A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5016, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4718, BONUS DEPRECIATION MODIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–517) on the resolution (H. Res. 661) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4718) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 641 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. 4923.

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

□ 1807

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. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, 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 earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 19, line 14.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $22,000,000)''.

Page 20, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,810,000)''.

Page 21, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $30,935,000)''.

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,551,000)''.

Page 52, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $49,062,000)''.

Page 59, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $121,358,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, ever since 1835, the rules of the House have forbidden spending money except for purposes authorized by law. Yet last year, the eleven appropriations bills reported out of the House Appropriations Committee contained over $350 billion in spending on unauthorized programs. The rule against unauthorized spending cannot be enforced because it is always waived by the resolutions that bring these appropriations to the floor.

The bill before us today contains $24 billion in such unauthorized spending for programs that have not been reviewed by the authorizing committees since as far back as 1980. That was Jimmy Carter's last year in office.

Now, I am sure that some of these programs are valuable and worthy of taxpayer dollars, but surely, others are not. The fact that they have not been authorized in as much as 35 years ought to warn us to be at least a little more careful about continuing to fund them.

Rather than reviewing our spending decisions and making tough choices about spending priorities, Congress simply rubberstamps these programs out of habit. It is no wonder we are so deeply in debt with so little to show for it. My amendment does not defund these unauthorized programs, as the House rules would require. It simply freezes spending on them at last year's levels.

The cuts contained in this amendment total just $121 million, which is about 0.036 percent of the total spending in this bill.

If year after year, the authorizing committees haven't found these programs worth the time to reauthorize, then maybe that is just nature's way of telling us they aren't worth the money we are shoveling at them either.

It is the proper role of the House of Representatives to control the purse strings of our government. But we do a disservice to our constituents when we allow this kind of spending growth to occur on autopilot, absent any oversight or congressional authorization.

I look forward to the day when Congress will again assert its constitutional prerogative to control Federal spending and enforce its own rules to prohibit spending blindly on unauthorized programs.

However, in the meantime, adopting this amendment will merely freeze the spending in these unauthorized programs, shaving just 0.036 percent of this appropriation. By freezing that spending on unauthorized programs, I hope that will be a small symbolic step toward reclaiming the House's responsibility to act as a watchdog over the Treasury.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's proposal.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman stood up earlier this afternoon and was trying to cut from really essential accounts. And I accept his desire to try to balance the budget.

When his party shut down the government and threw the wrench of shutdown into every program that the Nation depends upon, it created quite a bit of chaos around here and around the country. Money was wasted on furloughs. The military was trying to decide how they were going to rotate different operations and so forth. It was a terrible period that we lived through. And we are still taking and gluing our programs back together after all of that.

Some of the work of the authorizing committees, under your leadership, were not able to clear their bills on time. So the gentleman's solution is to say, well, you know, none of that happened. So I am just going to take this opportunity to go after the Energy and Water bill and kind of take this and this and this and propose this amendment.

And I think that the gentleman's goal of fiscal responsibility is one that I share, but this isn't the way to do it. This isn't the way to kind of pick some programs, and we don't even know what impact it will have across the country.

□ 1815

I would rather have a much more thoughtful presentation that would come before us. What programs is he talking about? The same ones this afternoon he was trying to cut, the renewable energy program—he is talking about cutting nuclear and fossil energy.

He really doesn't like the Department of Energy. I bet, if you ask the gentleman, he doesn't even want the Department of Energy to exist for our country. If you look around the world, I am probably not wrong on that bet, so this is just another way to try to cause havoc over at the Department of Energy.

As I have said earlier today, I view what is happening in that Department as one of the most important strategic sets of investments that this country has to make.

Why create more havoc over there? We have had difficulties in trying to balance our energy accounts over the years. Imported petroleum still constitutes 40 percent of what Americans are paying for. The average family, every year, $2,800 comes out of their pocket for gasoline.

Mr. Chairman, we need to modernize our fleet. There is a lot of natural gas conversions going on in the country for our truck fleets. We need not throw a wrench into that. We need to hasten it, to move America to a new day.

We need a modernized grid, whatever that is going to look like. We need to

be able to dispose of our nuclear waste. We need to make sure that our energy policy plays on all keys, not just a few.

I don't think this is a time to create more havoc, following on the havoc that has been created in the past, which I am sure the gentleman supported, and to pick on the Department of Energy—we need a much more coherent strategy in order to balance our budget, and the most important strategy we can have is to put people back to work and, through innovation in this country and the balancing of our trade deficit, begin to reinvest those dollars back here at home.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier today that we have about, oh, I think $34 billion in this entire bill. Our energy trade deficit with the world this year is a little over $210 billion. Maybe it is a little higher than that.

The deficit—the hole this year alone is eight times bigger than our bill. So if you look at what you are trying to do here, it is counterproductive, and we need to be looking at modernizing our energy system here in this country, not picking it apart, and not creating more havoc at the Department, but actually investing in America's future.

So I ask my colleagues to oppose the gentleman's amendment, and let's get on with the regular order here. Let's get this bill cleared. Let's go to conference with the Senate and do for America what she needs, and that is restoring her energy security in order that our liberty not be threatened in this generation and the future.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I agree with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from California, in that the rules of the House say we should not appropriate money for any unauthorized program.

Unfortunately, the authorizing committees have not reauthorized an awful lot of these programs throughout the government. In fact, a few years ago, I tried to reduce funding by eliminating any money for the endangered species listing because it was unauthorized for 26 years.

We lost on the floor on that, but his sentiment is absolutely correct, and we need to make sure the authorizing committees do their job.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I can forgive my colleague from Ohio for misstating California's history as she did earlier today, but I cannot excuse her for misstating the recent history that we were all quite familiar with.

I would remind the gentlewoman that this House passed three appropriations bills over to the Senate funding the entire government last year, including a lot of things that we would like to reform, but we agreed to fund all of those spending with one exception.

We asked for a 1-year delay in the train wreck that has become ObamaCare. I think the American people can see that that was a realistic request. Unfortunately, the Senate chose not to act. That is what caused the government to seize up and to shut down.

Now, I also want to correct the gentlelady in her suggestion that, somehow, this is motivated because I don't like energy. I love energy, and I want to see it efficiently researched, and that is best done by the private sector using its own money, rather than politicians using other people's money to reward politically well-connected companies.

I would simply ask the gentlewoman this: If these programs were all so worthwhile, why is it that the authorizing committees have not bothered to reauthorize them in a span of up to 35 years?

I suggest that fact speaks for itself. Until these programs are properly reviewed and reauthorized, all I am asking is we don't keep increasing their budgets; we freeze them until the authorizing committees review them and reauthorize them.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,100,000)''.

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $20,100,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their diligence in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I think every single American can agree that reducing our dependence on foreign oil is something that—and all foreign sources of energy—should be something that we should pursue, and in that vein, renewables is a significant component, but this bill cuts hydropower over $20 million.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would seek to restore funding specifically—not to all renewables—but to hydropower, and it is offset with a Department of Energy administrative cost. That is where the money is coming from. According to the budget office, the amendment actually reduces outlays by $8 million.

Now, hydropower is available in every region of the country. It is not just the east coast. It is the whole way across the country, to the point that 2,200 hydropower plants provide America its most abundant source of clean, renewable electricity and accounts for 67 percent of domestic renewable generation or 7 percent of the total electricity generated. This could increase that 15 percent, creating over 1 million jobs by 2025—1.4 million, according to my figures.

Mr. Chairman, hydroelectricity is predictable. You can count on it. It is not variable. You don't have to count on the wind blowing. You don't have to count on the Sun shining. Twenty-four hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, as long as the rain is falling and the rivers are flowing, we are generating power.

You don't need a bank of batteries. You don't need the wind to be blowing. You don't need an alternative source of base load powers being generated. It provides it at a relatively low-maintenance cost.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I would contend that it is the most efficient and economic form of renewable energy. It is unobtrusive. It is not bothering anybody. It is sitting there. You don't have to worry about birds flying into it or bats being killed on its blades. The fish swim right through it.

Now, it does face a significant regulatory approval process. There is much red tape, which equates to up to 15 years in permitting cycles, and that is a detractor that needs to be addressed, so much so that there are now 60,000 megawatts of preliminary permits and projects awaiting final approval and are pending before the commission in 45 of our 50 States—45 of our 50 States.

We can have this electricity if we can get through this red tape, Mr. Chairman. Of our 80,000 dams in the United States, 600—600 of them—have an immediate capability to produce energy at this moment.

Harnessing conventional hydroenergy will create a truly renewable and green energy source for our country. It is not just about Pennsylvania, and it is not just about the Fourth District that I represent. It is about all of our country becoming energy independent on renewable.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, while I oppose the amendment, I understand my colleague wants to see increased funding for the conventional hydropower within EERE. I understand that.

I am a big fan of hydropower in the Pacific Northwest.

One of the reasons we have some of the cheapest electricity in the country is because of the great use of hydropower in the Pacific Northwest.

The bill before us actually increases conventional hydropower by $1.7 million above last year. I look forward to working with the gentleman on this important program as we move forward through this process, but I do oppose this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to align my remarks with yours, and that is, though I would oppose the gentleman's amendment at this point, the potential of hydropower is enormous, both low-power hydro—and the more robust parts of the country, I am sure Idaho has big falls and Pennsylvania, in many places, but the low-power hydro that is more characteristic of the Great Lakes region, for example, offers enormous potential, and there are new inventions to be had in capturing the power of water, even as it moves in streams that flow just at grade.

Mr. Chairman, we need to allow this conversation to influence the Department of Energy, so that there is more attention given to hydro and to the development of new technologies, water dropping—being elevated and then being dropped in different parts of the country—as well as existing watersheds being used more effectively.

We need a lot more work. I would say to the gentleman that I bet we could get more than 15 percent, if we really put our minds to it, so I wanted to offer general support of the idea.

Even though we can't support your amendment today, let's hope in the future we can find a way to do a better job with hydropower.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with the chairman in the future on this and would ask, at this point, unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $9,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,000,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today because of the power and potential of water and in support of an amendment that I am pleased to offer with my two colleagues from Maine, Congressman MICHAUD and Congresswoman PINGREE.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment would increase funding to the Department of Energy's Water Power Program by just $9 million, a small price tag that will yield a huge return on investment. This increase is offset by an equal amount from the Departmental administration account.

The modest increase that we are proposing will support hydropower and also the development of innovative hydropower technologies, along with marine and hydrokinetic energy technologies.

Development of these new technologies can offer the United States a chance to lead the world in an emerging area of abundant renewable energy. Marine and hydrokinetic energy—in particular, energy from waves, currents, and tides which, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania just recognized, unlike the Sun and wind, do not stop—is an exciting frontier in the renewable energy sector.

Currently, Oregon State University and the University of Washington are using Federal funding from the Water Power Program to develop the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center, a center that will provide visionary entrepreneurs a domestic location to test wave energy devices, along with other technology, rather than traveling to Scotland to use the European test center. Without continued Federal investment, Europe will remain the leader.

When fully developed, wave and tidal energy systems could generate a significant amount of total energy used in the United States. As Congress promotes technologies that can help lower our constituents' energy bills, we must embrace new and innovative solutions, like marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy.

With this modest increase, the Water Power Program can do that while continuing to support a Federal investment in conventional hydropower technology.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1830

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly to oppose the amendment. The amendment would increase funding for the marine and hydrokinetic programs within the EERE account. I appreciate my colleague's passion for renewable energy programs. She has worked tirelessly to support efforts to advance American research and industry in this area.

This year's funding for EERE is $1.789 billion, $113 million below last year and $528 million below the budget request. This is roughly equivalent to the fiscal year 2013 level presequester and is nearly $1 billion more than last year's House bill.

Funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy is focused on three main priorities: helping American manufacturers compete in the global marketplace, supporting the Weatherization Assistance Program, and addressing future high gas prices. This left limited funding for renewable energy programs for which funding is prioritized to support two main projects: an offshore wind demonstration project and an enhanced geothermal field test site.

Within the remaining resources, the recommendation provides $38.5 million for water power and accepts the budget request proposal for an almost even split between the conventional hydropower program and the marine and hydrokinetic technologies program. I support the water program, and I would be happy to work with my friend in the event the EERE account receives additional funding in conference, but we simply cannot afford to increase these activities in this bill by diverting funds from inherently Federal responsibilities. While I am supportive of reducing the size of government, this amendment would reduce funding that supports 64 people within the Department of Administration. I must therefore reluctantly oppose the amendment and urge Members to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD), my friend and cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I rise in strong support of this amendment.

The Water Power Program supports critical private sector research, development, deployment, and commercialization for new American hydropower technologies and marine hydrokinetic energy. Water power research helps to reduce costs and environmental impacts of these reliable, renewable energy sources and is very critical for private sector investment.

In Maine, the Ocean Renewable Power Company has deployed our Nation's first grid-connected marine hydrokinetic energy system, the first in the country, and they are working to deploy additional units in other areas of the country. They have invested nearly $30 million in the local economy while creating or retaining over 100 quality jobs.

Countries like Japan, Chile, and Australia have shown an interest in this American technology, and it presents a great opportunity for exporting American technology. So not only will the development of new domestic water power technology create jobs and reduce the energy costs for homes and

businesses across the country, but it represents an opportunity for the U.S. to lead the world in an emerging area of renewable and abundant energy.

Now is not the time for a drastic cut in these important programs. I urge my colleagues to support this very modest amount of money while at the same time realizing that we do have fiscal constraints.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. BONAMICI. 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 Oregon will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for electricity delivery and energy reliability activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $160,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $27,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, our Nation's electrical system is in transition. The infrastructure is aging. It remains vulnerable to physical and cyber threats, and our energy use is changing and evolving every day.

The Nation's electric grid connects Americans with more than 5,000 power plants nationwide and about 450,000 miles of transmission lines. Seventy percent of those transmission lines and power transformers are more than 25 years old, and the average age of the power plant in this country is more than 30 years old.

Between 2003 and 2012, there were 679 power outages, each affecting at least 50,000 people and costing billions of dollars.

The Department of Energy's Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability works to modernize our Nation's electric grid and infrastructure by partnering with industry, academia, and State governments to modernize the grid and our Nation's electrical infrastructure.

The amendment Mrs. ELLMERS and I are offering increases funding for the Department of Energy's Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability office by $20 million and decreases the departmental administration account by the same amount.

Making smart investments to address issues facing our Nation's electricity infrastructure will have a number of benefits: it will ensure long-term stability in the electricity and energy systems; it will spur innovation; it will help make the transition to more efficient use of electric power; and it will create technical and manufacturing jobs. Ensuring a reliable and resilient electricity grid will reduce costs for businesses and consumers by saving energy.

Grid industry groups such as GridWise Alliance and the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, utilities, and manufacturers support this amendment. I urge its adoption.

I now yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), my colleague and cosponsor, and thank her for her leadership on this issue.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment, and I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) for his leadership as well and working with me to promote further research that protects and improves our Nation's energy infrastructure.

This amendment will have a positive impact on our Nation's energy reliability, efficiency, and security. It will help us maintain a robust manufacturing presence and will ensure the critical research and development to continue in the vital areas of energy transmission, smart grid technology, energy storage, and cybersecurity.

Technological advancements in the energy sector are occurring across the country at a rapid pace, and there is no better example of the industry's success than in North Carolina. The success of research and development is due in part to the strong partnership between the private sector and universities.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen firsthand on the campus of North Carolina State University where they have partnered with industry leaders to innovate grid technologies to create the Smart Grid Center of Excellence. I have also seen the positive impact of implementing this technology and the benefits it brings to our rural communities and their rural electric cooperatives.

Mr. Chairman, with a growing need for grid reliability and cybersecurity measures to promote our Nation's energy infrastructure, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. The amendment would increase funding for the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability by $20 million using funds from the departmental administration account as an offset.

The President's budget request proposes to increase the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability from $147 million to $180 million, a 22 percent increase, which the amendment would achieve. Instead, the bill before us provides a balanced increase of $13 million for the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, 9 percent above the fiscal year 2014 level. Put another way, that is a larger percentage increase than any other applied energy program in this bill. The underlying bill is a larger percentage increase than any other applied energy program in this bill.

The bill prioritizes programs within OE that keeps our electricity grid safe and secure. To that end, the bill provides $47 million to protect the energy sector's critical infrastructure against the ever-present threats of cyber attack and $16 million for infrastructure security, including $8 million for a strategic operations center to better respond to emergencies.

While I support the program championed by my colleagues, we must and have to abide by our allocation, and we simply cannot afford additional increases to the OE program by diverting funds from other Federal responsibilities. It is a choice that we have had to make as we balance this bill. As I said, this has the largest percentage increase—9 percent—of any other programs within this area of the budget. Therefore, I must oppose the amendment and urge Members to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, grid reliability is an issue that we are facing. Just this last year, we faced a physical attack on a substation in the south bay of the bay area. We are seeing increasing cyber attacks. We also have an opportunity to utilize renewable energy more effectively with grid responsiveness with the new technology that allows rapid switching. In other words, this could help transform our country to a more modern, a more reliable, more efficient, and a more economic grid system. So I think the money would be well spent. I urge my colleagues to support the McNerney-Ellmers 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. MCNERNEY).

The amendment was rejected.

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 yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), a capable and engaged Member of this House.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4923 is far from a perfect bill. I have serious concerns about some of the policy riders in the bill, and I am disappointed that it does not contain higher funding for renewable energy programs, but there are a number of important programs that receive the funding they desperately need. We all know that tough choices have to be made within the overall funding allocations, and I want to thank subcommittee Chair SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their hard work on the bill.

Earlier this year, I joined with 79 of our colleagues in support of strong funding for two important energy efficiencies programs at the Department of Energy: the Weatherization Assistance Program and the State Energy Program. These programs were underfunded in recent House appropriations bills, and I am pleased that this bill includes a significant improvement in the funding status for these two programs.

I want to thank my colleagues for joining me in expressing support for these programs to the committee earlier this year, and again, I thank the subcommittee chair and ranking member for responding to our requests for robust funding for these programs.

The Weatherization and State Energy Programs not only help our citizens to use energy more efficiently and effectively, these programs create and sustain jobs in communities across our great Nation. Energy efficiency improvements make homes more comfortable and keep utility costs affordable. They also create jobs for small business contractors in local communities.

The Weatherization Assistance Program enables seniors and veterans and persons with disabilities and families with low incomes to make energy efficiency improvements that they would otherwise not be able to afford. Lowering their energy bills frees up limited income they can use toward other essentials like food purchases and medicines. DOE estimates savings from weatherizing a home of over $400 per year. That is real money to many families who are struggling to make ends meet.

The State Energy Program enables our home States to develop and implement their own energy efficiency and renewable energy projects, projects that are tailored to address the very specific needs of our individual States.

The electricity sector is undergoing, as we all know, a significant transformation. The old model of one-way distribution from central generation points is giving way to systems with more distributed generation. Grids need to be upgraded and are becoming smarter; security issues need attention; and changing economics, fuel mix, and regulations are also catalyzing changes in this sector. State Energy Programs have an important role to play in this transformation, and support for these programs will be very helpful to States as they work through these changes.

□ 1845

On a separate issue, together with our colleagues Representative OWENS and Representative GIBSON, both of New York, we called for robust funding for DOE's Naval Reactors Program. The $1.2 billion included for naval reactors in this bill is critical to support three long-term projects: the Ohio class replacement, the spent fuel handling facility, and research and training reactor maintenance.

Over the past 5 years, Naval Reactors has been funded below requirements by over $450 million, including $151 million below the President's fiscal year '14 request. While I was disappointed to see Naval Reactors at $162 million below this year's request, I do thank the committee for including some very important report language.

The work done at the Kesselring site and the Knolls Atomic Power Lab is essential to our national security and our Navy's readiness. The training reactors at the Kesselring site in upstate New York are critical to training nuclear-qualified sailors. Earlier this year, unfunded maintenance and repair costs threatened to shut down one of the site's two reactors, which would have resulted in 450 fewer nuclear-qualified sailors in the fleet next year.

This bill requires significant funding for training reactor operations and maintenance at the Kesselring site and fully funds development of the Ohio replacement at KAPL, which cannot afford further delays. I hope that we can work together to make sure this critical program is fully funded moving forward to ensure that the Navy's nuclear-powered fleet has the resources, sailors, and research it needs to operate effectively and safely.

Finally, I am also pleased to see that the ARPA-E program receives robust funding in this bill. ARPA-E is an important program. Its mission to tackle big challenges in energy and move promising technologies forward into the market through strategic partnerships between government, universities, and businesses is vital to our long-term economic and energy security.

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NUCLEAR ENERGY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for nuclear energy activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $899,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $73,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for program direction including official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $10,000.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), $593,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $120,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 2, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $30,935,000)''.

Page 59, line 20, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $30,935,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I can use a passage from the Bible to describe an appropriations bill, but the money-wasting allocation of funds in this bill is perfectly described by the Gospel of Matthew. It observes:

> For whoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath.

A sociologist termed this the ''Matthew Effect,'' a term for why the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

That is pretty much what is going on here. Why on Earth are we handing out money to fossil fuel companies? They don't need more abundance. They are receiving more than enough from the Federal Government as it is, some $4 billion in taxpayer subsidies each year.

My amendment is extremely modest. It retains the $562.1 million for R&D that is in the budget—far more, I might add, than the President had in his budget of $475 million. But do we really need to increase the R&D budget for fossil fuels beyond the $563 million? Let's show the taxpayers we have just a little restraint.

Fossil fuel companies are perfectly capable of funding their own research. In fact, they do. ExxonMobil alone has spent about $5 billion since 2008. If more spending on R&D is, in fact, needed, they are more than capable of funding it on their own. Perhaps they could reallocate some of the $144 million, or

more than $396,000 per day, they spent last year lobbying Members of Congress. Maybe some of their 763 lobbyists—nearly two for each Member of Congress in the House—would be willing to start a new career in research.

Here in the Federal Government where we don't have millions of dollars to throw around willy-nilly, we need to reexamine our investments. Appropriations bills are documents that spell out our priorities. Increasing the fossil fuel R&D budget by $31 million to an already overly generous $562 million while slashing renewable R&D budgets by $80 million states loud and clear that we are more interested in funding rich energy companies of the past rather than energy of the future.

Again, this amendment is simple. It strikes $31 million in R&D from fossil fuels and commits it to deficit reduction and maintains the FY14 level of funding for this research.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman's references from the Bible in her debate. It is always interesting.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. The amendment would reduce funding for the fossil energy account by $31 million in favor of deficit reduction.

Fossil fuels, such as coal, oil, and natural gas, provide for 82 percent of the energy used by this Nation's homes and businesses and will continue to provide for the majority of our energy needs for the foreseeable future. That is 82 percent.

The bill rejects the administration's proposed reductions to fossil energy, particularly with drastic cuts to the coal program, which is reduced by 29 percent under the budget request, and, instead, funds these programs at $593 million, $31 million above last year. With this additional funding, the Office of Fossil Energy will research how heat can be more efficiently converted into electricity in a cross-cutting effort with nuclear and solar energy programs, how water can be more efficiently used in water plants, and how coal can be used to produce electricity, electric power, through fuel cells.

This amendment would reduce funding for a program that ensures that we use our Nation's fossil fuel resources as well and as cleanly as possible. In fact, if we increase the efficiency of our fossil energy plants, as I have said before during this debate, if we increase the efficiency of our fossil energy plants by just 1 percent—by just 1 percent—we could power an additional 2 million households without using a single additional pound of fuel from the ground. That is the research we are focusing on with funding this program.

We all know that American families and businesses have struggled with high energy prices, and the fossil energy research program holds the potential once and for all to prevent future high prices and substantially increase our energy security.

Therefore, I must oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, we have been having a raging debate in this House over the Ex-Im Bank. Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are screaming that that is, in fact, corporate welfare.

Well, when the three largest oil companies in this country—ExxonMobil, BP, and Shell—made over $62.7 billion in the last year, and you are sitting here and telling us that giving them $4 billion and giving them another $563 million is not enough, that we need to augment it by some $31 million, I think that is pretty darn laughable.

With that, 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. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

For expenses necessary to carry out naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities, $19,950,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, unobligated funds remaining from prior years shall be available for all naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities.

ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND

For necessary expenses in fulfilling the final payment under the Settlement Agreement entered into by the United States and the State of California on October 11, 1996, as authorized by section 3415 of Public Law 104–106 (10 U.S.C. 7420 Note), $15,579,815, for payment to the State of California for the Teachers' Retirement Fund of the State, of which $15,579,815 shall be derived from the Elk Hills School Lands Fund.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

For necessary expenses for Strategic Petroleum Reserve facility development and operations and program management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), $205,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve storage, operation, and management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), $7,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations available under this heading, $6,000,000 is hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Energy Information Administration, $120,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Ms. KAPTUR (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this amendment regarding opportunities for small businesses on behalf of our able and dedicated colleague from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who had to return to Texas on very important official business this evening, and she is airbound, I believe, at this point. I am honored to offer it on her behalf.

Essentially, the amendment increases funding for the Department of Energy's Office of Economic Impact and Diversity by a minimal amount of $500,000 offset by a reduction of like amount in funding for the Energy Information Administration. This amendment increases funding for the Department's Office of Minority Impact, which should be used to enhance the Department's engagement with minority programs and other related activities.

The Office of Economic Impact and Diversity is really a credit to Secretary of Energy Moniz's holistic view of diversity, which recognizes that participation via equal access is critical to our commitment to ensuring that the Department works for all Americans, particularly to improve the lives of low-income and minority communities, as well as our environment at large.

Twenty years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, directing Federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

We need to highlight the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity in the

Office of Economic Impact and Diversity because STEM education—science, technology, engineering, and math education—has become a real calling card.

The Department of Energy seeks to provide equal access in these opportunities for underrepresented groups in STEM, including minorities, Native Americans, and women.

Mr. Chairman, women and minorities make up 70 percent of college students but only 45 percent of undergraduates that are STEM degree holders. That is really quite a startling statistic. The women and minorities comprise 70 percent of college students. Only 45 percent of them that are undergraduates are STEM degree holders. That is almost a 2-to-1 ratio.

This large pool of untapped talent is a great potential source of STEM professionals. As the Nation's demographics are shifting and now most children under the age of 1 are minorities, it is critical that we take and close the gap in the number of minorities who seek STEM opportunities. I applaud the Secretary's commitment, which will increase the Nation's economic competitiveness and enable more of our people to realize their full potential and America's full potential.

Mr. Chairman, there are still a great many scientific riddles left to be solved, and perhaps one of these days a minority engineer or biologist will come up with the solutions. The larger point is that we need to make more STEM educators and more minorities to qualify for them and to make this country fully representative.

The funding provided by this amendment will help ensure that members of underrepresented communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to environmental sustainability, preservation, and health. Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their surroundings. In community education efforts, working with teachers and students, they can also learn about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects. In fact, many of the communities that these individuals live in are places where environmental cleanup is so desperately needed based on the legacy costs of our nuclear programs, for example.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy programs. The Department of Energy also works to increase low-income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees, as well as find employment.

The other offices within the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity are the Minority Business and Economic Development, the Minority Education and Community Development, Civil Rights Diversity and Inclusion, and the Council on Women and Girls and Minority Banks.

□ 1900

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can increase diversity, provide clean energy options to our most underserved community, and help improve their environments, which will yield better health outcomes and greater public awareness. Most importantly, businesses will have more consumers with whom they may engage in related commercial activities.

We must help our low-income and minority communities and ensure equity for those who are the most vulnerable in our country.

I ask our colleagues to join me in support of the Kaptur amendment, by way of SHEILA JACKSON LEE's amendment, for the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity program.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their stewardship in bringing this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

My amendment increases funding for DOE Office of Minority Impact by $500,000, which should be used to enhance the Department's engagement with minorities programs and other related activities.

Mr. Chair, the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity is a paean to Energy Secretary Moniz's holistic view of diversity, which recognizes that participation via equal access is critical to our commitment to ensuring that the Department works for all Americans—particularly to improve the lives of low income and minority communities as well as the environment at large.

Twenty years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, directing federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

I need to take time to highlight the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity in the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity because STEM education has become my calling card.

The Department of Energy seeks to provide equal access in these opportunities for underrepresented groups in STEM, including minorities, Native Americans, and women.

Mr. Chair, women and minorities make up 70 percent of college students, but only 45 percent of undergraduate STEM degree holders.

This large pool of untapped talent is a great potential source of STEM professionals. As the nation's demographics are shifting and now most children under the age of one are minorities, it is critical that we close the gap in the number of minorities who seek STEM opportunities. I applaud the Secretary's commitment which will increase the nation's economic competitiveness and enable more of our people to realize their full potential.

Mr. Chair, there are still a great many scientific riddles left to be solved—and perhaps one of these days a minority engineer or biologist will come-up with some of the solutions.

The larger point is that we need more STEM educators and more minorities to qualify for them.

The funding provided by this amendment will help ensure that members of underrepresented communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environmental sustainability, preservation, and health.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

Through community education efforts, teachers and students have also benefitted by learning about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. The DOE also works to increase low income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

The other offices within the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity are the Minority Business and Economic Development, the Minority Education and Community Development, Civil Rights, Diversity and Inclusion, Council on Women and Girls, and Minority Banks.

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can increase diversity, provide clean energy options to our most underserved communities, and help improve their environments, which will yield better health outcomes and greater public awareness.

But most importantly businesses will have more consumers to whom they may engage in related commercial activities.

We must help our low income and minority communities and ensure equity for those who are most vulnerable in our country.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support the Jackson Lee Amendment for the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity Program.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for non-defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $241,174,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REED

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that will provide an additional $4 million in funding to the nondefense environmental cleanup line of the subject bill by diverting money that otherwise would go to the D.C. bureaucracy and putting that money on the front line to this critical piece of necessary work that needs to be done across the country.

I would offer, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment supports public safety and health.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that we are operating in tough fiscal times, and I appreciate the work the subcommittee has done on appropriations by going through this bill in a very thoughtful and methodical way. It has offered a good piece of sound legislation.

However, I would ask that this amendment be considered and supported by my colleagues because what it fundamentally will do is provide the necessary resources for nuclear waste cleanup sites around the Nation and ensure that these dollars are spent at a level that recognizes the priority of these efforts to our country.

In our district, I have a site called the West Valley Demonstration Project that is one of these types of sites. I have heard from many of my constituents—the West Valley Citizens Task Force, in particular—that spend and devote a tremendous amount of time to this facility and this effort of cleaning up these nuclear waste sites across the country, and in particular the West Valley Demonstration Project site.

The information I received, Mr. Chairman, is that there is a need for consistent funding in this area, because if there is not, the long-term capability and the long-term cost to our country to clean these sites up significantly is increased because of the lack of consistency in the funding necessary to go through this tremendous remediation and restabilization efforts at these nuclear sites.

I am also pleased, Mr. Chairman, to rise with support on a bipartisan basis, working with Congressman HIGGINS, my colleague in New York, as well as Mr. MATHESON, who has joined us in these efforts to recognize across the country that this is a priority level type of effort that needs to be done for our nuclear waste sites across the country.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

I rise to support this amendment. I certainly understand the gentleman's concerns about support for the ongoing cleanup efforts at the Department of Energy sites. This amendment is a small adjustment that will ensure continued progress to the West Valley Demonstration Project, and I am pleased to support this amendment.

Mr. REED. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's support of that effort.

With that, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS. I appreciate Mr. REED yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment, which seeks to modestly increase the funding to the nondefense environmental cleanup program.

Passage of this amendment, as Mr. REED has said, will ensure nuclear cleanup sites across the country receive adequate funding, thereby protecting communities from the harmful effects of radioactive waste.

In western New York, as Mr. REED has said, the West Valley nuclear waste processing plant was established in 1966 in response to Federal calls to commercialize the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel. When the facility terminated its operation only a few years later, it left in its wake more than 600,000 gallons of high-level radioactive waste, a hazardous and unfortunate legacy that the community is still dealing with today.

This is a public safety and environmental hazard that we cannot ignore. The leakage of a plume of radioactive material at that site into groundwater underscores the danger posed by the proximity of the facility to streams that drain into Lake Erie. If this radioactive waste were to make its way into the Great Lakes, the effects would be devastating.

Simply put, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to make sure that cleanup proceeds expeditiously.

Mr. Chairman, it is critical that we maintain our commitment to West Valley and other nuclear sites across the country by continuing to support remediation efforts.

I am proud to work with my friend and colleague, Congressman TOM REED, on this issue, and I urge support of this important bipartisan amendment.

Mr. REED. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman for the support on this amendment. I thank my colleague on the other side of the aisle for joining us in this effort, and I ask that we support this amendment and move forward.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

For necessary expenses in carrying out uranium enrichment facility decontamination and decommissioning, remedial actions, and other activities of title II of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, $585,976,000, to be derived from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, to remain available until expended.

SCIENCE

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for science activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and purchase of not more than 17 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including two buses, $5,071,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $180,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for program direction: *Provided further*, That no funding may be made available for U.S. cash contributions to the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor project until its governing Council implements the recommendations of the Third Biennial International Organization Management Assessment Report: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Energy may waive this requirement upon submission to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a determination that the Council is making satisfactory progress towards implementation of such recommendations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $40,155,000)''.

Page 28, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $40,155,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to increase overall spending for the Department of Energy's Office of Science.

The underlying bill provides a budget allocation approximately $40 million below the President's request for the Office of Science. My amendment would restore the funding level to the President's request. Our national labs and the major user facilities housed at those labs are some of the greatest tools that we have to offer researchers and industry. My amendment would ensure that our national labs are on a sound footing to maintain our role as a global leader in innovation and scientific research.

The greatest long-term economic and national security threat that our country faces is the prospect of losing our role as world leaders in science and technology. Nothing is more critical to preserving our role as world leaders than the fundamental and applied scientific research that is supported by the DOE Office of Science.

As a physicist who worked at Fermi National Accelerator Lab for over 20 years, I understand the productivity

and the potential of the Department of Energy's national lab system, their contributions to our economy, and the wide range of scientific research that they support.

The Chicago area is home to a number of scientific centers, including Fermilab and Argonne National Laboratory. The economic impact of Argonne and Fermilab in Illinois alone is estimated to be more than $1.3 billion annually.

The work done at Argonne and Fermi national labs not only supports our local economy, employing roughly 5,000 people in Illinois, but it is critical to our Nation's long-term economic success.

Despite the economic benefits of scientific research, Federal investments in research and development are at historically low levels. In 2014, our Federal spending on R&D, both defense and nondefense, amounted to less than 1 percent of our GDP, a trend that simply must be reversed.

In fact, over the last 3 years, Federal research and development expenditures decreased by 16.3 percent, which is the steepest decline over a 3-year period since the end of the space race.

We simply cannot sustain this downward trend and still expect to be at the cutting edge of scientific research and innovation.

The Office of Science is responsible for supporting research that is too big for any single company or university to develop. Our national labs are critical research tools to academics and industry alike. For example, Eli Lilly conducts nearly half of its drug discovery research at the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne.

The Office of Science is also home to the Department's newest ventures, the innovation hubs, which seek to discover and develop the next generation of energy sources and delivery systems.

Programs like the Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, headquartered at Argonne, and the Fuels from Sunlight Hub, headquartered at the California Institute of Technology, bring together multiple teams of researchers who are working to develop energy advancements that have the potential to transform energy systems.

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

Through the Office of Science's Biological and Environmental Research programs, we have become world leaders in biofuels research. This research is laying the foundation for a revolution in biofuel production that will help to lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

And the list goes on.

The investments in the DOE Office of Science have also supported research driven by intellectual curiosity alone, such as the discovery science at the forefront of high energy and particle physics, astronomy, or the physics of ultracold atoms.

These investments have led to the development of new technology such as the construction of accelerators and detectors that enable our scientists to discover new particles, including the top quark, the heaviest known form of matter, and the Higgs boson, that help explain the fundamental nature of the universe.

But perhaps most importantly, the Office of Science has supported the training of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers for more than 60 years.

At a time of continuing economic stress, we must continue to develop the next generation of American technical workforce. As other world powers are growing and challenging our position as a global leader in science and innovation, we cannot afford to let the number of American scientists and researchers, or the quality of their research facilities, diminish.

Funding scientific research and development results in one of the highest return on investments that our Nation can make. It is essential that we continue to fully support funding for our national labs to preserve our global competitive advantage.

I rise in strong support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that the amendment proposes to shift funding from defense to nondefense functions.

Assuring funding for the modernization of our nuclear weapons stockpile is a critical national security priority in this bill. Shifting funding between defense and nondefense allocations would have negative repercussions on every appropriations bill by exceeding the Ryan-Murray budget caps that trigger sequestration.

I share my colleague's support for the programs within the Office of Science, and I will be happy to work with him in the event we have additional funding for the basic energy science program in conference. However, I must oppose the amendment as written, and urge others to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $300,000) (increased by $300,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to offer this amendment on behalf of Representative RUSH HOLT, who is, even as we speak, being honored for his many years of service to science, to Congress, and to the citizens of New Jersey.

Our amendment simply transfers funds within the Department of Energy's Office of Science account with the intent of restoring the National Undergraduate Fellowship Program, sometimes affectionately referred to NUF.

The Department of Energy's FY 2015 budget request would zero out funding for NUF while increasing funding for the Science Undergraduate Laboratory Internships, sometimes referred to as SULI.

□ 1915

Our amendment would simply reallocate the additional SULI funding back to NUF, allowing the program to continue. The elimination of NUF would reduce the overall slots available for those wishing to study plasma physics.

Additionally, the goal of NUF is to support a very specific workforce need, and an analysis of the numbers proves that this program has been remarkably successful, particularly in encouraging female participation in the sciences.

According to the data collected by program administrators, since 2000, almost three-quarters of the undergraduate students who have participated in NUF have entered a doctoral program in physics, and nearly half have studied plasma physics or related fields.

The program has succeeded in encouraging women to study plasma physics. The Division of Plasma Physics of the American Physical Society has a female composition of only 7 percent, yet 51 percent of female NUF participants enter a Ph.D. program, with almost half of those entering the plasma physics Ph.D. program.

I urge support for this amendment, which would restore the NUF program, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would restore the funding for the National Undergraduate Fellowship Program within the Office of Science, which was proposed for elimination as part of the administration's overall science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—or STEM's—consolidation efforts.

I appreciate my colleague's passion for the general science education. He has worked tirelessly to support efforts

that advance American research in this area. I have no issues with his amendment, and I would encourage its adoption by voice vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. I thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their work on this bill and for their support of this amendment.

Before I yield, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a section from a June 21, 2014, report by the Fusion Energy Sciences Advisory Committee, which assessed workforce development needs and the importance of a wide education pipeline:

> A complete picture of the scientific workforce must be understood in the context of the broader education pipeline. There are many reports that discuss the challenge of training highly qualified individuals in the so-called STEM—science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—fields. We believe that a robust workforce for fusion energy sciences requires a wide pipeline that starts with precollege activities and ends with strong employment opportunities. This pipeline should also tap into the full potential of the American populace, with opportunities to attract women and groups that are traditionally underrepresented in STEM fields.

The adoption of our amendment today will help address this point in part, but we would also like to state our opposition to the Department of Energy's plan to remove precollege science education activities from its mission portfolio.

The Department of Energy labs provide world-class facilities, where students and scientists conduct groundbreaking research. These facilities should operate both as hubs of innovation and as research tools to engage students.

When young students and teachers are able to directly engage with our national labs, it inspires an interest and a passion for science beyond what any textbook or online resource could ever provide.

Both Representative HOLT and I worked at a national lab for many years before coming to Congress, and we have witnessed firsthand how a young student's time spent among researchers and experiments can inspire a lifelong interest in science.

We fear that, in limiting educational activities only to the Education Department, that we will further isolate the public from important scientific research that is being conducted in our national labs and that we will diminish science education in America overall.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97–425), including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call up amendment No. 15.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $150,000,000)''.

Page 59, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $150,000,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us directs $150 million to be spent on ''activities related to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.'' For my constituents in southern Nevada, we know that that is code for ''build the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository.''

After decades of losing time and over $15 billion having been squandered on this boondoggle, the current administration has rightly said it is time for a new strategy.

Our colleagues in the Senate understand this need to turn the page, which is why Senators WYDEN and MURKOWSKI introduced bipartisan legislation that creates a new system for the disposal of the Nation's nuclear waste.

Unfortunately, some in this body still believe that we should force nuclear waste that has been created in their districts on a region that does not have a single nuclear power plant.

What started decades ago as a law authorizing the study and the selection of two geological depositories suitable for the permanent storage of spent nuclear fuel has now transformed into politics at its worst.

With the passage of the ''screw Nevada'' bill in 1987, which designated Yucca Mountain as the sole repository for the Nation's nuclear waste prior to the completion of adequate scientific evaluation, the goal shifted from how to find the best site for storage to how to force Nevada to take all of this waste—science and common sense be damned.

As the years passed, billions of dollars were wasted, and the misguided Yucca project changed from being a geologic depository to a manmade structure, with barriers erected to attempt to mitigate the tectonic fault lines that run directly under the mountain, threatening the geohydrology of the area with leaking radioactive waste.

The original plan was ill-conceived, and studies conducted over the past few decades clearly illustrate the dangers and costs associated with the project. Unfortunately, you can add the passage of legislation to institute a new national nuclear waste policy to the growing list of issues this Congress has now failed to address.

In the absence of coherent policy, I offer this amendment today to use the funding appropriated for carrying out the failed Yucca Mountain plan to reduce our deficit.

Instead of wasting tens of millions of dollars more on an unworkable solution, let's instead meet our fiduciary obligations to future generations. At the same time, let us commit to moving forward with a new policy to address the Nation's nuclear waste, one that relies on a consent-based system, so that it doesn't force waste on communities like mine.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and send a clear message that this Congress will not continue to go backwards, but that it will take serious action to address our Nation's nuclear waste policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlelady's passion with which she speaks about that, and I understand it, but when she says the failed Yucca Mountain policy, I have to remind her that Yucca Mountain is the law of the land. The policy of Yucca Mountain has not failed, and Yucca Mountain has not failed.

What happened is that someone running for the Presidency of the United States needed four electoral votes—or five or however many it was—in Nevada, so he promised the citizens of Nevada that he would shut down Yucca Mountain, regardless of what the law said, and that is what happened.

We can argue as to whether Yucca Mountain is the right place or not. I think there have been 52 or 53 studies done on Yucca Mountain. It is the most studied piece of earth on this Earth. We know more about it than anywhere else; yet, for political reasons, we have stopped it, and it will truly be a $15 billion waste if we don't proceed.

What we do in this bill is tell the administration to proceed with following the law, so I oppose the gentlelady's amendment.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), who has been an advocate and an ardent supporter of this for many years here in Congress.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague.

To my friends from Nevada, I, too, understand their issues of concern, and we look forward to working with them.

To the Appropriations Committee, you have done great work.

Mr. Chairman, there have been two laws passed: the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the amendments offered in 1987. It is the law of the land. In fact, the Federal courts have ruled in favor of the law of the land. That is why we are where we are today.

The gentlelady's amendment would say: take the money away for finishing the court-mandated scientific study. She even mentioned in her opening comments of the scientific research.

The Federal courts have said: DOE—the Federal Government—finish the scientific study. Her amendment would take that money away.

We are going to find out, through the scientific study, that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is going to end up saying that this is the best place on the planet Earth for the long-term nuclear storage of waste.

It is going to be safe for a million years, and that is going to come if we reject this amendment; but if we accept this amendment, it is their last chance to pull money away from finishing the court-mandated scientific study. That is what her amendment would do.

I know my colleagues here don't believe that I am all science-based, but in this case, I am. We have an independent commission that is ready to finish its work and render a decision, and all we are asking is to let us do it.

If the Nuclear Regulatory Commission says it is not safe, we are done, right, Chairman? Yet, if it is safe for a million years, I think the folks from Nevada are going to say: Okay. Let's work together to make this feasible. Let's bring jobs and economic growth.

The State of Nevada can't rely on gaming for economic growth and development. By closing Yucca Mountain down, you have lost high-paying Federal jobs in the scientific arena, and for a State that has such a need for jobs and a diversification of economy to reject this is really hard.

We are pledging right here—and the chairman is here also—that, as this moves forward and as we get a rendered decision that this location is safe, we are going to work with the State of Nevada to make sure the transportation location is safe; that the infrastructure is in place; and that the jobs, economic growth, and economy occurs.

That is what we plan to do, and I pledge here today my full support to being with the State of Nevada in jobs, in growth, and development as they diversify their economy.

Remember, Yucca Mountain is about 90 miles northeast of Las Vegas. It is in the desert, and it is underneath a mountain. There is not a lot there. I have been there a couple of times.

We are appreciative of the nuclear heritage of the State of Nevada. The law is the law of the land. It was passed and signed into law. It is time that we not jettison the $15 billion and 30 years. Let's finish the project.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for what you have done. I think we will get a chance to talk on this one more time in an additional amendment. I appreciate all you have done.

We look forward to moving this process forward, so that not just our spent nuclear fuel, but our defense waste has a long-term geological repository.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concern for the State of Nevada and its economy, and I invite him to come back again and spend some of his money there.

I also appreciate his argument that this is the law of the land. Indeed, the Affordable Care Act is also the law of the land, but that hasn't stopped the other side from trying, over 50 times, to change it.

I now yield to my colleague from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you to the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today to support the amendment offered by my colleague, Congresswoman DINA TITUS, from District One.

As she has so eloquently indicated and as I stand here today as the Representative who actually has Yucca Mountain in his district, first and foremost, we probably should start by pronouncing our State the way that people in Nevada say it, which is Nevada and not Nevada.

If we are going to screw Nevada by bringing nuclear waste and trying to store it in our State, we should start by recognizing that the people of Nevada hold dear to what is important to our State.

I oppose efforts to fund the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste project. Any avenues for the activation of this project should be blocked. Potential funding for the storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain should be put to better use, whether it is to reduce our deficit or to fund other essential government programs.

Nuclear storage at Yucca Mountain is a failed and unworkable proposal. There are investments that we have made in Yucca Mountain already, as my colleague has said—some $15 billion—and we should find an appropriate alternative use for this site.

□ 1930

But as it stands, this is a project that has been flawed from the start, and it remains flawed today.

This isn't about one political party or another. Our State has worked across the aisle for decades, from our Governor, Brian Sandoval, who is a Republican, to Senator DEAN HELLER, to others.

So this is not a partisan issue, this is a states' rights issue, and the people of Nevada reject you storing your nuclear waste in our backyard.

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

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

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities authorized by section 5012 of the America COMPETES Act (42 U.S.C. 16538), $280,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $28,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase funding for the Advanced Research Project Agency for Energy, otherwise known as ARPA-E. The bill provides $280 million for ARPA-E, which is $45 million less than the President's request. It also represents less than half of the difference between the committee mark and the President's request, with the increase offset by a reduction in the Department administrative account.

At the outset, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member of our subcommittee for the level of funding provided to ARPA-E this year, which is a substantial improvement over last year's House mark which cut the program by 80 percent. However, I think that rather than providing flat funding, we should be stepping up our commitment to a potentially game-changing research program, and that is what my amendment does.

This is a very modest investment for an agency whose work is helping to reshape our economy. While the amendment would leave us still short of where the funding should be and where it is in the President's budget, passing it would send a strong signal that there is bipartisan support for this kind of research. Last year, I offered a similar amendment to restore funding to ARPA-E in this fiscal year 2014 Energy and Water Appropriations Act, which was adopted by a bipartisan majority in the House.

Started in 2009, ARPA-E is a revolutionary program that advances high-potential, high-impact energy technologies that are too early for private sector investment. ARPA-E projects have the potential to radically improve U.S. economic security, national security, and environmental well-being. ARPA-E empowers America's energy researchers with funding, technical assistance, and market readiness.

ARPA-E is modeled after the highly successful Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, or DARPA, which has produced groundbreaking inventions for the Department of Defense and the

Nation, perhaps most notably the Internet itself. A key element of both agencies is that managers are limited to fixed terms so that new blood continuously revitalizes the research portfolio.

As we cut spending to return the budget to balance, we must not weaken those programs that are vital to our economic future and national security, and ARPA-E is just such an agency. Even if we can't make the investment that the President has called for in his budget, let's be sure that we don't hinder an agency that is pointing the way to a more energy-secure future.

Energy is a national security issue. It is an economic imperative. It is a health concern, and it is an environmental necessity. Investing wisely in this type of research going on at ARPA-E is exactly the direction we should be going as a nation. We want to lead the energy revolution. We don't want to see this advantage go to China or anywhere else in the world.

If we are serious about staying in the forefront of the energy revolution, we must continue to fully invest in the kind of cutting-edge work that ARPA-E represents. By providing the funding I am recommending today, we will send a clear signal of the seriousness of our intent to remain world leaders in energy.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to reluctantly—and I do mean reluctantly—oppose the amendment.

The amendment would increase funding for the Advanced Research Projects Agency for Energy, ARPA-E, as has been mentioned, by $20 million using funds from the departmental administration as an offset.

I share my colleague's support for advanced research; that is why the bill before us already provides $280 million for ARPA-E. That is the highest funding level the Agency has ever received in an annual appropriation, equal to last year's, with all funding going to fully fund new projects over the next three years. Put another way, this bill funds ARPA-E at $210 million more than last year's House bill did. This is the highest level of funding that ARPA-E has ever received. In addition, the bill fully funds ARPA-E's open solicitation to support the most promising new energy technologies out there. However, we still have to work within our overall budget allocation.

While I support ARPA-E's program, we must abide by our allocation. Although I am sympathetic to reducing the size of government, we cannot support taking $20 million from the departmental administration. This would do more than just trim the fat beyond what is simply wasteful and ineffective; it would slash funding that would result in approximately 143 people being laid off within the Department of Energy. These are jobs with real impacts on families. Therefore, I must oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the chairman for his comments, and I appreciate his opposition. I appreciate his reluctance even more than his opposition.

I know the chairman has a large fan company in his district he is very proud of, and justifiably so. Those big fans need energy, Mr. Chairman. They need a good efficient energy, and ARPA-E is just the kind of agency to deliver that.

ARPA-E, as our own mark and committee report notes, supports research that is aimed at rapidly developing energy technology whose development and commercialization is still too risky to attract sufficient private sector investment but is capable of significantly changing the energy sector to address our critical economic and energy security challenges. That is an excellent description of ARPA-E.

By providing robust funding, we can help this vital Agency continue working on a wide range of programs that will benefit the United States, both in the short-term and for many years to come. These programs include improvements in petroleum refining processes, heating and cooling technologies with exceptionally high energy efficiency, and transportation fuel alternatives to greatly reduce our dependence on imported oil.

So my colleague need not be so reluctant. He can join in support of this amendment. Again, it would basically split the difference between where the bill is now and what the President has asked for. It is a little less than the difference between the two.

But our competitiveness in this global economy, where we have to compete with labor that costs a fraction of what American workers cost, depends on research and development. We don't want to get in a race to the bottom with the developing world on what we pay our workers, so that means that we have to remain the most productive in the world. This is an agency that helps us do it, and I urge support for the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE 17 INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

Such sums as are derived from amounts received from borrowers pursuant to section 1702(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16512(b)) under this heading in prior Acts, shall be collected in accordance with section 502(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided*, That, for necessary administrative expenses to carry out this Loan Guarantee program, $42,000,000 is appropriated, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided further*, That $25,000,000 of the fees collected pursuant to section 1702(h) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account to cover administrative expenses and shall remain available until expended, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2015 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $17,000,000: *Provided further*, That fees collected under section 1702(h) in excess of the amount appropriated for administrative expenses shall not be available until appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Department of Energy shall not subordinate any loan obligation to other financing in violation of section 1702 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 or subordinate any Guaranteed Obligation to any loan or other debt obligations in violation of section 609.10 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM

For administrative expenses in carrying out the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program, $4,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations under this heading, $6,600,000 is hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), $255,171,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $30,000, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): *Provided*, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total $119,171,000 in fiscal year 2015 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95–238, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2015 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $136,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman and Members, I am pleased to offer this amendment regarding additional resources for environmental justice on behalf of our esteemed colleague, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who had to return to Texas this evening on very important official business.

The amendment is on page 26 of the 60-page bill, and it reprograms funding for the Department of Energy's departmental administration to increase support for environmental justice program activities by $1 million, offset by a reduction of like amount in funding for departmental corporate information technology programs. The amendment increases funding for the Department, and the program is an essential tool in the Department's effort to improve the lives of low-income and minority communities, as well as the environment at large.

Twenty years ago, when President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898 that directed Federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations, America walked toward a new horizon, and we began to understand that a healthy environment sustains a productive and healthy community which fosters personal and economic growth.

Maintaining funds for environmental justice that go to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Minority Serving Institutions, Tribal Colleges, and other organizations is imperative to protecting sustainability and growth of the community and environment. The funding of these programs is vital to ensuring that minority groups are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environment and the continued preservation of their homes.

It is amazing to go through some of these communities and neighborhoods across our country and to look at issues like lead-based paint or, importantly, dumps from prior decades that have been covered over but are leaching everything from low-level radioactive waste to toxic pollutants that have been buried there for years and people are living right next door, sometimes on top of these situations. It is unbelievable.

In Ohio, it is amazing how many toxic sites have to be cleaned up, and it is not the only place. If you look at maps across our country of unattended environmental cleanups, it is staggering, and it is important to see who lives on top of or next door to these places.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their own surroundings. America has to behave differently in 2014 than we did in 1900 or 1950 or 1980.

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

This program provides better access to technology for underserved communities and, together, the Departments of Energy and Agriculture have distributed over 5,000 computers to many of these low-income populations.

The Community Leaders Institute is another vital component of the environmental justice program. It ensures those in leadership positions understand what is happening in their communities and can, therefore, make informed decisions.

These programs have been expanded to better serve Native Americans and Alaska Natives, creating a prime example of how various other minority groups can be assisted as well.

Through community education efforts, teachers and students have also benefited by learning about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into energy efficiency and renewable energy programs, and the Department also works to increase low-income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees, as well as find employment.

□ 1945

Since 2002, the tribal energy program has also funded 175 energy projects, amounting to over $41.8 million in order to help tribes invest in renewable sources of energy.

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can provide clean energy options to our most underserved communities and help improve their environments, yielding better health outcomes and greater public awareness.

In fiscal year 2013, the environmental justice program was not funded. For fiscal year 2014, we ask that money be appropriated for the continuation of this vital initiative. We must help our low-income and minority communities, and ensure equality for those who are the most vulnerable.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Kaptur amendment, which actually is the Jackson Lee amendment, to improve the environmental justice program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

My amendment increases funding for DOE departmental administration by $1,000,000 which should be used to enhance the Department's Environmental Justice program activities.

Mr. Chair, the Environmental Justice Program is an essential tool in the effort to improve the lives of low income and minority communities as well as the environment at large.

Twenty years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, directing federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

A healthy environment sustains a productive and healthy community which fosters personal and economic growth.

Maintaining funds for environmental justice that go to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Minority Serving Institutions, Tribal Colleges, and other organizations is imperative to protecting sustainability and growth of the community and environment.

The funding of these programs is vital to ensuring that minority groups are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environment and the continued preservation of their homes.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

IMPORTANCE OF DOE'S ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

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

This program provides better access to technology for underserved communities. Together, the Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture have distributed over 5,000 computers to low income populations.

The Community Leaders Institute is another vital component of the Environmental Justice Program. It ensures that those in leadership positions understand what is happening in their communities and can therefore make informed decisions in regards to their communities.

In addition to promoting environmental sustainability, CLI also brings important factors including public health and economic development into the discussion for community leaders.

The CLI program has been expanded to better serve Native Americans and Alaska Natives, which is a prime example of how various other minority groups can be assisted as well.

Through community education efforts, teachers and students have also benefitted by learning about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. The DOE also works to increase low income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

Since 2002, the Tribal Energy Program has also funded 175 energy projects amounting to over $41.8 million in order to help tribes invest in renewable sources of energy.

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can provide clean energy options to our most underserved communities and help improve their environments, which will yield better health outcomes and greater public awareness.

In fiscal year 2013, the environmental justice program was not funded. For fiscal year 2014, we ask that money be appropriated for the continuation of this vital initiative.

We must help our low income and minority communities and ensure equality for those who are most vulnerable in our country.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support the Jackson Lee Amendment for the Environmental Justice Program.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $42,120,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed 4 passenger vehicles, $8,204,209,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $97,118,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,600,000)''.

Page 59, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,600,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is time we take a smarter approach to our nuclear weapons strategy.

I rise today to offer a reasonable amendment that ensures that taxpayer dollars are not wasted on a weapon that the Pentagon is not even sure we will have the capability to use. My amendment simply cuts the extra $7.6 million above what the NNSA has requested for the next generation long-range cruise missile's nuclear warhead.

This is a modest cut, one that allows the program to move forward at the requested level of $9.4 million. The reason behind the cut is clear: this funding is for the development of a warhead to be used on a cruise missile that the Pentagon has yet to approve. Given this, there is simply no reason for the NNSA to rush forward with investments on this warhead. And Congress definitely shouldn't be spending taxpayer dollars beyond the NNSA's request to do so.

To get a better idea of what we are spending our constituents' money on, let's walk through this program. This warhead is being developed for the next generation long-range cruise missile. The weapon it will replace, the air-launched cruise missile, isn't being phased out until the 2030s.

This year, the Pentagon delayed the development of this new cruise missile by 3 more years and has yet to set exact requirements for the missile or necessary warhead.

Despite there being no rush, this bill pushes extra money into developing that warhead. There are also serious questions about whether we will even need these new cruise missiles, given the technological advances we have already made.

The next generation long-range bombers will be big, expensive stealth bombers able to penetrate enemy airspace to drop their bombs without being detected. We are spending a small fortune on the B–61 bomb life extension for that advanced capability.

The B–2 stealth bomber, which this next-generation bomber will replace, doesn't carry a cruise missile. Advanced American stealth bombers don't need the capability to send a cruise missile from a bomber 1,000 miles away. We pay for very expensive submarines and very expensive ICBMs for that capability.

So ask yourselves: Should we be adding money above the request for a warhead that goes on a missile that the Pentagon doesn't even know it wants and one we probably don't even need?

Over the next few years, we will be spending billions on our nuclear weapons budget alone. Let me name a few of the things we need to pay for all at the same time:

The many NNSA life extension programs, such as the increasingly costly B–61 program; 100 next generation long-range bombers; ICBM refurbishment and possibly the next generation of ICBMs; plus 12 nuclear-armed Ohio-class replacement submarines.

At a time when we have so many other important projects at both the Pentagon and at the NNSA, the dollars and manpower spent on refurbishing this warhead for a cruise missile that does not yet exist are dollars and manpower the Pentagon and the NNSA could be using on bombers, subs, or even soldiers.

That is why I ask my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment to take an important step towards a more reasonable, sensible nuclear weapons strategy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill provides $8.2 billion for NNSA's weapons activities, an increase of $423 million over fiscal year 2014 and $111 million below the budget request.

The bill takes advantage of all opportunities to reduce funding for activities that are not essential to maintaining the stockpile while making sure the highest priority needs are met.

Assuring funding for modernization of our nuclear weapons stockpile is a critical national security priority in this bill. This includes the full $17 million in the bill to initiate early conceptual studies for a cruise missile warhead life extension program, $7.6 million above the budget request.

The additional funding is a modest amount that will ensure an appropriate set of alternatives is being considered. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

As chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, I am deeply familiar with our nuclear forces. In this case, we are talking about the long-range standoff weapon, LRSO, which is the follow-on replacement for the existing air-launched cruise missile, or ALCM.

The fleet of existing ALCMs are old and their reliability is declining. We have heard directly from the U.S. Strategic Command that they are well past their service life and have military effectiveness concerns. Projected adversary air defense improvements will impact its effectiveness even more. And this is a weapons system we are planning to sustain until 2030.

We need to start development of the nuclear warhead for the LRSO next year to meet the 2030 deployment date. The funding that this amendment seeks to eliminate is critical to getting this effort started and on-track.

The disarm-America crowd will say there is no military requirement for this weapon. On the contrary, I have here a letter from the Under Secretary of Defense for acquisitions, technology, and logistics, stating: ''The Department of Defense has established a military requirement for a nuclear capable standoff cruise missile for the bomber leg of the U.S. triad.''

There is a clear military requirement for LRSO. Preserving long-range cruise missile capability is a critical component of the U.S. strategic and extended deterrence strategies. Gravity bombs and conventional weapons cannot provide the same deterrence and defense effects. There is a clear national security imperative for LRSO.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman's amendment. It simply reduces the long-range standoff missile study to the President's request.

Given the National Nuclear Security Administration's dismal record on both life extension projects and construction projects, cost overruns like we have never seen before, I think it is wise to take a considered approach to any new system and any new study.

So I support the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort. Support the Quigley amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the NNSA has a tough enough job as it is developing nuclear weapons and handling and restoring the weapons that we already have. We have to make choices here. This is a weapon that won't be needed until 2030, if it is needed at all. They don't need additional money beyond that which is requested.

I urge a ''yes'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $1,592,156,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided by this Act for Project 99–D–143, Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, and by prior Acts that remain unobligated for such Project, may be made available only for construction and program support activities for such Project: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations available under this heading, $37,000,000 is hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000) (increased by $25,000,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to commend Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for bringing this bill to the floor. I am a proud member of this subcommittee. Their work is quite remarkable. And it is one of the subcommittees that tries to achieve a harmonious balance of bipartisanship in a very difficult and divided environment. I want to thank them both for that.

Mr. Chairman, most Americans may not realize, even though this is an Energy and Water bill, that there are important components of our national security buried within this bill. There is our nonproliferation regimen by which we help secure fissile materials and the technology that could potentially go with the development of nuclear weapons capability and it falling into the hands of the wrong people. This is very, very important work.

My amendment seeks to move $25 million from the mixed oxide fuel program and move it into the defense nuclear nonproliferation accounts, such as the global threat reduction initiative and other similar accounts.

The reason I am offering this is I am very concerned about the future of the mixed oxide, the MOX, fuel program. So is the Department of Energy. So is the administration. So is our committee. Everyone is very concerned about the potential viability of this program which we have already spent $4 billion of taxpayer money on.

This bill currently calls for about $350 million to be spent. The judgment of the committee is that it is necessary to do this, to put it on what I call a ready standby phase so that if the Department of Energy can come back to us and tell us that MOX has some viability in the future, that we will be ready to move it forward without spending enormous new amounts of money, versus what the administration has suggested in terms of putting it into cold storage.

If they determine it is viable, then we would have to spend a lot more to ramp it up. If it is not determined to be viable, then the cold storage route may have been the more prudent thing to do, which, as I recall, the administration wants to spend about $175 million on, if I have that correct, on the mixed oxide fuel plant.

Well, this causes a real dilemma for me because, again, we have got a situation in which our other accounts in the nonproliferation area are coming down. So it would seem to me prudent, if I was making this decision on my own, to actually move some money from an uncertain future in the mixed oxide fuel regimen into the nonproliferation accounts, such as the global threat reduction initiative.

However, one more caveat. On our nonproliferation reduction initiatives, there is also some uncertainty as to whether or not the Department of Energy can absorb the capacity of new money. It is not clear on how we would apply that. So there are some significant dynamics here that I think lend itself to further consideration.

Now, I am very grateful to the chairman in hearing me out, having heard these concerns when we are debating this on the committee as well as the ranking member's sensitivity to these whole dynamics.

I am going to withdraw this amendment. But I would ask that as we are moving forward—not in the next year, but in the next few weeks, as we complete these appropriations bills, that we urge the Department of Energy to give us some clarity about the real trajectory of the mixed oxide fuel, the MOX, program. And if we determine that its future is not viable, we need to stop wasting money now. We need to pull it into other areas that make more sense, that are higher public goods, that help stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the fissile materials that would go into them.

This is not a simple policy debate. I get that. We are trying to make judgment calls with a lack of information here. But it seems to me that if you are prioritizing something, it is the nuclear nonproliferation initiatives and reframing that for the 21st century. It is time that we do that.

The Department of Energy has suggested to us that they are ready to work hand-in-glove with us on thinking through a dynamic, new robust policy for nonproliferation.

With that, I would hope that the chairman will give assent to my request and continue to work aggressively with me on how we creatively construct this moving forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the way in which the gentleman is addressing two very important issues. The committee has decided that the Department hasn't yet told us what their option is if MOX were to close down.

We are asking for real cost estimates. There are differences of opinion about what the cost estimates for the life cycle of MOX are. So we have asked for further clarification.

And as the gentleman rightly stated, if we put it in cold standby and the decision is to proceed with MOX from the Department, it is going to cost us much more to bring it back up, which is why we have chosen the path that we have chosen.

□ 2000

The gentleman is also correct that I am as supportive and I think my ranking member is also—in fact, I think most of the Members on our subcommittee are—that nonproliferation is a very important issue. The question is: Can the Department spend $25 million more, and what will we get for that?

I want to work with you to make sure that we are doing the right thing and the intelligent thing in both arenas, so I appreciate the attitude that the gentleman is displaying in this.

I know there are a couple of individuals who would like to speak for a moment on MOX, so I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership, and Ranking Member KAPTUR, for your leadership in bringing this bill before us today.

I appreciate very much the Congressman from Nebraska and his interest in the global threat reduction initiative. It is very worthy, but I also want to point out that I am very grateful that the mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility is located in the district that I represent.

It is part of the Savannah River site, and actually, I represent a portion of the site and so does Congressman JIM CLYBURN of the Sixth Congressional District. This is really bipartisan, our support of the mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility.

Mr. Chairman, this facility really is crucial for environmental cleanup. It is very crucial to fulfill the nuclear nonproliferation agreement that we have with the Russian Federation. The site is over 60 percent completed.

You are right that $3.9 billion has already been spent, but the site will have such a positive impact by reducing what is already there—34 metric tons of weapons grade plutonium—and it is made into green fuel, part of the fuel for nuclear power production for our country.

Additionally, it will fulfill the agreement that we have with the Russian Federation, to do away with weapons grade plutonium and encourage them to do the same.

I want you to be aware that this is actually proven technology. There has been a facility built in France already that has provided and proven that this will work, and the other alternatives that have been proposed in the National Defense Authorization Act, we have asked for a study, but it is very clear that the most efficient and most beneficial to the American people and national security is to complete the MOX facility.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I join the chairman and Mr. WILSON in opposition to this, and I appreciate Mr. FORTENBERRY's withdrawing because of so much of what has already been said. This project actually is about 70 percent complete. It has been supported by three different administrations, authorized by Congress, and is written into an international nonproliferation agreement.

In fact, $4.7 billion has been spent, and this is money that has already been invested, and whenever we stop or put it on a cold start or cold standby, as this administration already has done, it ends up costing more money for the project.

The best thing to do is to complete this and send that signal internationally, but also to keep those jobs locally, which is so important for the Augusta, South Carolina, area.

I believe that if we, as Members of Congress, want to be responsible stewards of tax dollars, the best thing to do is to defeat this amendment, should it be offered, but, more importantly, get this thing completed.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this and appreciate his letting me speak.

Mr. SIMPSON. Again, Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Nebraska for both his consideration of this and his passion in this arena for what may be, in the long run, the most important thing this committee does.

So I appreciate working with him and look forward to working with you to try to address this as we answer these questions as rapidly as we can.

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Again, thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your understanding of the importance of this debate.

I ran a simple calculation. If we are going to consider this an important jobs bill, that is $233,000 per job that we are about to spend. That is a hefty, hefty price for a jobs bill.

Saying we have completed 60 percent of it at $4 billion, but we are not sure of its viability in the future is like saying we don't know where we are going, but any road will do. I am worried about that.

Maybe it becomes viable, maybe it still maintains a status in terms of our nuclear proliferation regime, but maybe not. We have got to get to this answer because we don't want to waste any more money, or we need to invest properly, moving forward, in the future.

That will be something that will actually help us reduce the probability of fissile materials spreading internationally.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. KAPTUR. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman for his erudite presentation this evening and for the manner in which he has handled the issue.

I appreciate what you have proposed on nonproliferation, very underfunded in the accounts, in my opinion, and we look forward to working with you in the months ahead.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL REACTORS

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for naval reactors activities to carry out the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition (by purchase, condemnation, construction, or otherwise) of real property, plant, and capital equipment, facilities, and facility expansion, $1,215,342,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $41,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for program direction.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator in the National Nuclear Security Administration, $386,863,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, including official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $12,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed one sport utility vehicle, one heavy duty truck, two ambulances, and one ladder fire truck for replacement only, $4,801,280,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $280,784,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for program direction.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses, necessary for atomic energy defense, other defense activities, and classified activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $754,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $249,378,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, for program direction.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93–454, are approved for the Black Canyon Trout Hatchery and, in addition, for official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed

$5,000: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2015, no new direct loan obligations may be made.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, including transmission wheeling and ancillary services, pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, and including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500, $7,220,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, up to $7,220,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southeastern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2015 appropriation estimated at not more than $0: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $73,579,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500 in carrying out section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the Southwestern Power Administration, $46,240,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), up to $34,840,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southwestern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2015 appropriation estimated at not more than $11,400,000: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $53,000,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That, for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7152), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500, $304,402,000, to remain available until expended, of which $296,321,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), and section 1 of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1939 (43 U.S.C. 392a), up to $211,030,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Western Area Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2015 appropriation estimated at not more than $93,372,000, of which $85,291,000 is derived from the Reclamation Fund: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $260,510,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That, for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

For operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams, $4,727,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund of the Western Area Power Administration, as provided in section 2 of the Act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of that Act and of 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $4,499,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services from the Falcon and Amistad Dams shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the hydroelectric facilities of these Dams and associated Western Area Power Administration activities: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2015 appropriation estimated at not more than $228,000: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2015, the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration may accept up to $802,000 in funds contributed by United States power customers of the Falcon and Amistad Dams for deposit into the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund, and such funds shall be available for the purpose for which contributed in like manner as if said sums had been specifically appropriated for such purpose: *Provided further*, That any such funds shall be available without further appropriation and without fiscal year limitation for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission for the sole purpose of operating, maintaining, repairing, rehabilitating, replacing, or upgrading the hydroelectric facilities at these Dams in accordance with agreements reached between the Administrator, Commissioner, and the power customers.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $3,000, $304,389,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated herein, not more than $5,400,000 may be made available for salaries, travel, and other support costs for the offices of the Commissioners: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $304,389,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 2015 shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this account, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 2015 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2015 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $0.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 301. (a) No appropriation, funds, or authority made available by this title for the Department of Energy shall be used to initiate or resume any program, project, or activity or to prepare or initiate Requests For Proposals or similar arrangements (including Requests for Quotations, Requests for Information, and Funding Opportunity Announcements) for a program, project, or activity if the program, project, or activity has not been funded by Congress.

(b)(1) Unless the Secretary of Energy notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 3 full business days in advance, none of the funds made available in this title may be used to—

(A) make a grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling $1,000,000 or more;

(B) make a discretionary contract award or Other Transaction Agreement totaling $1,000,000 or more, including a contract covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation;

(C) issue a letter of intent to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B); or

(D) announce publicly the intention to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 15 days of the conclusion of each quarter a report detailing each grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling less than $1,000,000 provided during the previous quarter.

(3) The notification required by paragraph (1) and the report required by paragraph (2) shall include the recipient of the award, the

amount of the award, the fiscal year for which the funds for the award were appropriated, the account and program, project, or activity from which the funds are being drawn, the title of the award, and a brief description of the activity for which the award is made.

(c) The Department of Energy may not, with respect to any program, project, or activity that uses budget authority made available in this title under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs'', enter into a multiyear contract, award a multiyear grant, or enter into a multiyear cooperative agreement unless—

(1) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award; or

(2) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement includes a clause conditioning the Federal Government's obligation on the availability of future year budget authority and the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 3 days in advance.

(d) Except as provided in subsections (e), (f), and (g), the amounts made available by this title shall be expended as authorized by law for the programs, projects, and activities specified in the ''Bill'' column in the ''Department of Energy'' table included under the heading ''Title III—Department of Energy'' in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act.

(e) The amounts made available by this title may be reprogrammed for any program, project, or activity, and the Department shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 30 days prior to the use of any proposed reprogramming which would cause any program, project, or activity funding level to increase or decrease by more than $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, during the time period covered by this Act.

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

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

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

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

(g)(1) The Secretary of Energy may waive any requirement or restriction in this section that applies to the use of funds made available for the Department of Energy if compliance with such requirement or restriction would pose a substantial risk to human health, the environment, welfare, or national security.

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of any waiver under paragraph (1) as soon as practicable, but not later than 3 days after the date of the activity to which a requirement or restriction would otherwise have applied. Such notice shall include an explanation of the substantial risk under paragraph (1) that permitted such waiver.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 8, insert ''the number of proposals or applications submitted for the award, documentation of the basis for selection of award recipient,'' after ''of the award,''.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely pleased that the appropriators and this chairman have included a requirement that discretionary grants awarded by the Department of Energy must be disclosed to the House and the Senate in a timely manner, and they must include information about where these funds are going.

This is a very positive step forward towards greater transparency and greater ability for this body to have oversight over agencies in the millions of dollars that are being spent on grants.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment that I am offering perfects that information about those grants and their ability to be disclosed. In addition to the money, where it would go, and whom it would go towards, it is critical that we know how many entities actually competed for these awards and how the winner was actually selected, so that we know the full transparency of the process itself.

Agencies have a tremendous amount of discretion, and they provide millions of dollars to grantees. It is incredibly important that Congress fulfills their responsibility of oversight. Shining a light on how these decisions will be made will allow for critical independent assessments of how the DOE spends its money.

Mr. Chairman, these additions I suggest are relatively minor, but it will go a long way to giving Congress greater data on how the Department of Energy functions with their grant process.

I applaud the committee for acknowledging how important disclosure is for this agency and for all accountability, and I hope that this is a positive sign of how we will handle oversight for all agencies and for all grants.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's intent, and I will be happy to work with him as we move forward in conference, but at this time, I must insist upon my point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, 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 inserts additional legislative language and is not merely perfecting.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

The gentleman from Idaho makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma proposes to change existing law in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

Under settled precedent, where legislative language is permitted to remain in a general appropriation bill, a germane amendment merely perfecting that language and not adding further legislation is in order, but an amendment effecting further legislation is not in order.

The Chair finds that the pending section of the bill contains legislative language prescribing certain notifications and reports by the Secretary of Energy. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma seeks to expand those notifications and reports to include additional information, such as the number of proposals or applications submitted for the award.

As such, the amendment does not merely perfect the pending legislative language.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be available to the same appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Available balances may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

Mr. SIMPSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 51, line 2, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 303. Funds appropriated by this or any other Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2015 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 304. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for the construction of facilities classified as high-hazard nuclear facilities under 10 CFR Part 830 unless

independent oversight is conducted by the Office of Independent Enterprise Assessments to ensure the project is in compliance with nuclear safety requirements.

SEC. 305. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to approve critical decision-2 or critical decision-3 under Department of Energy Order 413.3B, or any successive departmental guidance, for construction projects where the total project cost exceeds $100,000,000, until a separate independent cost estimate has been developed for the project for that critical decision.

SEC. 306. (a) Any determination (including a determination made prior to the date of enactment of this Act) by the Secretary pursuant to section 3112(d)(2)(B) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h–10(d)(2)(B)), as amended, shall be valid for not more than 2 calendar years subsequent to such determination.

(b) Not less than 30 days prior to the provision of uranium in any form the Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of—

(1) the amount of uranium to be provided;

(2) an estimate by the Secretary of the gross fair market value of the uranium on the expected date of the provision of the uranium;

(3) the expected date of the provision of the uranium;

(4) the recipient of the uranium; and

(5) the value the Secretary expects to receive in exchange for the uranium, including any adjustments to the gross fair market value of the uranium.

(c) If on the expected date of provision, the estimated gross fair market value of the uranium hexafluoride (UF6), comprising of uranium and conversion, is more than 10 percent lower than the gross fair market value on the date the most recent determination was signed by the Secretary, the Secretary shall issue a new determination pursuant to section 3112(d)(2)(B) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h–10(d)(2)(B)) before the provision can be processed.

SEC. 307. Notwithstanding section 301(c) of this Act, none of the funds made available under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science'' may be used for a multiyear contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement of $1,000,000 or less unless the contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award.

SEC. 308. In fiscal year 2015 and subsequent fiscal years, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees (as defined in U.S.C. 101(a)(16)) a report, on each major warhead refurbishment program that reaches the Phase 6.3 milestone, that provides an analysis of alternatives. Such report shall include—

(1) a full description of alternatives considered prior to the award of Phase 6.3;

(2) a comparison of the costs and benefits of each of those alternatives, to include an analysis of trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives against each alternative considered;

(3) identification of the cost and risk of critical technology elements associated with each alternative, including technology maturity, integration risk, manufacturing feasibility, and demonstration needs;

(4) identification of the cost and risk of additional capital asset and infrastructure capabilities required to support production and certification of each alternative;

(5) a comparative analysis of the risks, costs, and scheduling needs for any military requirement intended to enhance warhead safety, security, or maintainability, including any requirement to consolidate and/or integrate warhead systems or mods as compared to at least one other feasible refurbishment alternative the Nuclear Weapons Council considers appropriate; and

(6) a life-cycle cost estimate for the alternative selected that details the overall cost, scope, and schedule planning assumptions.

SEC. 309. (a) Unobligated balances available from prior year appropriations are hereby permanently rescinded from the following accounts of the Department of Energy in the specified amounts:

(1) ''Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'', $18,111,000.

(2) ''Energy Programs—Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability'', $4,809,000.

(3) ''Energy Programs—Nuclear Energy'', $1,046,000.

(4) ''Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development'', $8,243,000.

(5) ''Energy Programs—Science'', $5,257,000.

(6) ''Energy Programs—Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy'', $619,000.

(7) ''Power Marketing Administrations—Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration'', $1,720,000.

(b) No amounts may be rescinded by this section from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 310. From funds made available by this Act for pension plan payments in excess of legal requirements, up to $90,000,000 under ''Weapons Activities'' and up to $30,000,000 under ''Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation'' may be transferred to ''Defense Environmental Cleanup'' to support decontamination and other requirements at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

SEC. 311. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any prior Act under the heading ''Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation'' may be made available for contracts with, or Federal assistance to, the Russian Federation.

(b) The Secretary of Energy may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that such activity is in the national security interests of the United States. This waiver authority may not be delegated.

(c) A waiver under subsection (b) shall not be effective until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in classified form if necessary, a report on the justification for the waiver.

SEC. 312. All balances under ''United States Enrichment Corporation Fund'' are hereby permanently rescinded. No amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 313. (a) None of the funds made available by this or any other Act making appropriations for Energy and Water Development for any fiscal year or funds available in the SPR Petroleum Account in this and subsequent fiscal years may be used to carry out a test drawdown and sale or exchange of petroleum products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve as authorized by section 161(g) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6241(g)) unless the Secretary of Energy submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not less than 30 full calendar days in advance of such test—

(1) notification of intent to conduct a test;

(2) an explanation of why such a test is necessary or what is expected to be learned;

(3) the amount of crude oil or refined petroleum product to be offered for sale or exchange;

(4) an estimate of revenues expected from such test; and

(5) a plan for refilling the Reserve, including whether the acquisition will be of the same or of a different petroleum product.

(b) None of the funds made available by this or any prior Act or funds available in the SPR Petroleum Account may be used to acquire any petroleum product other than crude oil.

SEC. 314. Of the funds authorized by the Secretary of Energy for laboratory directed research and development, no individual program, project, or activity funded by this or any subsequent Energy and Water Development appropriations Act for any fiscal year may be charged more than the statutory maximum authorized for such activities.

SEC. 315. 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 ''Standards Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits'' and identified by regulation identification number 1904–AC87.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, notwithstanding 40 U.S.C. 14704, and for necessary expenses for the Federal Co-Chairman and the Alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission, for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $80,317,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100–456, section 1441, $29,150,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that section of the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Delta Regional Authority and to carry out its activities, as authorized by the Delta Regional Authority Act of 2000, notwithstanding sections 382C(b)(2), 382F(d), 382M, and 382N of said Act, $12,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DENALI COMMISSION

For expenses of the Denali Commission including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment as necessary and other expenses, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended, notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 306(g) of the Denali Commission Act of 1998: *Provided*, That funds shall be available for construction projects in an amount not to exceed 80 percent of total project cost for distressed communities, as defined by section 307 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (division C, title III, Public Law 105–277), as amended by section 701 of appendix D, title VII, Public Law 106–113 (113 Stat. 1501A–280), and an amount not to exceed 50 percent for non-distressed communities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 59, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates funding for the Denali Commission and uses the nearly $10 million in savings to pay down our $17.5 trillion national debt. It is a relatively small amount in relation to our national debt, but nonetheless, I believe it is a step in the right direction.

For those who don't know, the Denali Commission is one of seven regional commissions that help direct Federal funds to State and local projects. However, unlike the other commissions, the Denali Commission serves only one State, Alaska, making it a little more than an unnecessary middleman.

Many people would argue, including myself, that American taxpayers would be better served if Federal funds were distributed directly to the State of Alaska or to Alaskan communities.

After all, State and local governments are more knowledgeable and better equipped than the Federal Government to address the needs of local communities.

I am not the only one calling for an end to the 15-year-old Denali experiment. Last October, in his semiannual report to Congress, former inspector general of the Denali Commission, Mike Marsh, recommended that Congress eliminate Denali's funding in order to transition the Commission into a locally run and operated entity.

On Friday, September 27, 2013, The Washington Post ran a front-page article, this one here, entitled ''Fire Me,'' in which Mike Marsh, the inspector general, requested that Congress fire him and everybody that worked with him. He is quoted as saying:

I have concluded that my agency is a congressional experiment that hasn't worked out in practice. I recommend that Congress put its money elsewhere.

That is the inspector general for the Denali Commission.

Additionally, the Office of Management and Budget and the CBO have recommended the elimination of this Commission.

Additionally, as the former inspector general's report details, the projects funded by the Denali Commission are often wasteful and shortsighted.

For example, the Commission has spent millions on microsettlements. Records show that the Denali Commission spent $200 million to build facilities in 81 locations with a population of less than 250 people.

These 81 locations have a total population of less than 10,000 people. At 10,000 people, the Commission spent $57,000 per household. Think of that: $57,000 per household.

For nearly a decade, independent agencies have questioned the need for the Denali Commission. Agencies from the CBO to the White House have found 29 other programs that are capable of fulfilling the Commission's mandate.

The Republican Study Committee, Citizens Against Government Waste, Heritage, Cato, the American Conservative Union, National Taxpayers Union, and even President Obama have all targeted the Commission for elimination.

□ 2015

It is time that we heed these recommendations and eliminate funding for the Denali Commission once and for all. To do otherwise, I believe, would be imprudent and wasteful, especially when faced with a $17.5 trillion national debt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, as the gentleman said, would eliminate the Denali Commission, which is funded at last year's level of $10 million in this bill.

The Denali Commission provides infrastructure and economic development activities for some of the country's most rural and distressed communities. Regardless of whether it is one State or a region, the fact is the State is probably larger than any one of the regions that the Commission deals with.

In a time of economic instability, communities can scarily afford to lose the millions of dollars in private investments leveraged by the Commission annually. Elimination of the Denali Commission would deprive these communities of many essential infrastructure and economic development projects. I encourage my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. With all due respect to the gentleman offering this amendment, yes, we are one State; but if you took all of the land from the tip of Maine to the tip of Florida, from the Mississippi River over, that is part of Alaska. That is a big State, not a little State, like Ohio.

This Commission has work. And I have to say one thing, it is being referred to as the ''IG report by Mr. Marshall''—totally incompetent. It has been unfounded. His finding was unfounded. In fact, we can't find him. We would like to find out where he is. He no longer exists. What he said about this Commission is totally inaccurate. It has worked. It will work, and we are a rural area.

What it has done, one thing when it was created was to move the fuel tanks away from the waters that EPA said they couldn't be close to. These communities could not do that, and the process of the Federal Government and the other agencies, it would have taken too long. So we moved these fuel tanks across. And yes, it was used for clinics, and yes, it has been used for sewer and water. Forty-four of our villages don't have water yet, don't have sewage. They carry ''honey buckets.'' Why they call them ''honey buckets'' I have no idea.

But this Commission is to take and provide the proper things for, just as your constituents use every day and take for granted. This Commission has worked. We want to keep the money, and I want to thank the chairman for understanding this. This amendment has been offered time and time again. And as he said, this is a very small amount of money. That is not what I am arguing. It is money well spent. If we don't spend it on this type thing to cut out the middleman, and they keep saying there are other agencies. That is not true. Those agencies do not function. Most of our agencies today do not function because there are too many layers and nothing gets to the constituent, nothing gets to solving the problem.

So I am suggesting, and we have done some work on this. I asked for a GAO investigation; I did, to find if this has occurred. It has not been reported back to us yet. It will be. In fact, it will show that the IG's report is false, and that is one of the things I am looking forward to.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. It is time we accept the fact that this system works, as the other commissions do, for those communities that are less fortunate than the communities in which most people live in who are in this body. I come from a rural State. I want to serve my rural State, and I am sure the Commission does also.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would say this is not about Alaska. Alaska is a tremendous State that I have personally visited. I have not had an opportunity to live there, as my colleague has, obviously. But this is not about Alaska; this is about duplication in government efficiency and how we actually deliver services to these agencies.

In 2004, President Bush's Office of Management and Budget wrote that the Commission's activities were duplicative of other Federal programs that address the same needs and provide the same types of assistance.

In 2009, President Obama's OMB referred to the Denali Commission as duplicative, redundant, unnecessary, and stated there was no evidence that the Denali Commission's job training programs improve employment outcomes for participants.

The GAO found the Denali Commission's activities to be duplicative of other Federal programs.

The Congressional Budget Office examined the Denali Commission and they said that they failed to find any evidence that they have achieved success in these areas in large part due to the overlap of the Commission's activities in other Federal programs.

And in October of 2013, the Office of Inspector General said that the Denali Commission was a middleman, that it was an experiment that had run its course and argued that these funds could be appropriated and be put to better use.

Put the funds towards Alaska. Put them actually in direct grants rather than a program that is a middleman around it. There are ways to be able to determine this, but we as a Nation have to find ways to be able to eliminate duplication, and this is one of those moments.

Are we going to listen to the inspector general, the Congressional Budget Office, the GAO, two different Presidents' Offices of Management and Budget, or will we ignore all of those?

With that, I encourage us to deal with a transition, continue to take care of the needs of rural Alaska but find a more efficient delivery system to do that.

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Northern Border Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be available for administrative expenses, notwithstanding section 15751(b) of title 40, United States Code.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FATTAH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 4, after the dollar amount insert (increase by 1) (decrease by 1)

Mr. FATTAH (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the further reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank you and thank the chairman and the ranking member who have done an extraordinary amount of work developing this bill, everything from the nonproliferation work and the security and modernization of our nuclear weapons enterprise, the renewable and nuclear support programs, the energy labs, and their support of the Office of Science at DOE. I know the committee has worked very hard.

I rise tonight to offer an amendment which at the conclusion of my remarks I will withdraw, but I wanted to take this opportunity to say a number of things. One is that I have traveled with the chairman and other members of the committee over these many years to many of our national energy labs. And in particular, I have focused on the nuclear weapons enterprise, but I rise today in support of and wanting to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support for the Energy Efficient Buildings Hub in Philadelphia.

The administration had asked for an appropriation. The committee in its work has decided to go well beyond that, and I want to thank the chairman publicly. Even though it is in Philadelphia, I don't rise in a parochial sense. I also thank you for your support for the other labs. The Pittsburgh lab, for instance, is where the work was done that has enabled us to tap the Marcellus Shale. These labs are so vitally important. The science that is done there has increased our country's capacity in terms of energy, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, $250,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, including official representation expenses not to exceed $25,000, $1,052,433,000, to remain available until expended, of which $55,000,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated herein, not more than $9,500,000 may be made available for salaries, travel, and other support costs for the Office of the Commission, to remain available until September 30, 2016, of which, notwithstanding section 201(a)(2)(c) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5841(a)(2)(c)), the use and expenditure shall only be approved by a majority vote of the Commission: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $880,155,000 in fiscal year 2015 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2015 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2015 appropriation estimated at not more than $172,278,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be for university research and development in areas relevant to their respective organization's mission, and $5,000,000 shall be for a Nuclear Science and Engineering Grant Program that will support multiyear projects that do not align with programmatic missions but are critical to maintaining the discipline of nuclear science and engineering.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $12,071,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $10,099,000 in fiscal year 2015 shall be retained and be available until September 30, 2016, for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2015 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2015 appropriation estimated at not more than $1,972,000: *Provided further*, That, of the amounts appropriated under this heading, $850,000 shall be for Inspector General services for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, which shall not be available from fee revenues.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100–203, section 5051, $3,400,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

SEC. 401. The Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall notify the other members of the Commission, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, not later than 1 day after the Chairman begins performing functions under the authority of section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1980, or after a member of the Commission who is delegated emergency functions under subsection (b) of that section begins performing those functions. Such notification shall include an explanation of the circumstances warranting the exercise of such authority. The Chairman shall report to the Committees, not less frequently than once each week, on the actions taken by the Chairman, or a delegated member of the Commission, under such authority, until the authority is relinquished. The Chairman shall notify the Committees not later than 1 day after such authority is relinquished. The Chairman shall submit the report required by section 3(d) of the Reorganization Plan

No. 1 of 1980 to the Committees not later than 1 day after it was submitted to the Commission. This section shall be in effect in fiscal year 2015 and each subsequent fiscal year.

SEC. 402. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall comply with the July 5, 2011, version of Chapter VI of its Internal Commission Procedures when responding to Congressional requests for information until those Procedures are changed or waived by a majority of the Commission, in accordance with Commission practice.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913.

SEC. 502. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 504. (a) None of the funds made available in title III of this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriations Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(b) None of the funds made available for any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may be transferred to accounts funded in title III of this Act, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriations Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(c) The head of any relevant department or agency funded in this Act utilizing any transfer authority shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a semi-annual report detailing the transfer authorities, except for any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality, used in the previous 6 months and in the year-to-date. This report shall include the amounts transferred and the purposes for which they were transferred, and shall not replace or modify existing notification requirements for each authority.

SEC. 505. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994 (''Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations'').

SEC. 506. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to conduct closure of adjudicatory functions, technical review, or support activities associated with the Yucca Mountain geologic repository license application, or for actions that irrevocably remove the possibility that Yucca Mountain may be a repository option in the future.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

Ms. TITUS. 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:

Page 59, beginning on line 8, strike section 506.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, we all know the history of the misguided Yucca Mountain project, so there is no need to repeat it again. This simple amendment that I am going to offer would strike language included in the bill which prohibits the DOE from closing Yucca Mountain.

Now we heard earlier this evening from an esteemed colleague on this floor that he cares deeply about Nevada, and he went on to say that if the latest court mandated study determines Yucca Mountain is not safe for 1 million years, he will, indeed, lead the charge to move on to another solution. In fact, he called on the chairman of the committee to join him in that pledge. Well, I thank him for that, but I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, how can that be possible if the provision prohibiting closure of Yucca Mountain is left in the bill? Is this offer not a sincere one? Is this yet another empty promise to the people of Nevada?

Indeed, if this amendment is not adopted and instead the DOE is prohibited from ever closing Yucca Mountain, how can we believe anything that is being said or done in relation to this proposed dump site?

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, Nevada is not a wasteland, and I urge passage of this amendment that would strike that language prohibiting the DOE from ever closing Yucca Mountain regardless of whether it is found to be safe or not.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I oppose this amendment. It is an interesting argument the gentlelady made. The House has repeatedly had overwhelming votes in support of continuing the Yucca Mountain repository.

The language that would be stricken by this amendment we have been carrying for years as a way to keep the will of the House and the American people alive. In fact, the votes supporting Yucca Mountain in this House have been overwhelming each time that we voted on it.

I would remind the gentlelady that this doesn't mean that Yucca Mountain can never be closed. The comment of the gentleman from Illinois would still be true. An appropriation bill is a 1-year appropriation bill. That is why we carry this language in each appropriation bill.

We need to wait for the safety review by the NRC to be done to decide what we are going to do moving forward, instead of political decisions that have been made on Yucca Mountain in the past. And it has been a political decision. I think even the gentlelady would agree with that. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank the committee for doing again fine work. The amendment talked about none of the funds can be used for the NRC's work. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is the independent agency to ensure the safety of the nuclear power industry and the disposition of its waste.

In attacking this and pulling this money out, it is the last attempt to say: We are not going to allow the scientific basis and our Commission, most appointed by Democratic administrations, to do their work.

□ 2030

We know what they are going to come out with. They are going to say it is safe for a million years.

People need to go visit the great State of Nevada. But I will just tell you that it is a great State, and I have been there. There will be a time when we need to move forward, and I am pledging, along with the chairman, to do what is right by your State.

Yucca Mountain is just a small portion of the nuclear waste test site. You have DOE land; you have Bureau of Land Management land; you have military land. It is bigger than most States, and people don't understand that until they go out there.

Seven of your 17 counties at least support—what has been raised by the chairman—support the Nuclear Regulatory Commission coming to a final conclusion, and you all know that because they have passed a county resolution. So to say that everyone from

the State is opposed, what many folks from the State of Nevada say is let's find out the safety of this, let the NRC do its work, and we have resolutions from seven of the 17 counties that support that.

We will eventually get through this. We voted numerous times in this Chamber over my many years here. Last year, 335–81, 337–87. The House as a body, representing Members from across this great Nation, have spoken in support of supporting Federal law. You have the right to come down here and try to stop the implementation of law, and I understand that and I respect that; but there will be a time when we continue to pledge, as this policy moves forward, that we will do everything to do what is right for your State in moving and storing and ensuring safety for this as the national policy over land enacted by the Federal statute in 1982 along with the amendments in 1987.

I know I have got a lot of support on your side, and we need to get closure to this so that we can continue to have, really, an energy policy that is diversified. If we move on this climate agenda, how do you move on a climate agenda without nuclear power? You just can't. Large major generating facilities.

How do we deal with the World War II nuclear waste without a place to safely store, a place like Hanford in Washington State that is a legacy site from World War II? Do you know where that should go if the NRC concludes it is safe? Under a mountain, in a desert, 90 miles northeast of Las Vegas.

Again, I am not trying to be a jerk. I know it is tough. Eighty-two, 30 years, $15 billion—we can't walk away from that as an investment of this country. If we do, we are not being good public stewards of the taxpayers' funds and the ratepayers, which are about 32 States in this Union. Thirty-two States have put in money to the Nuclear Waste Fund on a promise that the Federal Government would have a site. Your amendment would say no, we are just going to walk away again.

Respectfully, I would ask for the defeat of the Titus amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your great work.

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my colleague, I believe he is addressing the previous amendment. This amendment simply deletes language from the bill that prohibits DOE from closing Yucca Mountain.

I would also remind him of the bipartisan bill that is in the Senate that would provide a solution for our nuclear waste problem, which is consent-based, bipartisan and consent-based.

This policy has been a waste of time and money and, indeed, it is bad politics, not good science.

I yield to my colleague, Mr. HORSFORD.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

First, I want to commend you for your tireless efforts in fighting this dangerous storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain. From your days as a leader as a State legislator to now as a Member of Congress, your unwavering commitment to this issue on behalf of the majority will of Nevadans who are opposed to dangerous storage of nuclear waste in our State—from our Governor, Republican Governor Brian Sandoval; our U.S. Senator, Republican Member, U.S. Senator DEAN HELLER; our majority leader, Senator HARRY REID—this is a State issue. The State is opposed to the storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain. There are local counties that have different positions, but the State's position has been clear for decades that we do not want dangerous nuclear waste stored in our State.

Ultimately, this threatens our State's health and our safety. It hurts our State's economy, not just gaming, but other areas. With one accident, it could devastate southern Nevada. The stakes are too high for our State to gamble with.

While this is 90 miles away from Las Vegas, we have 40 million visitors that come to our community—2 million people that live there in southern Nevada. But we are a State that relies on tourism, and that industry would be destroyed by any complication with nuclear waste. People come to Vegas for the bright lights, not for radioactive glow.

Our State leaders will continue to fight together, Republicans and Democrats, in Nevada to make sure that Yucca Mountain remains scrapped, as it should be.

I want to thank again my colleague, the Representative from District One, for her tireless leadership on this issue.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that protects the majority will of Nevadans who have consistently opposed the storage of dangerous nuclear waste.

To my colleague from Illinois, I think if you would take the time to come and visit our community, talk to the small business owners, to the parents who are concerned about the transportation, of what this would mean on our highways and our roads, the threat that it could have to our schools and our local businesses, then maybe you would understand why there is near unanimous agreement that Yucca Mountain and the storage of nuclear waste is not right for Nevada.

Ms. TITUS. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 507. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

Mr. SIMPSON. 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. SHIMKUS) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDING, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

2014 NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–129)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Committee on Financial Services, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Committee on Ways and Means, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Committee on Homeland Security, Committee on Natural Resources, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 2014 *National Drug Control Strategy*, a 21st century approach to drug policy that is built on decades of research demonstrating that addiction is a disease of the brain—one that can be prevented, treated, and from which people can recover. The pages that follow lay out an evidence-based plan for real drug policy reform, spanning the spectrum of effective prevention, early intervention, treatment, recovery support, criminal justice, law enforcement, and international cooperation.

Illicit drug use and its consequences challenge our shared dream of building for our children a country that is healthier, safer, and more prosperous. Illicit drug use is associated with addiction, disease, and lower academic