



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2013

No. 98

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 10, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK AMODEI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### END THE SEQUESTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, beginning this week, literally hundreds of thousands of civilian workers are being furloughed at defense installations in Maryland's Fifth District, across the State, and around the country. That means as of Monday, more than 650,000 hardworking, middle class defense employees are being forced to take a 20 percent pay cut for the remainder of the fiscal year.

It isn't because they are not doing their job well; they are.

It isn't because they don't have enough work; they do.

And it isn't because we don't need their talents, their experience, and their dedication to service; we need them more now than ever.

These employees are being furloughed because Congress has failed. Congress has failed to achieve deficit reduction in a balanced and responsible way. In fact, we passed a budget through the House of Representatives; the United States Senate has passed a budget. But the House of Representatives, Republican leadership, refuses to go to conference, refuses to follow regular order for which they've called so frequently, refuses to try to bring a compromise agreement back to this floor. This Congress has failed to achieve deficit reduction in a balanced and responsible way.

Instead, we now have the sequester—a senseless, stupid, irrational policy. It's a real shame, Mr. Speaker, that partisan politics is keeping some of our country's best and brightest from doing their jobs supporting our warfighters as they serve in Afghanistan and around the world.

Last Tuesday, I met with some of the outstanding men and women who work in civilian defense jobs at Pax River Naval Air Station in my district. When you go to Pax River, you often see uniformed and civilian personnel sitting side by side, working to accomplish the same mission, serving with the same dedication, partners in making our government stronger and making our defense stronger, each complementing the work of the other.

Now, as a result of these furloughs, one of them will get a 20 percent pay cut. One of them will be told to go home. One of them will be told you can't even volunteer to come back and get the job done. And the other will get one day a week of having to carry out the mission alone.

At that meeting, I heard from members of the Pax River community who

are deeply concerned about the effects of these furloughs on our military readiness, our ongoing missions, on Department morale, and on the local economy. They were concerned about themselves, but they were mainly concerned about the job that was going to be left undone, finished late, undermining our security. One person scheduled to be furloughed this Friday told me:

I have a strong work ethic, and I want to get the job done, whether it's late nights and weekends. And I'm worried someone will come to me on a Thursday and I'll have to say, I can't get the job done until Monday.

Because, Mr. Speaker, we are telling that person you can't come to work.

Another employee who was there last Tuesday emailed me afterward about the upcoming furlough writing:

There are many people in this organization who stretch themselves day after day, happily, to get the work done that needs to get done to support the Department of Defense and the warfighter.

I will tell you, and so many Members on both sides of the aisle have met these folks, not these specific folks perhaps at Pax, but around this country who are dedicated, patriotic, hardworking, and want to make sure that their country is strong and that we serve our people.

This one constituent continues:

"I've already started to see some of these same people giving less of themselves because they feel our Congressmen," that's meaning all of us, "and our country no longer put value in what they do."

We are undermining the morale of the American workers. We are undermining the ability of the American Government to be as effective with respect to national defense as it needs to be.

Mr. Speaker, this sequester is harming morale and may lead skilled employees to leave for the private sector just when we need them most.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4313

The effects of the sequester extend beyond the gates of our installations and affect entire communities with local businesses standing to lose as a result of belt tightening by families experiencing furloughs.

At the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Indian Head, also in Maryland's Fifth Congressional District, 97 percent of civilian personnel will be furloughed. That's more than 1,870 people.

Mr. Speaker, there's no reason why our civilian defense workers should be kept from doing their job just because Congress hasn't done its job. As long as the sequester remains in effect, and as long as Republicans refuse to compromise on a balanced approach to deficits that can end it, I'll keep coming to this floor and remind them exactly what is at stake. And I continue to call on Speaker BOEHNER to end the unnecessary delay in appointing budget conferees, which would be a significant step toward beginning negotiations in earnest that could lead to a big and balanced compromise on deficits.

We need to bring deficits down. We need to get our country on a fiscally sustainable path, but we need to do so in a rational way which does not undermine our national security, does not undermine the services being rendered to the people who are relying on them, and that does not send a message to our employees and those whom we need to recruit in the future that we are a good employer, we're a caring employer, we're an effective employer, and you ought to work for us, you ought to work for your country, for your fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we need to go to conference. We need to get rid of the sequester. We need to put America on a rational path to fiscal responsibility and effectiveness.

#### BENGHAZI MATTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, Benghazi matters, and the American people deserve answers.

On the evening of September 11, 2012, terrorist factions successfully attacked America in Benghazi, Libya, when they torched our consulate and killed four Americans. Early in the morning the following day, they attacked our annex.

Secretary Clinton's response to the American people was that these attacks were in response to a video posted on the Internet. The following Sunday, on September 16, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Susan Rice repeated Secretary Clinton's assertion on five separate television talk shows.

Today is July 10, 2013, and we now know that without question these attacks were strategically planned and had no relation to Secretary Clinton or Ambassador Rice's initial assertions. The investigation into our failure to

protect those four Americans who were killed, our consulate, our annex, and the administration's abysmal explanation for informing the American public must continue.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Clinton appeared before a Senate hearing and was asked about certain facts surrounding the attack. She replied: What difference does it make?

I suggest that Secretary Clinton may want to consult with the survivors of the four Americans who were slain and ask them what difference does it make. I take umbrage with her response, and I think it was done in a rather uncaring and very impersonal way.

Investigating this scandal is our duty and obligation as representatives of the American people and protectors of the public trust. To date, congressional hearings have raised far more questions than answers. We have to look no further than the testimony of Mr. Gregory Hicks before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Mr. Hicks is the former Deputy Chief of Mission in Libya, and his testimony is replete with contradictions from what Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice and others have told the American public. The matter, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, smacks of a coverup. We must continue to pursue and develop answers and explanations as to what happened so we will ultimately know what really did occur on that fateful night and ensuing days.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, Benghazi matters, and we must continue thoroughly to examine this until the truth ultimately surfaces. It matters, and the American public, Americans taxpayers, here, there, and yonder, deserve a final resolution to this episode. I suggest that we continue to keep our eye on the ball, otherwise this is going to disappear into the wind and that would be inexcusable.

#### CALL TO ACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's call to action on climate change is another reminder of the large and growing threat posed by the warming of our atmosphere. Yet instead of taking a leading role to address the problem, Congress has been held hostage by those who would deny the science altogether. Every day that we delay, we are losing ground in the race to develop new sources of energy that can protect the planet and break the grip of our dependence on fossil fuels.

This past year was one of the most extreme years for our Nation's weather. It was the warmest year on record for the U.S.; and droughts, wildfires, and floods were far more frequent and far more intense. In fact, nine of the 10 hottest years since 1880 have been in the past decade.

In 2012, 9.3 million acres of land across the country burned in wildfires,

more than double the annual average, and the second highest ever. Rainfall was far below the average, and it was one of the driest years in memory. Droughts, heat waves, and wildfires are now the norm rather than the exception.

The extreme weather was also a significant drag on our economy: Superstorm Sandy cost \$65 billion; western wildfires cost over \$1 billion; and losses from drought cost \$30 billion. Greenhouse gases emitted as a result of human activity are the biggest drivers of climate change. That is a fact that is accepted by virtually every scientist around the world.

We're only beginning to understand the impact of a global temperature rise on a nation's long-term environmental health and the health of the world; but with each new report by NASA, by the U.N., by universities here and overseas, we see that the threat grows and the possibility that we can avoid catastrophe and catastrophic consequences in the future recedes.

Some in this body have questioned the science, noting that droughts, floods, and climatic variations have been observed for centuries, often recalling Noah and his ark; but the speed and magnitude of the changes we are witnessing are consistent with scientific modeling of the effects of human activity on the climate. We must act now.

First, we have to diversify our energy sources. Instead of tax breaks for Big Oil, we should be investing in the development of new and renewable energy sources.

Second, we must work to reduce our emissions. Power plants are the single largest source of emissions in the U.S., accounting for roughly 40 percent of all domestic greenhouse gases, and the EPA must put in place Federal standards that will regulate both new and existing power plants.

Third, we must build a 21st-century transportation infrastructure and system that will support a growing economy and population. This means we need to invest in mass transit systems, and car makers must continue to improve fuel economy standards.

□ 1015

And fourth, we need to work with the international community, not against it, as many in this body have tried to do. America must take a leadership role. We need the cooperation of China and India, but we should not let their foot-dragging prevent us from taking actions that will protect our future.

President Obama took an important step in exerting American leadership on climate change when he called for action at the Federal level to curb carbon pollution, just as we limit our toxic chemicals, like mercury, sulfur, and arsenic. The President also wants to allow wind and solar energy companies to use government-owned land to generate more power.

These are good ideas, but a major effort on climate change depends on congressional action, and so far we have

allowed this important issue, one that will affect our children and grandchildren, to become a partisan wedge issue.

This country did not become great by ignoring problems or wishing them away. We did not become great by mocking scientists and those who would rely on cold, hard facts or, in this case, long, hot, endless summers. And we did not become great by ceding leadership in new technologies and new markets to our competitors, like China.

The time to address climate change is now.

#### IN DEFENSE OF LEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, America is a Nation of immigrants. We're all either immigrants ourselves or were the sons and daughters of immigrants. America's motto is "E pluribus unum"—"From many, one." From many nations we've created one great Nation, the American Nation.

There's only one way to accomplish this remarkable feat, and that's through the process of assimilation. Unlike other nations, our immigration laws were not written to keep people out. They were written to assure that those who come here demonstrate a sincere desire to become Americans, to acquire a common language, a common culture, and a common appreciation of American constitutional principles and American legal traditions.

Illegal immigration undermines that process of legal immigration that makes our Nation of immigrants possible. If we allow illegal immigration, then legal immigration becomes pointless, the process of assimilation that our immigration laws assure breaks down, and the bonds of allegiance that hold a country like ours together begin to dissolve.

As a recent article by John Fonte of the National Review points out, earlier immigration bills included a provision calling for "patriotic integration of prospective citizens into the American way of life by providing civics, history, and English . . . with a special emphasis on attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, the heroes of American history, and the meaning of the Oath of Allegiance."

But the director of immigration policy for La Raza objected to this language, writing that "while it doesn't overtly mention assimilation, it's very strong on the patriotism and traditional American values language in a way which is potentially dangerous to our communities."

Well, that language is pointedly missing from the Senate measure, suggesting a purpose fundamentally different from past immigration laws. It

raises the question of why groups supporting this bill find the mention of assimilation objectionable and consider patriotism and traditional American values not only disagreeable but, in their word, "dangerous."

Now, to those who say that we need a path to citizenship, I must point out we already have such a path that is followed by millions of legal immigrants who have obeyed all of our laws, who have respected our Nation's sovereignty, who've done everything our country's asked of them to do, including waiting patiently in line, and are now watching millions of illegal immigrants try and cut in line in front of them.

The 1986 Immigration Reform Act promised a balanced approach that combined legalization of the 3 million illegal immigrants then in the country with promises of employer sanctions and tougher border security. As we all know, legalization occurred instantly, but the promises of enforcement were first ignored and, later, actively resisted by the Presidents who followed.

The current administration, for all its rhetoric, has unlawfully suspended enforcement of our existing immigration laws and actively obstructed States from assisting in their enforcement. If this administration will not enforce our existing law, why should anyone believe its promises to enforce even stricter laws in the future?

Now, a common tactic of those on the left is to blur the distinction between legal and illegal immigration and to paint those in opposition to amnesty as "anti-immigrant." This is simply dishonest.

Legal immigration is the very essence of our country. It sets us apart from every other nation in the world, the fact that citizenship is open to all who evince a sincere desire to understand, adopt, and revere those uniquely American principles enshrined in our Declaration of Independence and animated by our American Constitution.

They do so by the thousands, every day, by obeying our immigration laws, renouncing foreign loyalties, and embracing American principles. By doing so, as Lincoln said, they become the "blood of the blood and the flesh of the flesh of the men who wrote that Declaration."

Illegal immigration destroys all of that, and any measure that encourages more of it, by granting special privileges to those who defy our immigration laws, is a direct affront to every legal immigrant who has become an American, and it is a direct challenge to the process of immigration that built our Nation.

To those illegal immigrants who seek citizenship out of a sincere desire to become Americans, I ask only that they respect our laws, and I invite them to begin the process of legal immigration that's already available to them and that's been followed by the millions who've come before them.

#### RURAL HUNGER IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, nearly every week that this House has been in session this year, I've come to the floor to talk about the need to end hunger now. Fourteen speeches later, I still hear from some of my colleagues who doubt that hunger is a problem in the 21st century here in this country, the richest, most prosperous Nation in the world.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that anyone who doubts that we have a hunger problem in America has a chance to read the article by Eli Saslow in Sunday's Washington Post, titled, "Driving Away Hunger," subtitled, "In Rural Tennessee, a New Way to Help Hungry Children, A Bus Turned Bread Truck."

Mr. Speaker, this is a heartwrenching story of hunger, where children of all ages have trouble getting enough food in the summer months in rural Tennessee. It breaks your heart.

The article may focus on a small area in rural Tennessee, but it really tells the story about the 50 million hungry Americans in this country, and more specifically, the 17 million kids who are hungry in this country.

And the blame shouldn't be cast on these poor Americans who are doing their best to make ends meet. Consider the Laghren family portrayed in this article. Jennifer, a mother of five, works full-time as a cook at a nursing home. Yet her kids don't have enough to eat because Jennifer only makes \$8 an hour.

SNAP helps during the school year when kids get to eat two meals a day at school. Combined, these five kids, ranging from 14 years old to 9 months old, ate a total of 40 free meals and snacks at school every week, but there's very little help during the summer months when school is out of session.

While the \$593 food stamp allotment lasted throughout the month during the school year, Jennifer only had \$73 in food stamps left, with 17 days to go in the month that she was interviewed for this article in The Washington Post.

And if that weren't enough to convince people about this ugly side of hunger, consider this heartbreaking paragraph from the article.

Desperation had become their permanent state, defining each of their lives in different ways. For Courtney, it meant that she had stayed rail thin, with hand-me-down jeans that fell low on her hips. For Taylor, 14, it meant stockpiling calories whenever food was available, ingesting enough processed sugar and salt to bring on a doctor's lecture about obesity and the early onset of diabetes, the most common risks of a food stamp diet. For Anthony, 9, it meant moving out of the trailer and usually living at his grandparents' farm. For Hannah, 7, it meant her report card had been sent home with a handwritten note of the teacher's concerns, one of

which read, “Easily distracted by other people eating.” For Sarah, the 9-month-old baby, it meant sometimes being fed Mountain Dew out of the can after she finished her formula, a dose of caffeine that kept her up at night.

Mr. Speaker, this is all taking place in rural Tennessee. That’s right, Mr. Speaker. Hunger doesn’t just exist in urban areas. According to USDA statistics, rural areas are poorer than urban areas. And according to the latest USDA data, households in rural areas were more likely to be food insecure. While 14.9 percent of all households were food insecure in 2011, 15.4 percent of households in rural areas were food insecure.

And let’s look at the SNAP statistics. While 16 percent of all Americans live in nonmetropolitan areas, 21 percent of SNAP beneficiaries live there. Ten percent of the rural population relies on SNAP, compared to 7 percent of the urban population. Children under 18 make up 25 percent of the rural population, but they are 40 percent of the rural population using SNAP.

These statistics show empirically that hunger is a problem in rural America. Sunday’s article paints a terrible and disturbing picture about hunger in rural America. And together, they show why we must commit ourselves to end hunger now.

That’s why it is so disturbing to me that so many of my Republican friends seem hell-bent on cutting huge amounts from the SNAP program, literally throwing millions of Americans off the program. It shows a stunning ignorance of current reality, and it shows a callousness that, quite frankly, is beneath this institution.

During the recent debate on the farm bill, I had heard a number of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle demean the poor in this country and diminish their struggle. I heard rhetoric from some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle characterizing these Americans who are struggling in poverty in inappropriate and demeaning ways. It was offensive, some of the rhetoric that was spouted here on this floor.

I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to reject any assault on the SNAP program.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to end hunger now, but we must take it. We need some leadership. We need leadership in this House, but we also need leadership from the White House in order to get this done. We need the White House to host a conference on food and nutrition. We need the President to bring the best and brightest minds from any and every corner of this Nation together, lock them in a room, and direct them to come up with a plan. It is not hard.

We need the political will to end hunger now. This issue needs to be more of a priority.

#### RIISING STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID stated, “If we do nothing, student loan rates go to 6.8 percent,” as reported by Politico.

In case the Leader forgot, interest rates doubled to 6.8 percent last week. The House acted to prevent it. The Senate did not.

Today, The Washington Post Editorial Board writes:

The Senate is set to consider on Wednesday the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act in what could be the Chamber’s only reaction to the recent doubling of a low student loan interest rate . . . lawmakers should reject this pathetic nonresolution.

The editorial continues:

With the President and the House in near alignment on the student loan issue, the Senate has no excuse to fail. Mr. Obama should press Democrats hard and work with Republicans to strike a deal, not to vote for dead-end policy.

Unfortunately, rather than solve problems, the Senate is wasting the American people’s time and moving forward with another dead-end policy, what today’s Post refers to as another “campaign gimmick.”

The people deserve better. Our students deserve better in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has no excuse.

#### IT’S TIME TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE’S WASHINGTON FOOTBALL FRANCHISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, it’s time that the National Football League and the NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell face the reality that the continued use of the word “redskin” is unacceptable. It is a racist, derogatory term and patently offensive to Native Americans.

The Native American community has spent millions of dollars over the past two decades trying earnestly to fight the racism that is perpetuated by this slur.

□ 1030

The fact that the NFL and Commissioner Goodell continue to deny this is a shameful testament of the mistreatment of Native Americans for so many years. It is quite obvious that once the American public understands why the word “redskins” is so offensive, they’ll know that the word should never be used again.

The origin of the term “redskins” is commonly attributed to the historical practice of trading Native American

Indian scalps and body parts as bounties and trophies. For example, in 1749, the British bounty on the Mi’kmaq Nation of what is now Maine and Nova Scotia was a straightforward “10 Guineas for every Indian Mi’kmaq taken or killed, to be paid upon producing such savage taken or his scalp.”

Just as devastating was the Phips Proclamation, issued in 1755 by Spencer Phips, lieutenant governor and commander in chief of the Massachusetts Bay Province, who called for the wholesale extermination of the Penobscot Indian Nation. By vote of the General Court of the Province, settlers were paid out of the public treasury for killing and scalping the Penobscot people. The bounty for a male Penobscot Indian above the age of 12 years was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for the males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds, while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. These scalps, Mr. Speaker, were called “redskins.”

The question is quite simple. Suppose that that redskin scalp that was bought for payment was the scalp of your mother, the scalp of your wife, the scalp of your daughter, the scalp of your father, the scalp of your husband, or of your son. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, Native Americans are human beings, not animals.

The current chairman and chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared in a joint statement that “redskins” is “not just a racial slur or derogatory term” but a painful “reminder of one of the most gruesome acts of ethnic cleansing ever committed against the Penobscot people.” The hunting and killing of Penobscot Indians, as stated by Chief Francis, was “a most despicable and disgraceful act of genocide.”

Recently, myself and nine Members of Congress explained the violent history and disparaging nature of the term “redskins” in a letter to Mr. Dan Snyder, owner of the Washington football franchise. Similar letters were sent to Mr. Frederick Smith, president and CEO of FedEx, a key sponsor of the franchise, and Mr. Roger Goodell, commissioner of the National Football League. As of today, Mr. Snyder has not yet responded. Mr. Smith ignored our letter as well, opting instead to have a staff member cite contractual obligations as FedEx’s reason for its silence on the subject.

Mr. Goodell, however, in a dismissive manner, declared that the team’s name “is a unifying force that stands for strength, courage, pride, and respect.” Give me a break, Mr. Speaker. In other words, the National Football League is telling everyone—Native Americans included—that they cannot be offended because the NFL means no offense. Essentially, Mr. Goodell attempts to wash away the stain from a history of persecution against Native American people by spreading twisted and false information concerning the use of the

word “redskins” by one of the NFL’s richest franchises. It is absolute absurdity.

Mr. Goodell’s response is indicative of the Washington football franchise’s own racist and bigoted beginnings. The team’s founder, George Preston Marshall, is identified by historians as the driving force behind the effort to prevent African Americans from playing in the NFL. And once African Americans were allowed to play in 1946, Marshall was the last club owner to field an African American player—a move he reluctantly made some 14 years later in 1962. It should be noted that Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy presented Marshall with an ultimatum—unless Marshall signed an African American player, the government would revoke his franchise’s 30-year lease on the use of the D.C. Stadium.

Congressman TOM COLE, the Representative from Oklahoma, Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Caucus, and a member of the Chickasaw Nation, states: “This is the 21st century. This is the capital of political correctness on the planet. It is very, very, very offensive. This isn’t like warriors or chiefs. It’s not a term of respect, and it’s needlessly offensive to a large part of our population. They just don’t happen to live around Washington, DC.”

Congresswoman BETTY MCCOLLUM, the Representative from Minnesota and Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Caucus, states that Mr. Goodell’s letter “is another attempt to justify a racial slur on behalf of [Mr.] Dan Snyder,” owner of the Washington franchise, “and other NFL owners who appear to be only concerned with earning ever larger profits, even if it means exploiting a racist stereotype of Native Americans. For the head of a multi-billion dollar sports league to embrace the twisted logic that [r]edskin’ actually ‘stands for strength, courage, pride, and respect’ is a statement of absurdity.”

Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the Representative from the District of Columbia, states that Mr. Snyder “is a man who has shown sensibilities based on his own ethnic identity, [yet] who refuses to recognize the sensibilities of American Indians.”

Recently, in an interview with USA Today Newspaper, Mr. Snyder defiantly stated, “We’ll never change the name. It’s that simple. NEVER—you can use caps.” Mr. Snyder’s statement is totally inconsistent with the NFL’s diversity policy.

Let me be clear on this—I love and respect Mr. Snyder’s people. They gave to mankind the Torah, the Bible, the Koran—the prophets like Adam, Methuselah, Enoch, Moses, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—and yes, and even our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

But I also want to remind Mr. Snyder that six million of his people were gassed, tortured, murdered, and even

skinned by the Nazis to make lamp shades and other forms of horrifying experimentations. Time will not allow me to elaborate further. But let me be clear—I would be among the first to defend Mr. Snyder and his people against racial intolerance. All I ask is for Mr. Snyder to do the same for our Native Americans.

Despite the Native American community’s best efforts before administrative agencies and the courts, the term “redskins” remains a federally registered trademark. It has been well over twenty years and this matter is still before the courts. This injustice is the result of negligence and a cavalier attitude demonstrated by a federal agency charged with the responsibility of not allowing racist or derogatory terms to be registered as trademarks. Since the Federal Government made the mistake in registering the disparaging trademark, it is now up to Congress to correct it.

#### REAL JUSTICE AND MILITARY JUSTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Today, I’d like to highlight two very important topics: real justice and military justice. As a recent case of sexual abuse illustrates, they are far from one in the same.

Last fall, Lieutenant Colonel James Wilkerson was convicted of sexual assault by a military jury. The assault took place in Wilkerson’s own home, as his wife and child slept upstairs. The all-male jury—four colonels and one lieutenant colonel—was unanimous in their ruling: guilty. Wilkerson was sentenced to 1 year in prison, a less than honorable discharge, and a loss of benefits. Three months later, General Craig Franklin, a three-star general who had originally called for the court-martial, overturned the punishment. General Franklin has no legal training. Wilkerson was free and clear and reinstated on Active Duty.

Now, that’s quite a reversal, you’d say. There must have been some iron-clad, watertight, slam-dunk evidence for a general to negate a jury of five officers, right? Some silver-bullet testimony? Sorry, no. In this case, the reasoning for the general’s stunning intervention was “character.” The general simply felt that Wilkerson was a “dotting father and husband.” You know, a family man.

Okay, you say. Maybe the general considered solid evidence that calls the entire night into question. Sorry, no. It turns out General Franklin relied on evidence that was ruled inadmissible in court. Evidence like letters of support from Wilkerson’s wingmen, who had his back. On the other hand, he ignored the results of a polygraph test that Wilkerson had failed.

Wait a minute, you say. Maybe this one terrible act was an isolated incident, horrible as it was. Sorry, no. Ear-

lier this month, the Air Force acknowledged that Wilkerson had previously fathered a child through an extramarital affair. Adultery is a crime in the military, but only inside a 5-year statute of limitation. This crime from 8 years ago is no longer punishable. And it was kept quiet by the Air Force. Why? Because they say the Privacy Act prevented the disclosure of those actions without Wilkerson’s permission. Can you believe that?

Those are the facts of the case. Currently, Wilkerson is slated to receive full military benefits, including a pension and health care, for life. And this is what military justice currently looks like. If the Uniform Code of Military Justice allows for such negligence and obstruction, then the Code is more than just outdated and ineffective; it’s broken. It’s damaging the military itself.

It’s also obvious to any legal expert that General Franklin was out of his depth and overmatched in this situation. Is he a lawyer? No, he’s not a lawyer. But you keep these proceedings in the chain of command and you get bias. You get a travesty. You get no justice at all.

Today, I’m demanding real justice. The Air Force needs to redeem itself. I call on the Air Force to convene an involuntary discharge board. For Wilkerson’s gross misconduct, the Secretary of the Air Force should also do a grade determination and assess whether Wilkerson should be demoted to his rank at the time of his first offense. I’ve sent a letter to the Secretary demanding these actions. Twenty-five of my colleagues in the House have joined me and signed the letter.

We’ve heard repeatedly how bad this problem is. There are 26,000 cases of sexual assault a year. A tiny fraction of those are reported. It’s rare that a case like the Wilkerson one ever gets to this stage. And when it does, look what happens. Zero tolerance evaporates and becomes zero accountability. Victims suffer all over again. The military continues to look inept, incompetent, arrogant, and unjust to everyone but to themselves.

In the meantime, we are left to describe this ongoing problem in any number of ways: a plague, a cancer, or simply a national embarrassment. Should we even consider this type of justice—this sham of military justice—worthy of our country and our values? I say “no.” I believe the American people would say a resounding “no” as well.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 38 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all to whom the authority of government is given. We pray that Your spirit of reconciliation and peace, of goodwill and understanding, will prevail on the hearts and in the lives of us all.

Encourage the Members of this House, O God, to use their abilities and talents in ways that bring righteousness to this Nation and to all people. Ever remind them of the needs of the poor, the homeless or forgotten, and those who live without freedom or liberty.

May Your spirit live with them and with each of us, and may Your grace surround us and those we love, that, in all things, we may be the people You would have us be in service to this great Nation.

May all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. GABBARD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### OBAMACARE

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today unable to understand why we stand by and watch as our country's future is threatened. It seems as though each week delivers a new disastrous element to the train wreck that is in ObamaCare.

Now that that implementation of ObamaCare's employer mandate has been delayed, more uncertainty has been created among business owners.

Mr. President, you cannot bargain with America's economy in hopes that your political philosophy succeeds.

I find it ironic that the President has now conveniently chosen to listen to the American people, when business owners like myself have been screaming for years. This administration is struggling to prove the merits of ObamaCare it initially advertised and now resorts to excuses. Delay after delay proves ObamaCare is unsustainable.

The bill was passed. We now finally know what's in the bill. Now it's time to repeal it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

#### STOP THE STUDENT LOAN RATE HIKE

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. My, my, my, Mr. Speaker.

Jade Andrushka is a Palm Beach State College student with big dreams and a small bank account. Her mother is a hospice social worker, has solely supported Jade while paying back her own student loans for over 20 years so that she and her daughter could have a better life.

Well, Mr. Speaker, July 1 has come and gone, and the Federal student loan rates have doubled, making college more expensive for millions of American families, including Jade and her mom, who now face two generations of loans.

Mr. Speaker, it takes a simple fix by Congress to do the right thing, reverse this excessive rate hike, and clear the path to one of the most important pathways to American prosperity—a college education.

My, my, my, Mr. Speaker. Can't we all work together to get this done?

#### GAS AND GROCERIES

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, when I go to the grocery store at home on Saturday mornings, I talk to Hoosier moms and dads concerned with high prices at the pump and the checkout line.

According to reports last month, gas prices in the five Midwestern States ranked in the top nine States nationally, with some folks in Indiana, motorists, paying \$4 per gallon.

A Starke County constituent wrote to me on the Fourth of July and said he canceled his holiday plans because he needed to save money for a tank of gas. He wondered what is Congress doing about it.

How can we help hardworking Americans keep more money in their wallets and pay less for gas and groceries?

The House passed two bills to address high energy prices, to create more jobs, and move our country closer toward energy independence. I supported these commonsense measures for single parents, for families, college students, senior citizens struggling to make ends meet during these tough economic times.

I urge the Senate and the President to join the House and pass this legislation to open more offshore areas for the development of natural resources.

A trip to the grocery store or a stop at the gas station should not be breaking the bank of Americans. Let's show the American people Congress can work together on basic solutions to make their daily lives a bit easier.

#### SO MUCH LEFT UNDONE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, so much left undone.

Our students are crying out. Maybe they're saying, "Mercy."

To avoid this 6.8 percent increase in their rates, putting hundreds of thousands of dollars in debt on our college students, Congress must act immediately, and we must push and drive those who believe our students are not important.

Undone. The high unemployment of youth. In our meeting with the President yesterday, I mentioned the idea that we must construct a program that deals with underemployed or unemployed youth, particularly those high numbers in our minority community.

And then, of course, the prevention of youth violence, gun violence, that is a crucial issue for all of us. The Congressional Black Caucus will be working extensively with the President to help drive legislation that will pass reasonable gun violence prevention legislation but, more importantly as well, keep our young people alive, keep them

in school, and, yes, keep them studying, understanding and preventing gun violence from making them a victim.

This Congress must act now and end sequestration to make sure that America is treated well by this Nation.

#### OBAMACARE COSTS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the true cost of the Affordable Care Act is being revealed day by day. We knew from the beginning that the law was double counting more than \$716 billion in cuts to Medicare to pay for the new entitlements. Another \$115 billion in implementation costs were left off the books. Then we saw the \$70 billion in projected revenues evaporate as the long-term care insurance plan was proven to be unsustainable and abandoned.

Now the President is telling us he needs more than double the anticipated amount to pay out the law's subsidies. Could this be because the administration will use the honor system to determine eligibility for subsidies, with no verification procedures in passing out subsidies?

Maybe we should use the honor system more often. We could trust that everyone paid their taxes. That would save us all money we spend on IRS agents.

We could trust that industries aren't polluting. That would save a lot of money we spend on the EPA.

Reagan used to say, "Trust, but verify." The byword for this administration is "Trust, and hope you aren't being defrauded."

#### COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, last month, the Senate passed historic comprehensive immigration reform, and now is the time for the House to act.

It is because of our family values that we cannot wait another year, another month, or another day to finally fix our broken immigration system. We must pass a bill that keeps families together, and we must do the right thing, the humane thing, and bring 11 million immigrants out of the shadows and into society. We must ensure that all who want to call this country home have a fair and reasonable road map to do so.

I urge the Republican leadership not to choose the partisan path. Instead, we should come together and pass bipartisan comprehensive legislation that will fix our immigration system and finally revitalize the American Dream.

The time to act is now.

#### CELEBRATING LUDINGTON PUMPED STORAGE PLANT'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate something. I'd like to take a moment to recognize a major milestone for the Ludington Pumped Storage unit that was built in Michigan's Second District four decades ago and continues to be a great success today.

Construction of the project, as the locals call it, began in 1969 and was completed in 1973 on the shores of Lake Michigan, south of Ludington. Today, employees back there are celebrating the plant's 40th anniversary.

The Ludington Pumped Storage Plant was the largest pumped storage hydroelectric facility in the world when it was constructed. It is 842 acres and is 2½ miles long and holds 27 billion gallons of water. There are six generating units at the plant that can produce enough electricity to power a city of 1.4 million residents.

This plant is an example of successful co-ownership between Consumers Energy and Detroit Edison, DTE Energy. By displacing higher costs, Ludington Pumped Storage Plant saves consumers and DTE customers millions of dollars each year.

What makes the plant's 40 employees most proud are the national awards that they've been earning for safe operation of the plant, however.

The future looks bright for the project. There is an \$800 million investment that's being made on behalf of the customers from both utilities to overhaul and upgrade the plant to improve efficiency, and we just want to congratulate this plant today as it works to fit into our all-of-the-above energy plan.

#### SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, after President Obama's historic announcement of his climate action plan 2 weeks ago, we returned home to our congressional districts for a week, and some of us saw record-high temperatures and drought. Others witnessed unseasonably heavy rainfall and tidal flooding. And yet this week we return to a House that's heading in the wrong direction.

The Energy and Commerce Committee is debating a bill that would give the Department of Energy veto authority over EPA's public health rules. The Energy and Minerals Subcommittee spent yesterday in a hearing on the wonders of subsidized coal production.

Fighting climate change is the biggest imperative of our time. The stakes are high, and ignoring it will not make the problem go away.

President Obama's plan is a step in the right direction, and I'm encouraged that EPA is moving quickly on meaningful standards for power plants. Strong power plant standards are an imperative if we're going to avert the worst impacts of climate change.

We've got a lot of work to do, Mr. Speaker, and it's time to get this House headed in the right direction on climate policy.

#### HONORING DUSTIN DEFORD

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dustin Deford, a 24-year-old Montana native who was among the 19 Hotshot firefighters who recently died while battling a wildfire in Arizona.

The son of Reverend Steve and Celeste Deford, Dustin grew up in the small town of Ekalaka, Montana, where he was well known for his joyful spirit as well as his deep faith in Christ.

Dustin also had a passion for community service at an early age. In fact, he volunteered for the Carter County Rural Fire Department as soon as he turned 18 and continued working as a county firefighter every summer from 2007 until this year, when he earned a position on the Granite Mountain Hotshots in Arizona.

Cindy and I join all the people of Montana in mourning the loss of Dustin and all the brave firefighters who lost their lives on June 30. We are keeping Dustin's family and loved ones in our thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

□ 1215

#### PRIDE MONTH

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize San Diego's LGBT Pride Parade and Festival that will take place this weekend.

Messages of diversity and inclusiveness are at the heart of the LGBT community. I'm proud to stand with San Diego's LGBT community and LGBT men and women across the country in commemorating their history and working for their future success. From that iconic night at Stonewall to Harvey Milk to the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell to the overturning of DOMA and Prop 8, we've experienced uneven but unmistakable progress toward equality.

As we recognize and celebrate our LGBT family and friends, we must also do the right thing and pass a trans-inclusive Employment Nondiscrimination Act so that all Americans are safe from the worry of being fired because their employers disagree with who they are and who they love.

This weekend, as San Diego celebrates Pride, I'm honored to stand with friends and colleagues to honor the contributions of LGBT Americans in San Diego and across the country.

#### TOO EXPENSIVE TO AFFORD

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we're learning an awful lot about ObamaCare these days, and it seems like every week is bringing something new. We have learned that this program is too expensive to afford. We have learned that it is too difficult to implement. We have learned that it is too burdensome for business. That is why the employer mandate is being delayed. Indeed, we're seeing these burdens on business lead to an under- and unemployed number, the U-6 number, 14.3 percent.

Where have the jobs gone? ObamaCare holds some of that answer.

We are also learning that there are too many mandates, too many rules, too many regulations. We're hearing it from our health care providers, we're hearing it from constituents, and we're hearing it from individuals who want to be able to make their health care decisions with their doctors, not a bureaucrat in Washington, D.C.

What my constituents are telling me is this: let's delay, let's defund, let's repeal, let's replace. This law is too cumbersome and too expensive to afford.

#### WORKING TOGETHER IN WESTERN NEW YORK

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, it's safe to say that Congress experiences more than its share of dysfunction. Too often, Members engage in behavior that serves to produce partisan gridlock and very little else. But this week, western New York's delegation has successfully bucked that trend.

Last night, my office worked closely with Congressman TOM REED to protect residents from leaking radioactive waste in West Valley, New York. Later today, Congressman CHRIS COLLINS will join in our efforts to protect Army Corps projects that will clean up western New York's waterways. Earlier this week, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER and our State's Senators joined in our continued push for airline safety in the wake of the crash of Flight 3407 in western New York.

There is no disputing the fact that on some issues we have vastly divergent views. But when you respect the positions of your colleagues across the aisle and tone down the partisan rhetoric, you create room to work together for the communities you are bound to serve. I am honored to work with these western New York colleagues.

#### COMMONSENSE SOLUTIONS FOR JOBS

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, last week, America celebrated its 237th birthday. As I spoke with constituents at parades and other events, the number one concern I heard was about the need for better jobs. Twelve million Americans are out of work, Mr. Speaker, and 4.3 million have been out of work for 6 months or more. We're more than 4 years into President Obama's recovery; yet his misguided policies have produced almost 4 million fewer jobs than the average recovery. The American people deserve better. Our 237-year legacy proves that we can do better. Americans deserve a government that lets our economy grow and doesn't kill jobs with overreaching regulations and mindless bureaucratic kingdom-building.

Just last week, President Obama conceded that ObamaCare's employer mandate will hurt job growth. By delaying implementation of the mandate, he recognizes this policy is a failure. Now is the time for President Obama to show true leadership, put aside his failed policies, and work with Republicans on real commonsense solutions.

#### REPEAL THE EMPLOYER MANDATE IN OBAMACARE

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, just over a week ago, the administration announced a 1-year delay of the employer mandate in the Affordable Care Act. While a temporary delay is a good thing for businesses, a full repeal would be even better. Businesses in my district in Georgia have made very clear that the employer mandate would prevent them from expanding their businesses or hiring workers. One of the main reasons I voted against the law in the first place was because too many job creators in my district simply can't afford the costs of the employer mandate under the Affordable Care Act.

We can fix this, however. I'm proud to be leading the effort to fully repeal the employer mandate, along with two of my colleagues from across the aisle. We know this can be fixed, and we've got the bipartisan legislation to do it. I urge my colleagues to swiftly bring up the full repeal of the employer mandate and make this delay permanent so businesses across the country can get back to creating the jobs we need.

#### AMERICANS SHOULD BE ABLE TO TRUST GOVERNMENT

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, every coin and bill we use bears the phrase "In God We Trust." Sadly, today, our trust tends to stop there. I don't recall hearing "In Government We Trust" very often.

President Reagan governed on the phrase "Trust, but verify." This holds true to the Founders' original plan of three branches of government working to safeguard the people from overreach or abuse of power by any one. Current scandals fly in the face of the very principles and ethos we live our lives by and the values we were founded upon.

I can tell you that we in southern and southwest Ohio take pride not only in hard work but honest work. We now face an executive branch so vast that those who are in charge now claim that full accountability is impossible. They claim that government is too vast to be held accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I will not give up on the goodness of the American citizen and the possibility of responsibility and trust that we should be able to have in our government.

#### IMMIGRATION AND ECONOMICS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, after hosting a special screening of "The Dream is Now" at the Rose Marine Theater on the north side of Fort Worth, I can assure you that the hundreds of constituents who attended the event represent a microcosm of undocumented immigrants in the U.S. who need the U.S. to act now on comprehensive immigration reform.

The dream for 11 million to come out of the shadows and contribute to the only country they have ever known rests in our hands. In my home State of Texas alone, immigrants paid \$1.6 billion in State and local taxes. The economic contributions of immigrants demand an immigration system that responds to the rapidly changing 21st century economy. We all agree that our current immigration system is broken. The Senate bipartisan bill was a start, and it is proof that a long-term, practical solution on immigration can be achieved.

I will continue to work with like-minded colleagues to ensure a practical and fair solution. We can no longer afford piecemeal solutions that are detrimental to our society and to our economy.

#### HONORING ARMY SERGEANT ZEKE CROZIER

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a truly remarkable

American—a Kansan—who came within inches of giving his life in the service of his country, but who has made an unthinkable yet not unbelievable recovery.

I first met Spring Hill native Army Sergeant Zeke Crozier 2 years ago. He was with the 158th Aviation Regiment out of Gardner, Kansas, and he was set to deploy to Afghanistan. After being in Afghanistan for only 41 days, the Chinook helicopter Sergeant Crozier was flying in crashed violently, and he suffered a severe traumatic brain injury.

Defying all odds, Sergeant Crozier has made a miraculous recovery, and even walked into my district office in Overland Park, Kansas, yesterday. Sergeant Crozier's recovery efforts are inspirational. They are also a reminder that we must always keep our commitment to our Nation's veterans. There are over 530,000 veterans benefit cases on backlog at the VA. This is unacceptable to me and to the men and women willing to serve our country bravely and honorably, especially those that now need our help in return.

To Sergeant Crozier and to all those who have served, a grateful Nation thanks you for your sacrifice.

#### NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATION ACT

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, in the coming days, we will soon be taking up H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, which is a long overdue reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I'm rising today to speak about the need to include in this reauthorization the Native Hawaiian Education Act. I've introduced H.R. 2287, which does just this. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure its passage.

Last week, when I was in Hawaii, I had the chance to meet with parents and educators in the Native Hawaiian Education community on the islands of Kauai, Maui, and Molokai. I heard from them about the firsthand successes of this program, which has been in place since 1988.

Education is, by far, the best investment that we can make in our economy and in our future. We are empowering and educating the next generation in communities that have largely been underserved, while at the same time preserving rich and unique culture, language, and values of our native people. The Native Hawaiian Education Act has been serving our kids for the last 25 years. It's critical that these innovative programs continue.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the NHEA and other programs that can enable and empower our underserved communities to thrive.

#### STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. I rise today to address the recent doubling of interest rates on federally backed, needs-based student loans. Students deserve access, not obstacles, to higher education. These rate hikes will make college less affordable at a time when we should be encouraging, not discouraging, people to seek higher education opportunities to grow our economy and to create jobs. But due to House Republicans' failure to act, the interest rate on college loans has doubled from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent for some 7.4 million students.

In these tough economic times, Democrats understand we should be making every effort possible to increase access to higher education for all Americans. There is no time left. We need to act now to reverse the rate hike and keep student loan interest rates low so more Americans can have a fair shot at a college education.

#### MAJOR LEAGUE SPORTS TEAMS HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO THE PUBLIC

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, in 1995, former Washington Bullets owner Abe Pollin announced that he would be changing the name of the Washington Bullets to the Washington Wizards. The change did not happen overnight, nor was everyone happy about it. But Mr. Pollin knew it was the right thing to do. And he did it successfully. Given the high homicide and crime rate in the early 1990s in Washington, D.C., Mr. Pollin became increasingly concerned about the Bullets' association with violence. Finally, when Mr. Pollin's close friend, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, was assassinated in November 1995, he made the final decision.

Mr. Dan Snyder, owner of the Washington Redskins, may never come to the realization that is so evident to us all in the 21st century—that the term "redskins" is racist, demeaning, derogatory, and offensive to Native Americans. But I stand today, once again, to make this appeal to Mr. Snyder. I am thankful for Mr. Pollin's brave decision to change the Bullets' name, and I urge Mr. Snyder to have the courage to do the same. Change the name of your football franchise.

#### IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for this House to address comprehensive immigration reform. If the Senate can fashion a bipartisan bill, we can too.

Follow the money. Bringing 11 million people out of the shadows would increase our gross domestic product by \$832 billion over 10 years. Follow the money. The CBO calculates that the Senate bill will cut the deficit by \$197 billion over 10 years. What is not to like about that?

The plan that passed the Senate would strengthen our borders, crack down on employers who knowingly hire undocumented workers, and let those who want to earn their citizenship do just that.

Mr. Speaker, if the Senate can do it, we can do it too.

□ 1230

#### STUDENT LOANS

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that during this past district work week you were asked, as I was: "What about the student loans?" What people were asking was: "What are you doing in Congress about the rates that are going to double on July 1?"

Let's review what we know, Mr. Speaker. We know that there are 7.4 million students that are affected. The rates are doubling from 3.4 to 6.8 percent, and this means \$1,000 more in debt. We know that a college education can mean about \$1 million more in future earnings over a lifetime. We know that we, as a country, need to build up our graduates to continue to be competitive. We also know that 45 percent of Americans hold student loan debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to act now for America's future.

#### STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to echo the sentiments of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle regarding the urgency to fix the student loan interest rate hike that took place last Monday.

The inability of Congress to come together and compromise on behalf of America's students is embarrassing. Doubling interest rates makes college less affordable, and the increased debt burden threatens the middle class and harms our economy.

Recent graduates who should be putting away money for their first home or saving up to start their own business are instead spending upwards of \$500 per month paying back loans for their college education. Recent Florida graduates left college with student loan debt equal to 54 percent of their annual income.

Just this Monday, I heard the concerns of students in my district on how this debt will impact their future. Some students are even considering dropping out of college.

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

#### STUDENT LOANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on further consideration of H.R. 2609, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1235

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. HOLDING (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 9, 2013, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 60, line 12.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. BASS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1315

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN  
Mrs. BLACKBURN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As such, I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

This is unacceptable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

□ 1330

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. BARROW OF GEORGIA

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1345

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

Amendment by Mr. HECK of Nevada.

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

## □ 1400

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 328]

AYES—156

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

Sarbanes	Sires
Schakowsky	Smith (WA)
Schiff	Speier
Schneider	Takano
Schrader	Thompson (CA)
Schwartz	Thompson (MS)
Scott (VA)	Tierney
Scott, David	Titus
Serrano	Tonko
Shea-Porter	Tsongas
Sherman	Van Hollen

## NOES—266

Aderholt	Gosar
Alexander	Gowdy
Amash	Granger
Amodei	Graves (GA)
Andrews	Graves (MO)
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)
Bachus	Griffith (VA)
Barber	Grimm
Barletta	Guthrie
Barr	Hall
Barrow (GA)	Harper
Barton	Harris
Benishak	Hartzler
Bentivolio	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)
Bishop (GA)	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler
Black	Hinojosa
Blackburn	Holding
Bonner	Hudson
Boustany	Huelskamp
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)
Bridenstine	Hultgren
Brooks (AL)	Hurt
Brooks (IN)	Israel
Broun (GA)	Issa
Buchanan	Jenkins
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam
Bustos	Jones
Calvert	Jordan
Camp	Joyce
Cantor	Kaptur
Capito	Kelly (PA)
Cárdenas	King (IA)
Carter	King (NY)
Cassidy	Kingston
Castro (TX)	Kinzinger (IL)
Chabot	Kirkpatrick
Chaffetz	Kline
Clyburn	Labrador
Coble	LaMalfa
Coffman	Lamborn
Cole	Lance
Collins (GA)	Langevin
Collins (NY)	Lankford
Conaway	Latta
Cook	Lewis
Costa	LoBiondo
Cotton	Lofgren
Courtney	Long
Cramer	Lucas
Crawford	Luetkemeyer
Crenshaw	Lujan Grisham
Cuellar	(NM)
Culberson	Luján, Ben Ray
Daines	(NM)
Davis, Rodney	Lummis
Denham	Maffei
Dent	Maloney, Sean
DeSantis	Marchant
DesJarlais	Marino
Diaz-Balart	Massie
Dingell	Matheson
Duffy	McCarthy (CA)
Duncan (SC)	McCaul
Duncan (TN)	McClintock
Ellmers	McCollum
Farenthold	McHenry
Fincher	McIntyre
Fitzpatrick	McKeon
Fleischmann	McKinley
Fleming	McMorris
Flores	Rodgers
Forbes	Meadows
Fortenberry	Meehan
Fox	Meng
Franks (AZ)	Messer
Frelinghuysen	Mica
Gardner	Miller (FL)
Garrett	Miller (MI)
Gerlach	Miller, Gary
Gibbs	Mullin
Gibson	Mulvaney
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Goodlatte	Neugebauer

Vargas	Westmoreland
Veasey	Whitfield
Velázquez	Williams
Walz	Wilson (SC)
Walters	
Watt	
Tierney	Campbell
Titus	Gohmert
Tonko	Hunter
Tsongas	Grijalva
Van Hollen	Holt

Wittman	Yoder
Wolf	Yoho
Womack	Young (AK)
Woodall	Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—12

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

## □ 1426

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

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 329]

AYES—155

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

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

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

Womack  
Woodall

Yoder  
Yoho

Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

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

Stutzman  
Thornberry  
Walberg  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield

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

NOES—266

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

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

Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Radel  
Rahall  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stewart  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vela  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf

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

□ 1432

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 330]

AYES—165

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

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

McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)

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

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

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

NOES—252

## NOT VOTING—17

Campbell  
Cole  
Delaney  
Gohmert  
Gutiérrez  
Holt

Horsford  
Hunter  
McCarthy (NY)  
Negrete McLeod  
Noem  
Rogers (MI)

Shimkus  
Smith (NE)  
Tiberi  
Webster (FL)  
Young (FL)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1439

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 331]

AYES—184

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

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

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

Campbell  
Cole

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

## NOES—238

Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (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  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Petri

## NOT VOTING—12

Cramer  
Gohmert

Hunter  
McCarthy (NY)

Negrete McLeod  
Rogers (MI)

Shimkus  
Young (FL)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1445

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California

changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 332]

AYES—196

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

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

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

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

NOES—227

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

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

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

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell  
 Gohmert  
 Holt  
 Horsford

Hunter  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 Negrete McLeod  
 Paulsen

Rogers (MI)  
 Shimkus  
 Young (FL)

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

□ 1452

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

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

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

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

A MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF THE YARNELL 19

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 333]

AYES—86

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

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

Crawford  
 Edwards  
 Farenthold  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Garrett

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

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

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

NOES—338

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

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

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

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

NOT VOTING—10

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

□ 1501

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1715

AFTER RECESS

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

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

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

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

□ 1716

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. PRICE of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 60, line 12.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. BASS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment by Ms. TITUS of Nevada.

Amendment by Mr. LYNCH of Massachusetts.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 243, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

AYES—182

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

NOES—243

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

Duncan (SC) Latham  
 Ellmers Latta  
 Farenthold Lipinski  
 Fincher LoBiondo  
 Fitzpatrick Lofgren  
 Fleischmann Long  
 Fleming Lucas  
 Flores Luetkemeyer  
 Forbes Lujan Grisham  
 Fortenberry (NM)  
 Foxx Luján, Ben Ray  
 Franks (AZ) (NM)  
 Frelinghuysen Lummis  
 Gallego Maffei  
 Gardner Maloney, Sean  
 Garrett Marchant  
 Gerlach Matheson  
 Gibbs McCarthy (CA)  
 Gingrey (GA) McCaul  
 Goodlatte McClintock  
 Gosar McCollum  
 Gowdy McHenry  
 Granger McIntyre  
 Graves (GA) McKeon  
 Graves (MO) McKinley  
 Griffin (AR) McMorris  
 Grimm Rodgers  
 Guthrie Meadows  
 Hall Meehan  
 Hanna Messer  
 Harper Miller (FL)  
 Harris Miller (MI)  
 Hartzler Miller, Gary  
 Hastings (WA) Mullin  
 Heck (NV) Murphy (PA)  
 Hensarling Neugebauer  
 Holding Noem  
 Hoyer Nugent  
 Hudson Nunes  
 Huelskamp Nunnelee  
 Huizenga (MI) Olson  
 Hultgren Palazzo  
 Hurt Paulsen  
 Issa Pearce  
 Jenkins Perry  
 Johnson (GA) Peterson  
 Johnson (OH) Pittenger  
 Johnson, Sam Pitts  
 Jordan Poe (TX)  
 Joyce Pompeo  
 Kelly (PA) Posey  
 King (IA) Price (GA)  
 King (NY) Radel  
 Kingston Reed  
 Kinzinger (IL) Reichert  
 Kline Renacci  
 Labrador Ribble  
 LaMalfa Rice (SC)  
 Lamborn Richmond  
 Langevin Rigell  
 Lankford Roby  
 Larsen (WA) Roe (TN)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell Horsford  
 DeGette Hunter  
 Holt McCarthy (NY)

□ 1745

Messrs. FARENTHOLD, DESANTIS, GRIMM, and MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. STOCKMAN, VISCLOSKY, RAHALL, MARINO, MULVANEY, and BROWN of Georgia, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ 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. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MEADOWS). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) 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 5-minute vote.  
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 308, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

AYES—114

Amash Higgins  
 Barton Himes  
 Becerra Hinojosa  
 Bonamici Honda  
 Brady (PA) Hudson  
 Broun (GA) Huelskamp  
 Buchanan Huffman  
 Burgess Huizenga (MI)  
 Capps Israel  
 Capuano Jones  
 Cassidy Keating  
 Chaffetz Kennedy  
 Chu Kilmer  
 Clarke Labrador  
 Cohen Lance  
 Conaway Larsen (WA)  
 Conyers Lee (CA)  
 Courtney Levin  
 Davis, Danny Lewis  
 DeFazio Long  
 DeLauro Lujan Grisham  
 DelBene (NM)  
 Deutch Luján, Ben Ray  
 Duncan (TN) (NM)  
 Edwards Lummis  
 Ellison Lynch  
 Eshoo Maffei  
 Marchant Esty  
 Markey Farenthold  
 Matheson Farr  
 Gardner Walorski  
 Gohmert Weber (TX)  
 Gosar Webster (FL)  
 Graves (GA) Wenstrup  
 Grayson Westmoreland  
 Grijalva Whitfield  
 Hall Williams  
 Heck (WA) Wilson (SC)  
 Hensarling Wittman  
 Wolf Wittman  
 Womack Wolf  
 Woodall Womack  
 Yoder Woodall  
 Yoho Yoder  
 Young (AK) Young  
 Young (FL) Young  
 Young (IN) Young (IN)

NOES—308

Aderholt Chabot  
 Alexander Ciocline  
 Amodei Clay  
 Andrews Cleaver  
 Bachmann Clyburn  
 Bachus Coble  
 Barber Coffman  
 Barletta Cole  
 Barr Collins (GA)  
 Barrow (GA) Collins (NY)  
 Bass Connolly  
 Beatty Cook  
 Benishek Cooper  
 Bentivolio Costa  
 Bera (CA) Cotton  
 Bilirakis Cramer  
 Bishop (GA) Crawford  
 Bishop (NY) Crenshaw  
 Black Crowley  
 Blackburn Cuellar  
 Blumenauer Culberson  
 Bonner Cummings  
 Boustany Daines  
 Brady (TX) Davis (CA)  
 Braley (IA) Davis, Rodney  
 Bridenstine Delaney  
 Brooks (AL) Denham  
 Brooks (IN) Dent  
 Brown (FL) DeSantis  
 Brownley (CA) DesJarlais  
 Bucshon Dingell  
 Bustos Doggett  
 Butterfield Doyle  
 Calvert Duckworth  
 Camp Duffy  
 Cantor Duncan (SC)  
 Capito Ellmers  
 Cardenas Engel  
 Carney Enyart  
 Carson (IN) Fattah  
 Cartwright Fincher  
 Castor (FL) Fitzpatrick  
 Castro (TX) Fleischmann

Hurt Issa  
 Jackson Lee Mulvaney  
 Jeffries Murphy (FL)  
 Jenkins Murphy (PA)  
 Johnson (GA) Neugebauer  
 Johnson (OH) Noem  
 Johnson, E. B. Nolan  
 Johnson, Sam Nugent  
 Jordan Nunes  
 Joyce Nunnelee  
 Kaptur O'Rourke  
 Kelly (IL) Olson  
 Kelly (PA) Owens  
 Kildee Palazzo  
 Kind Pascrell  
 King (IA) Pastor (AZ)  
 King (NY) Payne  
 Kingston Perlmutter  
 Kinzinger (IL) Perry  
 Kirkpatrick Peters (CA)  
 Kline Peters (MI)  
 Kuster Peterson  
 LaMalfa LaMalfa  
 Lamborn Pittenger  
 Langevin Pitts  
 Lankford Poe (TX)  
 Larson (CT) Polis  
 Latham Pompeo  
 Latta Price (GA)  
 Lipinski Price (NC)  
 LoBiondo Rahall  
 Loeb sack Reed  
 Lofgren Reichert  
 Lowenthal Renacci  
 Lucas Ribble  
 Luetkemeyer Rice (SC)  
 Maloney Richmond  
 Maloney, Sean Rigell  
 Marino Carolyn  
 Massie Rogers (AL)  
 McCarthy (CA) Rogers (KY)  
 McCaul Rooney  
 McCollum Ros-Lehtinen  
 McDermott Roskam  
 McHenry Ross  
 McIntyre Rothfus  
 McKeon Roybal-Allard  
 McKinley Royce  
 McMorris Ruiz  
 Rodgers Runyan  
 Meehan Ruppertsberger  
 Meeks Rush  
 Meng Ryan (OH)  
 Messer Ryan (WI)  
 Miller (FL) Sánchez, Linda  
 Miller (MI) T.  
 Miller, Gary Sanchez, Loretta  
 Miller, George Foster Scalise

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (UT) Diaz-Balart  
 Campbell Holt  
 Carter Horsford  
 DeGette Hunter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1752

Messrs. LYNCH and ELLISON 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. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 291, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

AYES—131

Amash	Himes	Pallone
Barton	Hinojosa	Paulsen
Becerra	Honda	Pearce
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Pelosi
Bonamici	Huelskamp	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Huffman	Pocan
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Polis
Buchanan	Israel	Posey
Burgess	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Capps	Jones	Quigley
Capuano	Keating	Radel
Cartwright	Kennedy	Rohrabacher
Cassidy	Kilmer	Salmon
Chaffetz	Labrador	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Lance	Sanford
Ciçilline	Lankford	Sarbanes
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Conaway	Lee (CA)	Schiff
Conyers	Levin	Schwartz
Courtney	Long	Sensenbrenner
Daines	Lowenthal	Serrano
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Sessions
DeLauro	(NM)	Shea-Porter
DeBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
Deutch	(NM)	Slaughter
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Edwards	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Ellison	Maffei	Speier
Eshoo	Marchant	Stockman
Esty	Markey	Takano
Farenthold	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Farr	Matsui	Tierney
Garamendi	McClintock	Titus
Gardner	McGovern	Tonko
Gohmert	McHenry	Tsongas
Gosar	McNerney	Velázquez
Gowdy	Meadows	Visclosky
Graves (GA)	Mica	Walberg
Grayson	Michaud	Waters
Grijalva	Miller, George	Waxman
Hahn	Moore	Webster (FL)
Hall	Mulvaney	Welch
Heck (WA)	Nadler	Woodall
Hensarling	Napolitano	
Higgins	Neal	

NOES—291

Aderholt	Chabot	Fincher
Alexander	Clarke	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Clay	Fleischmann
Andrews	Cleaver	Fleming
Bachmann	Clyburn	Flores
Bachus	Coble	Forbes
Barber	Coffman	Fortenberry
Barletta	Cole	Foster
Barr	Collins (GA)	Fox
Barrow (GA)	Collins (NY)	Frankel (FL)
Bass	Connolly	Franks (AZ)
Beatty	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Benishek	Cooper	Fudge
Bentivolio	Costa	Gabbard
Bera (CA)	Cotton	Gallego
Bilirakis	Cramer	Garcia
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Garrett
Bishop (NY)	Crenshaw	Gerlach
Black	Crowley	Gibbs
Blackburn	Cuellar	Gibson
Blumenauer	Culberson	Gingrey (GA)
Boustany	Cummings	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	Davis (CA)	Granger
Braley (IA)	Davis, Danny	Graves (MO)
Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney	Green, Al
Brooks (AL)	Delaney	Green, Gene
Brooks (IN)	Denham	Griffin (AR)
Brown (FL)	Dent	Griffith (VA)
Brownley (CA)	DeSantis	Grimm
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Bustos	Diaz-Balart	Gutiérrez
Butterfield	Dingell	Hanabusa
Calvert	Doggett	Hanna
Camp	Doyle	Harper
Cantor	Duckworth	Harris
Capito	Duffy	Hartzler
Cárdenas	Duncan (TN)	Hastings (FL)
Carney	Ellmers	Hastings (WA)
Carson (IN)	Engel	Heck (NV)
Castor (FL)	Enyart	Herrera Beutler
Castro (TX)	Fattah	Holding

Hoyer	Miller, Gary	Schneider
Hultgren	Moran	Schock
Hurt	Mullin	Schrader
Issa	Murphy (FL)	Schweikert
Jackson Lee	Murphy (PA)	Scott (VA)
Jeffries	Neugebauer	Scott, Austin
Jenkins	Noem	Scott, David
Johnson (OH)	Nugent	Sewell (AL)
Johnson, E. B.	Nunes	Shuster
Johnson, Sam	Nunnelee	Simpson
Jordan	O'Rourke	Sinema
Joyce	Olson	Sires
Kaptur	Owens	Smith (MO)
Kelly (IL)	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)
Kelly (PA)	Pascrell	Smith (TX)
Kildee	Pastor (AZ)	Southerland
Kind	Payne	Stewart
King (IA)	Perry	Stivers
King (NY)	Perrlmutter	Stutzman
Kingston	Peters (CA)	Swalwell (CA)
Kinzinger (IL)	Peters (MI)	Terry
Kirkpatrick	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Kline	Petri	Thompson (PA)
Kuster	Pittenger	Thornberry
LaMalfa	Pitts	Tiberi
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Tipton
Langevin	Pompeo	Turner
Larson (CT)	Price (GA)	Upton
Latham	Rahall	Valadao
Latta	Rangel	Van Hollen
Lewis	Reed	Vargas
Lipinski	Reichert	Veasey
LoBiondo	Renacci	Vela
Loeb	Ribble	Wagner
Loeb	Rice (SC)	Walden
Lofgren	Richmond	Walorski
Lowe	Rigell	Walz
Lucas	Roby	Wasserman
Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)	Schultz
Maloney,	Rogers (AL)	Watt
Carolyn	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
Maloney, Sean	Rokita	West
Marino	Rooney	Westmoreland
Massie	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
McCarthy (CA)	Roskam	Williams
McCaul	Ross	Wilson (FL)
McCollum	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Witman
McIntyre	Royce	Wolf
McKeon	Ruiz	Womack
McKinley	Runyan	Yarmuth
McMorris	Ruddersberger	Yoder
Rodgers	Rush	Yoho
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Young (AK)
Meeks	Ryan (WI)	Young (FL)
Meng	Sánchez, Linda	Young (IN)
Messer	T.	
Miller (FL)	Scalise	
Miller (MI)		

NOT VOTING—12

Bonner	Holt	Negrete McLeod
Campbell	Horsford	Nolan
Carter	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PRICE of Georgia) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1759

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 337, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

AYES—87

Amodei	Heck (NV)	Perlmutter
Bass	Honda	Peters (MI)
Becerra	Huffman	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Bishop (UT)	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Blumenauer	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Brownley (CA)	Jones	Ruiz
Capps	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda
Carson (IN)	Lee (CA)	T.
Chaffetz	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Lewis	Sarbanes
Clarke	Lofgren	Schakowsky
Cohen	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Crowley	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Davis (CA)	(NM)	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
DeFazio	(NM)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Carolyn	Takano
Duckworth	Markey	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	Matheson	Tierney
Engel	Matsui	Titus
Eshoo	McDermott	Tonko
Farr	McGovern	Tsongas
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Velázquez
Garamendi	Miller, George	Wasserman
Grijalva	Nadler	Schultz
Gutierrez	Napolitano	Pallone
Hahn	Pelosi	Waxman
Hastings (FL)		

NOES—337

Cooper	Grayson
Costa	Green, Al
Cotton	Green, Gene
Courtney	Griffin (AR)
Cramer	Griffith (VA)
Crawford	Grimm
Crenshaw	Guthrie
Cuellar	Hall
Barr	Hanabusa
Barrow (GA)	Hanna
Barton	Harper
Beatty	Harris
Benishek	Hartzler
Bentivolio	Hastings (WA)
Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)
Bilirakis	Hensarling
Bishop (GA)	Herrera Beutler
Black	Higgins
Blackburn	Himes
Bonamici	Hinojosa
Bonner	Dingell
Boustany	Doyle
Brady (PA)	Duffy
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)
Braley (IA)	Duncan (TN)
Bridenstine	Ellison
Brooks (AL)	Ellmers
Brooks (IN)	Enyart
Broun (GA)	Esty
Brown (FL)	Farenthold
Buchanan	Fattah
Bucshon	Fincher
Burgess	Fitzpatrick
Bustos	Fleischmann
Butterfield	Fleming
Calvert	Flores
Camp	Forbes
Cantor	Fortenberry
Capito	Foster
Cárdenas	Fox
Carney	Franks (AZ)
Cartwright	Frelinghuysen
Cassidy	Fudge
Castor (FL)	Gabbard
Castro (TX)	Gallego
Chabot	Garcia
Ciçilline	Gardner
Clay	Garrett
Cleaver	Gerlach
Clyburn	Gibbs
Coble	Gibson
Coffman	Gingrey (GA)
Cole	Gohmert
Collins (GA)	Goodlatte
Collins (NY)	Gosar
Conaway	Gowdy
Connelly	Granger
Conyers	Graves (GA)
Cook	Graves (MO)

LoBiondo Pearce  
 Loeb sack Perry  
 Long Peters (CA)  
 Lowey Peterson  
 Lucas Petri  
 Luetkemeyer Pittenger  
 Lummis Pitts  
 Lynch Poe (TX)  
 Maffei Pompeo  
 Maloney, Sean Posey  
 Marchant Price (GA)  
 Marino Price (NC)  
 Massie Quigley  
 McCarthy (CA) Radel  
 McCaul Rahall  
 McClintock Rangel  
 McCollum Reed  
 McHenry Reichert  
 McIntyre Renacci  
 McKeon Ribble  
 McKinley Rice (SC)  
 McMorris Richmond  
 Rodgers Rigell  
 McNerney Roby  
 Meadows Roe (TN)  
 Meehan Rogers (AL)  
 Meeks Rogers (KY)  
 Messer Rohrabacher  
 Mica Rokita  
 Michaud Rooney  
 Miller (FL) Ros-Lehtinen  
 Miller (MI) Roskam  
 Miller, Gary Ross  
 Moore Rothfus  
 Moran Royce  
 Mullin Runyan  
 Mulvaney Ruppertsberger  
 Murphy (FL) Rush  
 Murphy (PA) Ryan (WI)  
 Neal Salmon  
 Neugebauer Sanford  
 Noem Scalise  
 Nolan Schiff  
 Nugent Schneider  
 Nunes Schock  
 Nunnelee Schrader  
 O'Rourke Schwartz  
 Olson Schweikert  
 Owens Scott (VA)  
 Palazzo Scott, Austin  
 Pascrell Sensenbrenner  
 Pastor (AZ) Sessions  
 Paulsen Sewell (AL)  
 Payne Shuster

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell Horsford  
 Carter Hunter  
 DeGette McCarthy (NY)  
 Holt Negrete McLeod

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1806

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.  
 LYNCH) 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 amend-  
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 217, noes 206,  
 not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]  
 AYES—217  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Barber  
 Barrow (GA)  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Becerra  
 Benishek  
 Bera (CA)  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Himes  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Huelskamp  
 Huffman  
 Israel  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jeffries  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kirkpatrick  
 Kuster  
 Labrador  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lujan Grisham  
 (NM)  
 Luján, Ben Ray  
 (NM)  
 Lynch  
 Maffei  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Markey  
 Massie  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McIntyre  
 McNerney  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Michaud  
 Miller, George  
 Moore  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal

NOES—206

Aderholt  
 Alexander  
 Andrews  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Baretta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Bentivolio  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Bonner  
 Boustany  
 Bridenstine  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Broun (GA)  
 Bucshon  
 Burgess  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Carter  
 Chabot  
 Coble  
 Coffman  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Cooper  
 Cotton  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Daines  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 Carter  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Doyle  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellmers  
 Enyart  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Frelinghuysen

Gallego  
 Gardner  
 Garrett  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gingrey (GA)  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Granberg  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Griffith (AR)  
 Griffith (VA)  
 Guthrie  
 Hall  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Heck (NV)  
 Hensarling  
 Hinojosa  
 Holding  
 Hudson  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hurt  
 Issa  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jordan  
 Joyce  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Lankford  
 Latham  
 Latta  
 Long  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lummis  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Matheson  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKeon  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Moran  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Nunnelee  
 Olson  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Perry  
 Petri  
 Pittenger  
 Pitts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Pompeo  
 Price (GA)  
 Radel  
 Rahall  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Ribble  
 Roby  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Royce  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Salmon  
 Sanford  
 Scalise  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schock  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Shuster  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Royce  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Salmon  
 Sanford  
 Sanford  
 Scalise  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shuster  
 Sires  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Souterland  
 Speier  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Stockman  
 Stutzman  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Terry  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Brown (FL)  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Visclosky  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walorski  
 Walz  
 Watt  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Welch  
 Wenstrup  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Costa  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DeBene  
 Deutch  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Duckworth  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Esty  
 Farenthold  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Fleming  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Garamendi  
 Garcia  
 Gibson  
 Gowdy  
 Grayson

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell  
 DeGette  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Holt  
 Horsford  
 Hunter  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 Negrete McLeod  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Shimkus  
 Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1812

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will re-  
 port the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available  
 in this Act or funds available in the Bonne-  
 ville Power Administration Fund may be  
 used by the Department of Energy for any  
 program, project, or activity required by or  
 otherwise proposed in the memorandum from  
 Steven Chu, Secretary of Energy, to the  
 Power Marketing Administrators with the  
 subject line "Power Marketing Administra-  
 tions' Role" and dated March 16, 2012.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman  
 from Arizona is recognized for 5 min-  
 utes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, on March  
 16, 2012, the Secretary of Energy issued  
 a "Memorandum for Power Marketing  
 Administrators." This memo, com-  
 monly referred to as the "Chu memo-  
 randum," has created a great deal of

concern among our constituents who rely on Power Marketing Administrations, or PMAs, for affordable and reliable energy.

As many of you know, the PMAs are four regional Power Marketing Administrations which have been delivering reliable, clean energy to consumers for over 75 years. The PMAs have been successful models of regional collaboration with local stakeholders and a guided principle of “beneficiary pays,” meaning that whoever benefits from the specific investments in the PMAs’ infrastructure ultimately bears the cost.

The former Secretary’s memo directs the PMAs to act in areas involving transmission expansion, renewable energy, energy efficiency, and cybersecurity—all laudable goals—goals that, on the surface, I support. In fact, I have strongly advocated for the expansion of transmission here in Congress. However, I believe the Department of Energy’s means of these goals, the “Chu memo,” would implement a top-down approach that could certainly impose greater costs and risks that outweigh benefits and could undermine the collaborative and low-cost, emissions-free nature of the Federal power program.

This issue has undergone significant scrutiny here in Congress over the past year. Last year, I and Congressman JIM MATHESON, from Utah, led a letter expressing concern over the Chu memo. That letter was signed by over 160 U.S. Senators and Representatives, almost evenly split between Republicans and Democrats. Additionally, the House Appropriations Committee approved similar language to what I am putting forth today, by voice vote, to the 2013 Energy and Water Appropriations bill barring the Secretary from implementing the Chu directives. There are few issues that Congress has had such consensus on in the past.

Additionally, the House Natural Resources Committee has held multiple hearings on the memo, and it was a major topic of conversation at our recent PMA FY 2014 budget hearing. Members from both sides of the aisle have expressed concern about how the DOE might move forward with the Chu memo.

It is best if we stop this train wreck from moving forward before it is even implemented. My amendment would simply prohibit the power marketing agencies from utilizing their budgets to implement any new program, project or activity proposed under the guise of this memo. It is not intended to disrupt any previously existing activities of the PMAs, including the Bonneville Power Administration, that have been conducted in coordination and with the support of the customers. It is many of our beliefs that the recommendations of the memo fall far from the DOE’s authority under the existing law. If the DOE would like to move forward, this amendment ensures the administration will have to come forward in a transparent manner and request legal authority.

I hope my colleagues will support this commonsense amendment that will preserve the existing Federal power program and will ensure our constituents’ electricity costs stay low. I urge the support of my 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 support the gentleman’s amendment. As he said, we had a similar provision in last year’s bill, and we know the concerns are acute in the power marketing regions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability and Efficiency may be used by the Department of Energy for wind energy programs.

Mr. WHITFIELD (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would like to explain, number one, why I am offering this amendment and then explain, number two, specifically what this amendment does.

The reason it is in handwriting is that, after we submitted the printed amendment, we had a conversation with the Parliamentarian, and a suggestion was made to change it, so it was changed.

This administration has made it very clear to the American people that it is trying to dictate the fuels used to produce electricity in America, and they’ve made it very clear that they are flagrantly discriminating and giving preferential treatment to the wind industry.

Now, why do I say that?

I don’t say it because of the \$12.1 billion production tax credit that the wind industry has received this year, and I don’t say it because of the billions of dollars that the wind industry has received in past years. I say it because the administration has decided

not to prosecute the wind industry for violations of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or of the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act or of the Endangered Species Act.

According to an Associated Press investigation, in fact, the Obama administration has never fined or prosecuted a wind farm for killing eagles and other protected bird species—shielding the industry from liability and helping keep the scope of the deaths secret.

As a matter of fact, to show you how the administration is being very discriminatory in the prosecution of these acts, British Petroleum was fined \$100 million for killing migratory birds in the gulf oil spill. ExxonMobil was fined \$600,000 for killing 85 birds. PacifiCorp was fined \$10.5 million for killing birds. A utility in Wyoming was fined \$100,000 for killing one eagle. I could go on and on and on. Yet more than 573,000 birds were killed by the country’s wind farms last year, including 83,000 hunting birds, such as hawks, falcons and eagles, according to an estimate published in March in the peer-reviewed *The Wildlife Society*.

We know that this administration is getting the reputation of deciding what Federal laws it’s going to enforce and which ones it’s not going to enforce. Now it is deciding that we are going to prosecute on the Endangered Species Act, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act if you happen to be in this sector of the economy, but if you’re in the wind industry, we’re not going to prosecute you.

Do you know what is even worse than that?

They are now deciding that they want to carve out a rule, which the Obama administration has proposed, that would give wind energy companies potentially decades of shelter from the prosecution of the killing of any birds. The regulation is currently under review at the White House. The proposal, which was made at the urging of the wind industry, would allow companies to apply for 30-year permits to kill bald eagles, golden eagles and other migratory birds. Previously, companies were only eligible for 5-year permits. It’s basically guaranteeing a black box for 30 years, and they’re saying, Trust us for oversight.

“This is not the path forward,” said Katie Umekubo, a renewable energy attorney with the Natural Resources Defense Council.

So why should the American people be giving billions of dollars to this industry and be allowing this administration not to prosecute them when they are obviously killing thousands of birds—in direct violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, of the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, and of the Endangered Species Act?

My amendment simply says, with regard to the \$24 million set aside for research and development in the committee report, that it not be allowed to use that money simply because of the

extraordinary protection this administration is going to provide to prevent them from being prosecuted under the existing Federal laws that this Congress passed many years ago. That is the purpose of the amendment, and I would respectfully urge Members to vote for 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. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly to oppose the amendment because I know my colleague, my friend from Kentucky, has an incredible reputation of being the friend of animals and birds. Obviously, we are concerned about the issues he has raised.

Our bill already reduces the Wind Energy program from \$59 million to \$24 million, a cut of nearly 60 percent. His amendment goes a step further by eliminating the Wind Energy program entirely, which would result in the termination of the first offshore wind at-scale demonstration in the United States and would result in a dramatic drop-off in the U.S. deployment of wind energy systems. This setback would come at a time when wind is renewable energy's fastest growing sector.

I oppose my colleague's amendment. I am certainly aware of his heartfelt concern. We are listening to what he said, but I still oppose it.

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. I think the gentleman who is proposing the amendment is missing some major points.

Before a wind energy project can continue or go into effect, it has to meet very stringent environmental requirements. Those environmental requirements, among other things, deal specifically with all types of birds. I will tell you that, in my current district and in my previous district, I had the major wind farms in California, and no project was allowed to go forward without addressing these issues. Under the Endangered Species Act, it is possible for incidental takes to take place if there is appropriate mitigation, and I know from the projects in my area that there had to be appropriate mitigation.

□ 1830

The modern wind turbines are far different than the old wind turbines, which were, in fact, deadly to birds. The modern wind turbines are far less so. And if there is an incidental take of a listed species, it can only occur with proper and appropriate mitigation.

The author's reference to the issue of a longtime take opportunity only occurs if there happens to be an adaptive management program in place that allows the Fish and Wildlife Service and

other appropriate agencies to review the process and progress, or lack thereof, and apply different measures or stop the projects at that time.

So I would oppose the amendment. I think it is based upon incorrect facts. And I join the chairman in opposition.

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. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Last year, wind energy was the largest source of new generating capacity in our country, comprising 42 percent of all new generating capacity. Overall, America's wind energy capacity grew by 28 percent. That's an incredible record, and it demonstrates that wind energy is an affordable, reliable source of power that produces no carbon or other air pollution.

But the recent success of wind energy in our country doesn't mean we should stop investing in it. In fact, we need to do more, not less, to develop and deploy new wind energy technologies, and we're busy doing that along the Great Lakes.

Wind energy will play an important role in the transition to a cleaner energy economy. According to the American Wind Energy Association, this year alone U.S. wind projects will avoid nearly 100 million metric tons of carbon dioxide being poured into the atmosphere—the equivalent of reducing power sector emissions by over 4 percent or taking more than 17 million cars off the road.

In addition to cutting carbon pollution, investing in wind energy is a boon to our economy. In 2012, the industry supported more than 80,000 full-time equivalent jobs, including more than 25,000 manufacturing jobs at more than 550 facilities. As the global clean energy economy grows, the United States has a tremendous opportunity to attract more investment here and create even more manufacturing jobs, including in Kentucky and Ohio.

But we are at risk of missing out on this opportunity. At a time when the global clean energy market is getting more competitive, the United States has started to lag behind. In 2012, China's level of clean energy financing surpassed our country's for the first time.

Year after year, some House Republicans have pushed budgets and appropriation bills that would slash funding for clean energy and energy-efficiency programs. This appropriation bill is no exception, and Mr. WHITFIELD's amendment just takes it one step further. Eliminating all Department of Energy wind energy programs is exactly the wrong approach and one that will hurt our Nation's competitiveness in this growing market. It certainly isn't consistent with an all-of-the-above energy strategy.

Some may argue it makes sense to cut government investment in wind en-

ergy since it is a more mature technology than some emerging technologies, but wind energy isn't operating on a level playing field. The United States currently provides enormous government subsidies and tax breaks to fossil fuels. In fact, the International Monetary Fund just issued a report finding that the United States provides more subsidies to fossil fuels than any other country in the world, even China. Our annual subsidies total over—get ready for this—one-half of a trillion dollars.

We shouldn't cede the growing global clean energy market to China or make any of our other competitors happy.

And let me just say this, as I know quite a bit about this and Ohio has been fast about wind energy. I represent the Saudi Arabia of wind in the Great Lakes, which is called Lake Erie. Lake Erie also happens to be the warmest of the lakes, so it's a bird haven. On the Mississippi Flyway, we have more fish, fauna, and birds than all the other Great Lakes combined. And with that Mississippi Flyway coming up, we have lots of eagles, we have lots of different types of birds. The cormorants are some that are problematic, but, nonetheless, we are really a bird haven. We've learned that the wind turbines don't cause us any trouble. We have to situate them sometimes 3 miles from shore.

The biggest killer of birds nationwide is cats. So if you really want to look at where the problem is, maybe we need more cat control. But honestly, for the number of turbines that we've erected, what happens, especially when you have a set of turbines operating in the air, they create an updraft and the birds—they are pretty smart—sort of fly above the wind. They're amazing. They float on the pathway that the turbines generate. In addition to that, there are new technologies like strobe lights that are actually affixed to the turbines, and they keep birds away. It's almost like a silent radar in a way. So there are new technologies that are being developed to deal with that.

We actually want birds. We want turbines. We want clean energy. We want all types of energy in our region. We haul coal out of Kentucky to many of our power plants. So we have an all-of-the-above strategy in our region, but we really welcome the wind opportunities.

Cleveland, Ohio, and an investment group called LEEDCo is doing everything possible to move additional turbines onto the Great Lakes.

So I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I ask my colleagues to vote against it. And I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. 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 Kentucky will be postponed.

Ms. TITUS. 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 this evening to speak on a serious issue that affects my constituents. I've been investigating it since it was brought to my attention several months ago through our local media.

The Department of Energy is in the process of moving dangerous radioactive waste thousands of miles across the country from east Tennessee to southern Nevada. This waste is destined for the Nevada Nuclear Security Site, formally known as the Nevada Test Site. This is a totally separate issue now from the proposed Yucca Mountain storage site debate that we have heard earlier today.

If you're unaware that this radioactive waste is traveling through your backyard, I'm not surprised. The DOE has failed to properly inform Congress about this activity.

The project involves the transport of hundreds of canisters containing high-concentration fissile materials from the Consolidated Edison Uranium Solidification Project in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, to be dumped in my State of Nevada. The materials are so radioactive that they have a half life of more than 160,000 years.

I want to be clear that this is not the kind of low-level waste that the Nevada Test Site has been accepting for years. In fact, just weeks ago, I learned that the Department of Energy had reworked the waste acceptance criteria for the security site to allow storage of materials that have radioactive concentrations more than 40 times higher than anything that has ever been brought to the site for disposal before.

That revision to the WAC, or waste acceptance criteria, was signed off on by the DOE the very same day that agency officials met with my staff and State and local officials, yet DOE didn't think it was necessary or important to inform any of us about this change. As a matter of fact, it took an Internet search days later to discover that DOE had actually reworked the playbook for the site without any public input.

Mr. Chairman, there are far too many questions about what DOE is doing and plans to do at the Nevada Test Site, questions that so far have gone unanswered.

Nevadans have had a lot of experience dealing with Federal officials throughout the days of atomic testing and during the Cold War. We're not going to just turn aside now and let the DOE run roughshod over our communities.

And I can tell you that I'm not alone in expressing my concerns about the

DOE's activities. Our Republican governor, Brian Sandoval, has also publicly stated his opposition to the shipments of this radioactive waste. In a letter to the Energy Secretary, our Governor stated that classifying "this material as low-level waste sets a dangerous precedent." I will be submitting the letter from Governor Sandoval for the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, my district sits just 65 miles southeast of the Nevada Test Site. The Las Vegas metropolitan area is home to nearly 2 million residents and more than 40 million visitors annually. Any plan to transport waste through the heart of the Las Vegas Valley would be extremely risky and incredibly irresponsible. The stakes are just too high to gamble on District One's safety.

The DOE has refused to cooperate with repeated attempts to gather additional information so we can have appropriate oversight. It's unthinkable that DOE is moving forward with this program without properly briefing Members of Congress. If we are being kept in the dark, who is overseeing the DOE's plans? It's critical that DOE be forthright about how and why the WAC was changed, how the changes relate to the proposed shipment, and how these changes will affect the safety and security of southern Nevada and communities across the country in the path of this transportation.

I'd like to thank the chairman and especially the ranking member for allowing me to bring this to the attention of the House, and I would ask them to work with me to ensure that there's proper congressional oversight of DOE and that the people of Nevada and beyond get the answers that they deserve.

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

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
Las Vegas, NV, June 20, 2013.

Re Planned Shipment of Wastes from Oak Ridge to Nevada National Security Site

Hon. DR. ERNEST MONIZ,  
Secretary, U.S. Department of Energy,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY MONIZ: I'm writing to inform you that after long and serious consideration, I have decided to oppose the Department of Energy's plan to ship the Consolidated Edison Uranium Solidification Project (CEUSP) canisters containing dangerous and long-lived radioactive waste for disposal at Area 5 of the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS).

I am aware that DOE believes that these canisters qualify for disposal as low-level radioactive waste (LLW). My advisors have independently evaluated all of the important technical and regulatory issues. They have concluded that the CEUSP canisters are not commonplace LLW; even if these canisters meet a legalistic definition of LLW, they are not suitable for shallow land burial at the NNSS. Nevada is also not satisfied with the overall process that DOE has followed in developing its disposal and transportation plans, including failure to appropriately address the concerns of affected local governments and Native American Tribes.

The CEUSP canisters can only be considered LLW because they do not meet the legal

definition of high-level radioactive waste, spent nuclear fuel, transuranic waste, or uranium mill tailings. Using this logic, DOE is attempting to exploit a gap in current regulations. This dangerous waste should be managed in the same manner as remote-handled transuranic waste, which DOE currently ships to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant for permanent deep-geologic disposal. The canisters contain a high concentration of fissile material (Uranium 235 and Uranium 233), uranium isotopes that are extremely long-lived (half lives of more than 160,000 years), and have a relatively high surface dose rate (300 rem per hour), which makes them dangerous to workers and a potential source of "dirty bomb" material. Moreover, qualifying this material as LLW sets a dangerous precedent for the classification of potential future waste streams that exist across the nation.

Both Nevada and DOE have a mutual interest in the long-term and safe management of NNSS. Over the past two decades, the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection has worked successfully with DOE on a broad range of environmental assessment and remediation activities at NNSS. I believe that this provides a basis for shared planning for future uses of DOE facilities at NNSS.

I request a meeting with you at your earliest convenience to discuss in a cooperative manner Nevada's views on the future of operations at the NNSS. Timely matters for discussion include the recently completed Site-wide Environmental Impact Statement and pending issuance of the associated Record of Decision, troubling revisions to the NNSS Waste Acceptance Criteria, and the unsatisfactory manner in which DOE and National Nuclear Security Administration have dealt with affected local governments and Native American Tribes in Nevada.

The State of Nevada is committed to a long-term cooperative relationship with your Department, based on mutual respect, sound science, protection of the environment, and public health and safety. I look forward to meeting with you at your earliest convenience.

Sincere regards,  
BRIAN SANDOVAL,  
Governor.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

Mr. TURNER. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the active and inactive nuclear weapons stockpiles of the United States in contravention of section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573(b)).

Mr. TURNER (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 gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2906.

I offer this amendment in response to the President's recent address in Berlin in which he outlined his plan to further reduce the United States strategic nuclear arsenal below acceptable levels and in contravention of current law.

The President's latest proposal would once again call for unilateral reductions in our strategic nuclear arsenal at a time when countries like Russia and China continue to expand and modernize their nuclear capabilities.

To make matters worse, the President has undertaken this most recent effort without the consent of the United States Senate, as required under the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which states international agreements cannot limit or reduce the military forces of the United States unless enacted pursuant to a treaty or congressional-executive agreement.

Not only do the President's continued calls for weapons reductions jeopardize the safety and security of the United States, but he compromises the safety of our partner nations.

It is unacceptable that the President continues to make secret deals with countries like Russia while at the same time breaking promises with the American people and our allies.

The current threat environment around the world is very real and should not be underestimated. A robust nuclear arsenal is critical in deterring against emerging threats like Iran and North Korea.

My amendment simply ensures that none of the funds appropriated by this act may be used to further reduce nuclear force reductions outside of the formal process established under existing law.

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 support the gentleman's amendment, and I salute his leadership in this area, both in this Congress and the past Congresses.

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 rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and wish to say, first of all, it is unnecessary because there are no funds in the FY14 bill that are allocated to be used for nuclear weapons reductions below the New START levels.

The amendment, in my opinion, is constitutionally questionable because it impinges on the President's ability to set U.S. nuclear weapons policy and usurp's the President's ability to retire, dismantle, or eliminate non-deployed nuclear weapons.

□ 1845

This amendment restricts the President's constitutional authority to negotiate international agreements, including sole executive agreements for arms reductions; and it impinges on the President's authority to determine the number of strategic delivery vehicles needed to meet national security

requirements and implement changes in those forces, as appropriate. And it limits the President's authority to determine appropriate force structure to meet nuclear deterrence requirements and to set nuclear employment policy, an authority exercised by every President in the nuclear age. Frankly, it is bad policy.

Blocking nuclear weapons reduction is out of step with post-Cold War and post-9/11 security environment. Secretary Schultz, Secretary Kissinger, Secretary Nunn, and Secretary Perry all have encouraged further nuclear weapons reductions stating in 2007:

Unless urgent new actions are taken, the United States soon will be compelled to enter a new nuclear era that will be more precarious and psychologically disorienting, and economically even more costly than was Cold War deterrence.

The amendment disregards potential military requirements, including potential Strategic Command recommendations, and instead imposes congressional requirements.

It seems to restrict any reductions below the New START to bilateral negotiated reductions with Russia. So in effect it outsources decisions on U.S. nuclear force structure to Russia, and it requires maintenance of nuclear weapons levels that might be costly and unnecessary in an era of budget constraints.

I think the amendment is poorly written and will not achieve its objectives. It fails to ban unilateral reductions by referencing the ACA section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

It fails to keep deployed forces at 1,550. And, as written, it allows the whole stockpile to decline to that level since that's the limit in New START. This would entail retaining a total stockpile of 1,550 with a deployed force of 1,550, which simply does not make sense. Neither the active nor the inactive stockpile is limited by New START. The treaty limits the number of operationally deployed warheads and delivery vehicles. While operationally deployed warheads are part of the active stockpile, the size of the stockpile itself is not limited. Supporting 1,550 deployed warheads would require the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy to maintain an active stockpile in excess of 1,550 warheads. New START also does not count non-strategic warheads, so it is unclear whether the amendment intends to count the nonstrategic warheads under the New START limit.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit some additional comments for the RECORD. Obviously, I disagree with the gentleman's amendment and urge my colleagues to oppose his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
TALKING POINTS AGAINST THE TURNER AMENDMENT ON  
NUCLEAR WEAPONS REDUCTIONS

Turner Amendment language: Sec. . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in the active and inactive stockpiles

of the United States below that required by the New START treaty (as defined in \_\_\_\_ ) in contravention of section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 USC 2573(b)).

UNNECESSARY

There are no funds in FY14 bill that are allocated to be used for nuclear weapons reductions below New START levels.

CONSTITUTIONALLY QUESTIONABLE

The amendment impinges on the President's ability to set US nuclear weapons policy and usurps the President's ability to retire, dismantle, or eliminate non-deployed nuclear weapons.

This amendment restricts the President's constitutional authority to negotiate international agreements, including sole executive agreements for arms reduction;

impinges on the President's authority to determine the number of strategic delivery vehicles needed to meet national security requirements and implement changes in those forces as appropriate;

limits the President's authority to determine appropriate force structure to meet nuclear deterrence requirements and to set nuclear employment policy—authority exercised by every president in the nuclear age.

BAD POLICY

Blocking nuclear weapons reductions is out of step with post-Cold War and post-9/11 security environment. Sec. Schultz, Sec. Kissinger, Senator Nunn and Sec. Perry have encouraged further nuclear weapons reductions stating in 2007: "Unless urgent new actions are taken, the United States soon will be compelled to enter a new nuclear era that will be more precarious and psychologically disorienting, and economically even more costly than was Cold War deterrence.

Disregards potential military requirements, including potential Strategic Command recommendations, and instead imposes Congressional requirement.

Seems to restrict any reductions below New START to bilateral, negotiated reductions with Russia, so in effect outsources decisions on US nuclear force structure to Russia.

Requires maintenance of nuclear weapons levels that might be costly and unnecessary in an era of budget constraints.

INEFFECTIVE

The amendment is poorly written and will not achieve its objectives.

It fails to ban unilateral reductions by referencing the ACA Section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

ACDA does not prevent the President from making unilateral reductions in U.S. nuclear weapons. It says that the President cannot obligate the United States to reduce its forces in a militarily significant way without seeking the approval of Congress. "Obligate" usually means signing a legally-binding treaty or executive agreement. A handshake, or joint statement of political intent would not be an "obligation" under the terms of this legislation.

It fails to keep deployed forces at 1,550.

As written, it allows the whole stockpile to decline to 1,550, since that's the limit in New START. This would entail retaining a total stockpile of 1,550, with a deployed force of 1,550, which does not make sense. Neither the active nor the inactive stockpile are limited by New START. The Treaty limits the number of operationally deployed warheads and delivery vehicles. While operationally deployed

warheads are part of the active stockpile, the size of the stockpile itself is not limited. Supporting 1,550 deployed warheads would require DOD and DOE to maintain an active stockpile in excess of 1,550 warheads. New START also does not count nonstrategic warheads so it is unclear whether the amendment intends to count the nonstrategic warheads under the new START limit.

Quote by Gen Kehler, in response to question by Mr. Turner at STRATCOM policy hearing on March 5, 2013 (noting that you do not necessarily need an operational pit production infrastructure is needed before we reduce non-deployed nuclear weapons):

Mr. Turner. Great. Because you would agree that our ability to have a long-term ability for production, in a production infrastructure should be a basis for us considering whether or not we reduce any of our hedge in case there isn't an issue with the weapons that we have.

General Kehler. Sir, I think that is one consideration. I don't think that is the only consideration. And I think that there are some scenarios that you can unfold where an interim strategy will serve us even under some technical issues. So I—but I think for the United States of America in the long term that we want a permanent solution to the nuclear enterprise that includes a permanent solution to the plutonium.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I urge the House to support the Turner-Rogers-Franks-Bridenstine amendment.

The New START treaty is perhaps the first unilateral arms control treaty the U.S. has ratified in that it is the first treaty where only the U.S. has to make reductions in the central limits of the treaty.

Every six months new data is released by the Department of State showing that only the U.S. is reducing its deployed nuclear forces to implement this treaty.

Last month, in Berlin, the President announced that he was changing the Nuclear Weapons Employment Guidance and Strategy of the United States to support further reductions in United States nuclear forces.

Never before has a President done something like this.

Yes, Presidents since Truman have updated the nation's nuclear war plan.

But there is no precedent for a President to tell the national security team that, regardless of the nuclear weapons modernization programs of China, Russia, Pakistan, North Korea and others, the U.S. should plan to reduce our nuclear forces.

Every other President has asked one simple question when conducting a review like this: what level of nuclear forces do I need to ensure that a potential enemy or adversary knows that if he attacks the United States or our allies, we will have the ability to respond with nuclear forces that could result in nothing less than total devastation?

It has not been explained to me how fewer nuclear weapons in the U.S. nuclear deterrent is necessarily better for the country's security.

When allies see us backing away from our extended deterrent, and potential adversaries see us giving up these capabilities while they are growing them in practically every way—cascades of proliferation cannot be far behind.

Already we see that allies are concerned with the President's new approach.

For 66 years, since the U.S. used them to end World War II, our deterrent has kept the world safe.

This is not a recipe the Congress will let the President arbitrarily change to satisfy a small cloister of arms control and disarmament ideologues.

The reason the Turner-Rogers-Franks-Bridenstine amendment is so important is that in this new strategy the President announced, he refuses to commit to following the established precedent of only pursuing nuclear reductions with another nation through a treaty or a congressional-executive agreement that must be enacted by an affirmative act of Congress.

Practically every senior military officer who has testified before the House Armed Services Committee on the subject of further nuclear force reductions has been clear they must be "bilateral and verifiable" and that the only way to achieve this is through a treaty.

Yet, the civilians in the Administration refuse to state that this approach supported by the military is also the President's policy.

This amendment is consistent with language I offered, as Chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee that overseas our nation's nuclear forces, which was adopted by the House Armed Services Committee and the House itself, in the recent FY14 National Defense Authorization Act.

The President may think he doesn't need Congress when it comes to international agreements with states like Russia.

He may think he can ignore gross violations in arms control agreements, like those Russia is engaged in today.

But he still needs money to implement his policies.

And that's what we can deny him if he attempts to ignore or circumvent the people's elected representatives in Congress.

I encourage the support of this amendment and I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his support, leadership, and endurance during this long process.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN  
OF NEW MEXICO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil—Expenses", and increasing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction", by \$15,000,000.

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise to amend H.R. 2609, the Energy and Water appropriations bill, for the purpose of addressing several issues in New Mexico.

More specifically, my amendment would increase the construction account by \$15 million to ensure local governments, like the city of Rio Rancho, the county of Benalillo and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy Dis-

trict, get reimbursed for the work that they have done in conjunction with the Army Corps of Engineers. The Army Corps of Engineers works with local governments in New Mexico to construct levees, implement flood control measures, and other important infrastructure for the safety of the public.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, local governments have been left holding an IOU from the Federal Government for doing work based on good-faith written agreements with the Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there may be opposition from the Republican majority, but I'm hoping I can persuade the chairman to support me in this effort. Section 593 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 is under which the city of Rio Rancho and these other local governments entered into agreements with the Army Corps of Engineers. If the Republican majority disagrees with the authority, they should repeal it; but let's make these local governments whole.

When city and local governments enter into reimbursement contracts, they expect to be reimbursed. They have annual budgets with the expectation they will get paid back. Congress should live up to these obligations in the authority given to the agency by Congress. I understand the constraints that the subcommittee dealt with with the allocations given to them, but we need to make sure that we're working to make these local governments whole. Again, going forward, if this is an authority that the Republican majority feels we should do away with, we should do away with it. But let's make these local governments whole.

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

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

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

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

gentleman from New Mexico's amendment.

The gentleman makes the case that there's a need for this infrastructure, and maybe there is; but the Corps of Engineers has no particular expertise or reason for being the funding source. Especially when we're looking at such tight budgets to begin with, we must focus the Corps' funding on activities which have the greatest impact on our economy and public safety, namely, navigation and flood control—our historic responsibility. So I must oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to bring an action against the United States.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, since coming to the House of Representatives a little over 2 years ago, I have made it a priority to revitalize the economy in central Florida. As a result, I have had the opportunity to meet with community leaders in my district and the surrounding areas to talk about projects that matter the most to them—dredging of canals and the building of new roads.

Again and again, I find, however, that the Army Corps of Engineers is slow rolling many of these projects, not because they want to, but because they're forced to.

The Corps continues to move the goalpost on these communities. And once permits have been given and work has already been done, the Corps has come back with fines and penalties and mitigation.

When I asked the Army Corps what happened with these projects, it's the same thing. I constantly hear from the Corps that they're worried about being sued. They're worried because the advocacy groups all over this country are dedicated to doing nothing other than taking away Congress' responsibilities for setting our Nation's laws, regulatory policies, and giving it to the courts or the executive branch.

These activists don't want people of the United States of America or their elected officials to have any say in how this country is run. They want to force their own agenda on everybody else through the courts; and even more disturbing, they're doing it with taxpayer money.

These groups receive Federal grants; and once they take the Army Corps,

the EPA, or any other agency to court, they oftentimes get a cash settlement or payout to go away. That money goes back into the litigation system, furthering the problem.

Take, for example, the group Earthjustice, which in their tax year of 2011 nonprofit 990 tax form described themselves as a "public interest law firm" dedicated to pursuing "far-reaching, big-impact litigation." In that filing, Earthjustice used the phrase "our litigation" or "our lawsuits" over a dozen times. Their 2011 filing includes seven pages of attorneys' fees that have been awarded to them; and that document celebrates the fact that because of the work, the Federal Government is forced to back down. They have an entire section dedicated to their work to stop the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Moreover, they are doing it with our money. Groups like this get Federal dollars through grants. Then they use the money to help fund lawsuits against the Federal Government and these agencies. They take that settlement money that we pay out, to the tune of \$5 million in 2011 for just one group, one advocacy group, Earthjustice; and, guess what, that money comes from the pockets of the American people.

Whether or not you support the policy goals of groups like Earthjustice, every single person in this room should be worried about their tactics. Their self-stated mission is to take regulatory power out of the hands of Congress and hand it to the courts. The goal is diametrically opposed to the vision our Founding Fathers had.

Nobody in this Chamber should support abdicating our constitutional responsibilities to activists who then charge the tab back to United States citizens and then come back asking for even more money.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the work that the chairman has done in moving this particular bill through. In discussions with the chairman of the committee, we're going to withdraw this amendment because I believe that we can work together to try to resolve the fact that these groups shouldn't profit on the backs of American taxpayers, blocking justice and the ability for these places, communities that I serve and others in this great Nation to create jobs.

With that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN). Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to lease or purchase

new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that requires all new light duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2014 from being used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum.

Our transportation sector is by far the biggest reason we send \$600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs. But America doesn't need to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel. Alternative technologies exist today that, when implemented broadly, will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet, with over 14,000 being used by the Department of Veterans Affairs and other departments.

By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources—including biomass, natural gas, agricultural waste, hydrogen, renewable electricity, methanol, and ethanol.

When I was in Brazil, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding their use of ethanol. When people drove to a gas station, they saw what a gallon of gasoline would cost and what an equivalent amount of ethanol would cost and could decide which was better for them. I want Americans to make the same choices. If they can do it in Brazil, we can do it here. We can educate people on using alternative fuels and let consumers decide what is best for them.

Expanding the role these energy sources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies and will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil markets.

I have introduced a bill, along with the gentlewoman from Florida, that would also take a major step in this direction, and I think this policy is something that we need to move. So I ask that everyone support the Engel amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1900

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'm pleased to accept the amendment from my friend from New York State and his annual advocacy on behalf of this cause.

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. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Expenses", and by increasing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Construction", by \$1,000,000.

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

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Chairman, my amendment seeks to increase funding to the Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Construction account by \$1 million to support flood and storm damage reduction efforts. With hurricane season underway, it is important that we support the Corps' critical efforts in this area.

In H.R. 2609, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN has provided the Corps of Engineers with \$1.3 billion for projects that can mitigate natural disasters, including hurricanes, storms, and floods.

Having lived through Hurricane Sandy, I know the chairman is well aware of the value of these investments, and I would like to thank the chairman and the committee for their efforts on our behalf.

By providing this additional funding for the Corps to conduct important activities, my amendment demonstrates a commitment to addressing the threat of severe weather events and flooding. The Corps has undertaken a number of important flood projects throughout the country, and we must continue to provide the funding we need to support these efforts.

Again, I appreciate the efforts of the chairman and his committee's work in crafting this bill and supporting the Corps' important work, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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'm pleased to support the amendment. And let me thank the gentleman from Florida for his advocacy for his own congressional district and his State, and I commend him.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee to carry out section 301 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 16421a; added by section 402 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5)).

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

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would stop a loan program created by the infamous 2009 stimulus bill.

As I and many others have pointed out when the bill was passed, the stimulus, which was billed as funding shovel-ready programs, actually became a vehicle to bake in higher levels of spending and new government programs. As with other government loan programs, we've all too often seen abuses in mismanagement, and this program is no exception.

The elimination of the Western Area Power Administration's green transmission borrowing authority was recommended in the report to this year's House budget; and so if you voted for the budget, I would urge you to support this amendment as well.

I also want to thank my colleagues, Mr. MCLINTOCK and Chairman HASTINGS, for their work in the offering and marking up of a bill last year to repeal this program.

As the budget report notes:

The \$3.25 billion borrowing authority in the Western Area Power Administration's Transmission Infrastructure Program provides loans to develop new transmission systems aimed solely at integrating renewable energy.

This authority was inserted into the stimulus bill without opportunity for debate. Of most concern, the authority includes a bailout provision that would require American taxpayers to pay outstanding balances on projects that private developers failed to pay.

This bailout provision is particularly problematic because, in November 2011, the Department of Energy inspector general issued a lengthy management alert on this stimulus borrowing authority. To quote from that report:

Because of a variety of problems, the project is estimated to be 2 years behind schedule and \$70 million over budget, essentially out of funds, and currently at a standstill, with no progress being made. Western had not completed a formal root-cause analysis and corrective action plan designed to ensure more effective program safeguards are in place going forward. Because Western has committed \$25 million in developmental

funding to a potential \$3 billion project that would ultimately require an investment of \$1.5 billion in Recovery Act borrowing authority, we are issuing this report as a management alert.

Madam Chairman, this IG report speaks for itself, and I urge my colleagues to support the repeal of this failed stimulus program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I'm not quite sure why he's doing this, but, you know, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act provided \$3.25 billion in borrowing authority to modernize the electricity grid.

I believe your amendment focuses on WAPA, the Western Area Power marketing authority, solely; is that correct, sir?

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. That is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank you very much.

Now, I don't live out there. I'm from a part of the country that doesn't have one of these, but most of America is covered by power marketing authorities. If you really look at California, if you look at the TVA, regions of the country that have these borrowing authorities, and the way they work is that the ratepayers then pay back, over time, the costs of that investment.

We have to invest and modernize our grid. That part of the country is growing, and, frankly, they have been returning dollars at a fairly steady rate. I looked at those figures about a year ago.

And with the increase in renewables in the West, there's also a need to alter the grid and its ability to accept new forms of power. That part of the country is growing. The population is just exploding out there. And so, therefore, we're going to have a greater use of power and more of a need to put it on to the system.

So I don't see why the gentleman who comes from Louisiana—now, I know you've got a lot of oil drilling down there in the gulf and a lot of us have voted for that, but I don't really understand the purpose of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I'm happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. These companies, they certainly are welcome to borrow money and invest it themselves. This puts the taxpayer on the hook, and they're not delivering on these loans. They're well behind. And eventually, the taxpayers, as in so many cases from the stimulus bill, are going to be picking up the tab.

If it's so valuable and it returns investment over time, then fine; let them use their own capital.

Ms. KAPTUR. I hear what the gentleman is saying, but they actually do pay it back through usage. Just like you pay a utility bill and it goes back to the company, essentially WAPA is a company, and it borrows and then it pays back. And so these funds are going to be paid back over time.

I wish I had one in my area. I think it would really help us out a lot.

But I have to oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think it would be very counterproductive to hurt any part of our country and their power grid system, their ability to modernize their power grid system.

The gentleman has, I think, Southeast Power marketing authority. I don't know if that covers Louisiana or not. But different parts of the country have different systems that are in place, and I wouldn't want to take away the West's ability to power themselves and to do so in a very cost-effective manner.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. And again, I would just have to say, there's a dynamic to money. And yes, some of it may be paid back. But at the end of the day, if the money is not fully paid back, or paid back at the appropriate rate and the taxpayers have to make up the difference, then I would say that certainly in the private sector that wouldn't work out.

And I think that we should hold government, nongovernment, all those who handle money, and particularly taxpayer money, we need to hold them to the same standard. And they're not delivering on that return of investment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, I would beg to disagree. Reclaiming my time, I'm glad the gentleman stated that, but I think that you will hear strongly from them that they, in fact, are paying back, and they have a good rate of repayment.

I remember our former colleague, Norm Dicks, if I said anything against WAPA, boy, I'd be in big trouble because they do have a very good rate of repayment back. And, in fact, they have returned money consistently and paid back their original loan. So I think that they're free-floating now, and I think they have a very, very good record.

So I would oppose the gentleman's amendment very strongly in support of our colleagues in the West and their need for power and modernizing their electricity grid. And I urge my colleagues to vote against the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FLEMING. 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities", and increasing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers—Civil—Construction", by \$100,000,000.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I want to commend the staff, the Chair, the ranking member, and all of those who have worked so hard over the last couple of days to get this bill processed and to deal with all the amendments. It's been an arduous task and one that has created, I am told, far more amendments than have ever been presented on any such appropriation bill in the past.

And there's a reason for that. The reason is that this appropriation bill is a direct result of the, what we fondly call—or not so fondly call—the Ryan Republican budget. This is really the first opportunity that America has to see the effects of a very austere budget, one that really decimates programs all across America, programs that are of great value and great utility.

This particular subcommittee was presented with the mark, that is, the amount of money that it had available to it as a result of that budget that was passed by the majority in this House. Now, that budget's not law. There has been no conference committee. In fact, the majority in this House has refused to set up a conference committee, that is, to put in names for that conference committee. So this is really a one-House budget that is being carried out here with this legislation.

It is a remarkable and an extraordinarily important moment in which the American public has a chance to see exactly what austerity, as presented to us by the majority, means. It means that those research programs that allow America the opportunity to advance its energy programs, to take control of the energy programs of the future, the renewable energy programs, the nuclear energy programs, and on and on, those opportunities are lost.

□ 1915

I know the committee was faced with a very stringent budget, an austerity budget. They made decisions that are, in my view, extraordinarily detri-

mental to America. Specifically, the committee—the majority, that is—made a decision to take the money that was available and remove it from those programs that are the energy future of this Nation—wind, solar, conservation, biofuels, automobiles that are efficient, houses that are efficient, programs that are absolutely crucial to this Nation's future and to the world's future because they deal specifically with climate change—and move money from those programs to the Nuclear Weapons program and to programs that are not needed.

Consider for a moment that the United States has over 5,500 nuclear bombs, which are sufficient to end life on this planet. It's over if those were to be used. And the military says we don't need them. These are programs that are inefficient, ineffective, and are the sinkholes of American taxpayers' money. The majority decided to move the money there. Okay. Who are we going to use those things on? We can't. We don't need them for deterrence. But yet that's where the money goes. Not only does the money come from those energy programs that we absolutely need for our future and for our economy's future, the money comes from programs that are absolutely essential for the well-being of Americans today and tomorrow.

The Army Corps of Engineers protects our citizens with its levees and with its flood control projects. We've heard this over and over again for the last 2 days. And yet the majority continues to insist to spend the money on these nuclear weapons, not on those things that are essential for today's life and essential for the well-being of people now, as the storm season arrives here on the east coast with hurricanes, in the Gulf States with hurricanes, and in my State of California, in my district, where I have more than 1,500 miles of levees. People are at risk.

This amendment would take \$100 million from these weapons systems and put that money directly into the Army Corps of Engineers Construction account so that the Army Corps of Engineers can protect our citizens today.

I ask for an "aye" vote on this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 amendment. We've gone over this ground several times so I'll be brief.

All of us here strongly support investments in the Corps' work and their projects, particularly those projects with the greatest benefit to public safety and the economy, namely flood control and navigation. But this amendment proposes to pay for additional Corps construction by diverting funds needed for our nuclear weapons stockpile for national security. And that is the most critical priority in our bill.

And so I strongly oppose the amendment. His amendment is unacceptable because it is an issue of national security, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise today to voice my support for vital funding for important Army Corps of Engineers' projects across the Palm Beach-Treasure Coast district that I proudly represent.

This bill includes funding for the critically important Indian River Lagoon C-44 project, which will greatly improve the water quality in my district. For those of you unfamiliar with this local treasure, it is the most diverse estuary in North America, many of its species already threatened or endangered. But due to extreme pollution, local officials have issued health warnings advising residents to not contact this waterway. Tragically, it has also witnessed a major die-off of its population of manatees, dolphins, pelicans, and other crucial species. Completion of this project is essential to protecting this vital ecosystem as well as improving the water quality throughout the region.

The C-44 project is part of broader Everglades restoration efforts that the Army Corps is tasked with, which will protect this unique and important habitat. Furthermore, the Everglades provide drinking water for one in three Floridians, and restoration efforts also have a 3-to-1 return on investment in the local economy. Completion of the overall Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Project will shore up Florida's access to clean drinking water and improve the local environment and economy.

Locally, Everglades restoration is part of the solution to the harmful discharges that are currently being released from Lake Okeechobee into the St. Lucie River on the Treasure Coast. By returning water flows south of the lake and improving water quality in the area through projects such as C-44, we can mitigate the effects these harmful discharges from the lake continue to have on our local waterways year after year, devastating the environment and the economy.

Furthermore, the Army Corps is responsible for repairing the Herbert Hoover Dike, which surrounds Lake Okeechobee and is listed as one of the most at-risk of failure in the Nation. This project keeps local residents safe from devastating flooding that could occur if the dike were to fail. The Army Corps has already been struggling to meet its obligations on this and other projects, which is why we must continue to provide funding or risk further delaying these important ongoing jobs.

In addition to the important Indian River Lagoon, Lake Okeechobee, and Herbert Hoover Dike projects this bill

supports, it also provides important funding for inlet dredging projects. Being able to access and safely navigate our local waterways and ports is essential for public safety and our economy. The same can be said for those shore restoration programs that this bill also funds, returning our local beaches to their pre-storm conditions after extreme weather events such as Hurricane Sandy.

If you speak with any of my constituents, they'll tell you that all of these projects are vital to their daily way of life and to the health of the local population as well as the economy. We must provide certainty and continue the Corps' funding or risk devastating their progress on these important projects. Jeopardizing funding for these ongoing projects would only further aggravate the serious problem of toxic discharges in my district, prevent progress on essential water quality restoration projects, and have an overall negative impact on our local environment and, in turn, our local economy. To me, that's simply not an option.

Madam Chair, we have the obligation to provide adequate resources for programs that protect public safety, water quality, and our environment, such as these. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the underlying legislation to continue to fund these projects that are critical to the well-being of the Treasure Coast and Palm Beaches. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment that would eliminate funding for the vitally important Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC).

The ARC was established in 1965 to focus on the profound economic needs of the Appalachia Region. It was designed to provide the kinds of basic investment that would assist in strengthening rural communities long-overlooked by the government and ensure that hard-working, loyal citizens could successfully build their communities and their careers and contribute fully to the well-being of the Nation.

Since its establishment, the ARC has had measurable success in addressing the needs of Appalachian families and communities and its good works have improved the outlook for the entire region.

The ARC operates in partnership with State and local governments to help make the best, most strategically effective use of Federal investments, and, in the process, leverages private investments to help create well-paying jobs and lasting improvements to local economies. In Fiscal Year 2012 alone, ARC invested approximately \$66 million in projects that leveraged over \$267 million in private-sector investment, a 4 to 1 ratio, and helped to create or retain over 20,000 jobs.

In my State, Appalachian Regional Commission investment has meant that thousands of children could turn on the water faucet and drink safe water. It has spurred the creation of small businesses and provided needed funding that enabled rural towns to build basic infrastructure essential to attract new economic opportunities. It has enabled working men and women to receive training and find nearby jobs to rear their families, rather than having to rely on government assistance or leave

their homes and the State they love simply to earn a living.

It is said that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. Cutting a program with proven success at cost-effectively creating jobs and improving the economy of an entire region at this time is senseless. I urge the House to recognize the immense value of fully funding the ARC as a key component to achieving renewed economic strength throughout our Nation and to vote against this amendment.

Mr. SANFORD. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment to eliminate five regional commissions that waste taxpayer dollars. These programs were initially formed with the mandate to improve the lives of those who live in impoverished areas. However, they have instead veered from this mandate by routinely allocating funds to projects that not only fall under state and local responsibilities, but also projects that benefit only those who live in more economically developed areas.

For example, the Northern Border Regional Commission has granted: \$250,000 to construct a tower to improve cell phone coverage in New Hampshire, \$250,000 to construct a 93-mile, four-season, multi-use trail across northern Vermont and \$160,000 to promote and raise awareness of the maple syrup industry in New York.

These examples of government waste are not just confined to the Northern Border Regional Commission. A similar organization called the Delta Regional Commission, which spans from Mississippi to Southern Illinois, granted: \$150,000 to build a tornado safe room in a Missouri hospital and \$47,000 for updating a sprinkler system at a business incubator in Illinois. While there may be a need for these projects, they do not fall under the original mandate of these commissions. I believe that for government programs to be effective, they must be focused.

The problem is that these projects do not help those that the regional commissions were originally created for—Americans living below the poverty line. The Obama administration, along with the Government Accountability Office, has identified these programs as wasteful and duplicative while possessing no track record of success.

Madam Chair, eliminating these programs will save American taxpayers \$90 million and work towards reducing the national debt by targeting wasteful spending.

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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. 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. LUETKEMEYER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None the funds made available by this Act may be used for the study of the

Missouri River Projects authorized in section 108 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 111-8).

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. The Missouri and Mississippi River basins have faced major challenges over the past few years due to both extreme flooding and droughts. This devastation, combined with the sluggish economy and our aging inland waterways infrastructure, means that now more than ever we must be focused and responsible with taxpayer-funded river projects.

My amendment would prohibit funding for the Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study, also known as MRAPS. This \$25 million earmarked study comes on the heels of a comprehensive \$35 million, 17-year study that showed that the current authorized purposes are important and should be maintained.

This Congress and this administration need to focus on protecting human life and property by maintaining the safety and soundness of our levees. We also must support the important commercial advantages provided to us for our inland waterway system.

The Missouri River moves goods to the market and is an important tool in both domestic and international trade. That's why American Waterways Operators, the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River, the Missouri Farm Bureau, and the Missouri Corn Growers Group support this amendment.

This study puts in jeopardy not only the lower Missouri River but also the flow of the Mississippi River, which could create devastating consequences for navigation and transportation, resulting in barriers for waterway operators, agriculture, and every product that depends on the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers to get it to market.

The current authorized uses of the Missouri River provide necessary resources and translate into continued economic stability not only for Missourians, but also for many Americans living throughout the Missouri and lower Mississippi River basins. This study is duplicative and wasteful of taxpayers' dollars. On this exact issue we've already spent 17 years and \$35 million on hundreds of public meetings and expensive litigation.

I offered identical language during our first debate on the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution. That amendment passed by a vote of 245-176. In the fiscal year debates of 2012 and 2013, the exact amendment respectively passed by voice vote and by a vote of 242-168, and was later signed into law by President Obama. I appreciate my colleagues who offered their support and hope to have their support again.

Madam Chair, there's no doubt in my mind that water resources receive too little funding. It is time for the Federal Government to refocus and reprioritize to create safer, more efficient infra-

structure for our inland waterways and stop spending hard-earned taxpayer dollars unnecessarily.

I ask 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 Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. HIMES. I rise briefly to engage the chairman and the ranking member in a colloquy.

First, I would like to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their work on this bill and in particular for their willingness to hear my concerns regarding the needs of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I think I speak for all of us when I say that a well-funded Army Corps means good jobs and important infrastructure improvements in the regions helped by their projects. Of particular interest to me is the special role that the Army Corps plays in mitigating the impact of floods caused by an increasing number of severe weather events in our communities.

I know that I'm not the only Member in this room whose district was ravaged by Superstorm Sandy as it swept up the east coast last year. Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's district in New Jersey was also severely affected by the storm. And Sandy is just one example of the magnitude of damage our cities and towns suffer year after year when they are not adequately prepared. With limited resources available after a storm like Sandy, flood mitigation efforts have become more important than ever. An ounce of prevention is, as they say, worth a pound of cure.

Madam Chairman, back in 2010, I was able to secure an authorization for the Army Corps of Engineers to conduct flood mitigation studies in my area—studies that would culminate in important recommendations for preventing future flood damage in Fairfield County like that which occurred during Sandy, Irene, and countless other storms in recent years. Unfortunately, with the current backlog at the Corps, it is unlikely that these studies or any other so-called New Start projects will receive the funding they need to move forward as promised and needed years ago.

I know there are dozens, if not hundreds, of projects waiting for Army Corps funding, and I have no delusion that my district is more deserving than others of this funding. But perhaps it is time to reevaluate the necessity of these older projects, re-prioritizing the projects that are still necessary and those that are most urgent. We must find a way to begin new projects and ensure our cities and towns are prepared for the next big storm.

I would ask the chairman and ranking member whether this ban on New Start projects is something that merits further consideration, and I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. HIMES of Connecticut makes a good point about the importance of making infrastructure investments before major disasters can occur. I share his concerns about the backlog of Army Corps of Engineers projects, particularly in the backdrop of communities throughout the New England and the Mid-Atlantic area that continue to rebuild after one of the worst storms in our Nation's history.

I want to assure the gentleman that the committee's position on New Starts is reconsidered each and every year. We take a look at the funding requirements of ongoing studies and projects, new studies and projects, and overall funding levels for certain accounts.

I commend the gentleman for his attention to this issue. I look forward to working with him to address these new needs at the earliest appropriate time, and I yield back to the gentleman.

□ 1930

Mr. HIMES. I look forward to working with the chairman as well.

I yield now to the ranking member, the gentelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I join Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Representative HIMES in emphasizing the importance of the Army Corps of Engineers projects.

The Army Corps of Engineers has an important presence in the Great Lakes region, operating an electrified barrier in the Chicago Area Waterway System to keep the invasive Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes and devastating the fishing industry and ecosystem of one-fifth of the world's freshwater. So I appreciate the gentleman from Connecticut for acknowledging the importance of Corps projects beyond the eastern seaboard.

I agree that the backlog of Army Corps projects is preventing the Corps from taking on new projects in a time-effective manner, which is particularly problematic as we approach hurricane season once again. I look forward to working with Mr. HIMES in deciding how we can ensure new projects get the funding they need while also honoring those worthy projects that have been waiting for some time now.

Mr. HIMES. I thank the ranking member and look forward to working with her on this as well, and yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the dais.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

study conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, from extreme flooding to extreme drought, the United States has been hit very hard over the past few years. The families who live and work along the Missouri River have endured great hardship.

Though it's one of our Nation's greatest resources, the Missouri River would produce extreme, erosive regular flooding and be mostly unfit for navigation if not for aggressive, long-term management by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Congress first authorized the Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation Project (BSNP) in 1912 with the intention of mitigating flood risk and maintaining a navigable channel from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the river in St. Louis. Though the BSNP's construction was completed in the 1980s, the Corps' ability to make adjustments as needed remains crucial to this day.

President Obama, in his fiscal year budget of 2014, requested \$72 million for the Missouri River Recovery Program, which would primarily go towards the funding of environmental restoration studies and projects. This funding dwarfs the insufficient \$8.4 million that was requested for the entire operations and maintenance of the aforementioned BSNP. It is preposterous to think that environmental projects are more important than the protection of human life.

I do not take for granted the importance of river ecosystems. I grew up near the Missouri River, as did many of my constituents. Yet we have reached a point in our Nation where we value the welfare of fish and birds more than the welfare of our fellow human beings. Our priorities are backwards, Madam Chair.

My amendment will eliminate the Missouri River Ecosystem Recovery Program, MRERP, a study that has become little more than a tool by some for the promotion of returning the river to its most natural state with little regard for flood control, navigation, trade, power generation, or the people who depend on the Missouri River for their livelihoods.

The end of the study will in no way jeopardize the Corps' ability to meet the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. MRERP is one of no fewer than 70 environmental and ecological studies focused on the Missouri River. The people who have had to foot the bill for these studies—many of which take years to complete and are ultimately inconclusive—are the very people who have lost their farms, their businesses, and their homes.

Our vote today will also show our constituents that this Congress is aware of the gross disparity between

the funding for environmental efforts and the funding for the protection of our citizens. During the debate on fiscal year 2012 and 2013 appropriations, the House passed this exact language, which was ultimately signed into law by President Obama. It is supported by the American Waterways Operators, the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River, the Missouri Farm Bureau, and the Missouri Corn Growers Association.

It is time for Congress to take a serious look at water development funding priorities, and it is time to send a message to the Federal entities that manage our waterways. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to support our Nation's river communities and encourage more balance in Federal funding for water infrastructure and management.

Madam Chair, 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. I rise to express my opposition to the gentleman's amendment and my support for a river system that works.

The Water Resources Development Act of 2007—which was passed with such bipartisan support that it overcame a Presidential veto—authorized the Corps to undertake the Missouri River Ecosystem Restoration Plan and develop the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee to consult on the study. This authority provided a venue for collaboration between a 70-member stakeholder group of tribes, States, stakeholder groups, and Federal agencies to develop a shared vision and comprehensive plan for the restoration of the Missouri River ecosystem.

By prohibiting the Corps from expending any 2013 funds on a study and a committee, we continue the delay that started with the same short-sighted amendment that was adopted last year, sadly. This will lead to further erosion of trust in the delicate partnerships in the basin.

While the Corps will continue to comply with the endangered species requirements through other activities, I believe there is a role for a long-term plan for the basin. We face the same sort of issue in my part of the country where we have rivers and lakes that carry commercial trade, but we also have an ecosystem that we are a part of. And we are learning, as a world, how to deal with the natural systems of which we are all a part.

So I think what's been incredible with the Missouri River System is to see some of the flooding that has been prevented because of the Corps' work for a century now. I think all the American people support efforts to try to contain the power of that river at times when it could flood communities and harm both the people and our developed environment.

But I don't really support the gentleman's amendment because I do think there is a role for the ecosystem to be contemplated when long-term planning is done. With what's happening with rainfall, what's happening with population explosion and so forth, it's more incumbent upon us to work together and try to figure out how to work through those partnerships.

So, sadly, I oppose the amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman and ranking member on the Laboratory Directed Research and Development program at the National Nuclear Security Administration.

The Laboratory Directed Research and Development, LDRD, program at the National Nuclear Security Administration's national laboratories has, over the past two decades, made it possible for these labs to develop capabilities that have been critical to meeting the future mission needs via high-risk, high-payoff R&D. For example, at Los Alamos National Laboratory in my district, LDRD has supported a key technology that is now being applied toward the detection of nuclear and radiological threats and is a winner of this year's R&D 100 awards.

LDRD is also very important to recruiting and retaining top scientists and engineers. At Los Alamos, LDRD supports about one-half of the post-docs who have gone on to become the lab's permanent employees and is one of the key and leading sources of new lab employees.

The funding for the program is derived through a certain percentage of each lab's operating budget. Currently, that percentage is limited to not more than 8 percent. The bill we are considering today would lower that to be not more than 4.5 percent. I am very concerned that such a low level could harm the national labs' ability to meet future mission needs and ask the chairman and ranking member to work with us in making sure that the levels allowed for LDRD do not adversely impact the national security capabilities of the labs.

With that, Madam Chair, I would yield to the gentlelady from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Madam Chair, America is facing security, economic, and environmental challenges that are unparalleled in our history. Our national laboratories have

a unique set of assets we can leverage to meet these challenges.

Projects financed by LDRD have allowed the National Nuclear Security Agency to rapidly respond to unforeseen national security needs. In 1988, Sandia National Labs, located in my district, made a breakthrough in parallel computing that resulted in the ability to compute extremely complicated numerical simulations to ensure the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons stockpile without the need for nuclear tests. As a result, we have not tested a nuclear weapon since 1993.

The benefits of parallel processing supercomputers have also improved the competitiveness of U.S. industries in the global economy. They were used to map the human genome, develop new drugs, and shorten the development time of products by finding mistakes before they end up in prototypes.

Parallel processing supercomputers have also greatly increased our understanding of atmospheric changes through global atmospheric circulation simulation. These advancements have helped provide an understanding of the climate that cannot be determined by theory or by other experiments.

LDRD investments have been historically important in advancing the state of high-performance computing. Ongoing LDRD investments are enabling next-generation computing hardware and software approaches that will eventually lead to much better performance.

I am confident that we can work with the chairman and the ranking member to fund LDRD at levels that will maintain our vital national security assets, and I thank them for their willingness to work with us on this issue.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I appreciate my colleagues from New Mexico raising their concern for the long-term vitality of the National Nuclear Security Administration's laboratories.

I look forward to working with both of you to make sure that the levels allowed for the Laboratory Directed Research and Development, or the LDRD, program do not adversely impact the national security capability of these remarkable laboratories.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman. LDRD is an important program for the labs to recruit and retain the top talent that is needed to accomplish their mission. I join the chair in agreeing to work with our colleagues so that the national security capabilities of the labs are not adversely impacted by the levels allowed for LDRD.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their serv-

ice and for agreeing to work with us on this important issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. NOEM

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to issue rules or regulations to establish a fee for surplus water from Missouri River reservoirs.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Chair, this amendment is quite simple. It would block the Corps of Engineers from issuing rules or regulations that would charge a fee for surplus water on the Missouri River.

I offer this amendment to stop an overreach by the Corps of Engineers in its attempt to charge constituents in South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana for what is legally theirs—water from the Missouri River.

The States of South and North Dakota sacrificed hundreds of thousands of acres of prime farmland during the creation of the dams on the Missouri; but in doing so, they did not give up the right to their own water from the river. The Flood Control Act that created the dams and reservoirs specifically said:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of States in determining the development of watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control.

Madam Chair, I don't believe congressional intent could be any clearer in this instance. Rural water systems, businesses and tribes up and down the Missouri River rely on it for water and have been pulling water from the river for nearly 60 years without a fee.

Let us not forget that 2 years ago at this time residents up and down the Missouri were suffering one of the greatest floods that the river has ever seen. Many are still working to get back to the way things were, to the extent that it's even going to be possible. Now the Corps has brought forth this proposal that violates long-held historical and legal precedents to charge us for water that belongs to us.

I want to thank the chairman for being a leader on this bill that we have on the floor today and for the opportunity to talk about this amendment that is so important to the people in South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana. I urge my colleagues to stop the Corps from overreaching and ask them to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1945

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this important amendment. One wouldn't think that the Congress of the United States should have to pass amendments on appropriations bills to ensure that the Constitution is upheld by the bureaucracy or that long-held promises made by the Federal Government are kept.

That's exactly what this amendment does. Not only will it ensure that the Corps of Engineers no longer engages in charging the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana and its citizens and the sovereign tribes along the Missouri River for the water that is rightfully theirs, but it also frees up the Corps to engage in more productive activities that we've heard a lot about tonight.

I am proud to be a sponsor and proud to stand here and support this important amendment, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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.

I am actually very familiar with the effect of rising water costs on a community. In my own hometown in Ohio, water costs will increase by 56.5 percent over the next 5 years, with the average ratepayers bill increasing from \$125 to \$300 per year. Such a large increase takes a significant toll on hard-pressed families, especially on seniors living on fixed incomes. This is being done in order to construct major water facilities that are seriously out of date and in need of replacement.

The amendment being offered here tonight must be viewed, I think, in terms of equity. Currently, the vast majority of local communities benefiting from water supply from Corps of Engineers projects are charged fees for storage.

The Corps is working to review the current policy case by case in favor of a more consistent policy across the country. My community receives nothing from the Corps in the way of water storage or capacity. The region in question has already benefited from cost-free water storage over several years. It seems to be unfair to provide special treatment to one specific region, or create an exception for one region, from a nationwide policy.

Given the sharp fiscal constraints to agencies funded by this bill, it is particularly difficult to justify such a localized subsidy because we have pressing needs across our country and, frankly, not sufficient funds to meet all the water needs facing our Nation. Frankly, I think these water needs are going to be very significant as time goes on because our population will double. It already has doubled since the last century, and tripled. By 2050, they expect 500 million people to be living in this country. The amount of water isn't going to change. It's a resource

that just keeps replenishing. We have to treat it because we have more people and it's going to cost more to do this.

I respectfully rise in opposition to the gentlelady's amendment, urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development" is hereby reduced by \$30,000,000.

Ms. SPEIER (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, do we suddenly have extra money lying around, because I'm trying to figure out why we are so committed to wasting it.

Budget challenges are forcing us to reexamine our investments. Adding \$30 million beyond the President's request to support fossil fuel research is a foolish waste of taxpayer dollars that are better used to invest in the future and paying off our deficit. We simply cannot afford to spend taxpayer dollars on research the private sector can do better, and taxpayers should not be asked to provide additional support to an industry that consistently has record-breaking profits.

Our energy sector has some of the most promising ideas and technologies in the world. Our energy policy, however, is horribly outdated.

H.R. 2609 slashes research and development for renewable energy by some 60 percent and adds additional money that the administration neither wants nor needs to research fossil fuels and clean coal. At the same time, it continues to spend far too much on fossil fuel R&D. In fact, we dole out more fossil fuel subsidies than any other country—more than \$500 billion in 2011. They often go to expensive projects with little upside.

The fact is we don't need to spend taxpayer money this way. Fossil fuel companies are highly profitable, posting some of the highest profits in the world, and they can shoulder their own R&D costs. This is a clear example of duplication. Cuts to fossil fuel research are supported by the Fiscal Commis-

sion and the fiscal watchdog groups like Taxpayers for Common Sense. These kinds of cuts are necessary to get back on the right fiscal path, and these are the kinds of cuts our constituents elected us to enact.

This kind of research can, is, and should largely be funded by the private sector, since industry has market incentives to make new discoveries in this area. Government spending should be focused on areas where there are emerging markets, where public funds are needed to support basic research.

My amendment reduces our reliance on "old energy." The amendment simply strikes \$30 million in R&D from fossil fuels and commits it to deficit reduction, what we've all been clamoring for, and maintains the President's requested level of funding for this research.

Our biggest innovators succeed because they are forward thinking. Our energy policy needs to do the same.

We need to stop funding the past at the expense of the future. It is the fiscally responsible thing to do.

I ask that you support 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. Madam Chair, I rise to oppose the amendment. This amendment would cut funding, which has already been cut today, for the Fossil Energy Research and Development program, on top of reductions that we also took of 16 percent in our bill before we brought our bill to the floor.

We all know that American families and businesses are struggling to pay high gas prices. This Fossil Energy Research and Development program holds the potential, once and for all, to prevent future high gas prices and substantially increase our energy security. To cut it further would be dangerous and counterproductive, so I strongly oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the committee for this piece of legislation that's before us today.

Throughout the entire bill, we can see efforts that will result in more efficient use of taxpayer dollars. Additionally, it is encouraging to see the emphasis on certain research accounts at the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

It is clear that you understand the challenges that the fossil fuel industry faces in trying to meet the excessive regulations imposed by this administration. However, I am concerned that the \$78 million cut from current funding in this amended legislation represents a 16 percent reduction in funds and will have dire consequences for NETL's ability to manage grants and contracts to conduct the necessary research and development of fossil fuel energy. America depends on fossil resources for over 80 percent of our energy needs and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

As you know, the funding for this research and development has led to horizontal gas drilling, reductions in acid rain, increases in power plant efficiencies, and carbon capture and utilization efforts for enhanced oil recovery.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will continue to agree that, in order for us to continue this vital research in fossil fuel energy, NETL needs to be properly funded and that you will work with us in an effort to try to restore the 16 percent reduction in the funding for this account.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleague from West Virginia for his continued leadership on fossil fuel research. He knows it firsthand. He is a strong advocate. He is a strong supporter of NETL, of which he speaks, which is an important center for a critical, critical purpose.

As he knows well, fossil energy provides 82 percent of our Nation's energy needs, and research into tapping these resources as efficiently and as cleanly as possible is vital to our energy security.

I look forward to continuing to work with him and our other colleagues who have interest in fossil energy research through conference to ensure this vital program has adequate resources.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, thank you for those comments.

These research projects are in every State in the Nation and almost every congressional district throughout our country. Every one of our colleagues has a vested interest in this laboratory operating efficiently, putting us into the next generation of power and use and efficiency. We have appreciated your leadership and commitment to this program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development", and increasing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers—Civil—Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies", by \$10,000,000.

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, thank you for the constructive conversation that we had earlier today about this amendment. I regret that we weren't able to come to some solution to the problem that it's meant to address, but I appreciate your time and your sensitivity to the needs of coastal communities.

The amendment before us would increase the Army Corps of Engineers' Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account by \$10 million. It would do so by moving the same amount from the Department of Energy's Fossil Energy Research and Development account.

The Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account provides communities across the Nation with the funds that are necessary to prepare for floods, hurricanes, and other natural disasters. It also provides support for emergency operations, repairs, and other activities in response to those disasters.

Currently, the committee has requested that we fund this important account by only \$28 million. My amendment would increase that amount by approximately one-third. The Fossil Energy Research and Development account does what its name implies; it conducts research pertaining to the extraction and processing and use of mineral substances.

Unlike the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account, this one will be funded at \$450 million, almost \$30 million above the President's request. My amendment would simply reduce this account by only 2 percent, while still allowing for a \$20 million increase above the President's request for that account.

We as a body have tried the sequestration approach. We have axed accounts evenly across the board, but that's not an approach that our constituents favor. It is incumbent upon us to make rational choices at some point to prioritize funding for those items that are most important to our constituents and to America.

□ 2000

Madam Chair, this is what a rational approach looks like. Fossil fuels don't need a subsidy. Oil is selling at over \$100 a barrel. Oil companies have more than enough profits with which to conduct their own research. In contrast, there is no profit to be had for communities in disaster preparation—merely self-preservation. These are the efforts

that demand our time and our attention and that demand taxpayer funds. The cost of recovering from natural disasters is only increasing. A rational approach to the problem is to put more effort into preparing for them and mitigating the results.

As a Member from a State that has a tropical storm scheduled to make landfall this weekend, I hope that this body will support not only my amendment but the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account as well.

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, but I appreciate his persistence in trying to find an offset.

I, of course, share the gentleman's support for smart investments in our Nation's water resources infrastructure. In fact, as I've said on a number of occasions, the Corps of Engineers was really one of our primary priorities in putting our bill together. The total program level is \$50 million above the budget request and almost \$150 million above the post-sequester level.

The Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account specifically is at the President's request. These funds will go primarily to training and response activities. If repairs to projects are necessary due to storms, the Corps has previously-appropriated, unobligated Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies funds which could be used for these purposes.

On the other hand, the bill has already reduced funding for fossil energy by \$84 million, which is a 16 percent reduction, and I believe we took another substantial reduction earlier this evening. Research conducted within this program ensures that we use our Nation's fossil fuel resources as well and as cleanly as possible. We simply can't take another reduction to this account.

For this reason and several others, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ The amounts otherwise made available by this Act for "Appalachian Regional Commission", "Delta Regional Authority", "Denali Commission", "Northern Border Regional Commission", and "Southeast Crescent Regional Commission" are hereby reduced to \$0.

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

Mr. CHABOT. I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for his leadership in cosponsoring this particular amendment with me.

We introduced this amendment because, with a nearly \$17 trillion debt, the Federal Government can no longer continue to subsidize wasteful programs and policies. The programs that this amendment would eliminate—some of them in my own State—do little to achieve their intended purpose of economic development. These are wasteful programs that the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, and even the Obama administration have found to be duplicative and possessing no track record of success.

In his 2012 budget, President Obama eliminated Federal funding for the Denali Commission, for example. His argument, which I agree with, was that the Denali projects are not funded through a free market or a merit-based system. Additionally, the White House noted that there are 29 other Federal programs capable of fulfilling this commission's mandate. I would submit that this is also the case for a number of other commissions—for example, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Delta Regional Authority, the Northern Border Regional Commission, and the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission—for which we reduced and eliminated the funding.

Of particular note and concern is a recent report from the Denali Commission inspector general, which states that \$100 million is missing from the Denali Commission bank accounts. In his 2012 semiannual report to Congress, the inspector general recounted his attempts to track down the lost funds—unsuccessfully, I might add—and recommended that Congress not reauthorize the commission in light of this mismanagement.

Like Citizens Against Government Waste, I seek to end the Federal appropriations for this commission as well as for the others that I mentioned. By reducing the appropriations to these programs, my amendment would save \$90 million for American taxpayers.

GAO analysis found numerous Federal programs that overlap and provide similar services. In these reports, GAO found no fewer than 80 Federal economic development programs administered by four different agencies. Year after year we hear about the inefficiency and waste that is occurring within these programs. This inefficiency, duplication and overlap have cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars over the years.

These commissions were established for one purpose: economic development. Yet the CBO and other organizations have found no factual evidence that these commissions have created jobs or have improved education or health care. The inability to determine the success of these commissions is, in part, due to their overlap with other programs and agencies.

In summary, there is a tremendous amount of duplication and overlap in each one of the programs that I mentioned, so they are better dealt with at the State and local levels. The officials there are much closer to these types of programs than is the Federal Government. The programs have no track record of success in doing what they were intended to do, which is to create economic development and job growth. It just hasn't happened. The GAO report, as I indicated, has stated that the programs are duplicative and that there is a tremendous amount of mismanagement.

Taxpayers are fed up with wasteful spending in Washington. It's time we identified wasteful programs. These are truly almost the definition of "wasteful programs," and we need to cut them. I would urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I rise to oppose this amendment, this attempt by the gentleman from Ohio to zero out the regional commissions' budgets. I want to focus particularly on the Appalachian Regional Commission, the ARC.

The purpose of the ARC is to close the economic gap between Appalachia and the rest of the Nation to bring the region's 420 counties and 25 million people into the Nation's economic mainstream. ARC's goal is to help make this region and its people contributors to the national economy and to give them the opportunity to compete in today's international economy.

As a region, Appalachia confronts a combination of challenges that few other parts of the country face—its mountainous terrain and isolation, a dispersed population, inadequate infrastructure, a lack of financial and human resources, and a weak track record in applying for and receiving assistance from other Federal programs. Even with ARC's funding, in fiscal year 2010, Appalachia received 31 percent less in Federal expenditures per capita than the rest of the Nation. That is \$11,435 in Appalachia versus \$16,569 for the Nation as a whole.

ARC investments do not result in Appalachia's getting more than the rest of the country. In addition, as mentioned by the gentleman, ARC's programs do not duplicate other Federal programs. Instead, they extend the reach of those programs into the most challenging parts of Appalachia, enabling many distressed communities to take full advantage of other Federal programs when they would not otherwise be able to.

The ARC funds are often used as a local match that enables communities to compete successfully for these other Federal programs. In addition, the recent recession has hit Appalachia dis-

proportionately hard. Nearly two-thirds of Appalachia's 420 counties have unemployment rates greater than the national average. The recession has wiped out all of the job gains that have occurred since the year 2000. A comparable loss for the Nation wipes out the gains only since 2004.

Further, ARC has compiled an impressive record of accomplishments in creating economic opportunity in Appalachia. From fiscal year 2008 to 2012, ARC directed 55 to 60 percent of its non-highway funds to distressed counties. The number of high poverty counties has been cut from 295 in 1960 to 98 distressed and 99 at-risk counties in 2013. The regional poverty rate has been cut almost in half, from 31 percent to 16 percent. Infant mortality has been reduced by two-thirds, and the rural health care infrastructure has been strengthened through the addition of over 400 rural health care facilities. The percentage of adults with a high school diploma has increased by over 70 percent, and students in Appalachia now graduate from high school at nearly the same rate as that of the rest of the Nation. More than 850,000 Appalachian residents now have access to new or improved water and sanitation services through ARC projects.

Madam Chair, the ARC has worked, and it has shown demonstrable improvements in the Appalachian region, but despite these accomplishments, major challenges still confront the region:

Nearly a fourth of Appalachia's counties still suffer from persistent and severe economic distress; 98 counties are formally classified as "distressed," and another 99 are at risk of falling into the "distressed" category; Appalachia trails the Nation in per capita personal income and average earnings by roughly 20 percent; roughly 25 percent of Appalachian households are not served by a public water system, compared to 15 percent of the rest of the Nation's households; and 48 percent of the Appalachian households are not served by a public sewage system, compared to the national average of 25 percent. The region has been hit disproportionately hard by the loss of jobs in the manufacturing industry, as the region has lost one-fourth of its manufacturing jobs.

The ARC has been a model that has worked. For these reasons, we oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. NUNNELEE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

It is no secret that our Nation's budget is bleeding in red ink. This House has approved a budget that will turn that around, and the Appropriations Committee has brought forth bills consistent with that budget.

I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey, and the

ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio, for their efforts in meeting these budget targets and in eliminating wasteful programs but, at the same time, in preserving our priorities.

This amendment specifically deletes funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission, and I would like to address those priorities that are addressed by that commission. This is not a wasteful program. It has invested in infrastructure. It has changed the lives and the income of the men and women of that region, a region that I represent. When the Appalachian Regional Commission was formed almost five decades ago, it included some of the poorest counties of the poorest States in the Nation. Since then, it has achieved measurable results: the number of people living in high poverty has been cut in half; infant mortality has been cut by two-thirds; and students without a high school education have decreased significantly.

□ 2015

But the men and women of this region aren't sitting idly by, waiting for Federal investment to show up to solve our problems. We've used the Federal investment through the Appalachian Regional Commission and leveraged it with local and other State investments. In the last 4 years, the Appalachian Regional Commission has invested \$360 million in that region. At the same time, over \$1 billion of other public investment has occurred. What has that done? It's attracted over \$2.8 billion in private investment, which has resulted in 122,000 jobs that have been created. This commission has made a difference.

No, it's not wasteful spending. The Appalachian Regional Commission is making a difference in the lives of the men and women and families in Appalachian. Because of that, I oppose this 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. I rise this evening in opposition to my Buckeye State colleague, Congressman CHABOT, and I'm somewhat perplexed by this amendment. I don't really understand why he's offering it. I have to oppose him. If we look at the Appalachian Regional Commission, it actually benefits Ohio. It benefits some of those river counties that have historically been left out of the economic mainstream.

If you come to Ohio, it's rather interesting, because if you look at the State there are the big cities of Cleveland, which I'm privileged to represent a portion of, Columbus which is the State capitol, and Cincinnati, where the gentleman is from. There is a story that goes that those are the Big Three, and then there's the other part of the State that kind of winds its way from Toledo down toward Marietta. And the closer you get to Kentucky and Tennessee, the situation gets a little bit rugged.

In fact, I had occasion to travel there this year for the sad occasion of our former colleague Congressman Charlie Wilson's funeral. And I remember how hard Charlie worked to try to represent his district. In just getting to where we had to go for the ceremonies, I was struck again by how that part of Ohio is so inaccessible, just to try to move through the territory and get to where we were going. When I finally got to the high school where the ceremonies were held, and as I walked into the high school, I saw the bricks that Charlie had used to help start a project to help promote education in his region because there was no institution of higher learning. They had to link up to institutions in other parts of the State.

In just driving around and looking at that part of Ohio, the road system doesn't quite connect as it does from the other Big Three Cs. The other portion of the State doesn't work that way.

So the Appalachian Regional Commission meets a very important need, even though it's not a part of the State that I live in. There are very hard-working people. Economic opportunities, especially in the hillier parts, is more difficult to achieve. The Appalachian Regional Commission spans several counties and several States, and it tries to bring hope and opportunity to these regions.

A great part about our country is we're supposed to take care of one another, and the Appalachian Regional Commission provides a mechanism now going over several decades that has truly made a difference. But I can guarantee you that for the parts of Ohio that are included in its boundaries, the work is not finished. And with what's been happening in certain sectors of the economy, in many of these hollows and many of these nooks and crannies, life has gotten harder, not easier.

I want to say that I don't know what motivates the gentleman's amendment this evening, but I really do think it would hurt Ohio, and it would hurt a lot of these counties, spanning into other States that are covered. And the other commissions that exist are not parts of America—take the Denali Commission or the Northern Border Regional Commission, the Delta Regional Authority—these are not areas that are easily lifted in terms of their economic performance, and they need help.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the gentleman's amendment. I want to thank all those who worked with the Appalachian Regional Commission, particularly in my own State. I know it's not always easy, and we want to do what we can to support them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, I want to rise in opposition to this amendment, as well.

As has been noted here, this was created in 1965 as the ARC, and it has a real proven track record of success in creating economic development in an area of the country that faces unique challenges.

Again, it creates economic development. I think that needs to be stressed. It's not a handout, but it's a way to try to make investment into a region of the country that really can use some economic development encouragement, and that's exactly what this program does.

As a result of ARC funding, the regional poverty rate has been cut almost in half. Infant mortality rates have been reduced, and job-creating infrastructure has provided new and improved water and sewer services to over 112,000 residents. And that's just in the last 5 years.

Despite the tremendous progress that this program has made over the years, there's challenges that still exist. This region has lost roughly one-fourth of its manufacturing jobs and nearly one-fourth of Appalachia's counties still suffer from severe and persistent economic distress.

Now is not the time to zero-out this effective program, especially when you're focusing on economic development. Now, more than ever, we must empower local communities and regional planning commissions to utilize this much needed Federal assistance and provide the basic building blocks for regional economic development.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on 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 Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

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

Mr. CHABOT. 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 Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. It is the sense of Congress that the Army Corps of Engineers should take into consideration and prioritize emergency operations, repairs, mitigation activities, and other activities in response to or in anticipation of any flood, hurricane, or other natural disaster when evaluating construction projects.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD (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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Chair, I am very disappointed, to say the least, that significant cuts are being proposed to reduce funding for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. But with that in mind, I've come to the floor this evening with an idea that I think mitigates the effects of those cuts.

I will begin by saying that my amendment has no cost associated with it. It simply expresses the sense of Congress that the Army Corps of Engineers should consider and prioritize projects that mitigate the danger of natural disasters. Eastern North Carolina is especially vulnerable to extreme weather events, and other States have the same vulnerability.

The Corps works to improve the safety of communities near the Neuse River in Goldsboro, North Carolina, and in Princeville, where Hurricane Floyd all but destroyed the town because of the rapidly rising and poorly contained Tar River.

My amendment would give added confidence to my constituents in North Carolina and to many of your constituents, as well, that the Federal Government is doing everything possible to protect and reinforce communities and neighborhood from natural disasters.

For several years, the Nation has witnessed the widespread devastation caused by these disasters. Hurricane Sandy and Hurricane Irene are just two examples. Communities affected by natural disasters like those in my district face a long recovery filled with hardship and painful dilemmas. The underlying bill we are discussing today cuts \$104 million in civil projects of the Corps, and it rescinds \$200 million in previously appropriated funding.

At the same time, the Corps has a \$60 million backlog of projects, and some of my colleagues have referenced that tonight. Many of these are in important places like my district, and many of yours, as well, that experience frequent storms. Due to insufficient funding and a prohibition on new construction, no new projects have been initiated by the Corps since the year 2010.

The Corps has many important responsibilities, but none more so than its effort to mitigate flood and storm dangers. The Corps provides essential mitigation assistance such as repairing damaged levees and providing emergency water supplies to communities in need. It also works to engineer infrastructure that will prevent some of the effects of natural disaster.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has predicted an especially active hurricane season,

with up to 11 hurricanes and up to 16 major hurricanes in the 6-month hurricane season. The number of predicted storms is significantly greater than the seasonal average of six hurricanes and three major hurricanes. NOAA has also indicated that hurricanes threaten inland areas through rain and strong winds and flooding, as we saw in many communities.

Never has funding and support for the Corps been more critical to my constituents and the many areas throughout the country. So as we consider a bill that plans to reduce funding for the Corps, we must keep in mind the communities who may suffer, and many who have spoken tonight come from those districts. They suffer the most from this type of activity.

I remind my colleagues that this amendment costs no money whatsoever. A “no” vote on the amendment does carry the cost of heavy inaction.

I ask the Chair to overrule the point of order.

The chairman of the subcommittee mentioned earlier that he supports the Corps and funding for the Corps. This is simply an effort to try to instruct the Corps to prioritize the projects as they make these difficult decisions.

My colleagues, I thank you for listening, and 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 will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of Rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment proposes to state a legislative position.

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.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina proposes to state a legislative position of the House.

As such, the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of Rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, my friend, Mr. DUFFY from Wisconsin, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to develop or submit

a proposal to expand the authorized uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund described in section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, the reason I'm here tonight is to talk about the efforts that are being used to divert Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund monies to purposes other than what Congress intended, and that is dredging and maintenance of our harbors.

I'm talking about fairness, and I'm talking about commerce. We've all known for years that we have a problem when funds are collected for an intended purpose, that sometimes they don't get used that way. So we have money in, but money does not come out for its intended use.

There are a number of reasons for this happening. But until we get more funds for their intended purpose, Mr. DUFFY and I oppose expanding the authorities for the use of this funding.

□ 2030

This is a matter of fairness.

The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund has carried a surplus since 1997. At the end of fiscal year 2012, the trust fund had an estimated \$7 billion surplus that was not spent on harbor maintenance. Yet our harbors are under-maintained.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has estimated that full channel dimensions at the Nation's busiest 59 ports are available less than 35 percent of the time. That's unacceptable. Just from an economic standpoint, it should be unacceptable to us.

Ships, especially those in my district and throughout the Great Lakes, are light-loading. When that happens, American productivity is lost. Light-loading—we can't even load the ship to their capacity because we haven't maintained our harbors. We haven't dredged our harbors. This is an affront to commerce. It goes back to the very beginning of what the Founding Fathers thought about commerce as so important, getting products from point A to point B.

We must ensure that the moneys intended for dredging are not siphoned off for other reasons. Our amendment will prohibit moneys from being used by the administration to expand the authorized uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund moneys.

I know this is something that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) has supported in the past, and I appreciate his consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NOLAN. I rise in support of the Kelly-Duffy amendment, which would prohibit expanded uses of the Harbor

Maintenance Trust Fund at the current appropriations level.

Let me be clear, the needs of the Nation's ports and harbors are great, and they are largely unmet today. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has made a valiant effort to maintain these facilities, which are essential for American manufacturers and the business community, to access markets around the world. We're talking about jobs. We're talking about business income here in every State, in every congressional district in this country.

Beginning in 1997, however, as Mr. KELLY just pointed out, both Congress and the administration since that time have fallen short of allocating the entire balance of the harbor trust fund moneys to a current rate of less than 50 percent of the total revenues received. Tragically, as a result, we've fallen seriously behind in our essential harbor maintenance. If we were to restore full funding today, the Army Corps estimates it would take 5 years to catch up on the backlog in our Nation's busiest ports and another 5 years to catch up on the Nation's smaller ports, which are nevertheless essential to local and regional economies.

Channel dredging is the most critical factor in maintaining our harbors. To be sure, there are other needs. In 2011, the Army Corps suggested that this fund could be used to increase harbor security. Certainly access roads and other harbor facilities need constant maintenance. But if we expand the use of these funds without expanding the total funds appropriated, we will simply add to our current backlog, choke off future commerce, and cost the American economy the jobs that we desperately need.

The port of Duluth in my district is already restricting outbound shipments to 80 percent of the capacity because of this backlog in maintaining proper channel depth. How can we justify forcing our merchant fleet to operate at less than full efficiency?

I urge my Democratic colleagues to support this amendment and help us prevent a bad situation from getting worse.

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 happy to yield to Congressman KELLY offering the amendment or Congressman NOLAN, who spoke on the amendment, and to say that this amendment gives us an opportunity to talk about the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and the importance of all of our harbors, including those in the Great Lakes.

I spoke earlier today, and I said I don't know how long it's going to take to narrow the channel any more. Some of the ports I represent, what has been happening is that with less money, the width has been narrowing. I said so maybe our ships will actually look like

this some day, rather than having a bow that looks like this. There just simply aren't enough funds to dredge all of the ports that are necessary. And, in fact, there have been some harbors which have actually shut down.

So this gives us an opportunity to talk about the necessity of a review of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and its future use and what we might do in order to get a better allocation to our accounts so that we can take care of all of these ports that are being pressed around the country.

If the gentlemen have anything additional that they would like to put on the record at this point regarding the ports in the Great Lakes or elsewhere, I would be more than pleased to yield to them.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Chair, I thank Representative KAPTUR for yielding, and I would just add that it's costing business and commerce throughout the country and the Great Lakes billions of dollars. This is critical, essential infrastructure; and we look forward to working with you to find a way to release that trust fund for what it was intended, which is the dredging of our harbors. It is so critical to our commerce, our businesses, our jobs, and our economies.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, I hope the administration is hearing this and the Corps is hearing this and they work with us on a better allocation and not invading the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for other purposes.

I would hate to deny the administration the right to think about this and to make recommendations to us. I don't think that it is the intent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) to prevent any oversight or activities by the administration to better manage the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. I don't think that is his intent. I think his intent is to ensure that these dollars are spent for harbor maintenance.

But if, in fact, the administration has a good idea they want to throw in to help us with this, you wouldn't deny them the right to do that; am I correct? We need their cooperation in order to make this work.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Chair, they are already neglecting the needs for dredging in our harbors. To divert funds from existing appropriations that are available would only make the situation worse, which is why I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

I know Mr. DUFFY wishes to speak to the amendment as well.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman KELLY, your intention is not to preclude the administration from working with us on the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund if they have a creative idea that would help us?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I think the whole purpose of this—and Mr. DUFFY will have a chance to speak next—this money is collected for a specific reason. I had a conversation with Secretary LaHood talking about why can't we use the money that's been collected and set aside to be used. This is about commerce. This is about fairness. This is about growing our economy and being able to have access to the entire world. We're letting these harbors go unmaintained. We're not dredging them, and we're causing a huge problem in commerce. That's the problem. We can't get from point A to point B. We're lowering the efficiency of our businesses and their ability to get products out there. The whole purpose of this is to use the money that's collected for the intention for which it was collected. It's money that's going in, but not being used the right way, and I don't want to see it get diverted any other way, as we've seen happen already. We're already missing the boat, no pun intended. We're closing down these harbors, and we're not doing the right things by them.

I know my friend from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) wants to talk.

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

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

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

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Chair, I will try to address some of the concerns of the gentlelady from Ohio. I think everyone who supports this amendment is willing to work with the administration if the administration wants to work with us to start to dredge our ports, to make sure that we can actually have more flow of commerce through the American ports that haven't been serviced well.

If the administration wants to tap into the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and use those resources for other purposes, I think you would see a strong objection from those who support this amendment because those of us who especially live in the Great Lakes—Mr. NOLAN and I, the gentleman from Minnesota and I, have the great honor of sharing the Duluth-Superior port. We understand how important dredging is to making sure that port functions.

When we don't have enough resources going in to service our port, it gives us great pause because these are jobs in our community. It is economic growth in our community, and if we don't have that, we're concerned. So if the administration is willing to work with us, we are willing to work with the administration, no doubt.

But, again, if they want to take those resources and use them for another purpose, we would have great pause and pushback because what you've seen with the Harbor Maintenance Trust

Fund is that it is funded by the shippers. They pay taxes, they pay fees in the anticipation that those dollars, those revenues, are going to be used to service our ports. The problem is it hasn't been used to service our ports. So they're paying money into a fund that over the last 15 years has run a surplus, and now there's \$7 billion in the fund. And they sit back and they scratch their heads and they wonder why isn't this money being used for its intended purpose, which is to make sure American ports work. We've paid for it. We've agreed to pay the taxes; now do, government, what you've promised us to do, use it to make sure that we can actually have commerce in our industry.

I think it's important, the gentleman from Pennsylvania also talked about the Corps of Engineers doing studies and talking about our shippers having to light-load, talking about the Great Lakes ports, talking about Duluth-Superior, the twin ports, where they're unable to load at full capacity because we haven't effectively dredged that port. And that is loss of revenue for our shippers. Not only that, it's driving up the cost of the goods that we're shipping on the Great Lakes, which means the end consumer is paying more for those goods. This doesn't make a lot of economic sense, especially when we have \$7 billion of surplus in that fund.

This is one of those issues where I think government can do a better job serving the people. Putting money into a fund, paying taxes to specifically go into a fund for a specific purpose and then have that fund raided and robbed and used for a different purpose is unconscionable, and it is unacceptable; and that is not the agreement that Americans here in the shipping industry had with their government. It's unfair, at best.

To make one last point, this is a jobs amendment. This amendment will again make sure that we can have a growing, effective, efficient economy in shipping in ports across the country; but it also makes sure that we have lower-cost goods because we are effectively using our ports and our shippers across the country.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUFFY. I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I'm glad we've had this discussion tonight. Others have heard it. I think it will help encourage administration cooperation, being the Representative who has the ports of Lake Erie in her district—Cleveland, Lorain, Sandusky, Toledo, and many points in between—I fully understand the challenge here.

One of our budgetary challenges is we have to have a budget that allocates these dollars, and right now that hasn't come from your side of the aisle. So in order to use these dollars, it has to be incorporated in the budget resolution that comes to us. Our mark was too

low in our bill in order to be able to move those dollars. So let's work on that with the Budget Committee, as well, so we get that allocation and it comes to our subcommittee. That's something that we can all work on on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. DUFFY. Reclaiming my time, point well made by the gentlelady from Ohio. Just to make sure we're clear, this amendment is one that prohibits additional or expansion of the definition of use for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, so we can't use it for purposes other than for the ports, which was the original intent.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2045

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

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

Mr. RIGELL. I rise to enter in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Virginia is proud to be home of one of the Department's flagship national labs in nuclear physics, the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility, or JLab, located in Newport News, and its primary scientific facility there known as the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility.

In fact, the nuclear physics community so values the work at the JLab that they recommended a major upgrade to its accelerator, what's referred to as the 12 GeV project, as its number one priority in their 2007 long-range plan for nuclear physics. That upgrade has received over 70 percent of its construction funding through the tireless efforts of the subcommittee, and work is going to begin there on its commissioning in fiscal year 2014, that is, provided that sufficient funding is included in this appropriations measure.

I'm really grateful that the construction funding that is provided in the bill is at the level requested by the administration. However, I am concerned that the proposed reductions for nuclear physics below the budget request could force unilateral cuts in medium energy nuclear physics operations, and that these reductions could delay the start of the commissioning of the 12 GeV project, which is scheduled to start in the first quarter of fiscal year 2014.

Therefore, I'm asking the chairman if he would be willing to work with me and my colleagues in Virginia and others who support the priorities of the nuclear physics community to work towards completing this important con-

struction project and to begin operations in a timely fashion.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank my colleague for his interest and strong advocacy on behalf of the Jefferson Lab and for the nuclear physics program. Our allocation has made for some tough choices, and we worked hard to fund the Office of Science at \$32 million above current levels, post-sequester. This level of funding is sufficient to support a \$7.5 million increase for the Medium Energy Nuclear Physics program, which goes to the Jefferson Lab.

I want to thank my colleague for his advocacy and look forward to working with him to support this vital program through the appropriations process.

I also assure my colleague that the bill keeps CEBAF on track to begin operations in fiscal year 2014.

Mr. RIGELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding initially. I thank him for his leadership.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

Mr. LAMALFA I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to regulate activities identified in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 404(f)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A), (C)).

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chairman, I'm pleased to be able to present this amendment here. I thank the chairman of the committee for allowing this.

We have a situation here where section 404(f)(1) of the Clean Water Act exempts certain activities from the permitting requirements under section 404, including normal farming, forestry, and ranching activities, and construction and maintenance of farm and forest roads, irrigation ditches, and farm ponds.

In 1977, Congress made a deliberate policy choice to amend the Clean Water Act to provide carefully tailored exemptions for these ordinary activities of farmers, ranchers, and foresters from the costly and burdensome requirements to obtain Clean Water Act permits.

Despite this clear expression of congressional intent, however, the Corps of Engineers and the EPA in recent years have been trying to circumvent the 404(f)(1) permitting exemptions by attempting to interpret a limited "recapture" provision in section 404(f)(2) in such an expansive way as to virtually swallow up the exemptions in 404(f)(1).

As a result, we have a situation where Congress clearly provided a regulatory exemption from permitting in one paragraph of the Clean Water Act, only to have the Corps and EPA now take it away through a creative interpretation of the next paragraph.

The Corps and EPA cannot take away administratively what Congress gave legislatively. These administrative efforts to undermine congressional intent have resulted in excessive and overzealous efforts to expand regulatory powers into farming and ranching activities exempted from regulation.

In one instance, a family farm attempted to convert pastureland irrigated by ditch to a piped irrigation system to improve their water efficiency—a laudable goal from any perspective. This is an activity clearly exempted from regulation by section 404(f)(1), yet the Corps' argument that potential runoff from this work, which would run into a man-made drainage ditch and eventually into a terminal man-made pond with no outlet, would impact somehow the navigable waterway, the Sacramento River, which is over 6 miles away, which really bears no relation to reality, this regulation. This claim by the Corps turned a 1-day, \$2,500 project into, now, a multiyear legal battle resulting in over \$100,000 in legal costs to the family farm, all with no improvement or protection of the environment.

This amendment is intended to make it clear that the Corps is not to use any funds to regulate activities that are already excluded from regulation under section 404(f)(1)(A) and (C) of the Clean Water Act, and that the "recapture" provision in section 404(f)(2) is not to be used to undermine those section 404(f)(1) permitting exemptions. The amendment allows the permitting exemptions to stand on their own merits, without the Corps and EPA negating their use through clever legal interpretations.

In no way does this amendment attack or limit regulation of wetlands or our Nation's waterways. As a rancher myself, with wetlands, ducks, other wildlife on my land, I know full well the importance and value of reasonable protections for our natural resources.

Today, farms in California and elsewhere are being targeted for simply changing crops or irrigation methods. They are doing their best to follow every law, the spirit of the law, but are being targeted for something Congress explicitly exempted.

This amendment simply limits funds to ensure that agencies of government only spend money to follow the laws as Congress wrote them. I urge all Members to please support this amendment.

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 have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Our colleague from California describes yet another troubling example of what seems to be Federal overreach, regulatory overreach. I support his amendment, which I think addresses the situation.

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 rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment. If the proposed amendment would take effect, the Corps would be prohibited from requiring a permit for discharges into waters of the United States from certain agricultural activities.

The Clean Water Act already exempts certain agricultural activities from regulation unless those activities change the flow of navigable waters, then those agricultural activities, such as construction of stock ponds or irrigation ditches, construction of forest roads and reconstruction of recently damaged parts of levees, dikes, and dams, must be regulated.

The Clean Water Act already exempts agriculture business from many of the regulations imposed on others. This amendment would take away the commonsense safeguards built into the Clean Water Act to prevent the negative impact of some agricultural activities, and we have all been witness to some of those.

So I believe the Clean Water Act strikes the right balance in giving relief to agricultural businesses already and, therefore, urge defeat of 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. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available in this act to the United States Army Corps of Engineers may be used for sediment or soil dumping into the Missouri River.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, we have a situation that exists in Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri that I know of along the Missouri River, which I've represented the entire stretch along Iowa. It's an attempt to save the endangered species known as the pallid sturgeon, and I brought a little sample of him here. He's the only one in congressional captivity. This came from the hatchery at U.S. Fish and Wildlife, by the way.

But what they're doing is an attempt to create shallow water habitats so this pallid sturgeon can reproduce. They're opening up the old oxbows, and that's all right. But what they're doing

is dredging millions of cubic yards of dredge spoil out of those old channels into the river channel itself. And we know that dredge spoil is listed under the Clean Water Act as a toxic pollutant.

They wouldn't let farmers do it. They wouldn't let contractors do it. The Corps of Engineers doesn't need to. They have better alternatives that are consistent with the Clean Water Act.

So my amendment simply says none of the funds can be used to dredge this into the river, and they would need to follow their own rules like everybody else does.

I urge the adoption of this amendment, and 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. Madam Chairman, I don't have any objection to the amendment, although I do have a few concerns, which I'd like to cover.

First of all, I want to thank my colleague for bringing these issues to our attention. If, in fact, the Corps' actions are detrimental to flood control efforts in his region, those types of actions need to be stopped, and I would be happy to work with him to do that.

I do believe, of course, that some of these issues would be better dealt with by the authorizing committees that have jurisdiction over the Corps and the Endangered Species Act. So I think there are some concerns that we have that are legitimate here. We're going to do some more investigation and work with the gentleman to see if we can address his concerns.

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, the King amendment would provide no funds to be used for shallow water habitat construction if that involves sediment or soil dumping into the Missouri River.

In order to meet the obligations established within the 2003 amended biological opinion, the construction of shallow water habitat is an integral part of compliance. There are two ways to build shallow water habitats: either through flow actions or through mechanical actions.

The Corps has been implementing habitat construction to avoid manipulating flows mainly because of concerns expressed by the State of Missouri. This amendment would prevent the construction of shallow water habitat, leaving the pallid sturgeon fish unprotected.

I understand that farmers in Iowa have concerns that the Army Corps is not creating these habitats in an ecological manner, but the Army Corps studies show there will only be minimal increases in nutrients carried by the river during project construction.

If the Corps cannot put sediment into the Missouri River, it will have to dispose of the sediment in upland areas. There will be increased cost for each construction project. Disposal in upland areas would increase costs by requiring material to be placed in trucks and hauled offsite to upland disposal areas, or adjacent to the habitat projects. Project cost would be increased by 300 percent to 500 percent, depending on site specifics.

So disposing of sediment in upland areas will also result in increased negative environmental impacts. Disposal of material in upland areas will require disturbances of existing mitigation sites and increases the risk of damage to adjacent wetlands. It may also require additional land acquisition for disposal areas.

For all these reasons, we have to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LAMALFA. I yield to my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

And I regret I didn't have that opportunity to sit down and talk to the gentlelady from Ohio regarding this dredging that's taking place in the Missouri River bottom in my district, in my neighborhood where I spent my lifetime working on that river bottom and doing work like dredge work and dredge site work and dredge disposal site work.

We've done a number of projects with the earthmoving side of this thing, working in conjunction with dredge contractors. I've been up and down every mile of this river for decades now. I've watched what they're doing. They would never let a private interest do what they are doing. They wouldn't let a public interest do what they are doing. Only the Corps of Engineers can do what they're doing.

And I've not reviewed these numbers closely, but I did hear that it could be a 300 percent increase in the cost. I'd like to look at it more closely. I'm pretty confident King Construction can bid that substantially cheaper. However, we're not in the business of advocating what we do here in this Congress. The Corps of Engineers has often put out numbers that have been much higher than the actual cost necessary.

And it's pretty simple to me that if you could see what I saw last week, a 20-inch pipe pumping out water and dredge spoil that's churned up by the beater effect of the dredge, pumping that out into the middle of the river where the sediment, the heavy stuff drops out right away; it starts to fill the channel. The lighter stuff goes down the river and gets settled out.

□ 2100

And then the river has to be dredged again by putting that sediment into

the river. It ends up having to be treated. There's plenty of places for them to do this. They are contradicting their own policy. And so I urge the adoption of this amendment, and let's hold the Corps of Engineers accountable the same way they hold everyone else accountable.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Sec. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order No. 13547 of July 19, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the Stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes).

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

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, last year, the House adopted my bipartisan amendment that would prevent agencies under the FY 2013 CJS appropriations bill from imposing ocean zoning related to the Obama administration's National Ocean Policy under Executive Order 13547. Executive Order 13547 was signed in 2010 and requires that various bureaucracies essentially zone the ocean and the sources thereof. This essentially means that a drop of rain that falls on your house could be subject to this overreaching policy because that precipitation will ultimately wind up in the ocean.

The Department of Energy is a part of the National Ocean Council established under this executive order that has been tasked to zone the oceans. Concerns have been raised by many groups that the National Ocean Policy will restrict ocean and inland activities. It is also worrisome that the administration has not made any requests for funds for this effort, nor has Congress ever appropriated money for this purpose. We have had hearings on this in the Natural Resources Committee, and no agency has told us from what source they're getting the funding for this initiative. So where is the money coming from? Are they raiding existing accounts and diverting already scarce dollars from existing statutory responsibilities?

On this chart you can see the executive order creates a huge new bureaucracy at a time when we're trying to make the government smaller, more efficient, more accountable, and less intrusive. The next chart lists the 63 agencies that are involved in this effort to try to zone the oceans. This looks like much more than a planning exercise at this point.

Let me say you're going to hear from the other side from time to time some-

thing that says that planning is good. Yes, planning may be good. Planning with the intent to in effect backdoor nonstatutory rulemaking is not good.

And here's what the executive order states on its face. It says:

All executive departments, agencies, and offices that are members of the council and any other executive department, agency, or office whose actions affect the ocean, our coasts, and the Great Lakes shall, to the full extent consistent with applicable law, comply with Council-certified coastal and marine spatial plans.

That sounds like rulemaking, to me, that has not been authorized by statute.

It's important to note that ocean zoning was debated during the 108th, the 109th, the 110th, and the 111th Congresses, and each of those Congresses determined that this action was not necessary. This clearly indicates that Congress explicitly does not intend for the oceans to be zoned in the manner that the President is attempting to do. Thus, Executive Order 13547 has no specific statutory authority, and there have been no appropriations by Congress to pay for the cost of this new bureaucracy.

My similar amendment earlier this year passed by a bipartisan vote of 233-190 to the offshore energy packaged we considered last month. This amendment was also adopted on a bipartisan basis as a part of the FY 2013 CJS appropriations bill.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense 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. Madam Chair, I rise to oppose the amendment and to stress the importance of ocean policy. We already see acidification, low dissolved oxygen, harmful algae blooms, and dead zones in the Gulf, the Chesapeake Bay, Puget Sound, and throughout our Nation's coastal waterways.

The National Ocean Policy would help us better address the cumulative threats to our aquatic ecosystems from overfishing, coastal development, storm water runoff, carbon emissions, and pollutants in our waterways. The implementation of the National Ocean Policy will help to protect, maintain, and restore our ocean and coastal ecosystems, systems which provide important jobs, food, recreation, and which serve as the foundation for a substantial part of our Nation's economy. Only healthy, functioning, and resilient marine and freshwater ecosystems can support the fisheries we all depend upon so heavily.

There are some reports that show that over half of the fish in the oceans have been fished out. If you go to any supermarket, you're going to find on the shelves—the fish that are there—strange names you've never even heard of before because so many of the vari-

eties that were plentiful are simply fished out forever.

The core approach of the National Ocean Policy is to improve stewardship of our ocean's coasts, islands, and Great Lakes by directing government agencies with differing mandates to coordinate and work better together. The National Ocean Policy creates no new authorities. It's about increased coordination among existing agencies, the sort of effort that should be taking place on a Federal level in order to reduce inefficiency, waste, and redundancy between agencies.

This is an issue of bringing people together so that all of the ocean's users, including recreational and commercial fishermen, boaters, industries, scientists, and the public can better plan for, manage, harmonize, and sustain uses of oceans and coastal resources.

When you think about it, we now have 310 million people in our country. We look at the global populations in the billions. With the rate of population increase rising, more and more fishing going on—and how many of us come from regions where we see that fisheries have shut down? And that in fact what used to exist in Massachusetts, exists no more. That there are places on the West Coast where the fisheries that had been there are shut down. That's because there's so much draw on that life source in the ocean that we have to pay attention as a world how we are going to feed the generations of the future. This is not a casual engagement. This is downright serious business.

I would say that the gentleman's amendment is not forward-looking. I don't know what he has in mind here. But the better we understand what is going on and what Congressman Claude Pepper used to call Planet Ocean, where 70 percent of our Earth is actually water, much of it impinged now by pollutants and so forth. We have a responsibility to the globe. This is not simple.

Prior generations haven't had to think this way, but we have to think this way because there are many more draws on these resources. Look at the problems we've had with some countries going out and doing the fishing and just taking fish to one country and not allowing other fishermen to have equal access, even in the Great Lakes that I represent. It's amazing. Every single year, the number of fish you're allowed to catch goes down, because we've both got more fisherman, because the population is increasing, but there are fewer fish to draw from those lakes. And there are substantial threats in the form of invasive species.

So the gentleman and I are on different sides of this. I think it's important to understand the oceans and to coordinate among our agencies to put the best intelligence forward because the globe is changing and we have to be smart enough to deal with those ecosystem changes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

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

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment which addresses another misguided and restrictive Federal regulation.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prohibits Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of fuels unless their lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources. My simple amendment would stop the government from enforcing this ban on all Federal agencies funded by the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stifle the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquids jet fuel. This restriction was based on the opinion of some environmentalists that coal-based jet fuel might produce more greenhouse gas emissions than traditional petroleum. However, one of the unintended consequences of section 526 is that it essentially forces the American military to acquire fuel refined from unstable Middle East crude resources. Furthermore, section 526's ban on fuel choice now affects all Federal agencies, not just the Defense Department.

This is why I'm offering this amendment again today to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. The American military and our Federal agencies should not be burdened with wasting their time studying fuel restrictions when there's a simple fix. That fix is to not restrict Federal Government fuel choices based on unsound policies and misguided regulations like those in section 526.

Section 526 also essentially makes our Nation more dependent on Middle East oil. Stopping the impact of section 526 will help us to promote American energy, grow the American economy, create American jobs, and become more energy secure.

Madam Chair, it is also important to know what this amendment does not prevent and does not restrict. And it doesn't restrict or prevent the ability of the Federal Government from purchasing any alternative fuels, including biodiesel, ethanol, or other fuels from renewable resources. It places no

restrictions whatsoever on those types of procurements.

I offered this amendment to the Homeland Security appropriations bills and several appropriations bills during the 112th Congress, and they all passed on the floor of the House with strong bipartisan support. My friend, Mr. CONAWAY, also added similar language to the latest defense authorization bill to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Corps of Engineers to set water storage prices for municipal use for a nonhydropower lake constructed by the Corps above the price that was set at the time of the completion of that lake.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I rise today to offer an amendment that will provide temporary relief and assurance for communities who otherwise will soon be hit by some of the sharpest increases in water storage prices ever seen. My amendment is simple. It prohibits the Army Corps of Engineers from using any official resources or funds to set new, increased water storage prices for municipal use on any non-hydropower lake that was built by the Corps.

□ 2115

The Corps would only be permitted to set the same rates on local communities that were in place when the lake was completed, a dollar figure that is well documented and not subject to any sort of interpretation by the Corps.

A source of funding for the operation lakes owned by the Corps of Engineers is derived from water storage contracts with municipalities. The formula for pricing of water storage contracts on Corps lakes is defined legislatively as "current cost." This fixed formula creates a prohibitive financial burden on the citizens of municipalities desiring to contract with the Corps and, as a result, the Corps does not receive any income for the operation and maintenance of the lake.

In drought-stricken areas like Bartlesville, Oklahoma, the Corps' cur-

rent flawed methodology threatens to raise water storage prices on local residents from around 6 cents to nearly a dollar for the same 1,000 gallons of water. It also raises the total fiscal impact of water storage prices on Bartlesville from around \$1.6 million a year to more than \$24 million a year.

Earlier this year, the Senate adopted by unanimous consent an amendment by Senator INHOFE to their WRDA bill that requires the GAO to complete a study on the Corps' outdated and flawed methodology when it comes to these water storage prices. As the WRDA bill develops in the House and hopefully moves towards conference and enactment, I am looking forward to working with my colleagues on a long-term legislative solution to replace this outdated formula with one that is fair, reasonable, and affordable to all parties.

By adopting this amendment today, we can provide 1 more year of certainty and assurance for communities like Bartlesville by ensuring that they do not see outrageous increases in their water storage prices that they quite simply cannot afford.

The American taxpayer spends billions of dollars every year to fund the operations of the Army Corps of Engineers; but by adopting this amendment, we can ensure that none of those funds are used to enforce a formula that is outdated, unfair, and unjust as we move through the WRDA bill and other avenues towards a long-term solution.

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 a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 113th Congress, which states:

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriation bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section. The Congressional Budget Office has stated that this amendment has costs associated with it. The Corps' current pricing policy is based upon "updated cost of storage" which reflects today's value (indexed to current price levels) rather than at the original construction cost price level. So reverting to construction cost levels will unavoidably have a cost, with the net effect of increasing the level of budget authority in the bill.

Under section 3(d)(3), an increase in budget authority must be accompanied by an equal or greater decrease. This

amendment does not contain an equal or greater decrease, and so violates section 3(d)(3).

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

The gentleman from New Jersey makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5. Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chairwoman, I rise only to say thank you to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, who has been in this seat now for 38 days it seems like, but the entire time of this bill. He has not taken a break for any reason during the entire consideration of these dozens of amendments and general debate.

I want to thank the chairman for doing a great job during this debate, but also in drafting the bill, along with his colleague, MARCY KAPTUR, the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee. So, Mr. Chairman, we thank you for a job well done and thank you for persevering through all of this.

Also, I want to say a word of thanks to the staff, who deserve so much credit for the work that has been before the body for the last 2 days. Rob Blair, the clerk of the subcommittee, and all of the staff on both sides of the aisle have worked long and hard to bring this bill to the floor and to transpose it to the population of the House. So we thank you for a great job well done.

As we near the end of the deliberation on the amendments and finally vote on the bill, I want to urge everyone to vote for this bill. This is a good bill. It cuts spending, it does the Nation's business, and it's fair and transparent.

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

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. WHITFIELD of Kentucky.

Amendment by Mr. FLEMING of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment by Ms. SPEIER of California.

Amendment by Mr. CHABOT of Ohio.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) 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 94, noes 329, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

AYES—94

Aderholt	Gowdy
Bachmann	Graves (GA)
Bachus	Graves (MO)
Barr	Griffith (VA)
Benishek	Guthrie
Bishop (UT)	Hall
Blackburn	Harper
Bonner	Harris
Boustany	Hartzler
Bridenstine	Holding
Broun (GA)	Hudson
Burgess	Huelskamp
Cantor	Hultgren
Cassidy	Johnson (OH)
Chabot	Jordan
Coble	Kingston
Cotton	Kline
Cramer	Lamborn
Crawford	Lankford
DeSantis	Latta
DesJarlais	Long
Duffy	Luetkemeyer
Duncan (SC)	Lummis
Duncan (TN)	Marino
Fincher	Massie
Fleming	McClintock
Flores	McHenry
Foxx	McKinley
Franks (AZ)	Meadows
Garrett	Miller, Gary
Gingrey (GA)	Mulvaney
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)

NOES—329

Alexander	Capito
Amash	Capps
Amodei	Capuano
Andrews	Cardenas
Barber	Carney
Barletta	Carson (IN)
Barrow (GA)	Carter
Barton	Cartwright
Bass	Castor (FL)
Beatty	Castro (TX)
Becerra	Chaffetz
Bentivolio	Chu
Bera (CA)	Cicilline
Bilirakis	Clarke
Bishop (GA)	Clay
Bishop (NY)	Cleaver
Black	Clyburn
Blumenauer	Coffman
Bonamici	Cohen
Brady (PA)	Cole
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)
Bralley (IA)	Collins (NY)
Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Brooks (IN)	Connolly
Brown (FL)	Conyers
Brownley (CA)	Cook
Buchanan	Cooper
Bucshon	Costa
Bustos	Courtney
Butterfield	Crenshaw
Calvert	Crowley
Camp	Cuellar

Fortenberry	Palazzo
Foster	Perry
Frankel (FL)	Pittenger
Frelinghuysen	Pitts
Fudge	Price (GA)
Gabbard	Rahall
Gallego	Ribble
Garamendi	Rogers (AL)
Garcia	Rohrabacher
Gardner	Ryan (WI)
Gerlach	Scalise
Gibbs	Schweikert
Gibson	Scott, Austin
Goodlatte	Sensenbrenner
Gosar	Shuster
Granger	Smith (MO)
Grayson	Smith (TX)
Green, Al	Stockman
Green, Gene	Stutzman
Griffin (AR)	Tiberi
Grijalva	Tobin
Gutiérrez	Wagner
Hahn	Walberg
Hanabusa	Walorski
Hanna	Webster (FL)
Hastings (FL)	Westmoreland
Hastings (WA)	Whitfield
Heck (NV)	Williams
Heck (WA)	Willson (SC)
Hensarling	Woodall
Herrera Beutler	Yoho
Higgins	
Himes	
Hinojosa	
Honda	
Hoyer	
Huffman	
Huizenga (MI)	
Hurt	
Israel	
Issa	
Jackson Lee	
Jeffries	
Jenkins	
Johnson (GA)	
Johnson, E. B.	
Johnson, Sam	
Jones	
Joyce	
Kaptur	
Keating	
Kelly (IL)	
Kelly (PA)	
Kennedy	
Kildee	
Kilmer	
Kind	
King (IA)	
King (NY)	
Kinzinger (IL)	
Kirkpatrick	
Kuster	
Labrador	
LaMalfa	
Lance	
Langevin	
Larsen (WA)	
Larson (CT)	
Latham	
Lee (CA)	
Levin	
Lewis	
Lipinski	
LoBiondo	
Loeb sack	
Lofgren	
Lowenthal	
Lowe	
Lucas	

Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes

Lujan Grisham (NM)	Ros-Lehtinen
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Roskam
Lynch	Ross
Maffei	Rothfus
Maloney,	Royal-Allard
Carolyn	Royce
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz
Markey	Runyan
Matheson	Ruppersberger
Matsui	Rush
McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (OH)
McCaul	Salmon
McCollum	Sánchez, Linda T.
McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta
McGovern	Sanford
McIntyre	Sarbames
McKeon	Schakowsky
McMorris	Schiff
Rodgers	Schneider
McNerney	Schrader
Meehan	Schwartz
Meeks	Scott (VA)
Meng	Scott, David
Messer	Serrano
Mica	Sessions
Michaud	Sewell (AL)
Miller (FL)	Shea-Porter
Miller (MI)	Sherman
Miller, George	Simpson
Moore	Sinema
Moran	Sires
Mullin	Slaughter
Murphy (FL)	Smith (NE)
Nadler	Smith (NJ)
Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Neal	Southerland
Neugebauer	Speier
Noem	Stewart
Nolan	Stivers
Nugent	Swalwell (CA)
Nunes	Takano
Nunnelee	Terry
O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Olson	Thompson (MS)
Owens	Thompson (PA)
Pallone	Thornberry
Pascrell	Tierney
Pastor (AZ)	Tipton
Paulsen	Titus
Payne	Tonko
Pearce	Tsongas
Pelosi	Turner
Perlmutter	Upton
Peters (CA)	Valadao
Peters (MI)	Van Hollen
Peterson	Vargas
Petri	Veasey
Pingree (ME)	Vela
Pocan	Velázquez
Poe (TX)	Visclosky
Polis	Walden
Pompeo	Walz
Posey	Wasserman
Price (NC)	Schultz
Quigley	Waters
Radel	Watt
Rangel	Waxman
Reed	Weber (TX)
Reichert	Welch
Renacci	Wenstrup
Rice (SC)	Wilson (FL)
Richmond	Wittman
Rigell	Wolf
Roby	Womack
Roe (TN)	Yarmuth
Rogers (KY)	Yoder
Rokita	Young (AK)
Rooney	Young (FL)
	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Grimm	Marchant	Schock
Holt	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
Horsford	Negrete McLeod	

□ 2151

Messrs. BROOKS of Alabama, LABRADOR, Ms. ESTY, Messrs. BUCSHON, KILMER, TAKANO, ROONEY, Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. SANFORD, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, KELLY of Pennsylvania, HUIZENGA of Michigan, SERRANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. SESSIONS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. JORDAN, CRAWFORD, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, MULVANEY, SMITH of Missouri, HALL, CASSIDY, and RYAN of Wisconsin 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. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) 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 230, noes 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—230

Aderholt	Farenthold	Latham
Alexander	Fincher	Latta
Amash	Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo
Amodei	Fleischmann	Long
Bachmann	Fleming	Lucas
Bachus	Flores	Luetkemeyer
Barletta	Forbes	Lummis
Barr	Fortenberry	Marchant
Barrow (GA)	Fox	Marino
Barton	Franks (AZ)	Massie
Benishek	Frelinghuysen	Matheson
Bentivolio	Gardner	McCarthy (CA)
Bilirakis	Garrett	McCauley
Bishop (UT)	Gibbs	McClintock
Black	Gibson	McHenry
Blackburn	Gingrey (GA)	McIntyre
Bonner	Gohmert	McKeon
Boustany	Goodlatte	McKinley
Brady (TX)	Gosar	McMorris
Bridenstine	Godwy	Rodgers
Brooks (AL)	Granger	Meadows
Brooks (IN)	Graves (GA)	Meehan
Broun (GA)	Graves (MO)	Messer
Buchanan	Green, Gene	Mica
Bucshon	Griffin (AR)	Miller (FL)
Burgess	Griffith (VA)	Miller (MI)
Calvert	Guthrie	Miller, Gary
Camp	Hall	Mullin
Cantor	Hanna	Mulvaney
Capito	Harper	Murphy (FL)
Carter	Harris	Murphy (PA)
Cassidy	Hartzler	Neugebauer
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Noem
Chaffetz	Hensarling	Nugent
Coble	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Coffman	Holding	Nunnelee
Cole	Hudson	Olson
Collins (GA)	Huelskamp	Palazzo
Collins (NY)	Huizenga (MI)	Pastor (AZ)
Conaway	Hultgren	Paulsen
Cook	Hurt	Pearce
Cotton	Issa	Perry
Cramer	Johnson (OH)	Petri
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Pittenger
Crenshaw	Jones	Pitts
Culberson	Jordan	Poe (TX)
Daines	Joyce	Pompeo
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Posey
Delaney	King (IA)	Price (GA)
Denham	King (NY)	Radel
Dent	Kingston	Reed
DeSantis	Kinzinger (IL)	Reichert
DesJarlais	Klaine	Renacci
Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Ribble
Duffy	LaMalfa	Rice (SC)
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rigell
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Roby
Ellmers	Lankford	Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)	Shuster	Walberg
Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Walden
Rohrabacher	Smith (MO)	Walorski
Rokita	Smith (NE)	Weber (TX)
Rooney	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Wenstrup
Roskam	Southerland	Westmoreland
Ross	Stewart	Whitfield
Rothfus	Stockman	Williams
Royce	Stutzman	Wilson (SC)
Runyan	Terry	Wittman
Ryan (WI)	Thompson (PA)	Wolf
Salmon	Thornberry	Womack
Sanford	Tiberi	Woodall
Scalise	Tipton	Yoder
Schweikert	Turner	Yoho
Scott, Austin	Upton	Young (AK)
Sensenbrenner	Valadao	Young (FL)
Sessions	Wagner	Young (IN)

NOES—194

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

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell	Hunter	Schock
Grimm	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
Holt	Negrete McLeod	
Horsford	Rogers (MI)	

□ 2156

Mrs. CAPITO changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The 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 170, noes 253, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

AYES—170

Bass	Gibson	Napolitano
Beatty	Grayson	Neal
Becerra	Green, Al	Nolan
Bera (CA)	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Pallone
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Bonamici	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Hanabusa	Payne
Braley (IA)	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Brown (GA)	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Herrera Beutler	Peters (CA)
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Peters (MI)
Bustos	Himes	Peterson
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Capps	Honda	Pocan
Capuano	Huffman	Polis
Cárdenas	Israel	Price (NC)
Carney	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Rahall
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Jones	Ruppersberger
Chu	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	T.
Clarke	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Kildee	Sarbanes
Connolly	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kind	Schiff
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Courtney	Kuster	Schrader
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Levin
Davis, Danny	Levin	Lewis
DeFazio	Lewis	Lipinski
DeGette	Lipinski	Loeb sack
Delaney	Loeb sack	Lowenthal
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Lowe
DelBene	Lowe	Lynch
Deutch	Lynch	Maloney,
Doggett	Maloney,	Carolyn
Doyle	Carolyn	Markey
Duckworth	Markey	Matsui
Edwards	Matsui	McCollum
Ellison	McCollum	McDermott
Engel	McDermott	McGovern
Enyart	McGovern	McIntyre
Eshoo	McIntyre	McKinley
Esty	McKinley	McNerney
Farr	McNerney	Meeks
Fattah	Meeks	Meng
Foster	Meng	Michaud
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Miller, George
Fudge	Miller, George	Moore
Gabbard	Moore	Moran
Galleo	Moran	Murphy (FL)
Garamendi	Murphy (FL)	Nadler
García	Nadler	

NOES—253

Aderholt	Andrews	Barletta
Alexander	Bachmann	Barr
Amash	Bachus	Barrow (GA)
Amodei	Barber	Barton

Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Billirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costa  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper

## NOT VOTING—11

Campbell  
Grimm  
Holt  
Horsford

□ 2200

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

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

Posey  
Price (GA)  
Radel  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Schalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
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  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Holding  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo

□ 2200

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

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

gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) 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 174, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

AYES—174

Amash  
Andrews  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Bera (CA)  
Blumenauer  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks (AL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardenas  
Carney  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Chaffetz  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Daines  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeBene  
DeSantis  
Deutch  
Doggett  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Foxy  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Garamendi  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Grayson  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)

NOES—250

Aderholt  
Alexander  
Amodi  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Bentivolio  
Billirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blackmore  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Bucshon  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Carter  
Capito  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castro (TX)

Chabot  
Cleaver  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis, Rodney  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Engel  
Enyart  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallego  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Hultgren  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Joyce  
Kelly (PA)  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Lankford  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebuck  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lummis  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCauley  
McCollum  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters (CA)

## NOT VOTING—10

Barton  
Campbell  
Grimm  
Holt  
Horsford  
Hunter  
McCarthy (NY)  
Negrete McLeod  
Rogers (MI)  
Shimkus

□ 2204

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) 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 147, noes 273, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—147

Amash	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Amodei	Heck (NV)	Pompeo
Bachmann	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Barton	Holding	Radel
Benishek	Hudson	Renacci
Bentivolio	Huelskamp	Ribble
Bilirakis	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Hultgren	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Issa	Rokita
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Broun (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Roskam
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Bucshon	Jones	Royce
Burgess	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	King (IA)	Salmon
Camp	Kingston	Sanford
Carter	Kline	Scalise
Chabot	Labrador	Schweikert
Chaffetz	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Coble	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Coffman	Lankford	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Latta	Smith (MO)
Conaway	Long	Smith (NE)
Cook	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Lummis	Southerland
Culberson	Marchant	Stewart
Daines	Massie	Stockman
Davis, Rodney	Matheson	Stutzman
DeSantis	McCaul	Thornberry
Doggett	McClintock	Tiberi
Duffy	McKeon	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McMorris	Upton
Ellmers	Rodgers	Wagner
Farenthold	Messer	Walberg
Flores	Mica	Walden
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Fox	Miller (MI)	Lowe
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Lucas
Gardner	Mulvaney	Lujan Grisham
Garrett	Neugebauer	(NM)
Gingrey (GA)	Noem	Lujan, Ben Ray
Gohmert	Nugent	(NM)
Gosar	Olson	Lynch
Gowdy	Paulsen	Wittman
Granger	Pearce	Woodall
Graves (GA)	Perry	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Petri	Yoho
Hall	Pittenger	Young (FL)
Harris	Pitts	Young (IN)

NOES—273

Aderholt	Carney	Dent
Alexander	Carson (IN)	DesJarlais
Andrews	Cartwright	Deutch
Bachus	Cassidy	Dingell
Barber	Castor (FL)	Doyle
Barletta	Castro (TX)	Duckworth
Barr	Chu	Duncan (TN)
Barrow (GA)	Cicilline	Edwards
Bass	Clarke	Ellison
Beatty	Clay	Engel
Becerra	Cleaver	Enyart
Bera (CA)	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Esty
Bishop (NY)	Collins (NY)	Farr
Black	Connolly	Fattah
Blackburn	Conyers	Fincher
Blumenauer	Cooper	Fitzpatrick
Bonamici	Costa	Fleischmann
Bonner	Cotton	Fleming
Boustany	Courtney	Fortenberry
Brady (PA)	Crawford	Foster
Braley (IA)	Crowley	Frankel (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Cuellar	Frelinghuysen
Brown (FL)	Cummings	Fudge
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Bustos	Davis, Danny	Gallego
Butterfield	DeFazio	Garamendi
Cantor	DeGette	Garcia
Capito	Delaney	Gerlach
Capps	DeLauro	Gibbs
Capuano	DelBene	Gibson
Cárdenas	Denham	Goodlatte

Grayson	Maloney,	Ruiz
Green, Al	Carolyn	Ryunyan
Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger
Griffin (AR)	Marino	Rush
Griffith (VA)	Markey	Ryan (OH)
Grijalva	Matsui	Sánchez, Linda
Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)	T.
Gutiérrez	McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta
Hahn	McDermott	Sarbanes
Hanabusa	McGovern	Schakowsky
Hanna	McHenry	Schiff
Harper	McIntyre	Schneider
Hastings (FL)	McKinley	Schock
Hastings (WA)	McNerney	Schwartz
Heck (WA)	Meadows	Scott (VA)
Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Scott, David
Higgins	Meeks	Serrano
Himes	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Hinojosa	Michaud	Shea-Porter
Honda	Miller, Gary	Sherman
Hoyer	Miller, George	Shuster
Huffman	Moore	Simpson
Israel	Moran	Sinema
Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)	Sires
Jeffries	Murphy (PA)	Slaughter
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (OH)	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Joyce	Neal	Speier
Kaptur	Nolan	Stivers
Keating	Nunes	Swalwell (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Nunnelee	Takano
Kelly (PA)	O'Rourke	Terry
Kennedy	Owens	Thompson (CA)
Kildee	Palazzo	Thompson (MS)
Kilmer	Pallone	Thompson (PA)
Kind	Pascrell	Tierney
King (NY)	Pastor (AZ)	Titus
Kinzinger (IL)	Payne	Tonko
Kirkpatrick	Pelosi	Tsongas
Kuster	Perlmutter	Turner
Lance	Peters (CA)	Valadao
Langevin	Peters (MI)	Van Hollen
Larsen (WA)	Peterson	Vargas
Latham	Pingree (ME)	Veasey
Lee (CA)	Pocan	Vela
Levin	Polis	Velázquez
Lewis	Posey	Visclosky
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Walz
LoBiondo	Quigley	Wasserman
Loeb sack	Rahall	Schultz
Lofgren	Rangel	Waters
Lowenthal	Reed	Watt
Lowe	Reichert	Waxman
Lucas	Richmond	Welch
Lujan Grisham	Roby	Wenstrup
(NM)	Roe (TN)	Whitfield
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (FL)
(NM)	Rogers (KY)	Wolf
Lynch	Rooney	Womack
Maffei	Rothfus	Yarmuth
	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Campbell	Holt	Negrete McLeod
Cole	Horsford	Rogers (MI)
Crenshaw	Hunter	Schrader
Diaz-Balart	Larson (CT)	Shimkus
Grimm	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 2207

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014”.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Com-

mittee, 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, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Schneider moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2609 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$650,000)”.

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

Page 6, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$7,000,000)”.

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,650,000)”.

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,650,000)”.

Mr. SCHNEIDER (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to suspend reading of the motion.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

I rise to offer this motion to recommit to ensure, first, that the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River are protected from the continued threat of invasive species, including and particularly taking practical steps to address the threat of Asian carp to our fishing, tourism, and navigation on our Nation’s inland waterways.

Second, that we provide the resources necessary to combat invasive aquatic plant growths that threaten our national fisheries, wildlife, and communities.

Third, that we continue to fund efforts for our coastal communities to help them fully recover from natural disasters, while at the same time proactively prioritizing efforts being made to mitigate future threats to human life and property.

Madam Speaker, the underlying bill represents a historic divestment in American infrastructure, jobs, and energy research.

Instead of prioritizing investments that will safeguard our communities and improve our Nation's navigable waterways, this bill overemphasizes several outdated defense budget expenditures at the expense of making meaningful, forward-looking investments to grow our economy and contribute positively to our environment.

We must not use the guise of fiscal prudence as an excuse to block important investments in alternative energy and basic physical energy research which benefits all sectors of our economy or to block important investments in infrastructure projects to improve our inland waterways and mitigate the potentially devastating consequences of natural disasters or to block investment in weatherization assistance to help our most vulnerable populations.

This bill constitutes a generational abandonment of our communities and children who will have to face the stark reality of the decisions made here today, including a significant rollback of the Clean Water Act.

The proposed amendment does not address all of the concerns I have with the underlying bill, but it will at least help to improve the bill moving forward. Specifically, Asian carp continue to deplete fish stocks and degrade local ecological balance, and must be addressed by a holistic government approach that partners with States to utilize best practices.

This amendment would encourage these partnerships with the States while providing funding that can meaningfully address and prevent the outbreak of this invasive species.

□ 2215

Similarly, the influx of pollution and runoff to our waterways has contributed to an overabundance of aquatic plant life, such as algae blooms in Lake Erie, that choke vital nutrients from our natural ecosystems.

This amendment takes a more practical approach to limiting the causes of this overgrowth, improving our water quality.

The underlying bill also fails to adequately address the continuing needs of coastal communities adversely affected by flooding and other natural disasters.

This amendment would aid in addressing critical vulnerabilities of communities facing severe economic impact from flooding, while prioritizing

projects that will help safeguard human life.

Lastly, but very significantly, this amendment would strengthen the current cooperative energy research being performed between the United States and the State of Israel. For almost two decades, we have partnered with Israel in developing scientific, business, and research relationships that contribute positively to the energy sectors of both the U.S. and Israel. This amendment continues that long partnership and capitalizes on our joint research capacities to identify emerging technologies and best practices for manufacturing while efficiently utilizing taxpayer money to continue to strategically benefit both of our nations.

Madam Speaker, the essential provisions of this amendment will only improve the underlying bill, contributing significantly to American job growth, the safety of our communities, and protecting our vital natural resources. I strongly urge my colleagues to support these commonsense changes.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The House has worked its will over the past 2 days, and dozens of amendments have been considered in a very open and amicable process. This bill strengthens national security, fosters a stronger economy, and maintains important infrastructure that keeps American open for business and promotes job opportunities.

And we do all of this while making some tough, but smart, funding decisions, saving taxpayers \$2.9 billion over last year's enacted level. We have just 2½ months left before the end of the year. This is the time to act. Now is the time to pass our government funding bills. I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit and to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 230, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—195

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

NOES—230

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

Griffith (VA)	McKeon	Royce	Duffy	Lamborn	Roe (TN)	Lynch	Peters (CA)	Sherman
Guthrie	McKinley	Ryunan	Duncan (SC)	Lance	Rogers (AL)	Maffei	Peters (MI)	Sinema
Hall	McMorris	Ryan (WI)	Duncan (TN)	Lankford	Rogers (KY)	Maloney,	Peterson	Sires
Hanna	Rodgers	Salmon	Ellmers	Latham	Rohrabacher	Carolyn	Pingree (ME)	Slaughter
Harper	Meadows	Sanford	Flores	Latta	Rokita	Maloney, Sean	Pocan	Smith (WA)
Harris	Meehan	Scalise	Fincher	LoBiondo	Rooney	Markey	Polis	Speier
Hartzler	Messer	Schock	Fitzpatrick	Long	Ros-Lehtinen	Matheson	Price (NC)	Swalwell (CA)
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Schweikert	Fleischmann	Lucas	Roskam	Matsui	Quigley	Takano
Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)	Scott, Austin	Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Ross	McCollum	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner	Flores	Lummis	Rothfus	McDermott	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary	Sessions	Forbes	Marchant	Royce	McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Tiberi
Holding	Moran	Shuster	Fortenberry	Marino	Ryunan	McIntyre	Ruiz	Tierney
Hoyer	Mullin	Simpson	Foxx	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (WI)	McNerney	Ruppersberger	Titus
Hudson	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)	Frelinghuysen	McCaul	Salmon	Meeks	Rush	Tonko
Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)	Garcia	McClintock	Sanford	Meng	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)	Gardner	McHenry	Scalise	Michaud	Sanchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Hultgren	Noem	Smith (TX)	Garrett	McKeon	Schock	Miller, George	T.	Vargas
Hurt	Nugent	Southerland	Gerlach	McKinley	Schweikert	Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey
Issa	Nunes	Stewart	Gibbs	McMorris	Scott, Austin	Moran	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Jenkins	Nunnelee	Stivers	Gingrey (GA)	Rodgers	Sessions	Nadler	Schiff	Visclosky
Johnson (OH)	Olson	Stockman	Gohmert	Meadows	Shuster	Napolitano	Schneider	Walz
Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Stutzman	Goodlatte	Meehan	Simpson	Neal	Schrader	Wasserman
Jones	Paulsen	Terry	Gosar	Messer	Smith (MO)	Nolan	Schwartz	Schultz
Jordan	Pearce	Thompson (PA)	Gowdy	Mica	Smith (NE)	O'Rourke	Scott (VA)	Waters
Joyce	Perry	Thornberry	Granger	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Pallone	Scott, David	Watt
Kelly (PA)	Petri	Tiberi	Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)	Pascrell	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
King (IA)	Pittenger	Tipton	Graves (MO)	Miller, Gary	Southerland	Payne	Serrano	Welch
King (NY)	Pitts	Turner	Green, Gene	Mullin	Stewart	Pelosi	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)
Kingston	Poe (TX)	Upton	Griffin (AR)	Mulvaney	Stivers	Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Yarmuth
Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo	Valadao	Griffith (VA)	Murphy (FL)	Stockman	NOT VOTING—9		
Kline	Posey	Wagner	Guthrie	Murphy (PA)	Stutzman	Campbell	Horsford	Negrete McLeod
Labrador	Price (GA)	Walberg	Hall	Neugebauer	Terry	Grimm	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
LaMalfa	Radel	Walden	Hanna	Noem	Thompson (PA)	Holt	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
Lamborn	Reed	Walorski	Harper	Nugent	Thornberry	□ 2231		
Lance	Reichert	Weber (TX)	Harris	Nunes	Tipton	So the bill was passed.		
Lankford	Renacci	Webster (FL)	Hartzler	Nunnelee	Turner	The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.		
Latham	Ribble	Wenstrup	Hastings (WA)	Olson	Upton	A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.		
Latta	Rice (SC)	Westmoreland	Hensarling	Owens	Valadao	THE JOURNAL		
LoBiondo	Rigell	Whitfield	Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	Vela	The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.		
Long	Roby	Williams	Holding	Pastor (AZ)	Wagner	The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.		
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)	Hudson	Paulsen	Walberg	Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.		
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Wittman	Huelskamp	Pearce	Walden	REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 51		
Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Wolf	Huizenga (MI)	Perry	Walorski	Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) as a cosponsor to H.J. Res. 51.		
Marchant	Rohrabacher	Womack	Hultgren	Weber (TX)	Weber (TX)	The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?		
Marino	Rokita	Woodall	Hurt	Webster (FL)	Webster (FL)	There was no objection.		
Massie	Rooney	Yoder	Issa	Pitts	Wenstrup	HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW		
McCarthy (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoho	Jenkins	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland	Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.		
McCaul	Roskam	Young (AK)	Johnson (OH)	Pompeo	Whitfield	The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?		
McClintock	Ross	Young (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Posey	Williams	There was no objection.		
McHenry	Rothfus	Young (IN)	Jordan	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)	RECESS		

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell	Horsford	Negrete McLeod
Grimm	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Holt	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2223

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 198, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—227

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

Amash	Crowley	Heck (NV)
Amodei	Cuellar	Heck (WA)
Andrews	Cummings	Higgins
Barber	Davis (CA)	Himes
Bass	Davis, Danny	Hinojosa
Beatty	DeFazio	Honda
Becerra	DeGette	Hoyer
Bera (CA)	Delaney	Huffman
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Israel
Bishop (NY)	DelBene	Jackson Lee
Blumenauer	Deutch	Jeffries
Bonamici	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Bralley (IA)	Doyle	Jones
Brown (FL)	Duckworth	Kaptur
Brownley (CA)	Edwards	Keating
Bustos	Ellison	Kelly (IL)
Butterfield	Engel	Kennedy
Capps	Enyart	Kildee
Capuano	Eshoo	Kilmer
Cárdenas	Esty	Kind
Carney	Farr	Kirkpatrick
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Kuster
Cartwright	Foster	Langevin
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)
Castro (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)
Chu	Fudge	Lee (CA)
Cicilline	Gabbard	Levin
Clarke	Gallgo	Lewis
Clay	Garamendi	Lipinski
Cleaver	Gibson	Loeb
Clyburn	Grayson	Lofgren
Cohen	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Connolly	Grijalva	Lowey
Conyers	Gutiérrez	Lujan Grisham
Cooper	Hahn	(NM)
Costa	Hanabusa	Luján, Ben Ray
Courtney	Hastings (FL)	(NM)

NAYS—198

Heck (NV)	Heck (WA)	Higgins
Himes	Hinojosa	Honda
Hoyer	Huffman	Israel
Jackson Lee	Jeffries	Johnson (GA)
Johnson (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Jones
Kaptur	Keating	Kelly (IL)
Kennedy	Kildee	Kilmer
Kind	Kirkpatrick	Kuster
Langevin	Larsen (WA)	Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)	Levin	Lewis
Lipinski	Loeb	Lofgren
Lowenthal	Lowey	Lujan Grisham
Luján, Ben Ray	(NM)	(NM)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 51

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) as a cosponsor to H.J. Res. 51.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2311

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) at 11 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-149) on the resolution (H. Res. 295) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the department of agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today until 3:30 p.m. on account of the birth of his grandson.

Ms. SINEMA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 8 and 9 on account of attending memorial service in Arizona for the Prescott Fire Department's Granite Mountain Hotshots.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 2, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 324. To grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

H.R. 1151. To direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2383. To designate the new Interstate Route 70 bridge over the Mississippi River connecting St. Louis, Missouri, and southwestern Illinois as the "Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge".

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 11, 2013, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2196. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Scott R. Van Buskirk, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2197. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration (MARAD) for Fiscal Years 2010-2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2198. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Annual Report 2011, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5617; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2199. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Efficiency Design Standards for New Federal Commercial and Multi-Family High-Rise Residential Buildings [Docket No.: EERE-2011-BT-STD-0055] (RIN: 1904-AC60) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2200. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2201. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network (RIN: 0906-AA73) received July 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2202. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting report to Congress on the Backlog of Postmarketing Requirements (PMR) and Postmarketing Commitments (PMC) for 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2203. A letter from the Surgeon General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting fourth annual Status Report from the National Prevention, Health Promotion and Public Health Council; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2204. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R06-OAR-2009-0710; FRL-9831-1] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2205. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Redesignation of the Indianapolis Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0839; FRL-9832-3] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2206. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation

of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second Ten-Year PM10 Maintenance Plan for Canon City [EPA-R08-OAR-2010-0389; FRL-9832-1] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2207. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for Georgia; Partial Withdrawal [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0223; FRL-9831-5] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2208. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York State Ozone Implementation Plan Revision [EPA-R02-OAR-2013-0180; FRL-9830-7] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2209. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Approval of "Infrastructure" SIP with respect to Source Impact Analysis Provisions for the 2006 24-Hour PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0805; FRL-9832-4] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2210. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: MAGNASTOR System [NRC-2012-0308] (RIN: 3150-AJ22) received July 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2211. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2212. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Accrued Sick and Safe Leave Act of 2008"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2213. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance Regarding Deferred Discharge of Indebtedness Income of Corporations and Deferred Original Issue Discount Deductions [TD 9622] (RIN: 1545-B196) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2214. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "2013 Annual Plan for the Ultra-Deepwater and Unconventional Natural Gas and Other Petroleum Resources Research and Development Program"; jointly to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Natural Resources.

#### 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. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2218. A bill to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are

protective of human health and the environment; with an amendment (Rept. 113-148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 295. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-149). Referred to the House Calendar.

## DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[Omitted from the Record of July 9, 2013]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 819 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 Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 2637. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 2638. A bill to direct the President to establish guidelines for United States foreign assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 2639. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to add procedural requirements for patent infringement suits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 2640. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2641. A bill to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. LUCAS:

H.R. 2642. A bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas):

H.R. 2643. A bill to provide for a review of efforts to reduce Federal agency travel expenses through the use of video conferencing and a plan to achieve additional reductions

in such expenses through the use of video conferencing, to implement such plan through rescissions of appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2644. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to prohibit funding under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance grant program and the Public Safety and Community Policing grant program to be provided to law enforcement agencies that use license plate readers unless certain conditions are met; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2645. A bill to prohibit providers of social media services from using self-images uploaded by minors for commercial purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2646. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to issue a fishing capacity reduction loan to refinance the existing loan funding the Pacific Coast groundfish fishing capacity reduction program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. COLE, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SIREN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2647. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for public broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2648. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale or other disposition of a firearm to, and the possession, shipment, transportation, or receipt of a firearm by, certain classes of high-risk individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2649. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reform the Federal Communications Commission by requiring an analysis of benefits and costs during the rule making process and creating certain presumptions regarding regulatory forbearance and biennial regulatory review determinations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 2650. A bill to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 2651. A bill to improve the understanding and coordination of critical care health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FARR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. DELBENE,

Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PIN-GREE of Maine, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2652. A bill to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to marijuana-related businesses; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. GARRETT:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that President Barack Obama has violated section 3 of article II of the Constitution by refusing to enforce the employer mandate provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Rules, and Appropriations, 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. PETERS of California:

H. Res. 296. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that before the United States ends its commitment in Afghanistan and United States involvement in the conflict draws to a close, the Nation needs to ensure no one is left behind and all members of the United States Armed Forces are accounted for; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII

105. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 15 urging the Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 2637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 2639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 2640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution (relating to the power of

Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 2641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of specific legislative powers granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;" and Article III, in that the legislation defines or affects powers of the Judiciary that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 2642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The ability to regulate interstate commerce and with foreign Nations pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 includes the power to regulate commodity prices, practices affecting them and the trading or donation of the commodities to impoverished nations. In addition, the Congress has the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 which includes the power to promote the development of Rural America through research and extension of credit.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 2645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 2646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois

H.R. 2648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power... "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 2650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution vests Congress with the authority to engage in relations with the tribes.

The clause states that the United States Congress shall have power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 2652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 129: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 198: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 274: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 275: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 310: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 322: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 333: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 352: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. AMASH, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. YODER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 367: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 460: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 485: Mr. COSTA and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 521: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 523: Mr. GARDENAS.

H.R. 556: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 582: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 596: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. GALLEGRO.

H.R. 630: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 647: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 683: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 685: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 690: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 698: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 760: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 763: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 769: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 818: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 850: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 851: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 924: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 948: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1005: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1020: Mr. POLIS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1024: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1037: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1070: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1077: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1094: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1125: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1148: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1199: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1205: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1250: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1263: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1332: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1339: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VELA, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1395: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1416: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1443: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1461: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1473: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1494: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1507: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1553: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1563: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 1585: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1616: Mr. HIMES and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1666: Mr. COHEN, Mr. VELA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1690: Mr. COSTA, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1692: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1696: Mr. KEATING and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1698: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1717: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1731: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1739: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1748: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1763: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1771: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1772: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1779: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1780: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1787: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1798: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1806: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1825: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1843: Mr. BRALBY of Iowa.

H.R. 1869: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1874: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1890: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1908: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1920: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1921: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1950: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1962: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 1979: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1995: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1998: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2002: Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2009: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 2010: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2011: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2016: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2051: Mr. GALLEGRO.

H.R. 2086: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. JONES.  
 H.R. 2116: Ms. LEE of California.  
 H.R. 2137: Mr. OWENS and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 2169: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.  
 H.R. 2178: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.  
 H.R. 2182: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 2218: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. COTTON.  
 H.R. 2273: Mr. RENACCI.  
 H.R. 2315: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
 H.R. 2319: Mr. CRAMER.  
 H.R. 2347: Mr. COTTON.  
 H.R. 2387: Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 2399: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. POE of Texas.  
 H.R. 2424: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 2426: Mr. JONES.  
 H.R. 2445: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. CARTER.  
 H.R. 2447: Mr. BERA of California and Ms. ESTY.  
 H.R. 2448: Ms. SPEIER.  
 H.R. 2449: Mr. PIERLUISI and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2464: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. EDWARDS.  
 H.R. 2465: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. EDWARDS.  
 H.R. 2485: Mr. O'ROURKE.  
 H.R. 2494: Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
 H.R. 2498: Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.R. 2504: Mr. TERRY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SENBRENNER, and Mr. LOEBSACK.  
 H.R. 2523: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2540: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 2542: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. COLLINS of New York.  
 H.R. 2544: Mr. LAMALFA.  
 H.R. 2547: Mr. KING of New York.  
 H.R. 2553: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H.R. 2560: Ms. LEE of California and Mrs. BEATTY.  
 H.R. 2565: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. BARBER.  
 H.R. 2575: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. CARTER.  
 H.R. 2579: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. KINGSTON.  
 H.R. 2590: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. SCHRADER.  
 H.R. 2592: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. MCNERNEY.  
 H.R. 2606: Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 2619: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H.J. Res. 47: Mr. HALL.  
 H.J. Res. 51: Mr. CARTER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. NUGENT.  
 H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. PETERSON.  
 H. Con. Res. 41: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 35: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.  
 H. Res. 104: Mr. SIMPSON.  
 H. Res. 131: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
 H. Res. 201: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H. Res. 227: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. BILLRAKIS.  
 H. Res. 250: Mr. ADERHOLT.  
 H. Res. 284: Mr. CONNOLLY.  
 H. Res. 285: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. MCNERNEY.  
 H. Res. 293: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LATTA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COLE, Mr. YODER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 2642 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL, or a designee, to H.R. 761 the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

#### DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. LATHAM.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 36: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Operation and Maintenance", and increasing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies", by \$10,000,000.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. LYNCH

AMENDMENT No. 37: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Department of Energy-Energy Programs-Fossil Energy Research and Development", and increasing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Department of the Army-Corps of Engineers-Civil-Construction", by \$20,000,000.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT No. 38: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by a private entity to bring an action against the United States or its agents.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. LAMALFA

AMENDMENT No. 39: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to regulate activities identified in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 404(f)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A), (C)).

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 40: At the end of the bill, (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Energy Programs-Fossil Energy Research and Development", and increasing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies", by \$10,000,000.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. FLEMING

AMENDMENT No. 41: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee to carry out section 301 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 16421a; added by section 402 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5)).