC. 402. The Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 1 day after the Chairman begins performing functions under the authority of section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1980, or after a member of the Commission who was delegated emergency functions under subsection (b) of that section begins performing those functions. Such notification shall include an explanation of the circumstances warranting the exercise of such authority. The Chairman shall report to the Committees, not less frequently than once each week, on the actions taken by the Chairman, or a delegated member of the Commission, under such authority, until the authority is relinquished. The Chairman shall notify the Committees not later than 1

day after such authority is relinquished. The Chairman shall submit the report required by section 3(d) of the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1980 to the Committees not later than 1 day after it was submitted to the Commission.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS AND RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913.

SEC. 502. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to eliminate or reduce funding for a program, project, or activity as proposed in a President's budget request for a fiscal year until such proposed change is subsequently enacted in an appropriations Act, or unless such change is made pursuant to the reprogramming and transfer provisions of this Act.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 504. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 505. (a) None of the funds made available in title III of this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriation Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(b) None of the funds made available for any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may be transferred to accounts funded in title III of this Act, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriation Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committees on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(c) The head of any relevant department or agency funded in this Act utilizing any

transfer authority shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a semi-annual report detailing the transfer authorities, except for any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality, used in the previous 6 months and in the year-to-date. This report shall include the amounts transferred and the purposes for which they were transferred, and shall not replace or modify existing notification requirements for each authority.

SEC. 506. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994 ("Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations").

SEC. 507. None of the funds made available under this Act may be expended for any new hire by any Federal agency funded in this Act that is not verified through the E-Verify Program as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note).

SEC. 508. (a) Of the unobligated balances available from prior year appropriations for the following accounts, the following amounts are hereby permanently rescinded:

(1) Under the heading "Corps of Engineers—Civil—Department of the Army", \$200,000,000, to be derived by the Secretary of the Army from funds made available for "Construction, General", "Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee", "General Investigations", "Construction", "Investigations", and "Mississippi River and Tributaries".

(2) "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy", \$157,000,000.

(3) "Department of Energy—Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities", \$142,000,000.

(4) "Department of Energy—Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation", \$20,000,000.

(b) No amounts may be rescinded under this section from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to this section?

Hearing none, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 509. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to conduct closure of adjudicatory functions, technical review, or support activities associated with the Yucca Mountain geologic repository license application, or for actions that irrevocably remove the possibility that Yucca Mountain may be a repository option in the future.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, lines 10 through 16, strike section 509.

Ms. TITUS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to ask my colleagues to join me in protecting the fiduciary interests of the American taxpayer and in preserving the safety of my constituents in southern Nevada as well as of all of those who live along the proposed route for Yucca Mountain waste.

My amendment would remove misguided language included in this bill that injects politics into a very serious and consequential debate surrounding the issue of nuclear waste disposal. This amendment would simply strike the language included in this bill that tries to restart the failed Yucca Mountain project by prohibiting the DOE from moving forward with plans to close Yucca Mountain and develop proposals for its alternative use.

When the Department of Energy made the correct decision to put an end to the misguided Yucca Mountain project in 2010, they did so after decades of debate with nothing to show for it except for \$15 billion wasted and a big hole in the ground. According to the Government Accountability Office, had the project been completed, it would have cost more than \$80 billion. Those figures don't even take into account the cost of transporting 75,000 metric tons of highly radioactive nuclear waste thousands of miles across the country, through nearly every State in the Union.

Now, this waste wouldn't just magically appear in Nevada. It would travel through many of your congressional districts—through backyards all across the country, near schools, homes, parks, and businesses—nor does this enormous cost figure account for the significant security expenditures required to protect the contents of Yucca Mountain from those seeking to cause our Nation harm.

Mr. Chairman, if a nun with a pair of bolt cutters were able to break into one of the most secure nuclear facilities in the world, how can we ever expect to protect all of the Nation's waste in just one location?

Let's not forget that Yucca Mountain is less than 100 miles from one of the Nation's largest cities that hosts more than 40 million visitors a year.

In January of 2012, the Department of Energy's bipartisan Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future, led by former Congressman and 9/11 Commission Vice Chairman Lee Hamilton and former National Security Advisor Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft stated in its final report: "The need for a new strategy is urgent."

The key concept here is "new," but, instead, this bill tries to turn back the clock, back to an old, flawed strategy. It's Groundhog Day here in the United States House of Representatives.

On the subject of Yucca, Congressman Hamilton stated: "Nuclear waste storage at Yucca Mountain is not an option."

General Scowcroft said the Commission will "look forward, not back."

It appears that that message didn't make it all the way up the steps of the Capitol and that some Members of Congress have not gotten the message that Yucca is dead.

□ 0000

We cannot continue to throw good money after bad ideas and go down the same failed path that Congress put us on when politics targeted the people of Nevada in the development of the Yucca Mountain project decades ago.

Although I don't agree with everything that's included in the bill, I applaud the bipartisan group of Senators who have introduced legislation to enact the recommendations of the Commission and have an actual debate that doesn't target communities like Nevada.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment. It's time to have a serious debate over the safe disposal of the Nation's nuclear waste and develop an alternative plan that doesn't throw away billions of taxpayer dollars, endanger citizen safety, or threaten economic development projects in southern Nevada.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The House has repeatedly had overwhelming votes in support of continuing the Yucca Mountain Repository. The language that this amendment would strike, we have been carrying for years as a way to keep the will of the House alive, and the American people support what we're doing.

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

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

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 510. The Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a comprehensive report compiled in conjunction with the Government Accountability Office that details updated missions, goals, strategies, and priorities,

and performance metrics that are measurable, repeatable, and directly linked to requests for funding.

SEC. 511. It is the sense of the Congress that the Congress should not pass any legislation that authorizes spending cuts that would increase poverty in the United States.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 512. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a medical mandated recovery.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending the memorial service in Arizona for the Prescott Fire Department's Granite Mountain Hotshots.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 793. An act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes, Committee on Financial Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, July 10, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2195. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 657. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to improve the management of grazing leases and permits, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-145 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 819. A bill to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-145 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 292. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness (Rept. 113-147). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 657 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NUNNELEE (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 2628. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to United States Route 78 in Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2629. A bill to provide an exemption for low-revenue companies from certain SEC regulations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2630. A bill to require a report from the Comptroller General of the United States regarding implementation of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2631. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to criminalize unlawful presence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 2632. A bill to amend section 399Z-1 of the Public Health Service Act to extend for 5 years the authorization of appropriations for operational grants under the school-based health centers program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 2633. A bill to require the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Sesquicentennial Anniversary of the adoption of the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which officially marked the abolition of slavery in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2634. A bill to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. BONNER):

H.R. 2635. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Hank Aaron, in recognition of his contributions to the national pastime of baseball and his perseverance in overcoming discrimination and adversity to become a role model for all Americans; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2636. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Hudson River Valley, New York; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENISHEK (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. CAMP):

H. Res. 290. A resolution recognizing the centennial of Camp Grayling Joint Maneuver Training Center in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. DESANTIS):

H. Res. 291. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Republic of Argentina's membership in the G20 should be conditioned on its adherence to international norms of economic relations and commitment to the rule of law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H. Res. 293. A resolution expressing support for designation of August 2013 as "Blue Star Mothers of America Month"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H. Res. 294. A resolution congratulating the Miami Heat for winning the 2013 National Basketball Association Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.