United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2013 No. 97

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 9, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be on the floor again talking about the failed policy in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, most people in my district know that I've signed over 11,000 letters. They're condolence letters to families who've lost loved ones in Afghanistan and Iraq because of the unnecessary war we fought in Iraq. In the last 2 weeks, we were home for the July 4 break. There were two weekends. I've signed 16 letters to families in this Nation who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, it's almost like we in Congress don't know we're still at war; yet there are young men and women dying in Afghanistan and being wounded every day. The American people do not understand why we continue to fund this failed policy in Afghanistan. Each and every day the failures become clearer and clearer to the American people, but not to Congress.

Most recently, Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction John Sopko warned that the Pentagon is moving ahead with plans to spend $771 million on aircraft, including 30 Russian helicopters for an Afghan military team. This purchase comes despite the fact that only seven of 47 Afghan Air Force pilots are qualified to fly the helicopters. As reported by CNN, an audit by Mr. Sopko explained that the reason so few pilots are able to fly the aircraft is that ''it's difficult to find literate recruits who don't have links to insurgents or criminals.''

Mr. Speaker, that should wake up the Congress, if nothing else.

Unfortunately, this is only one of many examples of American money being wasted in Afghanistan. I've written multiple letters requesting a hearing to allow Mr. Sopko to testify before the House Armed Services Committee regarding this and other findings that he has made in Afghanistan and the abuse of American funds, but to my knowledge a hearing has not been scheduled. I will continue to push the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, which I serve on.

Mr. Speaker, what is so sad, truthfully, is for the American taxpayer, that their Representatives in Washington will continue to spend money in Afghanistan with very little accountability. The American people are tired of this war in Afghanistan, and they're tired of seeing young men and women coming back in flag-draped coffins.

While this administration is in the final stages of negotiating a bilateral security agreement with Afghanistan, Congress has had no debate on this strategic agreement. I realize that the President is not required to come before Congress for approval, but it is that we in Congress should have the concern that we would bring up the issue itself and debate it and vote up or down whether we should stay in Afghanistan for 10 more years.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I want to remind that in these 16 letters that I signed in the last 2 weeks, some of these letters were addressed to children, whether it be two, three, four children, to say that I'm sorry that your father, your brother, your sister, or your mother has been killed in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask God to please bless the men and women in uniform, to bless the families of our men and women in uniform, in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I ask God to bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God. I will ask God to bless the President and give him the courage to do what is right for the American people.

And three times I will say, with the greatest respect, God, please, God, please, God, please, continue to bless America.

GUN VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, entire neighborhoods in my city of Chicago are being torn apart by violence.

Last week, from Wednesday evening through Sunday evening, more than 70 people were shot in Chicago, 11 of whom died. Last year, over 500 people

Printed on recycled paper.

were murdered in my city. Of these murders, 80 percent were gang related, and nearly 90 percent were at the hands of a gun. The numbers speak for themselves. The city of Chicago is facing an epidemic of violence and the reasons behind it are clear.

There are many ideas to solve this problem. One—rounding up 18,000 members of the Gangster Disciples—is simply not legally or financially feasible. What is feasible and a significant way to stop gun violence in my city is to stop the flow of illegal guns into Chicago.

One reason the violence is at record levels is because gang members have such easy access to illegal guns. It's time for the Federal Government to step in and do something about it.

Despite the city's tough gun laws, Chicago cops are recovering illegal guns at nine times the rate of their counterparts in New York City. That's nearly three times the number of weapons in a city one-third the size. These outrageous numbers call for nothing short of a Federal response. We need a renewed effort at the Federal level to prosecute gun traffickers who put illegal weapons in the hands of gang members. We need to give our law enforcement the tools they need to put these guys away.

Last year, Chicago ranked last among Federal jurisdictions and Federal gun prosecutions. This is simply unacceptable. Gun traffickers should know that if you traffic illegal weapons in the city of Chicago, you will be spending a long time in a Federal penitentiary. We can no longer let these criminals be charged with mere paperwork violations.

I welcome the nomination of Zachary Fardon as Chicago's new Federal prosecutor and urge him to prosecute more of these cases in Federal court. But to try more gun traffickers in Federal court, we need to give law enforcement the tools and funding they need to do so. That means finally passing a Federal law making gun trafficking illegal, with stiffer penalties for those who violate the law; that means increasing funding for Federal COPS grants to put more police on our streets instead of ignoring municipalities across the country that have been forced to cut their public safety budgets in these difficult economic times; and that means finally giving law enforcement the proper tools to go after corrupt gun dealers.

One percent of gun dealers are responsible for half the guns used in crimes in this country; yet current law foolishly limits things like inventory inspections. If law-abiding dealers reported inventories, the ATF would be much more effective in identifying lost and stolen weapons and combating corrupt gun dealers. That's why I introduced the TRACE Act this Congress, which would allow the ATF to require dealers to perform inventory checks and to report lost and stolen guns.

Mr. Speaker, people are being gunned down in my city every day. And while we continue to spend billions of dollars on nuclear weapons, tanks, and wars overseas, we're ignoring the gang war that is happening here at home. It's time for the Federal Government to step up to the challenge by stopping gun violence where it starts.

DOD CIVILIAN FURLOUGHS

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday over 14,000 civilian Department of Defense employees at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in my community were furloughed as a result of sequestration. For 11 days, over the next few months, these hardworking members of my community will see their pay cut by 20 percent.

I voted against this mess. I knew the effects of sequestration on our national security and our community and its citizens would be significant and for many devastating. These vital members of our national security structure have essentially been told they are expendable. Morale at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and DOD facilities around the United States is suffering because of this.

I've spoken to not just these civilian employees, but to car dealers, restaurant owners, small businesses, all of who feel the pain and frustration because of inaction here in Washington. It doesn't have to be this way. The House has passed an act to avert sequestration. The Senate has failed to pass a single bill to avert sequestration. The President, who promised the American people that this would not happen, has done nothing. Meanwhile, families and businesses, not only in Ohio but across the country, are suffering. It's time for the President to keep his promise that he made during his election campaign and to work to set aside sequestration.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against sequestration. The House has passed legislation to halt it, and it's time that the Senate and the President come to the table and work to find a way to avert these furloughs and their devastating impact on the lives and businesses of hardworking Americans and its impact upon our national security.

PERSONALIZE YOUR CARE ACT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues a very simple question: Can this Congress approve legislation that is supported by over 85 percent of the American public that is truly bipartisan legislation, with distinguished Republican cosponsors, and will not cost anything and, in fact, could even save billions of dollars? Can we give the American public something they not only want, but they need and to which they're entitled?

I would hope so. I would hope that Congress could act on the Personalize Your Care Act, H.R. 1173, which I've introduced along with Dr. ROE, Mr. REED, Mr. HANNA, Dr. MCDERMOTT, and Dr. BERA.

I would make part of the Record survey research by the Regence Foundation and the National Journal that shows overwhelming public support for this type of protection for families. Ninety-six percent of Americans surveyed said it was important that these health and end-of-life issues be a top priority for our health care system; 97 percent agree that it's important that patients and their families be educated about palliative care and end-of-life option treatments available, along with curative treatment; and 86 percent agree that these discussions about palliative care and end-of-life treatment should be fully covered by health insurance.

Americans agree that people need to know what faces them in difficult situations approaching end of life or when people are temporarily unable to make medical decisions for themselves. But Medicare, which will pay tens of thousands of dollars for a full hip replacement for a 93-year-old woman with terminal cancer, will not authorize a couple hundred dollars for her and her family to have medical consultation about her personal choices and circumstances for the future. Our legislation will change that.

There have been fascinating studies about how doctors die differently from the rest of us because they know what works and what doesn't. Doctors, it turns out, tend to consume health care much differently and often less in their final year of life. It's not that they don't understand. It's not that they don't have access to health care. They can afford it. They just know their situation better than the rest of us, they know what works, they know what they want, and usually that means comfort and quality of life and more control.

Our legislation will be a small, but important, step to make sure that every American is treated like a doctor in their last year of life: knowing their choices, knowing their prospects, being able to identify what they want, and make sure that their wishes are known and respected.

I don't think there are any of us on the floor of the House who has not felt some frustration. Can't we get something done? Here's an opportunity that doesn't depend upon what your view of ObamaCare is. Whether it's implemented, delayed, or repealed doesn't matter.

□ 1015

This is legislation that doesn't need to cost anything. It actually will end up saving money, but money is not the point.

Can we act together to do something for the public, show that we're not paralyzed, that we can work together, that

we can make progress in a difficult environment?

I would urge my colleagues to join the bipartisan and growing list of Members who have cosponsored the Personalize Your Care Act, H.R. 1173. Some day Congress is going to deal with the vast looming crisis we face. In the meantime, helping patients understand their choices and make their wishes known and respected is an important step to start.

SURVEY RESEARCH FROM THE REGENCE FOUNDATION AND THE NATIONAL JOURNAL

AMERICANS AGREE THAT DISCUSSIONS ABOUT PALLIATIVE CARE AND END-OF-LIFE CARE TREATMENT OPTIONS SHOULD BE FULLY COVERED

Now, please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding these health and life issues.

Discussions about palliative care and end-of-life care treatment options should be fully covered by health insurance: 86% agree.

Discussions about palliative care and end-of-life care treatment options should be fully covered by Medicare: 81% agree.

AMERICANS OF ALL STRIPES SAY IT'S IMPORTANT FOR THESE ISSUES TO BE A TOP PRIORITY FOR THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

Now that you've heard some more information, how important is it that these health and life issues be a top priority for the health care system in this country?

96%: important.

72%: 'very' important.

AMERICANS WIDELY AGREE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATING PATIENTS ABOUT THEIR OPTIONS AND THE VALUE OF A PUBLIC DEBATE

Now, please tell me whether you agree to disagree with the following statements regarding these health and life issues.

It is important that patients and their families be educated about palliative care and end-of-life care options available to them along with curative treatment: 97% agree.

A public dialogue and debate about these health and life issues will help patients and their families by providing them with more information about their treatment options: 86% agree.

IMMIGRATION BILLS

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

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the wake of the passage of the Senate amnesty bill to shed light on two important elements of illegal immigration that the Senate has grossly overlooked. As we know, the Senate bill pairs border security with amnesty. This makes no sense. You would never replace your carpet at home if you still had a hole in the roof.

I am hopeful that the House will put border security first, but I still have concerns. That's why today I'm introducing two pieces of legislation. One will address the problem of visa overstays, and the other will ask for a full accounting of what went wrong with the 1986 amnesty deal that led to our current illegal immigration problem.

The first bill, the Visa Overstay Enforcement Act of 2013, will, for the first time, make staying in the country after your visa has expired a felony criminal offense instead of just a civil offense. Upon a first offense, the visa overstay would bring a $10,000 fine and 1 year in jail. The illegal immigrant may not be legally admitted to the United States for 5 years from the date of conviction and may not apply for a visa for 10 years after the date of conviction. A second offense would be subject to a fine of $15,000 and up to 5 years in jail. The illegal immigrant would be banned from entering the United States for life.

Most of the talk about this issue has been focused on the southern border, but that won't solve our illegal immigration problem alone. If we fix our broken visa system, we can take care of nearly half of our illegal immigration concerns.

The second part of this bill requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a plan to Congress detailing a biometric exit program involving the taking of fingerprints of those leaving the country at all land, sea, and air ports.

As I have often said, since 40 percent of illegal immigrants here today are here on an expired visa, it is obvious that if your State is home to an international airport, then you effectively live in a border State.

And we should learn from history. In 1986, we were told that if we just granted amnesty to 1.5 million illegal immigrants, the problem would go away. That didn't happen. Instead, 3 million people came here to take advantage of amnesty. We need to know what effect the 1986 amnesty program had on the American worker and whether the effects still linger today. Were wages depressed? Were jobs taken away from legal workers because so many received amnesty? We should learn our lesson.

My second piece of legislation is the 1986 Amnesty Transparency Act. It requires a comprehensive report on the failures of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, which are many.

Speaking of 1986, let's remember in that year, one of the bombers in the 1993 World Trade Center attack was granted amnesty. He had originally arrived on an agricultural visa. He was really a taxi driver, and all he ever planted was a bomb.

The real losers in this debate are the legal immigrants who have followed the rules. Here is a clear example:

Under the ObamaCare employer mandate, any company with 50 or more employees must provide health insurance to their employees or pay a fine of $3,000 per employee, but illegal immigrants granted amnesty under the Senate bill are exempt from ObamaCare. So I ask you: What is the incentive to hire a legal American worker who would come with a health care price tag over an illegal worker who would not? None.

We have immigration laws for two reasons: to protect our national security and to protect American jobs. The Senate bill violates both of those principles. So tell me, why would we do this?

I ask the House to consider my commonsense bills and put border security first. Let's put the safety of the American citizens first.

FAILURES OF OBAMACARE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week while the American people were preparing to celebrate the 237th birthday of the Nation, the Obama administration announced, via a blog post, that it will provide an additional year before the employer reporting requirements and the employer shared responsibility requirements of ObamaCare take effect.

There are few issues as personal and significant in the lives of individuals and families as health and well-being, which is why the irony of reminding Americans that government now controls their health care during the week we celebrate our country's independence did not go unnoticed. Despite efforts to quietly buy time and obfuscate responsibility for this fatally designed health care law, most Americans rightfully view this delay as an admission of failure.

Mr. Speaker, the businesses that provide the jobs and the source of health care coverage for most Americans were not surprised by this announcement. Most are well aware that this law was thoughtlessly rammed through Congress in the middle of the night with a litany of technology flaws and other blatant failures.

Unfortunately, employers have been struggling with high health care costs since before the law passed. Given the combined pressure of new taxes and regulations, businesses are hurting exponentially worse now that the law's provisions have begun to take effect. These new government mandates incentivize businesses to reduce their workforce to under 50 full-time equivalency employees. To avoid financial penalties, the incentive under ObamaCare is to reduce individual hours to avoid these mandates. Employees now face the redefinition of ''full-time'' down to just 35 hours per week.

This law denies opportunities for growth that could and should be available and promoted. This is fundamentally counter to what a vibrant and robust American economy demands. Fewer jobs and reduced individual hours are not good for individuals, for families, for businesses, or for our economy. Nonetheless, employees and employers alike are experiencing the consequences of ''Obama-sizing'' both businesses and jobs.

By the time the law is fully implemented in 2023, the Congressional

Budget Office estimates that the President's health care law will still leave 30 million Americans uninsured. At the same time, the law is massively driving up the cost of care for both employers and employees. In fact, 17 of the Nation's largest insurance companies indicate that health insurance premiums will grow an average of 100 percent under this law.

The evidence is overwhelmingly conclusive, Mr. Speaker: ObamaCare is not only unaffordable, but it also fails to address access to care in any meaningful way. In the process, we're damaging everything that is good and effective about the current system. To boot, we're undermining growth and stalling our economic recovery. Effectively, we've thrown the baby out with the bathwater. The fact that the White House used a blog post to announce the employer mandate change reveals just how desperate the administration is to cover up the flaws of this fatally flawed bill. Unfortunately, this is not something the White House was willing to admit until after the midterm election.

CYRUS CYLINDER

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of a document of great significance, the Cyrus Cylinder, that will be touring the United States for the duration of this year and will be on display in museums across this country. On October 2, the Cyrus Cylinder will be displayed to the public at the Getty Museum in Malibu, California.

In what historians call the ''first bill of human rights,'' the Cyrus Cylinder, out of Persia, remains important, particularly as the Cylinder's inheritors, the people of Iran, continue to suffer under the repressive Islamic Republic in Iran.

Jews, Babylonians, and Greeks left laudatory accounts of Cyrus' actions. The Cyrus Cylinder is widely considered to be not only the first human rights document, but a document to protect other cultures. In the Torah, it is written:

> King Cyrus issued a decree concerning the house of God in Jerusalem, let the house be rebuilt. The cost will be paid from the cost of the King.

In what now can be considered a defining moment in history, Cyrus permitted the Jews to take their statues, their ceremonial vessels, and important cultural and religious objects back with them to Jerusalem and rebuild their temple.

Cyrus the Great holds a special position in the history of civilization. His humanitarian values of freedom for all people, respect for culture and religious diversity, and recognition of the fact that it is better to be loved than feared are remarkable attributes for any ruler.

But as Ali Razi, who left Iran in the wake of the Iranian Revolution, shares with us, for someone who lived 2,600 years ago, such beliefs are truly exceptional. Ali Razi makes a second point about the document's influence on Persian and Greek culture, and on the European Enlightenment. Cyrus' values and ideas for governance have long inspired political thinkers and leaders of men, including the Founding Fathers of this country, who wove these same ideals into the very Constitution of the United States. Thomas Jefferson owned two copies of ''Cyropedia,'' a book of histories by the Greek historian Xenophon that told the story of King Cyrus—Cyrus the Great, as the Persians call him. Such was Jefferson's admiration for this work that Jefferson wrote to his own grandson:

> I would advise you, go first through the Cyropedia, and then read Herodotus and Thucydides.

Unfortunately, contrary to the traditions of the Cyrus Cylinder, the Iranian Government continues to engage in widespread human rights abuses. While the Cyrus Cylinder highlighted peace and acceptance as its ideals, the current regime in Iran has steadily increased its discriminatory practices and repression of the country's ethnic and religious minority populations—from Azerbaijanis to Baluchis, to Kurds and Arabs, to the Baha'is and Christians and Zoroastrians. Iranian authorities routinely deny its citizens the most basic human rights through harassment, intimidation, detention, and violence.

And for those minorities who have served in the prison system in Iran, they can tell you the stories of how horrible that violence can be. Actions that often violate Iran's own international obligations routinely occur there in that country, and I hope that the tour of the Cyrus Cylinder across the United States brings attention to the oppressiveness of the Iranian regime and serves as a symbol, a symbol that promotes human rights around the world, a symbol to remind people of what that culture once stood for under Cyrus the Great.

So, in 2013, on the occasion of the first-ever visit of the Cyrus Cylinder from the British Museum to the United States, and to the Getty Museum in Malibu from October 2 to December 2, we call attention to this important historical document for the example it set over two millennia ago.

MOURNING LOSS OF LIFE ON ASIANA FLIGHT 214

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend as the Nation celebrated the Fourth of July, the birth of our country, tragedy struck. As all the world knows, a plane crash landed at the San Francisco airport, something very uncommon, but something that shared a common interest.

□ 1030

Our thoughts and prayers today rest with the passengers and the crew who were on board Asiana Airlines Flight 214, with the families of the victims of the horrific tragedy, the men and women recovering in hospitals across the Bay Area.

Our prayers are with the families of the two young girls, Ye Mengyuan and Wang Linjia, who lost their lives on Saturday. Indeed, we know that no words can console their loved ones today. All of San Francisco shares in their shock and grief. We will do everything we can do to care for those affected and their families.

The sudden crash shook the grounds of San Francisco International Airport, testing the training, strength and courage of those who would be the first on the scene.

As a Representative of San Francisco in the Congress, a privilege I share with Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER—the airport is actually in Congresswoman SPEIER's district—we will join together to observe and mourn the losses tomorrow when some more of our Members are here, back from the Arizona tragedy.

But for now, I wanted not another day to go by before commending the crew. They performed so heroically. The crew was so magnificent, and a reminder to us that the first responsibility of the crew is safety, that they are trained for it, and they performed magnificently. And the flight attendant, the lead flight attendant was the last person to leave the plane, not until everyone else was off.

First responders responded in characteristic fashion, with bravery, with valor, without regard for their own safety, with their sights set only on the safety of others. Their stories are so remarkable. Their stories are so remarkable about what they saw on the plane and how people responded.

And it was also the coolness and the cooperation, not only of the crew, but of many of the passengers, that enabled so many people to be saved. Seeing the sight of the plane and the crash, it was almost miraculous to think that so many people would survive the crash.

There was only minutes to react, and within minutes, the flight crew and the San Francisco and San Mateo police officers and fire departments were climbing up the rescue chutes, running through smoke-filled aisles and leading passengers out to safety.

Within minutes, Fire Rescue Captain Tony Molloy and his team had set up a triage-and-treatment area so they could immediately evacuate the most severely injured.

Within minutes, the air traffic controllers and airport staff were effectively diverting traffic and travelers to secure the area.

Within minutes, local hospital staff had prepared, made ready and visited to provide the injured with the necessary care and support.

As we speak, the injured are recovering at San Francisco General Hospital, the source of pride to us in San Francisco. It is a major trauma center. And if you have to go to a trauma center, San Francisco General is the gold standard.

UCSF Medical Center, Stanford Hospital and Clinics, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, St. Francis Memorial Hospital, St. Francis Medical Center, California Pacific Medical Center.

The swift and fearless response of each of the men and women who responded—each of these are heroes—saved the lives of many on the Asiana flight. Their actions are a hallmark of their professions and a testimony to the strength and selflessness that defines the San Francisco Bay Area.

The story of Asiana Flight 214 is not over. Long after the news of the tragedy fades from the front pages and nightly news reports, the National Transportation Safety Board will continue to investigate what happened, and we will all work to ensure that it never happens again.

I want to particularly commend the Board and Chairwoman Deborah Hersman for being on the scene immediately with an investigative team in the most professional, thorough manner.

We will continue to work with the Federal Aviation Administration and San Francisco International Airport to ensure that our planes are secure, our passengers are safe, our U.S. aviation remains the safest way to travel.

It's been decades since we had any incident at the San Francisco airport. I can't remember any.

We will honor the acts of the first responders, the flight crew, the flight crew, the flight crew—weren't they magnificent, weren't they all—the traffic controllers, the hospital staffs.

We will remember those lost in the tragedy and will do what we can to always ensure the safety and security of all travelers in America.

Again, our prayers are with those who suffered through that tragedy and the trauma that many experienced that is beyond physical but, hopefully, comforted by the prayers and interest of others.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Stir our spirits, O Lord, that we may praise You with full attention and be wholehearted in all the tasks You set before us this day.

We ask Your blessing upon our Muslim brothers and sisters as they begin observation of the holy month of Ramadan. May their dedication to You as You have revealed Yourself to them, and their commitment to grow in relationship to You, redound to the benefit of our Nation.

Bless the Members of this people's House with wisdom this day. As they continue the work of this assembly, guide them to grow in understanding in attaining solutions to our Nation's needs that are imbued with truth and justice.

May all that is done here this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GUTHRIE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration last week announced that it would delay until 2015 the employer health mandate, a crucial provision of its signature health care law. This is of questionable legality.

Days after that announced delay, the White House said that it would roll back requirements for new State online insurance marketplaces to verify the income and health coverage status of people who apply for subsidized coverage.

And this week it was reported that the Obama administration has quietly notified insurers that a computer system glitch will limit penalties that the law says companies may charge smokers.

These disclosures underscore the fact that ObamaCare is unaffordable, unworkable, and isn't what the American people were promised. It is time for President Obama to work with House Republicans to repeal the Affordable Care Act and replace it with effective, commonsense reforms that actually lower health care costs for working families and small businesses while protecting jobs and our economy.

STUDENT LOAN RATES

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because every American deserves access to an affordable education. Unfortunately, high costs keep too many students from realizing this dream. Last Monday, the interest rates on subsidized student loans doubled to 6.8 percent. We have the ability to fix this, and the time to act is now.

This week, the Senate will vote on a plan to lower interest rates to 3.4 percent for another year. Authored by my friend and colleague from Rhode Island, Senator JACK REED, this bill is a commonsense solution to another self-imposed crisis. I realize, as does my colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), that over 40,000 Rhode Island students receive subsidized Stafford loans and will soon be making financial decisions for the upcoming school year.

If education is truly the great equalizer, if it's the thing that's going to help our students achieve their own path to success and truly grow our economy, then how can we justify making it less accessible to the most economically disadvantaged?

Mr. Speaker, we must act today to help students access higher education. I urge the Senate to pass this bill and the House to take it up without delay.

IRS IS AN AGENCY OUT OF CONTROL

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, after spending the past week meeting constituents across my district, I come to

the floor to remind my colleagues that the American people are incensed over the unwarranted targeting and mistreatment by the IRS.

Without the administration's help, the House has done its due diligence to get to the bottom of this issue, but it seems as though a new scandal comes to light every day. Most recently, we learned about the purchase of wine, romance novels, and even illicit material on IRS credit cards. Add lavish conferences, improper contracting practices, singling out of adoptive families, and, of course, the systematic targeting of conservative and religious groups, it is apparent that the IRS is an agency out of control.

Mr. Speaker, the Fourth of July causes our entire Nation to pause and reflect on the vision of liberty our Founders valued when they declared our independence. Liberty is jeopardized when Federal agencies abuse the trust granted by the people. It must end, and the administration and the IRS must show Congress and the American people that it will never happen again.

REPLACE SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, Washington's failure to replace sequestration is imposing real penalties on families all across our country. This week, in my home State of Rhode Island, more than 3,000 civilian Department of Defense employees at the Naval Undersea Warfare Center and the U.S. Naval War College were furloughed, imposing the equivalent of a roughly 20 percent pay cut through the end of the fiscal year. And it doesn't stop there.

Sequestration is expected to cost the American economy 750,000 jobs this year alone, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Americans have had enough of dysfunction, gridlock, and political posturing between Republicans and Democrats in Washington. It's time for Congress to start getting things done for working families, and that's why I'm calling on the House Republican leadership to immediately bring H.R. 2060 to the House floor for an up-or-down vote so we can replace sequestration with smart, targeted spending cuts and new sources of revenue by eliminating subsidies for big oil companies and closing tax loopholes for corporations that ship American jobs overseas, commonsense solutions that all of us in this Chamber should agree on.

REPEAL AND REPLACE OBAMACARE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, according to a recent editorial in the Washington Times:

> The promise of ObamaCare was that it would make health insurance both universal and affordable.

It was obvious from the beginning that President Obama's scheme, a fantasy of politics and palaver, wouldn't work. The folly of the health care takeover becomes ever more clear with the appearance of the markers for implementation. Robust economic growth is crucial, and ObamaCare threatens to make a bad economy much worse. Congress must listen to the whistle of that speeding train bearing down on us and step on the brakes and avoid the wreck while there's still time to come.

The wheeling and dealing of the dishonest ObamaCare campaign has finally caught up with the President. Delaying the employer mandate while still requiring individuals to comply with the government health care takeover bill is wrong and will place a burden on American families. We must repeal ObamaCare in its entirety and replace it with a plan to preserve the doctor-patient relationship before this unworkable law destroys more jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

SECURITY AT OUR PORTS

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of our Nation's busiest port complex and the cofounder and cochair of the Ports Caucus, I understand the unique security challenges that ports pose to our economic and national security. Ports are a crucial piece of our economy, and a potential attack or disruption to trade operations could have a disastrous impact on the American economy.

Last week, the Brookings Institution released a study highlighting troubling cybersecurity weaknesses at our Nation's ports, an all too often overlooked area of infrastructure vulnerability.

We need to do better and finally take a comprehensive examination of the security of our Nation's ports facilities and develop a plan to address any gaps or vulnerabilities.

This is why I urge my colleagues to support the GAPS Act, my legislation that directs the Department of Homeland Security to conduct a comprehensive classified study of potential gaps in port security and prepare a plan to address them. After all, think tanks aren't the only ones looking for security weaknesses at our ports.

STOP OBAMACARE

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, just last week the administration chose to delay implementation of the employer mandate by 1 year. While this delay grants business owners more time to determine their options, it is not the repeal that we need.

The House majority leadership sent a letter to President Obama today asking him to explain what prompted a delay in the employer mandate. The American people—families like yours and mine—are left wondering what led to this decision and why the individual mandate, which will be just as costly, remains in place. I join my colleagues in requesting this vital information.

The requirements of the health care law have always left more questions than answers. I continue to hear from Kentuckians who wonder if they will lose their coverage, be forced to choose different providers, or be saddled with enormous new costs. ObamaCare continues to be the train wreck that will destroy jobs, and we have to stop it.

SCHOOL-BASED HEALTH CENTERS ACT

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to legislation I'm reintroducing, the School-Based Health Centers Act.

My bill is simple and straightforward. It reauthorizes the only source of Federal support dedicated to the operations of school-based health centers. These centers provide vital, preventive, and primary health services to over 2 million students nationwide. They are often the only source of health care for children and adolescents, and they are easily accessible, keeping students healthy, in school, and learning.

Yet, in the current economic climate, many of the nearly 2,000 centers are at risk of cutting services, jobs, or even closing. That's why I've reintroduced legislation to ensure that these important health centers not only remain open, but can expand to serve even more students.

Students deserve reliable access to quality comprehensive health care services, and at school-based health centers, they can find one of the best ways to do just that.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the School-Based Health Centers bill.

COLLECTION AND USE OF DATA

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing on the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's widespread collection and use of data.

At this time, Washington is flooded with scandals over mass surveillance and political targeting. Over the past

few months, Americans have seen and continue to see the potential for personal information to be misused and compromised by the government.

Now another government agency that has touted itself as being transparent is spending millions of dollars to collect and store information on potentially millions of U.S. citizens.

Even more troubling is that in today's hearing, the Acting Deputy Director of the CFPB couldn't even give a broad estimate of the number of Americans having their data monitored.

Americans have a right to know that their government has gone too far. It is time for the CFPB and the administration to answer questions from Congress, allow for greater transparency, and safeguard the privacy and constitutional rights of American citizens.

OUR NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, this month we celebrate one of America's best ideas, our national park system, and what it means for millions of our families each year to be able to enjoy the park system throughout our country. As we mark National Parks and Recreation Month, we remember that the parks in America belong to all of us.

We have some wonderful parks in California. Yosemite National Park is in my backyard, and it brings millions of Americans to California, who stand in awe of Half Done and Yosemite Falls, Toulumne Grove and the Mariposa redwoods.

I have introduced legislation before this House that would protect Yosemite's vulnerable western boundary by expanding the park to include 1,600 acres that was originally intended by John Muir. This would ensure that we continue to preserve the park for future generations of Americans as it was originally envisioned almost 150 years ago.

It has been said that nothing is more American than our national park system. My bill would guarantee that we're protecting one of the crown jewels of this truly American treasure.

□ 1215

OBAMACARE DELAYS EMPLOYER MANDATE

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Three and a half years and hundreds of millions in taxpayer dollars later, this administration still hasn't figured out how to implement their healthcare law. What more proof do they need?

More now than ever, it's clear that this law is too complicated, too expensive, and worst, failing American families.

Last week, the Obama administration announced they would no longer require businesses to offer health insurance to workers next year, nor require States to verify residents' income before signing them up for insurance.

While these actions provide much-needed relief to our job creators, who have been forced to shrink paychecks and freeze hiring, it still requires individuals and families to obtain insurance. It also opens the door to more waste, fraud, and abuse of precious taxpayer dollars.

American families want, need, and deserve patient-centered care, not the government-knows-best healthcare system.

It's time to repeal and shred this broken law into ribbons. Let's start over with real, commonsense reform before it's too late.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF KAITLYN KIRCHNER

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kaitlyn Kirchner, a constituent of mine from Madelia, Minnesota. She created the winning recipe in the White House's second annual Healthy Lunchtime Challenge and won an invitation to today's Kids' State Dinner hosted by the First Lady.

Yesterday, I had the honor of meeting Kaitlyn and her family, and what an impressive young woman. At age 9, she created not only a healthy recipe that would make any chef proud, she did it making it healthy with 100 calories or less in the dish.

Since she's been 3 years old, Kaitlyn has been helping her mother handpick vegetables and cook seasonal dishes.

Her recipe for the competition was a garden stir fry featuring Minnesota homegrown carrots, broccoli, yellow summer squash, sugar snap peas, red bell peppers, and onions.

There's no doubt that Kaitlyn has a bright future ahead of her in whatever she decides to do. It's an honor for me to meet Kaitlyn and her family and congratulate her on this high honor and her contribution to making America a healthier Nation.

OUR MANTRA SHOULD BE: JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's now been 919 days since I arrived in Congress—919 days—and the Republican leadership has still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis.

After learning of Friday's lackluster job numbers, many pundits and politicians actually cheered. It could have been worse, they said. They also said things are returning to normal.

Try telling that to any of the 11.8 million Americans who are still out of work, or to the millions more who are underemployed or have given up looking for work.

According to Friday's job numbers, the average length of unemployment is now at 35 weeks. Before the Great Recession, the average was just 16 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, it's no wonder people are losing hope. It's our obligation to restore that hope.

As we begin this July session, let's commit to passing a comprehensive bill to restore unemployment for young people, recent grads, and the long-unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, our mantra should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

THE NEXT CHAPTER IN THE WAR ON WOMEN

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

Ms. TITUS. When the majority leader announced a list of bills that the House may consider over the next few weeks, I was disappointed to hear that, in July, instead of focusing on significant challenges that face our Nation, House Republicans will begin the next chapter in their war on women.

We may consider, we heard, appropriations bills and another farm bill that would have drastic cuts to vital programs like SNAP and WIC that disproportionately devastate low-income women and families.

We may, yet again, vote on legislation to repeal or gut the Affordable Care Act, which has provided millions of women with access to preventive care and ensured, finally, that being a woman is not a preexisting condition.

What's equally troubling is what we didn't hear, what's missing from the list. Where is a budget to replace the sequester, which is prohibiting access to lifesaving programs for victims of domestic violence?

Where is legislation to create jobs, put Americans back to work, and strengthen economic opportunities for the middle class?

And where is the Paycheck Fairness Act to finally ensure that women get equal pay for equal work?

I say we need another list.

CONDOLENCES TO THOSE AFFECTED BY THE CRASH OF ASIANA AIRLINES FLIGHT 214

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Leader PELOSI in expressing my condolences to all those affected by the crash of Asiana Airlines Flight 214 on Saturday morning at San Francisco International Airport in my district.

My thoughts and prayers are with the families of the two victims of the crash on their way to a summer camp

in southern California. My thoughts and prayers are with all those who were seriously injured and face months or years of recovery.

The miracle of Flight 214 is that 305 passengers and crew survived this horrific tragedy. That is due, in no small part, to the many heroes of that day: crew, fellow passengers, valiant first responders, SFO staff, everyone who evacuated the plane, even when fire was burning in the fuselage; the crewmember who carried a young passenger off the plane on her back because he was too frightened to escape; the firefighters and San Francisco Police Officer Jim Cunningham, who was wearing no protective gear, who entered the plane and helped four passengers escape, including one who was trapped. It was nothing short of heroic and remarkable.

Plane travel is safer than it ever has been, but this crash is a reminder that we need never stop the focus on safety. Thankfully, the National Transportation Safety Board, under the leadership of Chairman Deborah Hersman, is there to fully investigate and determine exactly what happened.

Mr. Speaker, this was a horrible tragedy, but we have much to be thankful for.

THE NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon this body to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Moments ago, I was at a mock graduation of hundreds of Dreamers. These are young, de facto Americans, Americans who are as American as you or I, grew up, played on the sports team, were cheerleaders, in some cases valedictorians in their high schools, and yet they lack the paperwork to prove that they are Americans.

They are as American in their hearts as any of us and have so much to give to the great country in which they grew up. And yet they are prevented from doing so by the failure of this body to act.

I applaud President Obama's deferred action program, at least a temporary solution to allow these young de facto Americans to have the paperwork they need to get a job or get a driver's license. But there's no certainty there.

What becomes of them in 2 years, in 4 years?

How do they know that the time that they spend investing and earning a college degree will be able to pay off with a good job down the road?

It's time for this body to take up action on the Senate bill or pass a comprehensive House bill. We have a unique window of opportunity to do something very important for our economy, creating jobs for Americans, important for our national security, and important for the future of our country.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 9, 2013 at 10:50 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 793.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2609, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 288 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 288

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. House Resolution 288 provides for an open rule for consideration of H.R. 2609, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for fiscal year 2014.

This rule contains the tradition reinstated by the Republican majority in the last Congress that appropriations bills should come to the floor in a manner that allows every Member of the House, both Republican and Democrat, to amend those bills and to have their voices heard.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill, making appropriations for the Department of Energy and the United States Corps of Engineers. The bill provides for $30.4 billion for these agencies, which is $2.9 billion below fiscal year '13 enacted and $4.1 billion below the President's request, at a time of fiscal constraint, when government, like our constituents, must make tough choices on where to smartly spend the money the American taxpayers have trusted it to oversee.

The bill provides critical funding for our energy needs, making $450 million available for advanced coal, natural gas, oil and fossil fuel technologies. Moreover, the bill provides $5.5 billion for environmental cleanup activities, funds to safely clean sites contaminated by nuclear weapons production.

The underlying bill before us has been carefully crafted by the Appropriations Committee under the leadership of Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, Subcommittee Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and Subcommittee Ranking Member KAPTUR.

Funding for energy programs is cut by $1.4 billion, while simultaneously prioritizing funds to advance our goal of an all-of-the-above solution to energy independence.

Further, the House continues its commitment to achieve a long-term storage facility for nuclear waste, providing support activities in support of the opening of Yucca Mountain, a solution long overdue.

The House energy and water bill furthers this majority's commitment to spending taxpayer money wisely, cutting waste and inefficiencies wherever they may be.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the underlying bill, H.R. 2609, the fiscal year 2014 Energy and Water Appropriations Act.

Having this bill on the floor this week is another example of how we, as a body, our Congress, has its priorities wrong. It's why Congress has an approval rating of 12 percent.

Rather than fixing our broken immigration system and replacing it with one that works for our country, rather than doing something about the fact that student loan rates just doubled for students that are incurring new loans, here we are sacrificing our renewable energy future while simultaneously increasing spending for new and unneeded nuclear weapons far above even the sequestration level of funding.

□ 1230

It's no wonder this institution has the disapproval rating that it does.

This legislation is fundamentally flawed. It underfunds programs that not only grow our Nation's clean energy sources but also create jobs, promote emerging technologies, and maintain critical infrastructure. Yet, while making these cuts, it increases weapons activities by $97.7 million above the 2013 enacted levels. Here we have a bill that prioritizes unnecessary weapons and defense programs at the expense of our Nation's innovation and international competitiveness.

The underlying bill slashes program funding for a valuable program called the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, or ARPA–E. Yesterday, in our Rules Committee, both the ranking member and the subcommittee chair agreed that they were fans of this critical program; yet it cuts funding by $215 million below last year's funding level. ARPA–E was modeled after DARPA, the Department of Defense's Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, which has led to so many great, innovative technologies that improve our security as a country. In its few short years of existence, ARPA–E has funded 285 projects in 33 States that promise to transform the energy future for our country.

ARPA–E's rigorous program design and competitive project selection process show that our taxpayer dollars are being used wisely, and the program has paid off. Since 2009, at least 17 ARPA–E programs have leveraged the government's small initial investment of approximately $70 million into what is typically $500,000, $1 million, or up to $2 million in private sector capital.

I was a founder of several startup companies before I came to Congress, and I understand the value of risk-taking and the role the government has in promoting innovation in basic technology. I represent a district with two major research universities that receive a combined Federal research investment of about $700 million. Many of these basic technologies which we as a country invest in lead to the jobs and the companies and the consumer technologies of the future. And what could be more critical than putting our Nation on a path to sustainable energy development?

Just this last February, I met with an ARPA–E project team from my district. Within the first year of receiving ARPA–E funding, this University of Colorado project team has demonstrated important energy yield improvements and cost-reducing potential in solar photovoltaic power systems. That's an example of an ARPA–E project that will help boost our economic well-being as a country and lead to our energy independence and national security far more than a few more unneeded nuclear missiles.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that this program is essential to protecting our energy future; and that's why this program, ARPA–E, has been lauded by Democrats and Republicans alike, as it was in our Rules Committee yesterday evening.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also disproportionately cuts from science and clean energy programs while bolstering wasteful spending for fossil fuel subsidies, continuing to have our country subsidize oil and gas, to subsidizing nuclear weapons, while making cuts in our energy future. By maintaining these fossil fuel subsidies while cutting clean energy research, we're prioritizing fossil fuels over innovative technologies that actually hold the key to our clean, sustainable energy independence.

While I appreciate that this bill has some decreases to the amount of Federal subsidies going to the fossil fuel accounts compared to last year—and I think it's high time that we end these subsidies to one of America's most profitable industries—the report language from the committee seems to be searching for a reason to spend our precious taxpayer dollars at a time of sequestration and at a time of deficits. How can we spend more on fossil fuels when we should be spending less?

In addition, this bill needlessly increases the funding for weapons activities and defense programs at a time when we're winding down our involvement in two wars that have been very costly in lives and dollars in this last decade. That's why I'm offering an amendment with Representative QUIGLEY that would reduce the B61 Life Extension Program back to the agency's request level, which would save $23.7 million in taxpayer dollars and reduce the deficit. This bill actually increases funding by over $20 million for these ongoing missile programs in an era where Americans should expect our government to be more transparent about how this money is invested.

While some of these missiles represent a strategic commitment we have to our NATO allies, there have been growing concerns raised by the Air Force's own Blue Ribbon Review Panel about the effectiveness and security vulnerabilities of the B61. That's why the price for this program has continued to rise dramatically and confidence in the missile program has dropped. In fact, some of our NATO allies, like Germany, have actually called for the B61s to be removed from their borders.

Again, given our fiscal constraints, it's a time of choices. It's not to have it all, but I think we need to ensure that taxpayer money is not wasted on programs that fail to sufficiently protect our national security and that in fact some of our allies don't even support.

Another unneeded increase in this funding bill, throwing more government money after more government money, is for the W76 Life Extension Program. The current bill requests $248 million—$13 million more than the administration requested—because of a fear of a lack of nuclear deterrence capability if we reduce our stockpile below the levels required in the New START Treaty. To put that in perspective, the START Treaty requires us to have no more than 1,550 nuclear weapons. Isn't that enough, Mr. Speaker? How many times can we completely obliterate not only our enemies but the entire world with 1,500 weapons?

Even this lower stockpile of nuclear weapons is, frankly, a relic of our foreign policy during the Cold War and can be drastically reduced. Unfortunately, this bill increased it. In fact, the Arms Control Association identified over $39 billion in savings to the taxpayer if it reduced our nuclear weapons stockpile to 1,000 nuclear weapons—more than enough to deter any threat to the United States, more than enough to obliterate humanity from the planet. We can save $39 billion by going down to 1,000 nuclear weapons.

These are some of the many reasons why I oppose the underlying bill. I'm very supportive of this rule coming forward from our committee that will allow for a full and open debate. I hope that many of these ideas that I have presented, as well as other ideas from Members on both sides of the aisle, will prevail so the end work product of this House is something that Democrats and Republicans can join together in supporting—something that no longer sacrifices our renewable energy future for yet more and more nuclear weapons today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I do feel obligated to point out that the object under discussion currently is the rule that will allow us to debate the energy and water appropriations bill. The rule is an open rule. If the gentleman has disagreements with the language in the underlying bill, it's an open rule. He's free to bring those amendments to the floor, have a full and fair debate, both sides, one opposed, one in support; and the will of

the House will prevail. That is the way it should be under an open rule.

Let me just state that I have, for the record, amendments that I will be placing before the House. I hope they're accepted, but I will accept the underlying bill even in the absence of those amendments. And I hope the gentleman from Colorado will approach it in a similar spirit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I was going to comment to the gentleman that the committee work product, the bill before us, is a highly flawed bill. I certainly hope that the open process and the will of the House will significantly alter and improve upon this bill. We will find that out in the days ahead.

It is my honor, Mr. Speaker, to yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California, a former colleague on the Rules Committee (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my district of Sacramento is one of the leading clean energy economies in the country. The sharp cuts to clean energy initiatives in this bill are deeply troubling. It will no doubt hurt American innovation and American jobs, particularly as other nations continue to invest in clean energy technologies. It is also not reflective of an all-of-the-above energy strategy that our Nation desperately needs.

At the same time, this bill addresses some of the important flood protection priorities for my district. Sacramento is the most at-risk metropolitan area for major flooding, as it lies at the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers. We have a great deal at risk. As the home of the State capital and half a million people, a major flood event in Sacramento would have economic damages of up to $40 billion.

I am pleased that this bill includes nearly $70 million in funding for Sacramento's flood protection priorities, including more than $66 million to continue construction on the Folsom Dam Joint Federal Project. In addition, this bill includes report language, which I requested, expressing concern with the Corps' current levee vegetation policy. Sacramento is ground zero for the impact of the Corps' vegetation policy. Instead of a one-size-fits-all solution, the Corps should consider regional variances and local input, as called for under bipartisan legislation I introduce in H.R. 399, the Levee Vegetation Review Act.

The bill also includes report language that I also requested expressing concern with the Corps' decision to end its section 104 crediting policy, which has halted flood protection projects from moving forward, particularly one in west Sacramento.

Mr. Speaker, moving forward, we must also be cognizant that there are other much-needed public safety projects that remain unfunded and unbuilt due to a lack of a WRDA bill. We urgently need to improve America's crumbling levee infrastructure. In Sacramento, my constituents have taxed themselves twice and $350 million of construction work is well under way for the Natomas Levee Improvement Project, all while awaiting congressional authorization for over 2 years after receiving a chief's report from the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, on May 15 the Senate passed a robust WRDA bill with clear bipartisan support of 83–14. It is my sincere hope that the House will soon follow suit. We cannot wait until the next disaster takes lives and wrecks our economy. This is a bipartisan issue that must be addressed immediately in Congress.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to respond to something that was said in the initial opening by the minority. The student loan bill passed this House over a month ago. It has been sitting in the Senate for the entire month of June. The problem with student loans could have been addressed by the other body. It could have been addressed prior to the July 1 deadline, which was a deadline, after all, that the Democrats had set when they were in the majority.

So to say that the House has not done its work is in fact not correct. The House has done its work. We await the other body to act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To further address the student loan issue, this body did pass a bill to prevent the increase in the student loan rates that just occurred. However, that bill—a very similar bill—failed in the Senate. So the Kline bill failed in the Senate. So, too, a Democratic bill to provide a 2-year extension of the student loan rates also failed in the Senate.

So at this point, the victims of all this are students in our country who are going back to school and will be forced to borrow at twice the rate—6.8 percent—if Congress can't get its act together. And that's why if we defeat the previous question, I'll offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 2574, the Keeping Student Loans Affordable Act, sponsored by Representative GEORGE MILLER, Representative RUBÉN HINOJOSA, myself, and several others, which would undue the recent doubling of student loan interest rates.

It's that simple. While we work towards a market-oriented solution along the parameters President Obama has spelled out, making sure we have the protections in place like caps for students everywhere, we need to at least make sure that students returning to school this fall are not borrowing at a rate twice the rate of last year.

To discuss this bill, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), my colleague on the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2574, entitled Keeping Student Loans Affordable Act of 2013, legislation that would extend and fully pay for an additional year of the 3.4 percent interest rate on subsidized Federal direct Stafford loans.

Given that millions of students and families are struggling to afford the skyrocketing cost of a college education, it's shocking to me that this Congress allowed interest rates to double on July 1. I'm afraid that this Republican-majority Congress is making college more expensive for millions of students. With student debt surpassing $3 trillion, another increase of $1,000 of debt would be damaging to millions of student already struggling to afford basic expenses like rent and food.

□ 1245

The student loan debt crisis is crushing the dreams and aspirations of students and college graduates. High levels of debt are creating obstacles for young people who hope to start a family, purchase a home, and save for retirement. At this rate, they cannot accomplish those standard goals that every American should be able to achieve.

In my view, student loan debt sets our country backward, not forward. Without Congress' swift action, more than 7 million low- and moderate-income students working towards a college degree will have to pay an additional $1,000 for each loan that they borrow.

The Keep Student Loans Affordable Act of 2013 will secure low interest rates for an additional year as Congress works on a long-term and sustainable approach for the Federal student loan program that works for both students and taxpayers.

Importantly, this bill will help ensure that college remains within reach for students who rely on Federal loans to pay for their education. In stark contrast, the GOP student loan plan is irresponsible and puts students in a yearly-adjustable student loan, which will result in great unpredictability and skyrocketing costs. What's more, the GOP bills add more debt onto students, even more than the doubling of the interest rates.

In a globally competitive economy, an education is clearly a necessity. This Congress should be helping students afford a college education, not saddling them with student loan debt.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what is right and pass H.R. 2574 to reverse the student loan rate increase.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

Again, if I recall correctly, the bill that the gentleman from Texas just referenced has only Democratic sponsors. It is not a bipartisan bill.

The other body, completely controlled by Democrats in the majority, has within its power to pass a bill, conference with the Republican-passed bill

here in the House, and work out the problem. They have failed to do so.

The House has done its work. The House-passed bill was received in the Senate on the 3rd of June. It has been there for over a month. The other body certainly has within its power to act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Again, to respond to that, the bill that the House passed failed in the United States Senate. So, too, did a 2-year delay in keeping the student loan rates low; that has failed in the Senate. So we can simply say, oh, we're just not going to do anything and let student loan rates double, or we can take it upon ourselves in this body to try to find a new way. That's what the Democrats and Ranking Member MILLER have put forward, a way to say, look, we couldn't agree on 2 years, we couldn't agree on a long-term solution. Let's give us a 1-year window where the kids coming back to school in a month aren't going to be borrowing at twice the rate that they were last year.

We have the chief sponsor of the bill here to speak about it. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we debate this rule, it has now been a little over a week since interest rates on loans for millions of the neediest college students doubled thanks to Republican obstructionism. With that doubling, those who can afford it least will continue to be burdened under a mountain of debt with no end in sight. Because Congress has not acted in a responsible way, this rate increase will cost borrowers an additional $1,000 per student per loan.

The doubling of interest rates did not have to happen. Rather than making it more affordable for students and families to pay for college, House Republicans decided to pass a bill that would make college more expensive.

The bill was dead on arrival in the Senate. It was dead on arrival in the Senate because it was worse for students than the doubling of the interest rates, and it left the students without an option other than the doubling of the interest rates. That's why we must act today. We must defeat the previous question so that we can deliberate this and get a solution until we can work on a long-term, bipartisan agreement on this one.

The Republican plan that passed the House was totally irresponsible. It was simply not a smart solution. It has been advertised by my friends on the other side as a long-term fix, but we all know the truth. The Republican bill adds more debt onto the students, even more than doubling the interest rates.

The Republican bill also puts students in a yearly-adjustable student loan, which will result in great unpredictability and soaring loan costs to the students and to their families. And the insistence from the GOP that the students pay down the national debt is outrageous and offensive.

The student loan program is a program that the Federal Government makes $50 billion off the back of the students, and the Republicans' response is that the students should pay higher interest rates so they can pay down the national deficit. The student loan program itself is paying down the national deficit because of the profit the Federal Government makes. It's time to stop that and make student loans affordable for students and for their families.

This Congress simply has not done right by students. They are forcing these students to continue to graduate with an increasing mountain of debt while, at the same time, they lament that students are graduating with increased debt.

That's what the Republicans offered. That's why, as my colleague from Colorado said, it was dead on arrival when it went to the Senate. It was dead on a bipartisan basis when it went to the Senate.

The time has come now to defeat the previous question so that we can bring the 1-year fix to make sure that students are protected from the doubling of the interest rate that is now occurring because of the inaction by the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, again, just a bit of a history lesson.

In 2007, Democratically-controlled House, Democratically-controlled Senate passed the student loan rates. They built into the law an expiration date of last July. Last July, a 1-year extension was passed. This year, the Republican House passed a responsible extension. The Senate, the other body, needs to do its work. When they do, we're here to talk.

I now wish to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the energy and water appropriation bill.

This, historically, has been one of the first appropriation bills brought to the floor. I'd like to inform the Members that, as is the practice of the Republicans in the majority, it's an open rule, and there are a number of amendments that will be made. It's my understanding that any individual who wishes to offer an amendment can come to the floor and do so.

The bill is coming in at $30.4 billion, which is $2.9 billion below fiscal 2013 enacted and $4 billion below the President's request, so the Appropriations Committee is operating in compliance with the House budget that we passed several months ago.

This is a good rule. It's a good bill. I would hope that we can support the rule and obviously support the bill.

I would like to also add an editorial comment on the student loan rate issue.

Obviously, we want those interest rates to be as low as possible. But I would point out to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the House passed a bill; it's waiting to be brought up in the other body. They can bring it up tomorrow and vote it, send it to the President for his signature.

Apparently, the great sin in the House-passed bill appears to be that it moves towards an adjustable rate interest rate as opposed to a fixed rate that is below market rates. We would all like to have zero percent interest, obviously.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I'm told you have all kinds of time, so I will not yield, but I appreciate you wanting to ask me to.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I thank the gentleman. I just know that there have been less speakers on the other side, and I was hoping that we might be able to use some of the ''all kinds of time'' in a bipartisan way.

The gentleman from Texas was not accurate in saying that the House bill awaits action in the Senate. It had a vote in the Senate; it did not pass. So, too, a 2-year extension did not reach the cloture vote.

So, again, here we are. We can either start blaming each other—the folks on the other side of the building—or we can actually do something and get to work to keep student loan rates low for America's college students.

And of course Democrats are open to tying something into market-based rates; President Obama even proposed such. So, if that's what the gentleman wants to do, let's engage in a discussion about that. In the meantime, let's pass a 1-year extension so the rates don't double—which they already did 2 weeks ago—when the kids come back to school in the fall.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a leader on this issue and a colleague of mine on the Education and the Workforce Committee.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for the time.

A lot of American families are getting their financial aid notices for the new academic year. Much to their chagrin, they're opening these envelopes and finding out that the student loan that cost them 3.4 percent last year is going to cost them 6.8 percent starting this year. This is a huge problem for the millions of American families who borrow money to educate their children or themselves.

Now, what Congress has produced on this thus far is blame and finger-pointing. So here's what happened:

The Republican majority passed a bill on this floor that actually made the problem worse, that actually would cost more than just going up to the 6.8

percent by about $4,000 per student over a 5-year period. They actually poured kerosine on the fire. They sent that bill over to the Senate. The Senate rejected the bill and didn't pass anything else.

Now, I regret all of that, but, ladies and gentlemen, we have two choices in front of us today. We can quit on the issue and quit on America's students, or we can try to do something about it. I think we should try to do something about it. Here's the something:

Mr. MILLER has a proposal that would keep the rates at 3.4 percent for 1 more year. It would pay for this and not add a dime to the deficit by closing a tax loophole that exists for fairly wealthy people. Our proposal is we should put that bill on the floor and take a vote on it. I hope that a majority of Members would vote ''yes'' to help American students in this way, but we're not even requiring that. We're simply saying that what we should do this afternoon on this floor is put that proposal up for a vote.

In a couple of minutes, we're going to take a vote on whether to take a vote on that question. Now, as is often the case around here, the rules are a little backward. Those who vote ''no'' on the next vote are voting in favor of bringing this up so that Congress can work its will. Those who vote ''yes'' are saying we should not do that.

The choice is clear: we either take a vote and try to fix this problem, or we quit on America's students and America's families. Let's do our job and take a vote on this bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from the other side as to whether or not they have additional speakers?

Mr. POLIS. We're not aware of any at this time. There might be one more coming, but if they're not here, I'm prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, we wonder why this body has an approval rating of 12 percent. Instead of tackling issues that Americans want us to tackle—like finally fixing our broken immigration system, which, by the way, a bill received more than two-thirds support in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans. It's hard to get two-thirds of anybody to agree on anything, and yet 70 percent of Americans support comprehensive immigration reform, two-thirds of the United States Senate. Let's bring that bill up and pass it.

Student loans? Sure, we can cast blame on the Senate. We can cast blame on whomever we feel like. But the fact is American families are borrowing at 6.8 percent instead of 3.4 percent—now, this fall, student loans. So we can either just say, okay, it's not our fault, we passed something, let's go home, or we can actually try to reach a solution.

If we can defeat the previous question today, we can bring Representative MILLER's bill right to the floor to allow a 1-year window for Congress to work this out and keep the student loan rate at 3.4 percent and prevent our next generation of college kids from having their backs broken under the weight of high-interest student loans.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to this bill—again, not the bill that America wants us to be discussing; instead, a bill that cuts our renewable energy future, puts even more money into nuclear weapons—I can't support this committee report on the energy and water spending bill. I hope that through this process the will of the House changes this bill dramatically. If not, then we're simply making the wrong decisions for our energy future.

The bill slashes critical funding that would create jobs, grow our economy, lead to energy security, and increase our competitiveness. At the same time, the bill adds spending to increase our nuclear weapons stockpiles.

□ 1300

How can we expect to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists if we cut the nuclear nonproliferation activities by $600 million under this bill?

While the bill increases funding for our weapons programs and continues funding for fossil fuel subsidies, it guts many of our renewable energy programs, like ARPA-E, the Department of Energy's Office of Science, and investing in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

This bill threatens to increase our reliance on foreign oil, reduce job growth, increase pollution, and damage the health of American families. If we don't act to reverse this legislation's deep cuts to science programs and energy research, the United States will have many, many missiles armed with nuclear warheads, but we will fall behind our global competitors who are investing heavily in renewable and next-generation energy technologies.

I strongly urge that we defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I cannot recall a place in the Constitution where it says the House passes a bill, the Senate can't pass it, so the House comes back and tries to find a better bill that maybe the Senate will now take up. Boy, I wish that had happened on that health care stuff back in 2009 and 2010. We would have a lot better world today.

But the fact of the matter is, the House has passed the student loan bill and the Senate has the obligation to act. The deadline of July 1 was, in fact, provided to us by a funding cliff that the Democrats enacted back in 2007 when they started this process.

The deadline was self-imposed by a Democratic majority in the House of Representatives and a Democratic majority in the Senate. Democrats in the other body are fully aware of that deadline, we are fully aware of that deadline, and they were the ones that let it lapse. The House had done its work. They were fully capable of passing something and sending it back to us so that it could either be passed or adjusted prior to the July 4 recess.

In regards to the legislation we are currently considering, we do continue the Republican commitment to maintaining an open and transparent nature to the appropriations process. This rule balances our commitment to energy independence and national security with good stewardship of taxpayer money.

I want to, again, commend Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and Ranking Member KAPTUR for working together to craft a bill that balances our spending priorities with our concerns over the deficit and our climbing national debt.

At this point, I ask for an ''aye'' on the previous question and an ''aye'' on the underlying resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 288 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2574) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2574.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to

offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

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

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 288, if ordered, and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 182, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

YEAS—220

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

NAYS—182

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

NOT VOTING—32

Barber
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Campbell
Davis, Danny
Franks (AZ)
Gosar
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Hurt
Johnson, E. B.
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Meadows
Meeks
Moore
Moran
Negrete McLeod
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Posey
Rangel
Rogers (KY)
Salmon
Schweikert
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Young (FL)

□ 1331

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting in my office and didn't make it to the floor before the gavel came down for the first vote (rollcall Vote 308) in this series. I did vote for the subsequent rollcall votes in this series. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Stated against:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 308, I was at the White House for a discussion on U.S. economy. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 178, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—226

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

NAYS—178

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

NOT VOTING—30

Barber
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Gosar
Hastings (WA)
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Hurt
Johnson, E. B.
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Meadows
Moore
Negrete McLeod
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Rangel
Rogers (KY)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Yoho
Young (FL)

□ 1340

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for the following vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "yes" on adoption of the rule for Energy and Water Appropriations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote 308: on ordering the previous question to H. Res. 288—I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote 309: on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 288—I would have voted "aye."

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding my absence from the House for votes on the afternoon of July 9, 2013. I was unfortunately absent due to a medical appointment. I would like to submit how I would have voted had I been in attendance for the following votes:

Rollcall No. 308, on the motion on ordering the previous question on the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2609, I would have voted "no."

Rollcall No. 309, on agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 288), I would have voted "no."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 262, nays 138, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—262

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clay
Coble
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Takano
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)

NAYS—138

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
Dingell
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Israel
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lowenthal
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Nugent
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—33

Barber
Boustany
Buchanan
Butterfield
Campbell
Diaz-Balart
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gohmert
Gosar
Grijalva
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Hurt
Johnson, E. B.
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Moore
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Rangel
Rogers (KY)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Terry
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1348

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 308 on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 288, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 309 on H. Res. 288, providing for consideration of the bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 310 on approval of the journal. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY HONORING NELSON MANDELA

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 43, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 43

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY HONORING NELSON MANDELA.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on July 18, 2013, for a ceremony honoring the life and legacy of Nelson Mandela on the occasion of the 95th anniversary of his birth. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1352

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is my honor to bring the fiscal year 2014 Energy and Water Development bill before the membership of the House.

However, before I go through its highlights, I would like to thank my ranking member, Ms. KAPTUR, for her partnership on this bill and hard work and friendship. It's been a real honor to work with you, and I look forward to working with you to get through the entire process. I would also like to thank all the members of our committee on both sides of the aisle for putting this bill so quickly together and so responsibly.

I would also like to recognize the hard work of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY to bring this bill, and several others before it, to the floor under an open rule.

The bill for fiscal year 2014 totals $30.4 billion, $2.9 billion below last year's levels and more than $4 billion below the President's request.

The budget allocation we received this year made for some very difficult decisions, but in our bipartisan tradition, we worked hard to incorporate priorities and perspectives from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, we placed the greatest priority on national defense, our nuclear deterrent, also the critical work of the Army Corps of Engineers and other activities on which the Federal Government must take the lead. The reductions we had to make to the applied energy research and development programs will shift more of their work to the private sector.

The bill provides $7.6 billion, an increase of $98 million above the fiscal year 2013 amount, to modernize the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile and its supporting infrastructure, excluding rescissions.

I would also like to note that the recommendation contains no funding to

implement the President's recently announced plans in Berlin to reduce the nuclear stockpile. No funding for such purposes will be available until Congress has judged that these plans will fully support our national defense.

The recommendations increase the Corps of Engineers by $50 million above the President's request and redirects funds to ensure our waterways and harbors keep America open for business and economically competitive. These waterways and harbors handled foreign commerce valued at more than $1.7 trillion last year alone. As in previous fiscal years, the bill maintains the constitutional role of Congress in the appropriations process by ensuring that all worthy Corps of Engineers projects have a chance to compete for funding.

Basic science programs total $4.7 billion, just above last year's post-sequestration levels.

Environmental cleanup programs to address the legacy of the Manhattan Project and other contaminated sites are funded at $5.5 billion, approximately $185 million above the post-sequester levels for fiscal year 2013.

In order to find room for the bill's core priorities, applied energy research and development had to be cut. The recommendation prioritizes funding in this area for programs which truly support American manufacturing jobs, stable energy prices, and diversity of energy supplies.

Our bill includes $450 million for fossil energy technologies and $650 million for nuclear energy activities. Both of these programs are cut below the fiscal year 2013 post-sequester level.

The bill combines the electricity delivery program and the energy efficiency and renewable energy program, and provides $983 million for these activities, excluding rescissions. The recommendation orients these programs to focus on electricity infrastructure resilience—to include cybersecurity—and gasoline prices.

Finally, on Yucca Mountain, our recommendation includes $25 million to sustain the program, along with similar language as last year's prohibiting activities which keep that facility from being usable in the future. It also includes support for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to get that Yucca license application finally finished. No funding is included for requested activities to move past the Yucca Mountain repository program. If and when Congress authorizes changes to the program of record, the committee will consider funding for alternatives.

Mr. Chairman, this bill recognizes our fiscal realities and makes the tough decisions to ensure we get our spending under control without sacrificing our most critical of Federal functions. I'm expecting a vigorous and open debate during an open process over the coming days so all can have a chance to contribute to this legislation.

Before I reserve the balance of my time, I want to thank those who helped bring this bill on the floor. On the majority side: our clerk, Rob Blair; Angie Giancarlo; Ben Hammond; Loraine Heckenberg; Perry Yates; Adam Borrelli. On the minority side: Taunja Berquam. From our personal offices, Ms. KAPTUR's: Nathan Facey, her deputy chief of staff; and Ryan Steyer. From my staff: Nancy Fox, my chief of staff; and Katie Hazlett.

All of these individuals and others behind the scenes make this process work, one that we can be proud of, and I think we have a bill that, indeed, we can be proud of.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2014 (H.R. 2609)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
Investigations	125,000	90,000	90,000	-35,000	---
Supplemental (P.L. 113-2) (emergency)	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Subtotal	175,000	90,000	90,000	-85,000	---
Construction	1,674,000	1,350,000	1,343,000	-331,000	-7,000
Supplemental (P.L. 113-2)	3,461,000	---	---	-3,461,000	---
Subtotal	5,135,000	1,350,000	1,343,000	-3,792,000	-7,000
Mississippi River and Tributaries	252,000	279,000	249,000	-3,000	-30,000
Operations and Maintenance	2,410,000	2,588,000	2,682,000	+272,000	+94,000
Supplemental (P.L. 113-2) (emergency)	821,000	---	---	-821,000	---
Subtotal	3,231,000	2,588,000	2,682,000	-549,000	+94,000
Regulatory Program	193,000	200,000	193,000	---	-7,000
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)	109,000	104,000	104,000	-5,000	---
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies	27,000	28,000	28,000	+1,000	---
Supplemental (P.L. 113-2) (emergency)	1,008,000	---	---	-1,008,000	---
Subtotal	1,035,000	28,000	28,000	-1,007,000	---
Expenses	185,000	182,000	182,000	-3,000	---
Supplemental (P.L. 113-2) (emergency)	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Subtotal	195,000	182,000	182,000	-13,000	---
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	5,000	5,000	5,000	---	---
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	10,330,000	4,826,000	4,876,000	-5,454,000	+50,000
Appropriations	(8,441,000)	(4,826,000)	(4,876,000)	(-3,565,000)	(+50,000)
Emergency appropriations	(1,889,000)	---	---	(-1,889,000)	---
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah Project construction	---	---	6,425	+6,425	+6,425
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	---	---	1,000	+1,000	+1,000
Central Utah Project Completion Account	19,700	---	---	-19,700	---
Subtotal	19,700	---	7,425	-12,275	+7,425
Program oversight and administration	1,300	---	1,300	---	+1,300
Total, Central Utah project completion account	21,000	---	8,725	-12,275	+8,725
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and Related Resources	895,000	791,135	812,744	-82,256	+21,609
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund	53,068	53,288	53,288	+220	---
California Bay-Delta Restoration	39,651	37,000	30,000	-9,651	-7,000
Policy and Administration	60,000	60,000	60,000	---	---
Indian Water Rights Settlements	---	78,661	---	---	-78,661
San Joaquin River Restoration Fund	---	26,000	---	---	-26,000

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2014 (H.R. 2609)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Central Utah Project Completion Account	---	3,500	---	---	-3,500
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	1,047,719	1,049,584	956,032	-91,687	-93,552
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	1,068,719	1,049,584	964,757	-103,962	-84,827
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Programs					
Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability and Efficiency	---	---	982,637	+982,637	+982,637
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	1,814,091	2,775,700	---	-1,814,091	-2,775,700
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	139,500	169,015	---	-139,500	-169,015
Nuclear Energy	759,000	735,460	656,389	-102,611	-79,071
Fossil Energy Research and Development	534,000	420,575	450,000	-84,000	+29,425
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	14,909	20,000	14,909	---	-5,091
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	192,704	189,400	189,400	-3,304	---
Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve	10,119	8,000	8,000	-2,119	---
Rescission	-6,000	---	---	+6,000	---
Subtotal	4,119	8,000	8,000	+3,881	---
Energy Information Administration	105,000	117,000	100,000	-5,000	-17,000
Non-defense Environmental Cleanup	235,721	212,956	194,000	-41,721	-18,956
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	472,930	554,823	545,000	+72,070	-9,823
Science	4,876,000	5,152,752	4,653,000	-223,000	-499,752
Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy	265,000	379,000	50,000	-215,000	-329,000
Race to the Top for Energy Efficiency and Grid Modernization	---	200,000	---	---	-200,000
Title 17 Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program	38,000	48,000	22,000	-16,000	-26,000
Offsetting collection	-38,000	-22,000	-22,000	+16,000	---
Subtotal	---	26,000	---	---	-26,000
Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loans program	6,000	6,000	6,000	---	---
Departmental Administration	237,623	226,580	187,863	-49,760	-38,717
Miscellaneous revenues	-108,000	-108,188	-108,188	-188	---
Net appropriation	129,623	118,392	79,675	-49,948	-38,717
Office of the Inspector General	42,000	42,120	42,000	---	-120
Total, Energy programs	9,590,597	11,127,193	7,971,010	-1,619,587	-3,156,183
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration					
Weapons Activities	7,577,341	7,868,409	7,675,000	+97,659	-193,409
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2,434,303	2,140,142	2,100,000	-334,303	-40,142
Naval Reactors	1,080,000	1,246,134	1,109,000	+29,000	-137,134
Office of the Administrator	410,000	397,784	382,000	-28,000	-15,784
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	11,501,644	11,652,469	11,266,000	-235,644	-386,469
Environmental and Other Defense Activities					
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,023,000	4,853,909	4,750,000	-273,000	-103,909
Defense Environmental Cleanup (legislative proposal)	---	463,000	---	---	-463,000

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2014 (H.R. 2609)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Other Defense Activities	823,364	749,080	830,000	+6,636	+80,920
Total, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	5,846,364	6,065,989	5,580,000	-266,364	-485,989
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	17,348,008	17,718,458	16,846,000	-502,008	-872,458
Power Marketing Administrations /1					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	8,428	7,750	7,750	-678	---
Offsetting collections	-8,428	-7,750	-7,750	+678	---
Subtotal	---	---	---	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	45,010	45,456	45,456	+446	---
Offsetting collections	-32,308	-33,564	-33,564	-1,256	---
Subtotal	12,702	11,892	11,892	-810	---
Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	285,900	299,919	299,919	+14,019	---
Offsetting collections	-194,000	-203,989	-203,989	-9,989	---
Subtotal	91,900	95,930	95,930	+4,030	---
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund	4,169	5,331	5,331	+1,162	---
Offsetting collections	-3,949	-4,911	-4,911	-962	---
Subtotal	220	420	420	+200	---
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	104,822	108,242	108,242	+3,420	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	304,600	304,600	304,600	---	---
Revenues applied	-304,600	-304,600	-304,600	---	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy	27,043,427	28,953,893	24,925,252	-2,118,175	-4,028,641
Appropriations	(27,049,427)	(28,953,893)	(24,925,252)	(-2,124,175)	(-4,028,641)
Rescissions	(-6,000)	---	---	(+6,000)	---
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	68,263	64,618	70,317	+2,054	+5,699
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	29,130	29,915	29,915	+785	---
Delta Regional Authority	11,677	11,319	11,319	-358	---
Denali Commission	10,679	7,396	7,396	-3,283	---
Northern Border Regional Commission	1,497	1,355	1,355	-142	---
Southeast Crescent Regional Commission	250	---	250	---	+250
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	1,027,240	1,043,937	1,043,937	+16,697	---
Revenues	-899,726	-920,721	-920,721	-20,995	---
Subtotal	127,514	123,216	123,216	-4,298	---
Office of Inspector General	10,860	11,105	11,105	+245	---
Revenues	-9,774	-9,994	-9,994	-220	---
Subtotal	1,086	1,111	1,111	+25	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	128,600	124,327	124,327	-4,273	---
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,400	3,400	3,400	---	---

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2014 (H.R. 2609)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	254,496	243,330	249,279	-5,217	+5,949
Appropriations	(254,496)	(243,330)	(249,279)	(-5,217)	(+5,949)
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Sec. 508 Rescissions:					
Corps of Engineers	---	-100,000	-200,000	-200,000	-100,000
Department of Energy: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	---	---	-157,000	-157,000	-157,000
Department of Energy: Weapons Activities	---	---	-142,000	-142,000	-142,000
Department of Energy: Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	---	---	-20,000	-20,000	-20,000
Total, Title V, General Provisions	---	-100,000	-519,000	-519,000	-419,000
Grand total	38,696,642	34,972,807	30,496,288	-8,200,354	-4,476,519
Appropriations	(36,813,642)	(35,072,807)	(31,015,288)	(-5,798,354)	(-4,057,519)
Rescissions	(-6,000)	(-100,000)	(-519,000)	(-513,000)	(-419,000)

1/ Totals adjusted to net out alternative financing costs, reimbursable agreement funding, and power purchase and wheeling expenditures. Offsetting collection totals only reflect funds collected for annual expenses, excluding power purchase wheeling.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's able and collegial leadership throughout this process and efforts to assemble a bill in an inclusive manner in our subcommittee. I also want to say what a pleasure it was to work with him, and I wish all subcommittees could work as effectively.

I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for their efforts to restore a semblance of regular order to this House in consideration of our appropriations bills, and I want to thank all members of our subcommittee for their thoughtful deliberation in considering the best interests of our Nation as they relate to energy and water development and, importantly, America's nuclear security.

I appreciate the dedication, hard work, and sound judgment of our committee staff on both sides of the aisle. On the majority committee staff side: Rob Blair, Ben Hammond, Loraine Heckenberg, Angie Giancarlo, Perry Yates, and Adam Borrelli. And on the minority committee staff side: Taunja Berquam; from the Chairman's personal office, Katie Hazlett and Nancy Fox; and finally my staff, Ryan Steyer, Nathan Facey, and Steve Fought.

□ 1400

While Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's worthy efforts are to be commended in the highest way, the allocation imposed on our subcommittee by the Republican leaders of this House, and its Budget Committee, move America backwards in a global economy where our Nation's future is at stake.

The Budget Committee's directive to us reminds me of a seafaring expression: ''If you don't know which way your ship is headed, you're bound to run aground or die at sea.''

This bill runs America aground. It says to future generations, we'll risk your lives floating lost at sea. It's simply inadequate to meet the needs of our Nation.

America's budget deficit spiked because high unemployment, resulting from Wall Street's abandon and over a decade of war, caused high unemployment that reduced Federal revenues.

This bill will not embrace the future, nor create the necessary jobs to reverse that trend and lift up America's working families. Our focus has to be on the future, on creating jobs and opportunity, with every single measure that comes before this House.

Foreign energy dependence is our Nation's chief strategic vulnerability. This bill abandons America's quest for energy independence, which has the potential to create millions of new jobs.

For every American life lost in pursuit of our Nation's national security, now dependent on energy imports, I dedicate my work on this bill today. And I also dedicate my work on the floor in memory of Judge Francis ''Buddy'' Restivo, a World War II veteran who passed this weekend, and just a phenomenal citizen of our country.

This bill not only guts funding for alternative energy research and development, it officially heralds the Republican majority's embrace of sequestration.

Sequestration is the most vivid symbol of congressional negligence. With that one dreadful bill, the Republican majority manages not only to turn its back on energy independence, but also to surrender its congressional responsibility to manage the budget of our country responsibly. The majority has waved the white flag.

This year, in the Lake Erie region, we are celebrating the heroics of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry, hero of the pivotal battle of Lake Erie in the War of 1812. Oliver Hazard Perry's motto was ''Don't give up the ship.''

The majority's motto is ''We just give up.'' We give up trying to perform our constitutional responsibilities with respect to fiscal affairs. We give up trying to create the much-needed jobs that will restore our fiscal footing. We give up trying to help America break free of its dependence on imported petroleum. We just give up. Let the mindless sequester be the status quo.

It's no mystery why Congress' approval ratings have hit an all-time low. This policy is running our economic ship of state aground when we need full sail ahead.

The allocation for the energy and water bill is $30.4 billion, which is $4.1 billion below the administration's request and $2.8 billion below last year's level. There are further allocation cuts beyond even sequestration levels, resulting in deep and severe reductions made to important priorities within the bill.

The chairman worked to include resources for many Federal priorities, including the Corps of Engineers, the Advanced Manufacturing Office, nuclear safety and cleanup, and the bill also prioritizes some of the nuclear security programs.

But funding these programs came at the expense of others so vital to future energy systems for our Nation, including renewable energy, cut by nearly 60 percent, and advanced energy research at ARPA–E, which received an 81 percent reduction.

Shortchanging critical energy and infrastructure investments will slow economic growth and job creation, hindering America's competitiveness.

Let us look at the water accounts. We must continue to invest in America. The scope of damage caused by natural disasters like Hurricane Sandy have laid bare the inadequacies of our water infrastructure.

The Corps of Engineers budget currently has a backlog of authorized projects in excess of $60 billion from coast to coast. But this bill continues a steady decline in water resources infrastructure, reducing the construction account by $304 million from 2013.

Communities across our country will continue to erode as they experience, firsthand, this decreased investment. The risks illustrated by the failure of flood control projects that the American people endured in the wake of Katrina are not gone. Communities across our country are in desperate need of investment, but this bill shortcuts that.

Take St. Louis, Missouri, or Sacramento, California, where a levee break could leave residents with as little as 20 minutes to flee before the water gets 1 foot deep, are just two examples of major metropolitan areas where the Corps must work harder and faster toward more comprehensive protection.

What sense does cleaning up after natural disasters make when preventive measures could prevent destruction and loss of life?

We should be doing more to build infrastructure and create jobs, not less. Investments now will yield future benefits that will far outweigh repayment costs. That is what the Hoover Dam was all about. That is what our Mississippi River lock and dam system is all about. That is what electrifying our Nation, rural and urban, was all about, great visions for a great Nation, not Lilliputian surrender.

On future energy systems, this bill would slash funding for applied energy research and development by more than half, even as foreign competition doubles down to develop 21st century technology while undermining our markets through illegal dumping and intellectual property theft.

Renewable energy is a vital leg of future energy independence beyond the fossil fuel age. It will achieve cost competitiveness, but the question is, which countries will develop and own those technologies?

The United States has spent $2.3 trillion importing foreign petroleum since 2003, representing thousands and thousands of dollars out of the pockets of every hardworking American family. These are dollars diverted not to much-needed American job creation but overseas, assisting our competitors in developing their economies and their energy futures. We are ceding millions of jobs and trillions in income from this country to undemocratic kingdoms far from home.

Wake up, America. Wake up, Congress.

In 2012, every billion dollars of U.S. exports supported nearly 5,000 jobs here at home. But can you imagine what $2.3 trillion in our energy trade deficit translates into lost jobs in America over the last 10 years?

It's a hemorrhage. Our Republic will not compete in this 21st century and beyond if we further reduce investments in this area and cede our energy future to other countries.

Predatory foreign competition in energy poses a real security threat to our country. I view it as the chief security threat to our country. I appreciate the chairman's commitment to ensure that technology developed with taxpayer dollars benefits our Nation first.

The Department of Energy, however, must do more to ensure that intellectual property supported by Federal dollars furthers the interests of the United States economy. And I'm concerned with the level of funding, but I appreciate the chairman's commitment to American manufacturing in this bill.

Manufacturing remains one of the most important job drivers in our economy, and there is little merit in using Federal dollars to foster technological advances or breakthroughs for products that are not ultimately made in America and manufactured domestically.

America must do more to reverse the trend of domestic firms shifting production overseas because, to put it simply, domestic manufacturing drives domestic innovation and jobs here in America.

Tragically, the science account critical to the competitiveness of our Nation is reduced by 5 percent from 2012. And, with an 81 percent reduction, 81 percent reduction in the new ARPA-E program, this bill would effectively end the most advanced research our Nation can launch. That is not a formula for success.

We are beginning to see the initial payment from the ARPA-E, which advances high-potential, high-impact energy technology so advanced it is too early for private sector investment. Return on investment from our publicly-funded research and development ranges from 20 to 67 percent. It's a home run.

With this rate of return, Congress should be increasing our investment in science. This bill moves us exactly in the opposite direction.

Finally, I remain concerned this bill increases spending for nuclear weapons upgrades at the expense of nuclear nonproliferation and cleanup. I support the funding to maintain our nuclear arsenal at acceptable levels, and I appreciate the efforts to improve program and project management, including the reporting requirement on Life Extension Programs at the National Nuclear Security Administration.

However, nonproliferation programs are on the front lines of our defense. They are the most cost-effective way to achieve the urgent goal of securing and reducing the amount of vulnerable bomb-grade material. But this bill cuts these critical efforts by $559 million.

What sense does that make?

Further, I am concerned that the funding the bill includes for environmental management activities is insufficient to meet the Federal Government's legal obligations to clean up its defense nuclear waste.

In sum, this bill should achieve critical investments in our country. It fails to do so. It should promote job creation. It fails to do so. It should ensure national energy security and national security. It fails to do so. It should protect and promote vital infrastructure. It fails to do so. And it should advance American competitiveness, and it fails to do so.

Unfortunately, Republicans on the Budget Committee continue to push the outrageous notion that we can balance our budget through cuts to nondefense discretionary spending, which accounts for only 17 percent of Federal spending. In so doing, they harm America's future in a very major way.

Again, I commend the chairman's effort, however the allocation for this bill is insufficient and irresponsible and I cannot, in good conscience, support it.

It is my firm hope that the committee will be provided a workable path toward the fiscal 2014 appropriation bills, and I look forward to the day we will return allocations to acceptable levels and to working with the chairman to draft a bill worthy of support.

Let me, before reserving the balance of my time, read that quote right up there above the Speaker's rostrum.

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

That is our charge in this bill, and this bill fails.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), our very able ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Well, I first want to thank the chair, and I appreciate your important work on this bill. And I would like to thank the chairman of the full committee, and the ranking member, for your leadership and for your eloquent statement on this bill. It has been a pleasure for me to work with you, and I thank you so very much.

I rise in strong opposition to this woefully inadequate bill. With an allocation of $30.4 billion, $2.8 billion less than the FY 2013 enacted level, when adjusted for Sandy reconstruction, and a little more than $4 billion below the request, the consequences of following the majority's budget are crystal clear: the erosion of America's high-tech and scientific workforce, the loss of clean and renewable energy breakthroughs to countries like China, the abandonment of communities along our Nation's coastlines and waterways.

And with an 81 percent reduction in ARPA-E and a 60 percent, or $700 million, reduction to energy efficiency, renewable energy and energy delivery and reliability programs compared to last year, this bill will leave our scientific and technological workforce ill-equipped to tackle the great challenges of our time. Such drastic cuts will force the Federal Government to withdraw critical support for clean energy and renewable investments on the cusp of their maturity.

□ 1415

These funding levels will inflict great pain on the American people, who will be left jobless with the exportation of America's clean energy and innovation economy to China and other foreign competitors.

The consequence of allowing our competitors to gain ground is already evident. Last month, China's newest supercomputer, which was built almost entirely from Chinese parts, was deemed the fastest in the world, clocking in about twice as fast as the best American machine. If supercomputing is a measure of our scientific innovation, we are losing badly.

This bill also dramatically underinvests by $300 million below last year in our Nation's water resource infrastructure, leaving homes, businesses, and communities vulnerable to damage from natural disasters like Superstorm Sandy. This decrease would compound prior cuts in 2011, 2012, and 2013, totaling $769 million, of which $688 million was cut from the Army Corps' construction account for projects we all know need to be done. Over 300 projects were suspended between 2011 and 2012. Are we going to abandon these projects forever? As a Member whose district was affected by Hurricane Sandy, I can attest that prevention is cheaper and smarter than paying for reconstruction later.

Additionally, decreasing investments in water infrastructure inhibits construction job creation, and local businesses and individuals will not reap the indirect economic benefits that encourages critical investments in their communities.

It is my firm hope that the majority will recognize that this bill does not provide a workable path forward and return to the spending levels agreed to under the Budget Control Act. To do otherwise is to purposely undermine efforts to support American job creation and economic growth.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, Representative BERA.

Mr. BERA of California. I rise today to applaud the committee for addressing a critical issue not just to my own hometown but to our Nation.

Most know Sacramento as the capital of the Golden State. What many don't know is that the Sacramento region, which sits at the confluence of the Sacramento and American Rivers, where they converge near the bay delta, has the second highest flood risk in the United States. Only New Orleans is at greater risk for flooding. And we know what happened in Hurricane Katrina.

The Folsom Dam Joint Federal Project is vital to protecting the region from disaster. We must continue

to fund these improvements to take pressure off our overburdened levees and keep people who work and live in the region safe. A flood in Sacramento would be devastating to the 1.4 million residents in our metropolitan area. The flood risk could result in closures of evacuation routes like Interstate 5 and Interstate 80, a shutdown of our international airport, and destruction of homes and hospitals, not to mention the irreversible tragic loss of life. Additionally, flooding could result in billions of dollars in potential damage, and it could take weeks or months to pump the water out of the region.

Another area of crucial importance that I hope this body will soon address is the Sacramento-American River levee system. Many of the levees in my area date from the 1870s, when farmers began building nearly 1,100 miles of protection around the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to control floodwaters and create farmland. Today, these levees are in desperate need of critical repair to help prevent a catastrophic disaster.

We all witnessed the devastation caused by Superstorm Sandy this past November. However, unlike a slow-moving hurricane, a breach of the levees could occur with little or no warning. In fact, Robert Bea, professor of engineering at the University of California, Berkeley, warns:

> In terms of damage, deaths, and long-term costs, a rupture in the delta levees would be far more destructive than what happened in Hurricane Katrina. This is a ticking bomb.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BERA of California. In 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger declared a state of emergency for California's levees. He signed an executive order directing agencies to identify, evaluate, and repair the levees. The citizens in Natomas levied themselves a tax; and they've already paid, along with the State of California, for 35 percent of the work. But we now need this body to allocate the rest to keep our region safe.

As the ranking member said, it is better to prevent a catastrophe than wait for that tragic loss of life. Addressing vital projects like the Sacramento-American River levees is crucial. It's what we should be doing. It puts people to work. It is time for us to come together as a body and get America working again and fund vital projects like the Sacramento-American River levees.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Representative JANICE HAHN.

Ms. HAHN. I'm disappointed that, once again, we're shortchanging American ports, businesses, and consumers by failing to fully utilize the receipts and surplus of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund on our ports.

When our ports aren't well maintained, when we fail to support their infrastructure and their dredging, we threaten more than $3 trillion of economic output and over 13 million jobs. American consumers face higher costs and American businesses have a harder time competing globally.

Decades ago, Congress created a tax on the value of the goods imported through our ports to ensure that no American port would suffer underdredging. Yet, for years, Congress has failed to fully use the receipts of this tax on keeping our ports in good order. It has gotten so bad that the American Association of Port Authorities estimates that the full channel dimensions of our Nation's ports and harbors are available less than 35 percent of the time. Ships are constantly forced to light load or wait for high tide to enter U.S. harbors. Those inefficiencies and added costs ripple all the way back to the wallets of average Americans. I don't think it's right to make Americans pay for a tax and pay again for our failure to use that tax that we promised.

We may be increasing the amount of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund we are spending on ports in this bill, but it still $700 million less than what our ports are owed. By the start of FY 2015, we will owe our ports nearly $9 billion that should have gone to investments in our ports that would create jobs and keep us globally competitive. We can't wait anymore. We need to fully utilize the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund as soon as possible.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, may I ask if the ranking member, Ms. KAPTUR, is prepared to close.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Chair, the Energy and Water Subcommittee is to be commended for its efforts to present a more balanced and reasoned approach to America's energy needs, particularly with respect to numerous provisions that recognize coal's key role in our Nation's energy supply. I strongly support, for example, provisions in the bill that would block agency efforts to redefine fill and jurisdictional waters of the United States—both of which would have severe consequences for coal mining in my home state.

I am grateful to the Subcommittee for providing $450 million for Fossil Energy Research and Development at the Department of Energy—a figure that is $20 million above the President's request. That bump up represents the realization that coal is and will continue to be a vital part of America's energy portfolio throughout the foreseeable future. It is particularly significant given the overall budgetary constraints with which the Appropriations Committee is confronted and against the backdrop of anti-coal political fervor that seems to have taken hold in much of Washington these days.

As much as I welcome this additional funding, I feel it important to make the case for even more funding for coal research and development. Just this week, in testimony before the Committee on Natural Resources, a representative for the Institute for Energy Research noted that coal continues to be an abundant domestic energy resource; that it provides more than 40 percent of energy production worldwide; and that other nations—including China and Germany—are ramping up coal-fired electricity generation. In fact, according to the Energy Information Administration, coal use in China has grown by 40 percent over the last decade.

However much the legions of wishful thinkers believe they can merely fantasize coal away, coal is real, it is here, and its use is on the rise globally.

Given that truth—one thing that coal supporters and coal opponents ought to agree on is that we should continue pursuing every avenue to find more and better ways to burn coal more cleanly and efficiently. Through the fossil energy program, public-private partnerships have led to huge improvements in the efficiency of coal power as well as dramatic reductions in the environmental effects of burning coal.

I believe that effort ought to continue and that the United States ought to continue leading that effort, but to do that we need to fund research and development robustly and better position our Nation to shape worldwide energy advances.

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

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

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2609

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and related efforts.

INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary where authorized by law for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and related needs; for surveys and detailed studies, and plans and specifications of proposed river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, and aquatic ecosystem restoration, projects and related efforts prior to construction; for restudy of authorized projects; and for miscellaneous

investigations, and, when authorized by law, surveys and detailed studies, and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction, $90,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION

For expenses necessary for the construction of river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and related projects authorized by law; for conducting detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of such projects (including those involving participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such detailed studies, and plans and specifications, shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction), $1,343,000,000, to remain available until expended; of which such sums as are necessary to cover the Federal share of construction costs for facilities under the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities program shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund as authorized by Public Law 104–303; and of which such sums as are necessary to cover one-half of the costs of construction, replacement, rehabilitation, and expansion of inland waterways projects shall be derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for flood damage reduction projects and related efforts in the Mississippi River alluvial valley below Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as authorized by law, $249,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as are necessary to cover the Federal share of eligible operation and maintenance costs for inland harbors shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and related projects authorized by law; providing security for infrastructure owned or operated by the Corps, including administrative buildings and laboratories; maintaining harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency that serve essential navigation needs of general commerce, where authorized by law; surveying and charting northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removing obstructions to navigation, $2,682,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as are necessary to cover the Federal share of eligible operation and maintenance costs for coastal harbors and channels, and for inland harbors shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund; of which such sums as become available from the special account for the Corps of Engineers established by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 shall be derived from that account for resource protection, research, interpretation, and maintenance activities related to resource protection in the areas at which outdoor recreation is available; and of which such sums as become available from fees collected under section 217 of Public Law 104–303 shall be used to cover the cost of operation and maintenance of the dredged material disposal facilities for which such fees have been collected: *Provided*, That 1 percent of the total amount of funds provided for each of the programs, projects or activities funded under this heading shall not be allocated to a field operating activity prior to the beginning of the fourth quarter of the fiscal year and shall be available for use by the Chief of Engineers to fund such emergency activities as the Chief of Engineers determines to be necessary and appropriate, and that the Chief of Engineers shall allocate during the fourth quarter any remaining funds which have not been used for emergency activities proportionally in accordance with the amounts provided for the programs, projects, or activities.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary for administration of laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands, $193,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

For expenses necessary to clean up contamination from sites in the United States resulting from work performed as part of the Nation's early atomic energy program, $104,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For expenses necessary to prepare for flood, hurricane, and other natural disasters and support emergency operations, repairs, and other activities in response to such disasters as authorized by law, $28,000,000, to remain available until expended.

EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the supervision and general administration of the civil works program in the headquarters of the Corps of Engineers and the offices of the Division Engineers; and for costs of management and operation of the Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity, the Institute for Water Resources, the United States Army Engineer Research and Development Center, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers Finance Center allocable to the civil works program, $182,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official reception and representation purposes and only during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation provided in this title shall be available to fund the civil works activities of the Office of the Chief of Engineers or the civil works executive direction and management activities of the division offices: *Provided further*, That any Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies appropriation may be used to fund the supervision and general administration of emergency operations, repairs, and other activities in response to any flood, hurricane, or other natural disaster.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR CIVIL WORKS

For the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works as authorized by 10 U.S.C. 3016(b)(3), $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The Revolving Fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available during the current fiscal year for purchase (not to exceed 100 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for the civil works program.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. (a) None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that—

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

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

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

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

(5) increases funds for any program, project, or activity by more than $2,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or

(6) reduces funds for any program, project, or activity by more than $2,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less.

(b) Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to any project or activity authorized under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, section 208 of the Flood Control Act of 1954, section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960, section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962, section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968, section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, or section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992.

(c) The Corps of Engineers shall submit reports on a quarterly basis to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing all the funds reprogrammed between programs, projects, activities, or categories of funding. The first quarterly report shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. In looking at our bill and looking at some of the accounts, especially for the energy and water accounts and the general provisions, there was an excellent article in this week's International Herald Tribune. It talks about sound investments. I will read portions of it very briefly here. It talks about how the rate of economic growth in Germany is surpassing our own just now, and the unemployment rate as a result has dropped to 5.3 percent, and falling further—much lower than in the United States. It investigates why that is the case. It talks quite a bit here about the German economy having made investments whose future benefits will far outweigh repayment costs. This bill and its accounts, essentially, should be doing that; but, unfortunately, it cuts back on some of the most significant job growth.

The article goes on to say that the U.S. economy is still in doldrums. And that's because many of the needed workers and machines are now idle. If the country waits, it will need to bid them away from other tasks. Also, because of the sluggish economy, the materials required for the work are now relatively inexpensive. So this is really the time to encourage investment in our economy to lift the entire system.

The article goes on to talk about the fact that in Germany there had been certain austerity backers, they call them, and it says:

> Now austerity backers urge—preposterously—that infrastructure repairs be postponed until government budgets are in balance. But would they also tell an indebted family to postpone fixing a leaky roof until it paid off all of its debts? Not only would the repair grow more costly with the delay, but the water damage would mount in the interim. Families should pay off debts, yes, but not in ways that actually increase their indebtedness in the longer term.

I found this article particularly instructive as we move amendments to the floor and move this bill forward.

In the article it says:

Austerity advocates object that more deficit spending now will burden grandchildren with crushing debt. That might be true if the proposal were to build bigger houses and stage more lavish parties with borrowed money.

But, in fact, the dollars were being invested in the nation in projects that were creating opportunity and infrastructure that would advance the worth of the nation in decades hence.

□ 1430

So I think that we ought to think about this as we proceed title by title in this bill and ask ourselves the question why it is that many of the important accounts, such as the Corps of Engineers—and several of our speakers today have referenced those—has been cut by $104 million compared to this year's enacted level and falls far short of the investments that we need in one of the fundamentals in the country, and that is in water systems.

Madam Chair, I will place this article in the RECORD from the International Herald Tribune.

I also want to point out and place in the RECORD some of the severe cutbacks in this bill with more specificity:

The Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency account is $971 million less than the 2013 enacted level and $1.96 billion less than the President's request;

The Department of Energy Office of Science is $223 million less than 2013's enacted level and $499.8 million less than the President's request;

The Advanced Research Projects Agency is $215 million less than the 2013 enacted level and $329 million less than the President's request;

The funding for environmental cleanup is $243 million less than the 2013 enacted level and $133 million less than the President's request;

The Nuclear Nonproliferation account is $334 million less than the 2013 enacted level and $40 million less than the President's request;

In terms of the Army Corps of Engineers, it is $104 million less than the 2013 enacted level;

In the water resources projects within the Department of the Interior, there is a $104 million reduction less than the 2013 enacted level and $85 million less than the President's request.

So when we think about the cumulative impact of it, it is just extraordinary. And I will place this data in the RECORD as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the Global Edition of the New York Times, July 6–7, 2013]

WHEN DEBT IS A SOUND INVESTMENT

(By Robert H. Frank)

I recently spent a week in Berlin, where the entire city seemed under construction. In every direction, cranes and other heavy equipment dominated the landscape. Although many projects are in the private sector, innumerable others—including bridge and highway repairs, new subway stations, and other infrastructure work are financed by taxpayers.

But wait. Hasn't Germany been one of the most outspoken advocates of fiscal austerity after the financial crisis? Yes, and that's not a contradiction. Fiscally responsible businesses routinely borrow to invest, and, until recently, so did most governments.

Lately, however, fears about growing government debt have caused wholesale cuts in U.S. public investment. The Germans, of course, yield to no one in their distaste for indebtedness. But they also understand the distinction between consumption and investment. By borrowing, they have made investments whose future benefits will far outweigh repayment costs. There's nothing foolhardy about that.

The German experience suggests how Americans might move past the stalled debate about economic stimulus policy. In the aftermath of the financial crisis, the policy discussion began with economists in broad agreement that unemployment remained high because total spending was too low. Keynesian stimulus proponents argued that temporary tax cuts and additional government spending would bolster hiring. Austerity advocates countered that additional government spending would merely displace private spending and that Americans already had too much debt in any event. And the debate has languished there.

A preponderance of evidence suggests that Keynes was right. But as the German experience illustrates, progress is possible without settling that question. The Germans are investing in infrastructure, not to provide short-term economic stimulus, but because those investments promise high returns. Yet their undeniable side effect has been to bolster employment substantially in the short run.

Not all German public investments have met expectations. Berlin's new consolidated airport, for example, has experienced several delays and cost overruns, and parts of the city's recently constructed central rail station will be closed this autumn for major repairs. But private investment projects undergo occasional setbacks, too, and no one argues that businesses should stop investing on that account.

The Germans didn't become bogged down in a debate over stimulus policy, and they didn't explicitly portray their infrastructure push as stimulus. But that didn't hamper their strategy's remarkable effectiveness at putting people to work. The unemployment rate in Germany, at 5.3 percent and falling, is now substantially lower than that in the United States, where it ticked up to 7.6 percent in May and held there in June. (By contrast, in March 2007, before the financial crisis, the rate in Germany was 9.2 percent, about five percentage points higher than what it had been in the United States.)

A prudent investment is one whose future returns exceed its costs—includIng interest costs, if the money is borrowed. Opportunities meeting that standard abound in the infrastructure domain. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, the United States has a backlog of about $3.6 trillion in overdue infrastructure maintenance. No one in Congress seriously proposes that the country just abandon crumbling roads and bridges, and everyone agrees that the repair cost will grow sharply the longer we wait.

The case for accelerated infrastructure investment becomes more compelling with the U.S. economy still in the doldrums. That is because many of the needed workers and machines are now idle. If the country waits, it will need to bid them away from other tasks. Also because of the sluggish economy, the materials required for the work are now relatively inexpensive. If the country waits, they will cost more. And long-term interest rates for the money to pay for the work continue to hover near record lows. They, too, will be higher if the country waits.

Austerity advocates object that more deficit spending now will burden grandchildren with crushing debt. That might be true if the proposal were to build bigger houses and stage more lavish parties with borrowed money—as Americans, in fact, were doing in the first half of the past decade. But the objection makes no sense when applied to long-overdue infrastructure repairs. A failure to undertake that spending will gratuitously burden the country's grandchildren.

In 2009, austerity proponents in the United States argued against stimulus, predicting that the economy would recover quickly and spontaneously. It didn't. Later, they said the country tried stimulus and it didn't work. But in the face of a projected $2 trillion shortfall in the spending needed for full employment, Congress enacted a stimulus bill totaling only $787 billion, spread over three years. And much of that injection was offset by cuts in state and local government spending.

Now austerity backers urge—preposterously—that infrastructure repairs be postponed until government budgets are in balance. But would they also tell an indebted family to postpone fixing a leaky roof until it paid off all its debts? Not only would the repair grow more costly with the delay, but the water damage would mount in the interim. Families should pay off debts, yes, but not in ways that actually increase their indebtedness in the longer term.

Austerity advocates, who have been wrong at virtually every turn, are unlikely to change their minds about stimulus policy. But with continued slow growth in the outlook, it's time to re-frame the debate. The best available option, by far, is to rebuild tattered infrastructure at fire-sale prices. If the austerity crowd disagrees, it should explain why in plain English.

HIGHLIGHTS OF 2014 ENERGY & WATER APPROPRIATIONS ACT

2014 mark: $30.426 billion.

2014 budget request: $34.483 billion.

2013 enacted (including Sandy reconstruction): $36.744 billion.

2013 enacted (excluding Sandy reconstruction): $33.240 billion.

The 2014 Energy & Water Appropriations Act would provide:

$982.6 million for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency (not including a $157 million rescission to 2013 funding), which is $971 million less than the 2013 enacted level and $1.96 billion less than the President's request for the same activities.

$4.653 billion for the Department of Energy Office of Science, which is $223 million less than the 2013 enacted level and $499.8 million less than the President's request.

$50 million for the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy (ARPA—E), which is $215 million less than the 2013 enacted level and $329 million less than the President's request.

$5.5 billion for environmental cleanup activities, which is $243 million less than the 2013 enacted level and $133 million less than the President's request.

$7.675 billion for Weapons Activities (not including a $142 million rescission), which is $97.7 million more than the 2013 enacted level and $193.4 million less than the President's request.

$2.1 billion for Nuclear Nonproliferation (not including a $20 million rescission), which is $334 million less than the 2013 enacted level and $40 million less than the

President's request. The House bill also includes $245 million in activities previously appropriated within the weapons account, as requested by the Administration.

$1.109 billion for Naval Reactors, which is $29 million more than the 2013 enacted level and $137.1 million less than the President's request.

$4.876 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers (not including a $200 million rescission), which is $104 million less than the 2013 enacted level and $50 million more than the President's request.

$965 million for water resources projects within the Department of Interior, which is $104 million less than the 2013 enacted level and $85 million less than the President's request.

SEQUESTRATION IMPACT ON ENERGY & WATER ACCOUNTS

This bill fails to address the sequester, ensuring it will harm our ability to meet energy and water needs next year, on top of the following impacts that are already taking hold.

Forgone hiring by Department of Energy of 300 full-time employees; reduced contractor labor by estimated 1,200 employee-years through furloughs, layoffs, and hiring deferrals; furlough of approximately 60 employee-years affecting approximately 3,600 contractor employees; and layoff or voluntary separation of more than 300 contractor employees.

Severe cuts to renewable energy and efficiency research, including $16 million from advanced vehicle technologies, $14 million from solar energy, $10 million from biofuels, $5 million from wind, $3 million from hydropower, $3 million from weatherization assistance, and $5 million from electrical grid modernization.

Cuts to Office of Science delaying or cancelling laboratory construction, maintenance, and upgrades; and reducing math, computing, physics, atmospheric, and cytogenics research at labs and universities around the country.

Cuts to Environmental Management resulting in furloughs, terminated activity and forgone work at Hanford Site (WA), Idaho National Laboratory, Oak Ridge Reservation (TN), Savannah River Site (GA), and Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (NM).

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

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

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chair, I rise to commend the Committee on Appropriations for its leadership in resolving the nuclear waste issue. This is certainly a very crucial issue for all Americans.

Last year, I would remind us that the House voted 326–81 in favor of the Shimkus amendment to increase the bill's funding for Yucca Mountain license review. This year, the committee has once again reflected the will of the House not just by funding the license review, but also providing the Department of Energy the authority to transfer funds to the NRC, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. It's my understanding that this provision gives both DOE and the NRC the flexibility to make sure that the Yucca Mountain licensing case gets optimum resources, where needed, to make real progress in meeting our Nation's need for a safe repository to isolate our spent nuclear fuel and high-level defense waste.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman from Michigan is correct: the Department of Energy would have the flexibility to transfer funds, as needed, to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission either from funds appropriated in our bill or from funds previously appropriated for this purpose that remain unspent. This language would also allow the Department of Energy to reprogram funds and subsequently transfer them to the NRC for this purpose, if necessary, to ensure that no one could claim that access to adequate funds is a barrier to completing the review of the Yucca Mountain license application.

Mr. UPTON. Well, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. This approach really does build on last year's momentum to get the job done.

Consumers and taxpayers have paid over $15 billion—that's ''b'' as in ''big''—to find out whether Yucca Mountain would be a safe repository for civilian spent nuclear fuel and defense nuclear waste. They deserve an answer, yes, they do; and under this bill, they're going to get one.

I commend all the members of the Appropriations Committee for this. And I would urge all Members to vote ''yes'' on this appropriation bill for FY 2014 so that we can make additional resources available to perform the critical work.

I yield again to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would also like to recognize his leadership on this issue as the chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. He has worked hard with his colleagues to ensure that the will of the people is heard. The administration must apply the law that Congress already enacted and get this job done.

We look forward to working with the gentleman to get this appropriation enacted and to get this license wrapped up at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mr. UPTON. I just want to say again, I want to compliment you and your staff. This has been a major issue for us for a good number of years, something that needs to get done. I look forward to continuing that strong relationship as we look to the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, the dispatch with which the committee has moved forward made it not possible for me to offer the amendment that I was going to offer formally, but I just intend to deal with the issue very briefly for the committee and look forward to trying to work with the committee going forward.

Six years ago, in section 2032 of WRDA 2007, Congress directed the President to issue a report describing the vulnerability of the United States to damage from flooding. In addition to examining the risk to public health and property, Congress instructed the President to undertake an assessment of existing programs to address flooding, the effectiveness of those programs, and recommendations about how to improve them. Unfortunately, despite almost daily reminders that we see about flooding in the news, this report has yet to be written.

The President has requested funding for this study in its annual budget requests for the Corps of Engineers. The fiscal year 2014 budget calls this study a ''high priority evaluation of the Nation's vulnerability to inland and coastal flooding and of the effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability of existing programs and strategies.'' I agree. And the amendment that I would have offered would seek to provide funding for the Corps to finally undertake the study.

The need is clear. Flooding is America's most common natural disaster. From 2002 to 2011, total flood insurance claims averaged more than $2.9 billion a year. Last month, a new FEMA report indicated that rising sea levels and increasingly severe weather are expected to increase the areas of the United States at risk by 45 percent by the end of this century.

The Federal Government, led by FEMA and the Corps of Engineers, plays a significant role in flood damage reduction and emergency response. Reducing flood damage is one of the core missions of the Corps. It builds levees, floodwalls, shore protection projects, and restores natural floodplains. However, our current understanding of the actions necessary to reduce vulnerability to flooding and, therefore, reduce the amount that we spend to respond to flooding is lacking.

If we could do this report, it would be very helpful. The Corps of Engineers spent $1.5 billion annually on flood control activities for the last decade, and Congress has provided over $26 billion in additional supplemental appropriations responding to flooding and other natural disasters over the same period.

Despite massive expenditures on flood control, flood damages have increased at alarming rates. Long-term average flood damages are more than double what they were earlier this century. Obviously, we're not doing everything right.

The cost of this study would only be $1 million. The Investigations program is being funded at $90 million. In order to reduce government spending, we need to know how much money we are continuing to throw at projects that may or may not help.

I would hope that we could work with the committee to make sure that we have the best information available before the Corps commits to even more projects. I would hope that we could work to make sure that this comes to

pass. It will make the job of the committee easier and will make a difference for Americans across the country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 102. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to award or modify any contract that commits funds beyond the amounts appropriated for that program, project, or activity that remain unobligated, except that such amounts may include any funds that have been made available through reprogramming pursuant to section 101.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. The rapidity with which this process is moving, we might be dealing with the Transportation rather than the Energy and Water appropriations; therefore, my amendment apparently passed without an opportunity to present it.

We just heard our colleague from Oregon speak to the issue of flooding. I represent 200 miles of the Sacramento River, yet this bill ignores the need for this Congress to protect human life. This bill spends $7.67 billion on nuclear weapons and cuts the money for levee protection.

Human life is at risk in my district, and yet this bill ignores the reality of flooding. When a flood occurs in my district, it's not in the summertime; it is not warm water. It is very, very cold water and thousands of lives are at risk. Yet the majority cannot seem to find the money necessary to protect human life, but plenty of money for nuclear weapons. Is this the priority, $7.6 billion for nuclear weapons and not enough money to protect the lives of the citizens of this Nation from real danger, real floods? It's really going to happen, gentlemen and ladies of the majority.

The Corps of Engineers' budget is decimated, and for the last 3 years we have not been able to get one new project even though human life is at risk. Is that the priority? Apparently, human life is not.

Projects in my district: the Hamilton project for the last 3 years has been in the President's budget, yet no New START prohibitions place us in a dangerous situation in my district. Apparently, we need more nuclear weapons but not more levees. Is that the majority's position? $7.6 billion for nuclear weapons, and not enough for a $15 million project to protect the citizens of Hamilton City. You should be ashamed that that's your priority.

This particular appropriation bill is an abomination. It is a disgrace. It is a representation of the wrong priorities. But yet that's what you want to do. I suppose if this had not been a railroad and you weren't moving things so fast, I would have had an amendment opportunity to simply say that New START vital to the life and well-being of citizens in this Nation should be in this bill, but I didn't have a chance to do that because of the railroad you're operating here.

Run it as you will, but at the end of the day there will be human life at stake, at risk, and, quite likely—quite likely—floods in the 200 miles of the Sacramento River and its tributary that I represent.

This is wrongheaded. This is wrong. Your priorities could not be worse. You should be ashamed that this is the priority you put. Levees will not be built. Human life will be at risk. But, presumably, that's what you want.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I wonder, for those that don't come from your part of the country, Congressman GARAMENDI, talk about what it's like to face that possibility of nonrepair of the facilities that you are discussing.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their comments through the Chair.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I would be happy to address my comments through the Chair.

Madam Chair, the priorities that are in this bill are dead wrong. Natomas in Sacramento, 20-foot potential water in the wintertime, with the water temperature somewhere in the 40 to 50 degree range, perhaps human life can last 10 minutes—maybe—but that's the priority.

Hamilton City, the same situation. Yuba City, Marysville, the same situation. A winter storm in California and a levee break is deadly. This is not New Orleans, where you can stay in the water for a few hours. This is cold water temperature. And yet, Madam Chair, the majority's position is to build more nuclear weapons and not to build levees.

□ 1445

When the flood occurs, and it will, what will happen? Could we not take $100 million out of the nuclear weapons account and put it into the levees account in the Army Corps of Engineers? Apparently not.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the Energy and Water appropriations bill on the floor, which I think appropriately reflects the need to spend taxpayer dollars responsibly in light of our current budgetary problems.

Total funding in this bill represents a decrease of $2.9 billion below the fiscal year 2013 enacted level and $700 million below the post-sequester level. While funding is reduced, this bill still provides critical resources for important projects and programs that ensure our Nation continues to have access to affordable, reliable, and clean water and energy.

The bill also provides much-needed funding for our country's flood control projects that are constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers. My own district, California's 42nd District, is home to the Santa Ana River Mainstem project, which is one of the largest Corps projects west of the Mississippi River. I am pleased that the Corps and the Energy and Water Subcommittee continue to recognize the project's importance to providing adequate flood protection to the southern California region.

Additionally, in southern California, we recently lost 2,200 megawatts of power generation with the permanent shutdown of the San Onofre nuclear power plant. A significant generation shutdown of this nature creates tremendous uncertainty for ratepayers through our region.

Of course, energy production challenges are by no means exclusive to southern California. That is exactly why the energy programs funded in this bill are necessary. I am particularly pleased that our subcommittee has funded energy programs by taking an all-of-the-above approach that includes renewable, nuclear, and fossil fuels.

Americans rightfully expect affordable access to clean, affordable, and reliable energy and water. As a member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, I believe we have done our best to meet those expectations with this bill, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support the bill.

In closing, I just want to thank Subcommittee Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, as well as Chairman ROGERS, for their leadership and crafting a good, responsible bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I would just like to raise an issue here with the amount of money in this bill that we are appropriating for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers construction account. I have heard several of my colleagues here speak earlier on individual projects in their districts that affect their constituencies, and I am totally in agreement with that on both sides of the aisle.

But I do want to acknowledge the priority that should be recognized in this bill, and that is recognizing the impacts of these large coastal storms. I happen to represent the port of Boston and the community south of Boston along the south shore; a beautiful area that has a great number of towns with great history there. While they were not affected to the degree that New York and New Jersey were during Hurricane Sandy—Superstorm Sandy—a lot of their infrastructure was damaged

to the point of near collapse. So there is a great need for seawall reconstruction. They withstood that impact. They did the job that they were intended to do at the time that they were constructed. But I feel that this bill in its current form continues to undermine the ability of the Army Corps of Engineers to keep pace with the needed maintenance and reconstruction of our infrastructure.

I just want to call to mind the whole initiative here and what our priorities should be. We are, in many cases across the country, the beneficiaries of people who came before us and made the necessary investments in infrastructure. They saw the need, and we today, and up to today, have enjoyed a competitive advantage against some of our international neighbors because our infrastructure is there.

There is a definite increase in the number of these catastrophic storms. It seems like in my area we have 100-year storms every 3 or 4 years now. There is definitely something going on with climate change and the intensity of these storms.

It seems appropriate that we try to recognize the need here. I notice we are putting an awful lot of money into fossil fuel research and not nearly enough money to recognize the impact that climate change has already had on a lot of our coastal areas. We should be reinvesting in that infrastructure so that we are not faced with the total collapse that we saw in New York and New Jersey with Superstorm Sandy.

I just would call on my colleagues across the aisle in a request for bipartisanship and for recognizing the long-term interests of Americans across the country, Democrats and Republicans, and making sure that we use a commonsense approach in this bill. I think that we are off course with respect to the defunding of the construction account for the Army Corps of Engineers, not just for my district—I'm not saying that just for the communities that I represent who do have considerable need because of recent storms—I'm talking about all across the country. I'm talking about Republican districts as well as Democratic districts.

We have a wonderful organization here in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. They do fantastic jobs. We get more than our money's worth. We put $1 into the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and we get $5 back or $7 back, depending on the project. I think it is just wise stewardship to make sure they have the resources necessary to perform the reconstruction in some cases and maintenance in other cases of the seawalls along the east and west coast to make sure that we are indeed prepared for these storms that are inevitably coming.

I have an amendment later on at the appropriate time in this bill where I will be asking for additional money for the construction account of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Chair, this is a fiscally responsible bill. It cuts $2.9 billion below the fiscal year 2013 enacted level and it is $4.1 billion below the President's request. That is an impressive achievement working in this very difficult fiscal environment that we are in today.

What I really find impressive about the bill and the work that's been done by the subcommittee chairman and the chairman and the Appropriations Committee is the fact that this bill sets some very good priorities. In fact, there is $2 billion for navigation projects and studies to advance American competitiveness in our ability to export, which is critical for growth in the U.S. economy.

It includes $1 billion of appropriation from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. This is a record level. This is $200 million more than what we saw in fiscal year 2013, something that is absolutely critical, because we know that our Federal ports, our harbors, are essential if we are going to be able to ship goods overseas. Getting the dredging funds is absolutely necessary because we lose economic efficiency. In fact, on the Mississippi River, every time we lose a foot of draft it is about $1 million per ship, per day, in lost economic activity.

If we are going to get this economy growing, create value, create jobs, we have to export. To export, we have to have the waterways that allow us to do that. According to the Army Corps of Engineers, nearly 1,000 Federal ports and harbors have not been adequately maintained due to inadequate budgetary allocations over time.

This bill now takes a strong step forward to correct that. I want to thank Chairman ROGERS for this encouraging step forward for bringing attention to the fact that America's infrastructure—its ports, its locks, its dams, its inland waterways—are old and have not received the appropriate investment and have often been ignored. It has cost us time, it has cost us money, it has cost us economic growth, and it has cost us jobs.

Clearly, if we are expanding these trade agreements, looking at the Pacific with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, looking at a transatlantic agreement, we have to have our ports, our harbors, our waterways working at maximum efficiency if we are going to grow this economy.

Also, I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and full committee as well for including language from my colleague, Congressman RODNEY ALEXANDER. This is language included in the bill requiring the Department of Energy to report on its plans to address the backlog of natural gas export applications, liquefied natural gas export applications, and to encourage the timely completion of this approval process.

Given the fact that so many of these applicants have been waiting for well over a year to get a decision from the Department of Energy, it is just unacceptable to have this kind of a backlog at a time when this is going to help us expand trade, help improve our trade deficit, it will help create jobs, it will help us with—actually, interestingly, help stabilize the price of natural gas so we will see more drilling, and help our energy security in the long-run.

So expediting this process, getting the Department of Energy to be held to account on the backlog of these permits is critically important because these companies have invested millions of dollars in this permitting process. To be sitting in limbo is just simply unacceptable.

I am very, very happy that Congressman ALEXANDER's language has been included in this base bill, and I want to thank the chairman for doing this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, a few moments ago, I talked about priorities; $7.6 billion plus for nuclear weapons.

We just heard the gentleman discuss the issue of locks and levees and ports, projects in my district for the ports, for deepening the channels, for rebuilding and expanding. The economic activity in this Nation is not going to be funded.

Do we really need to spend an additional $7.6 billion-plus on nuclear weapons when we have over 8,000 of them—Russia 7,000, China 250—do we really need to spend the money there, or do we need to spend it on our economic activity, as the gentleman just said?

There is not enough money in the Corps of Engineers' budget to provide for all of the ports, all of the improvements that are needed, so that our ports on the west coast, the east coast, gulf coast can be competitive. Apparently, we have enough money.

Why don't we take some money out of this program and put it where it will be immediately beneficial? It's a matter of priorities. Where your money is is where your heart is. Okay. That's not where my heart is.

You talked about all-of-the-above energy. We ought to talk about all-of-the-above energy. Yet, ARPA–E, where we create the new science, the new technology, the new programs that will provide us with new energy sources, improved energy sources, and the improvement of all energy sources—gutted, gutted; an 87 percent reduction. The Office of Science, where we do real research, where we really can do all-of-the-above, whether it is coal or oil or renewables—gutted; a 73 percent reduction.

Where are our priorities? Where are the priorities of the House of Representatives? Is it to build more nuclear weapons that by the grace of God we will never use—8,000 of them? Or is it to build a levee? Or is it to make sure the researchers at our universities and laboratories have the money that they need to really deal with the problem of the future, which is climate change?

□ 1500

It's about priorities.

Madam Chair, it's about priorities, and through you, of course, I ask my colleagues: What are the priorities? They are listed very clearly in your legislation.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would just like to reclaim a couple of seconds here and place on the record that, as to the Army Corps of Engineers, the gentleman is correct. If we look back to the years 2011 and 2012, the bills terminated or suspended over 300 projects across this country. That is not an insignificant number. That is a very significant number. It's one of the reasons that we weren't able to put in New START, because we've got so many other wounded and casualties standing in line, waiting for assistance across the country, including the communities you represent.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you.

I might just point out that, with sequestration this year, we took $250 million out of the Corps of Engineers' budget, so we're building on a lower base. This is going to be tragedy and tragic—but, Madam Chair, these are our priorities. Oh, excuse me. These are not my priorities. These are the majority's priorities.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Madam Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to come down and speak about a very important issue that I know is important to you as well as to myself.

The Great Lakes are facing a crisis right now. The Great Lakes Navigation System is a critical international waterway that extends from the western part of Lake Superior. In fact, that point in the western part of Lake Superior is further west than St. Louis, Missouri—the Gateway to the West—and it extends all the way along the Saint Lawrence Seaway to the Atlantic Ocean, which is a distance of over 2,400 miles.

The U.S. portion of the system includes 140 harbors, 60 of which are deemed as commercial and 80 as recreational and harbors of refuge, and it includes over 600 miles of maintained navigation channels. The system can handle 200 million tons of cargo that generate and sustain nearly 130,000 good-paying jobs in the eight Great Lakes States, not to mention what happens to our friends to the north and east and in the Canadian provinces and how important that relationship is with the trade that goes on. While the Army Corps of Engineers' national Operations and Maintenance account has increased by 20 percent from 1995 through 2012, the annual budget for the Corps' maintenance of harbors and navigation channels in the Great Lakes has remained virtually unchanged during that same period.

We all know of the challenges we are facing as a Nation financially—fiscally—but that, Madam Chair, does not seem right or fair to me, and it certainly is not an acknowledgment of the importance of the Great Lakes to our vital economy.

There are 18 million cubic yards of sediment right now clogging the Great Lakes' ports and waterways, which has reduced the amount of cargo shipped by over 500,000 tons over the course of the navigation season. To put this number into context, I own a gravel pit. I have dump trucks that go out and around. A normal-sized, standard dump truck is 10 yards. To put it in context, 18 million yards of sediment would be like 1.8 million dump truck loads of sediment that is out there right now.

In fiscal year '12, the Corps received $45 million for maintenance dredging and $95 million for navigation structure maintenance in the Great Lakes, but it's going to cost more than $200 million to restore ports and waterways to what their designed depths and widths are. In order to make up that shortfall, the State of Michigan recently authorized over $20 million—State funds only—in emergency dredging funds to ensure that commerce, tourism, and jobs remained available in port cities, big and small.

I commend the State of Michigan. However, the Federal Government has a constitutional requirement to maintain interstate commerce through those ports in and among the States as well as internationally. The funds that come from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are paid for as a user fee of 0.125 percent on the value of cargo shipped. In the previous year, that equated to $1.7 billion which was paid into the fund, but only $804 million was used for the dredging and maintenance of our harbors because the trust fund, frankly, has been raided over the years to pay for other projects and unrelated projects sometimes.

I would like to thank my colleague for working towards a solution to this problem by reprioritizing spending, which is really what this is all about. We know that we have to reprioritize and reflect a $1 billion disbursement from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to the bill and encourage funding in the future.

I know that there is some specific language. Madam Chair, had I been able to have been down here, I would have offered an amendment that would have clarified our making sure that $30 million that is put in for small ports and subsistence ports would have been more clear. In the meantime, we must act before the crisis in the Great Lakes grows worse.

So I thank my friend from New Jersey for the work that he has done on this bill. While I would prefer more clarity, I am satisfied with the intent of the committee to help our ports, big and small.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for being a strong advocate for sufficiently maintaining his waterways and the Nation's waterways. These ports and channels are very important, not only to the Great Lakes' economy, but to our national economy, and I want to commend him for his attention to the needs of his constituents. He is extremely knowledgeable from a professional point of view and certainly as a Member of Congress, who voted to the needs of his constituents.

The committee has heard from many Members, including from those from the Great Lakes, who are concerned that the administration's budget processing has left small, remote, subsistence ports across the Nation unable to continue to conduct business due to inadequate or oftentimes nonexistent maintenance. These are what prompted the committee to include a minimum of $30 million to be made available to such ports. The Great Lakes' ports will certainly be eligible for this funding. I believe our bill addresses his concerns to the greatest priority possible in light of other priorities which he mentioned in our bill, which are, obviously, balancing the Federal budget and controlling spending.

I want to thank our colleague for bringing the concerns of the Great Lakes' ports to our attention. We will do our level best to work with the gentleman. We honor his request.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 103. None of the funds in this Act, or previous Acts, making funds available for Energy and Water Development, shall be used to award any continuing contract that commits additional funding from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund unless or until such time that a long-term mechanism to enhance revenues in this Fund sufficient to meet the cost-sharing authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–662) is enacted.

SEC. 104. Not later than 120 days after the date of the Chief of Engineers Report on a water resource matter, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) shall submit the report to the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees of the Congress.

SEC. 105. During the fiscal year period covered by this Act, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to implement measures recommended in the efficacy study authorized

under section 3061 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–114; 121 Stat. 1121) or in interim reports, with such modifications or emergency measures as the Secretary of the Army determines to be appropriate, to prevent aquatic nuisance species from dispersing into the Great Lakes by way of any hydrologic connection between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River Basin.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 21, after the period insert the following: ''Further, the Army Corps of Engineers, in coordination with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and the United States Geological Survey, shall lead a multiagency effort to slow the spread of Asian Carp in the Ohio River basin and tributaries by providing high-level technical assistance, coordination, best practices, and support to State and local government strategies to slow, and eventually eliminate, the threat posed by Asian Carp. To the maximum extent practicable, the multiagency effort shall apply lessons learned and best practices such as those developed under the Management and Control Plan for Bighead, Black, Grass, and Silver Carps in the United States, November 2007, and the Asian Carp Control Strategic Framework.''.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, part of the district that I represent is Lake Erie. I also have the Ohio River Watershed. My amendment would have allowed the Army Corps to combat the Asian carp in the Ohio River.

There are over 30 States affected by Asian carp, and this invasive fish is already throughout the Midwest. This is about protecting our regional economy, the fishing industry, and the livelihoods of all of us who rely on the water for our jobs.

This invasive species significantly alters the habitat. It crowds out native fish, and it is also a threat to boaters. I've worked very closely with Senator TOOMEY, with the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission, as well as with legislators who represent that potentially affected area, to both study and develop plans of action to deal with this invasive species. This is what we understand:

Under just one measure, the Great Lakes fisheries generate U.S. economic activity of approximately $7 billion annually, and our native fish populations, like walleye, perch, and lake herring, would be devastated by the Asian carp establishment, threatening this industry and the livelihoods of all of those who depend on this ecosystem's health.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to bring this forward, and I hope, in the future, we can take a look at it.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I seek to identify my side with the gentleman's remarks on the importance of the Asian carp issue to the freshwater lakes of our country and certainly to Lake Erie. He and I share that. The lake is neither Republican nor Democratic. It is the largest fishery in the entire Great Lakes system, which contains 20 percent of the world's fresh surface water, and Lake Erie actually has more fish than all of the other Great Lakes combined.

Honestly, this Asian carp threat is truly a nightmare for those people and the multibillion-dollar industries—the maritime industry, our fisheries, our tourism centers. I especially appreciate the gentleman's desire to have a multiagency effort and more dispatch within the executive branch to deal with the possibility of these fish, these very destructive fish, coming in and destroying our perch, our walleye—our native fish. It is a very, very worrisome invasive species to our lakes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I want to thank you very much for your comments. The gentlelady from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) is also very aware of this.

I think all of us who represent the Great Lakes area understand the danger that this fish is bringing into our Great Lakes and into the fishing industry. It is unbelievable the amount of damage that's being done, not only to the fishing industry, but also to boaters. For anybody who has seen film, this is a fish that actually comes out of the water and goes after boaters. It gets very easily aggravated. Now, you don't have to have a motor on the boat—you can be paddling the boat—and this fish will come out of the water and hit people. I have seven grandchildren whom I take out with me from time to time. The oldest one is 8 years old. These are small people. This fish is 70 pounds when it reaches its full maturity. It is a voracious eater. It is going to totally take over the Great Lakes, and it will ruin our fishing industry.

So I can't tell you how much I appreciate your comments and your concern. Also, I know this is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. This is an American issue that has to be looked into, and I thank you very much for your comments.

Ms. KAPTUR. In reclaiming my time, I have the desire to work with the gentleman in any way possible.

Literally, the gentleman is right. This fish is like a guided missile except there are millions of them, and until you actually see it happen, you don't believe it. It's like some kind of movie—''The Twilight Zone''—except it's real. It came from the aquaculture industry down in Mississippi, which had an accident, and they brought these fish in to do the cleaning in the fish tanks. Yet, when the walls were breached, they started swimming north in the Mississippi River, and now they are about 30 miles from the Chicago harbor and through the ship canal there. They are about 30 miles from there, but they're coming up into the St. Joseph River in Indiana. They've caught some there. We don't know about the Ohio River, but the Maumee River, which I represent—the largest river that flows into the Great Lakes—is a spawning area for walleye, for example, and this species is really a predator, one that could wipe out our entire multibillion-dollar fishing industry in the Great Lakes.

□ 1515

There is no scientific solution at this point. So I hope the administration is hearing us. I hope the Army Corps and the Department of the Interior and others are hearing us. Our country needs a real solution to prevent the spread of this predator into our freshwater lakes, and it is an unsolved challenge for the Nation.

So I thank the gentleman so much for coming to the floor today. You have my full support. I know the chairman of the full committee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, will work with us in any way possible.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 106. As of the date of enactment of this Act and each fiscal year hereafter, the Secretary of the Army may transfer to the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service may accept and expend, such funds as the Secretary and the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service determine to be necessary to mitigate for fisheries lost due to Corps of Engineers projects, except that in no event may the amount of funds transferred pursuant to this section during any fiscal year exceed the amount identified for such purpose in the report accompanying the appropriations for that fiscal year.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act making appropriations for Energy and Water Development may be used by the Corps of Engineers to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations and guidance in effect on October 1, 2012, pertaining to the definition of waters under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), including the provisions of the rules dated November 13, 1986, and August 25, 1993, relating to such jurisdiction, and the guidance documents dated January 15, 2003, and December 2, 2008, relating to such jurisdiction.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 11, beginning on line 8, strike section 107.

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, I just want to say Asian carp, is a very troubling situation. In fact, we've got the snakeheads in this part of the country that can walk on dry land from river to river and pond to pond. Something's happening, and it's not good. But I'm glad that the issue was raised.

Madam Chairwoman, I do have an amendment with our colleague, JOHN DINGELL. The amendment simply strikes section 107 of this bill. The reason for doing that is that section 107 would prevent the Corps of Engineers from updating regulations and guidance defining what waters and wetlands are subject to the Clean Water Act.

Even though everyone, including the building industry, agrees there's confusion regarding what waters fall under Federal jurisdiction, section 107 would deliberately continue this confusion. In fact, many private commercial interests have gone on record in support of clarifying the term ''waters of the United States,'' but that clarification would be prohibited under section 107 of this bill.

Madam Chairwoman, there have been two Supreme Court cases on this subject: Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County in 2001 and Rapanos in 2006. Combined, these two rulings have created confusion and uncertainty regarding the limits of the Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act. In layman's terms, the Court called into question the Federal Government's jurisdiction the further away the water was from where you could float a boat all year long. In both cases, though, a majority of the Court could not agree on where Federal jurisdiction should end. Intermittent streams and rivers that only flow seasonally, are they under Federal jurisdiction? Sixty percent of all stream miles in the lower 48 States fall into the category of intermittent or ephemeral; in other words, they don't exist for some part of the year, yet they receive 40 percent of all individual wastewater discharges.

Even more importantly, more than 117 million Americans get some of their drinking water from these very streams that don't flow year round. Section 107 of this bill, though, would ensure that these sources of drinking water remain at increased risk of pollution. And with rising temperatures, more severe droughts and climate change, the protection of our waters and wetlands are a greater concern than ever. That's why I mentioned the Asian carp and the snakeheads. Extreme things are happening, but the most important thing that's happening is that climate change is creating a very extreme threat to every American, and we're seeing it in bodies of water across the country.

Before my colleague suggests that we shouldn't worry about climate change, that the States have authority in the absence of Federal authority, I should tell my friends that that argument doesn't hold water in States that use the Federal definition to run their program. Forty-eight States share common water bodies. Without Federal jurisdiction, no State can tell an upstream State what to do unless we have a baseline minimum Federal standard that all States must abide by.

Through a public comment process and appropriate congressional oversight, we can allow the administration to finalize its guidance and eventually move forward on a formal rulemaking process, or Congress could define navigable water ourselves. But why would this Congress do its job when it can complain about the administration not doing its job?

Madam Chairwoman, 2 years ago, the Court and EPA issued a draft guidance to provide additional clarity on this issue. They took public comment on the draft for 90 days and received over 230,000 comments on the guidance, comments that were overwhelmingly favorably. The draft guidance provides a more predictable and consistent procedure for identifying waters and wetlands protected under the Clean Water Act. It focuses on protecting smaller waterways that keep downstream water safe from upstream pollutants and on protecting adjacent wetlands that filter pollution and store waters and help keep communities safe from floods. The guidance also maintains all of the existing exemptions for agricultural discharges and identifies specific types of water bodies to which it does not apply, areas like artificial lakes and ponds and many types of drainage and irrigation ditches.

It does not extend Federal protection to any waters not historically protected under the Clean Water Act, and it's fully consistent with the law and the decisions and instructions of the Supreme Court. So I think we should let the administration go forward, provide greater clarity, and we can only do that by striking section 107.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment to strike section 107 of the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill.

Section 107 prohibits the Corps of Engineers from developing, adopting, implementing, administrating, or enforcing any change to the Corps and EPA rules and guidance defining the waters of the United States. This provision is aimed at the so-called ''guidance'' which the Environmental Protection Agency and the Corps of Engineers have developed to expand the extent of waters covered by the Clean Water Act. This so-called guidance goes far beyond merely clarifying the scope of waters subject to the Clean Water Act programs. This guidance has been sitting around for nearly 3 years and is acting as de facto law.

By the agency's own admission, the guidance would substantially change Federal policy with respect to which waters fall under the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act and significantly increase the scope of the Federal Government's power to regulate waters and land associated with those waters.

The effect of the guidance will be to reverse the decisions by the United States Supreme Court that recognized limits to the Federal Government's regulatory authority and to undermine the longstanding Federal-State partnership in the regulation of waters. This expansion has resulted in confusion, permitting delays, and added costs and burdens for communities, farmers, small businessmen, industries, and other Americans.

The administration has issued this so-called ''guidance'' and has refused to go to the rulemaking process, which violates the principles of the Administrative Procedures Act, the APA, and the intent of Congress when they enacted the law. The APA sets the standards for the activities and rulemaking for all Federal regulatory agencies and is designed to ensure those Federal agencies use open, uniform, and fair procedures. The requirements of the APA are not mere formalities.

In unilaterally developing its guidance, the administration has ignored calls from the State agencies and environmental groups, as well as Members of Congress, including almost half the Members of the House of Representatives, to proceed through the normal rulemaking procedures and has avoided consulting with the States, which are the Federal agency partners, in implementing the Clean Water Act.

This amendment condones the administration's willingness to ignore the requirements of the APA and supports the administration's Federal jurisdictional power grab under the Clean Water Act.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chairwoman, if you like confusion, keep the status quo and oppose the amendment.

If you want to get clarity and you want to understand and you want to get investment and progress and if you want to have people understand what the law is, support the amendment.

The proposal that has been put forward by the Corps of Engineers is clarity itself. It does not change the decision wrongly made by the Supreme Court, no matter how much I might dislike that decision. What it does is it allows people to know what the law is as set forth by the Supreme Court. Foreclosing the Corps of Engineers from carrying out its proper responsibilities under the law going back before 1899 is an act of extraordinary unwisdom and stupidity. My colleagues on the other side do not understand the issue. The simple fact of the matter is all this does is to allow the Corps of Engineers to tell the people of the United States what the law is with regard to what is navigable waters that may be affected by pollution, ditching, draining, and doing other things.

So when you vote to strike this section, you are not changing the law; you are allowing the Corps of Engineers to set forth what the rules happen to be, and you're allowing the Supreme Court to bring clarity to the decisionmaking of the United States and seeing to it that people may then go forward and invest and do the other things that are necessary in the light of the decision of the Supreme Court, which again, I repeat, is not changed, not by the amendment which is offered by my friend from Virginia.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by Mr. MORAN of Virginia because it brings clarity to a confused situation, and it makes plain and apparent what the law is.

So if you want to get progress so that people will know how they're going to invest in doing things that affect their property and the waters of the United States, supporting the amendment is the way to do it; and failing to support the amendment is to ensure that confusion will continue to exist and that businesses, industry, and the communities of the United States that need to act upon the waters to see to it that they are protected and that they are preserved, you're seeing to it by opposing the amendment that that cannot be done.

The Supreme Court was wrong in the decision which they made. I was here on the floor when we agreed that the navigable waters are all of the waters of the United States. The Supreme Court was either too ignorant or too lazy to bother reading that particular debate, but the legislative history of the law is clear. And I repeat, this does not move us back to the old way, and it does not change the unfortunate decision of the Supreme Court. What it does is it ensures that for the first time since this kind of amendment was offered on the floor, that we are able to finally begin to move forward to deal with the law as it affects navigability, the Clean Water Act, and the other things which are so important both to protecting our waters and to ensuring that business and industry may invest with a clear understanding of what the law is.

To oppose this amendment is to ensure that there will be more litigation, which will cause more obfuscation and delay and more difficulty in terms of achieving our purpose of having American citizens be able to enjoy the water in accordance with the law as the Corps of Engineers will set it out so that everyone will know what the law is rather than the Congress stultifying the law and seeing to it that we're incapable of having a clear pronouncement of what the law is as made by the agency which has the responsibility to do so under the law.

□ 1530

I urge you to support the amendment. I urge you to strike section 107, and I urge you to get this country going forward on a very important matter which is being thoroughly obfuscated by a lot of people who know nothing about the matter. I urge adoption of the amendment and the striking of the section.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Moran-Dingell amendment which will protect not only the Clean Water Act but also the power and integrity of the United States Congress.

When the Clean Water Act was passed, I stood on the floor of this House and explained the intent of the Conference Report on the Clean Water Act. I said, "the conference bill defines the term 'navigable waters' broadly for water quality purposes. It means all 'the waters of the United States' in a geographical sense. It does not mean the 'navigable waters of the United States' in the narrow technical sense we sometimes see in some laws."

In 2006, the Supreme Court wrongly restricted the original Congressional intent of the Federal government's authority under the Clean Water Act. The Supreme Court completely ignored Congress' intent to provide a broader definition of "U.S. waters" and instead upended 35 years of precedence simply because they refused to review the facts.

But the issue before us today is not whether or not you agree with the Clean Water Act. The question is, simply: Is the Corps of Engineers going to be able to tell people what the law is and how it is to be interpreted by the Corps and how citizens will then have to behave?

Under the law, our amendment simply says the Corps may inform people of what the law, as set forth in the Supreme Court's rulings, means. I think that is something which is important in terms of seeing to it that people may go forward with their planning, with economic development and everything of that sort.

In light of the Supreme Court's misguided decision, the Army Corps of Engineers is working on updated guidelines that will take into account the decision of the Court and define what their new jurisdiction will be under the Clean Water Act. This is not a massive expansion of power by the Corps as some would have you believe. This is simply attempting to comply with the Supreme Court's decision.

By preventing the Corps from spending any funds to implement these new guidelines, this House would be casting a pall of uncertainty over the country. If someone wants to build a home or new business near a wetland or other body of water, do they need to consult with the Army Corps of Engineers before doing so? The language in this bill would not answer that question and would likely lead to more costs on that homeowner or businessperson in legal and court fees. The language in this bill would certainly lead to more court battles and create a wonderful mess that would lead to lawyers making plenty of money.

To say anything else about this legislation is either to be misled or to mislead. I would beg my colleagues to vote in favor of the intelligent approach of seeing to it that we are going to allow people to know what the law is and allow the Corps of Engineers to set out what the law is for the benefit of business, industry, and people.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, Mr. MORAN and I have had this discussion six or seven times on this very amendment over the past few years; and, once again, I rise to oppose it. Contrary to what the gentleman from Michigan just said, I do understand the issue; and, frankly, understanding it is why I am opposed to it.

In 2006, the Supreme Court determined that the EPA and the Corps of Engineers did not have the authority to regulate nonnavigable waters under the Clean Water Act. Now, you might disagree with that Supreme Court decision. Tough luck. They made the decision, and we follow the decisions of the Supreme Court.

In accordance with this decision, the term "navigable waters" has long been the phrase used to limit Federal intrusion with regard to the Clean Water Act's authority. Nonnavigable waters are currently regulated by the States. Everybody who stands up and talks assumes that if it is a nonnavigable water that nobody is regulating it. In fact, the States are regulating those things.

However, last year the Corps of Engineers and the EPA issued guidance that would expand the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act to nonnavigable, intrastate waters, effectively resulting in a massive expansion of the Federal Government's authority to increase the number of waters subject to the water quality standards—including irrigation canals, ponds, drainage ditches, and other things.

Deciding how water is used should be the responsibility of State and local officials who are familiar with the people and local issues. If all intrastate waters are regulated by the Federal Government, the language could be broadly interpreted to include everything within a State, including groundwater.

As a result, the reach of the Federal jurisdiction would be so broad that it could significantly restrict landowners' ability to make decisions about their own property and local government's ability to plan for their own development.

The language in the bill protects the authority of the States to prevent the Army Corps from expanding its regulations to include intrastate bodies of water under the Clean Water Act for any reason other than drinking water standards.

Clarity is needed on this issue, and the gentleman from Michigan mentioned clarity. But I will tell you, clarity simply for clarity's sake is not an answer. Death is a clarity. It's not necessarily the outcome you want, though.

So doing this just so you have clarity in it is not the right direction to go. Congress does need to provide that clarity, but not the agencies through the regulatory process. The Supreme Court has already determined that the Army Corps does not have the authority to do what it is proposing, and I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment offered by my good friend from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I hope to provide some clarity to this by quoting directly from the guidance that the agency has given us. Now, it's important to remember that this is guidance, not a rule. The Obama administration, President Obama has repeatedly and proudly said that if Congress won't act, he will. Last week he said he was going to stand up and, through executive order, do all that he can to try to bring carbon emissions under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and try to restrict CO_2 by executive order.

Here the Obama administration is doing what the law says it can't do, and that is expand the jurisdiction of the EPA and the Army Corps by guidance, not by using a rule. The law says they have to issue a rule, get public input, have hearings. Here they simply got a bunch of their lawyers together and issued guidance to their agencies around the country. And to quote directly from the guidance, the Obama administration directs:

The agencies to interpret waters in the region to be the watershed boundary defined by the geographic area that drains to the nearest downstream traditional navigable water or interstate water through a single point of entry.

The geographic boundary, every stream, every rivulet, no matter how vertical it is, the Supreme Court and the statute said the EPA is limited to regulating navigable waters. The way this reads, literally, the EPA and the Army Corps now, through this guidance, have the authority to regulate every single stream of water that drains in the geographic area, in the watershed boundary, that drains to the nearest traditional navigable water.

That is an incredible expansion of Federal power. As the gentleman from Idaho quite correctly said, this was done outside of the normal rulemaking process because the Obama administration knew that the public would overwhelmingly disapprove of this, that the Congress would disapprove of this, that this goes beyond what the Supreme Court intended, that this goes beyond what the law allows, so they did it through the back door using lawyers and bureaucrats to write a 33-page document that you literally have to go to the back end of to learn that they are attempting to exercise jurisdiction over every stream of water in the geographic area that drains to the nearest navigable waterway.

That's why Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Chairman ROGERS included this language to cut off funding for the implementation of this rule, because we've discovered that the Obama administration will do whatever they want, regardless of the Constitution. They ignore subpoenas. They ignore congressional hearings. They ignore letters from Congress. They ignore everything except when you cut off the money. That's the only way to make the Obama administration follow the law.

Vote against this amendment to ensure that the Obama administration follows the law and that we protect private property rights and keep the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers off of people's private property across America. I urge Members to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I support the gentleman's amendment. I have been listening to the debate and thinking we're a great Nation because we figured out how to build a nation. We had 13 Colonies. And then, miraculously, somehow, through the Northwest Ordinance and other means, we added more States and we figured out where their boundaries were. Sadly, Michigan and Ohio had to fight a little war on a piece of territory between us, but we even got that figured out. Then, golly, you know, we sort of expanded. Even Alaska became a State. As we became more adult as a Nation, we figured out where the watersheds were. We even have maps for watersheds in our country. We've always been a country that is a can-do Nation, not a can't-do Nation.

So I believe the amendment takes America in an important direction by allowing the Corps the needed flexibility to deal with real confusion that has reigned in the wake of two Supreme Court decisions and, frankly, climate change. As water distribution changes around our country, we are moving into a different era, if anybody cares to open their eyes and look at what is happening across our country.

Without this amendment, the bill would result in increased implementation costs to Federal and State resource agencies, as well as to the regulated community, increased delays in the implementation of important public works projects, and protracted litigation on the disparity between existing Federal regulations and the two court decisions.

Further, the current provision does not apply to just this year; it applies to any subsequent energy and water development act, ensuring the uncertainty continues indefinitely.

How is that good for anything? Why is can't do better than can do?

Let's provide clarity. Let's provide some certainty to the market. We should be allowing the Corps to take actions that address the Supreme Court's rulings, bringing clarity and certainty to the regulatory process, not prolonging the confusion, further delay, further uncertainty. How does that help anything, regardless of what region of the country you live in? I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VALADAO. This amendment puts a lot of my district in jeopardy. My district relies heavily on irrigation and canals and other types of water projects. When you see a government agency, an unelected government agency come in and take jurisdiction without any of us in this body, 435 Members in this body who have a responsibility to represent our constituents and make sure that their voices are heard, when you take that power away and you give it to a bureaucracy in the dark of night where there's not an opportunity to speak their minds and have their voices heard, you set up a pretty bad precedent.

When you look at a constituency that feeds the country like we do in California on my part of the valley, we do feed a good portion of the country. We grow 350 different crops. We produce a lot of beef, poultry, and pork. All of these different products go to feed the Nation.

When you look at an idea like this which a lot of my constituents or most of my constituents all oppose, we're setting up for a really bad idea. So this should be presented and it should be talked about amongst the 435, not one agency, not one President pushing an idea. So, obviously, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chair, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by my friend from Virginia, and I do so for three reasons, and I believe that the previous speakers on our side have listed these reasons, but I wanted to just

drive these points. There are three of them.

Number one, it does cede a tremendous amount of power to the executive branch. It is clear that this administration prefers to bypass Congress every chance it gets and cede things to an unelected bureaucracy. And in this case, this is a tremendous decision that the bureaucracy would be making instead of the elected representatives in the House and the Senate.

Mr. CULBERSON actually quoted part of it. He said that the agencies will interpret in the regions such proximate other waters to be the watershed boundary defined by the geographic area that drains to the nearest downstream navigational or interstate water through a single point of entry.

So in my district where we have the Savannah River and the St. Mary's River, the Ogeechee River, the Altamaha River and the Ohoopee, it would appear that the entire district, which I represent in coastal Georgia, would come under this new permitting process if the bureaucrats and if Mr. MORAN had his way. I'm against that. If that's going to happen, let the legislative branch debate it and then send it to the executive branch.

Number two, if you do so, all you're going to do is have more busybody bureaucrats in our lives interfering with job creation and interfering with progress in general.

You know, my area of the Savannah River was authorized in the 1999 WRDA Act to dredge the river. It took 13 years for four Federal agencies to sign off on the dredging even though we have been dredging the Savannah River ever since Oglethorpe sailed up it in 1733; but it took our government, four Federal agencies, 13 years to give us a record of decision.

During that period of time, China started to build a port that is now bigger than the Port of Savannah. They started from scratch to finish, and here we are supposed to be competing in a world marketplace, but that's the kind of permitting process and delays that the bureaucracies cause us.

I would rather leave these waters under State jurisdiction than the Federal Government.

Number three and finally, it's vague. It's totally vague. Anytime the Federal bureaucrats with their unlimited bank accounts get involved in rulemaking, they can run the clock. They can charge up the permitting, the lawyer fees, do everything they want.

I will ask a question of my friend from Virginia. Can you tell me what ''significant nexus to navigable waters'' means? Does anybody know what that means? I can promise you, 435 people in this body would have a different definition as to what a ''significant nexus to navigable waters'' means.

We do not need this executive branch and this administration to have more power. This is the crowd that brought you the IRS and the AP scandals. This is the crowd that brought you Fast and Furious. Do you really want them to have more power to interpret laws? I think not. I fear they would use that kind of authority to reward their friends and punish their enemies.

For these three reasons, Madam Chair, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1545

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 108. Section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–676; 102 Stat. 4013) is amended by striking ''$775,000,000'' each place it appears and inserting ''$2,918,000,000''.

SEC. 109. (a) Section 1001(17)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–114; 121 Stat. 1052) is amended—

(1) by striking ''$125,270,000'' and inserting ''$152,510,000'';

(2) by striking ''$75,140,000'' and inserting ''$92,007,000''; and

(3) by striking ''$50,130,000'' and inserting ''$60,503,000''.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as of November 8, 2007.

SEC. 110. The authorization under the heading ''Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana'', in section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–662; 100 Stat. 4115), as modified by section 127 of Public Law 109–103 (119 Stat. 2259), is further modified to authorize completion of the project at a total cost of $269,988,000 with an estimated Federal cost of $202,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $67,188,000.

SEC. 111. During fiscal year 2014, the limitation relating to total project costs in section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280) shall not apply with respect to any project that receives funds made available by this title.

SEC. 112. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act making appropriations for Energy and Water Development for any fiscal year may be used by the Corps of Engineers to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations in effect on October 1, 2012, pertaining to the definitions of the terms ''fill material'' or ''discharge of fill material'' for the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, beginning on line 1, strike section 112.

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, my colleague, JOHN DINGELL and I have another amendment that strikes, in this case, section 112 of this bill because section 112 would prevent the Corps of Engineers from updating regulationsdefining the terms ''fill material'' or ''discharge of fill material'' for the purposes of the Clean Water Act.

Presently, the Army Corps issues a section 404 permit if the ''fill material'' discharged into a water body raises the bottom elevation of that water body or converts an area to dry land.

When Congress first enacted the Clean Water Act, and that's why Mr. DINGELL is so concerned about this, the 404 permit process was supposed to be used for certain construction projects, like bridges and roads, where raising the bottom elevation of a water body or converting an area into dry land was simply unavoidable.

But then, some clever attorneys in the George W. Bush administration found a way to allow mining waste to be dumped into rivers and streams without a rigorous environmental review process. They simply changed the definition of what qualifies as ''fill material.''

Under a 2002 rule change, the Bush administration broadened that definition to, and I'd put this in quotes, ''include rock, sand, soil, clay, plastics, construction debris, wood chips, overburden from mining or other excavation activities.''

Now, these guidelines are simply not well-suited for evaluating the environmental effects of discharging hazardous waste, such as mining refuse and similar materials, into a water body or wetland.

When Congress first enacted the Clean Water Act, and for the first 30 years of its passage, the law helped keep America's lakes, rivers and streams safe from mining pollution, protected wildlife and drinking water. But that's no longer the case today.

Perhaps it would come as no surprise to many that, in 2009, the Supreme Court upheld this newer, broader definition of ''fill material'' that was adopted by the executive branch in 2002. The Court allowed this new definition to be used for a Kensington mining operation near Lower Slate Lake in Alaska.

I want to point out this anecdotal example, although it's a very important one. So the permit allowed the discharge of toxic wastewater from a gold ore processing mill to go, untreated, directly into the lake, despite the fact that the discharge violates EPA standards for the mining industry. Today, all of Lower Slate Lake's fish and aquatic life is gone, dead.

Now, Madam Chair, that's why we raise this amendment to strike section 112, which would permanently preclude the Corps from considering any regulatory changes to the current definition and permit process. I would

note that, to much of the environmental community's frustration, the Corps hasn't issued any regulations to change the definition of ''fill material'' or ''discharge of fill material.''

You can go back to that language that came about as a result of that clever change in 2002. You can find no effort by the Corps to change it, and the Corps hasn't expressed any plans to do so. That's disappointing.

But since there is no time limit on the provision in this appropriations bill, it would not only block the current administration but any future administration from considering any changes, even one less sympathetic to the adverse health and environmental consequences of discharging hazardous waste into our drinking water.

Madam Chair, this provision that's in this bill is intended to be a preemptive strike against protecting our drinking water. We should not be putting this kind of legislation onto an appropriations bill, particularly when it has such adverse consequences to the future health of our population. And that's why I would urge my colleagues to join me in removing this section from this appropriations bill.I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chair, I stand in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend from Virginia, and I want to start out by clarifying something that was said a minute ago, that this was done by clever Bush administration lawyers. In fact, it was a rule proposed by President Clinton. That would be Democrat President Clinton, a rule proposed by Democrat President Clinton.

Now, there was a public comment period. It wasn't done in the dark of the night, but it was done with public comments, and the rule was changed in 2002, which is true that President Bush would have been the President during that time period. But it was an ongoing and a slow and deliberate process, and it was simply a commonsense need that was something that I think was pro-business, which I understand is offensive to some people.

But it also streamlines the bureaucracy and helps the private sector create jobs. And all it simply did was get the Corps of Engineers and the EPA to have the same definition of fill. That's not a radical concept. That's common sense. And again, if we're going to compete in the world marketplace, we should have common sense, even with Washington bureaucrats.

Now, the definition includes materials that, when placed into the waters of the U.S., have the effect of replacing or changing the bottom elevation of any portion of that water. Therefore, it includes rock, sand, soil, clay, plastics, construction debris, wood chips, and overburden from mining.

These are regulated right now. They're not exempt from this. It simply says that the EPA and the Corps of Engineers would use the same definition. So I stand in opposition to this.

And I do not think that this is the purpose of the gentleman's amendment, but I do worry that, as this administration seems to have an open war going on on coal, is this perhaps part of it? Not necessarily this amendment, but the thinking that two different agencies can now get on a different sheet in terms of what a definition is and, therefore, one agency can be more proactive in slowing up progress and activities of which you don't approve.

There is an estimation that if this was to happen, 375,000 jobs in the mining business could be jeopardized. Now, I understand, this administration doesn't like mining, but for the rest of us who use the products in the United States of America, this is something that is significant and disturbing; 375,000 jobs in what we have called an anemic recovery already.

So I believe that the responsible thing for us to do is to reject this amendment and say that, if this definition does need to be changed, let it not be done by bureaucrats, and let it not be done by lawyers either, but let it be done by the elected representatives, both Democrat and Republican, of the American people, and let 218 of us in the House have a ''yes'' or a ''no'' vote, and then 51 in the Senate, and then send it to the White House for signature, rather than have unelected bureaucrats whom no one knows make these very important significant legal decisions for us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by my good friend from Virginia. I urge them to strike section 112.

There's no one in this Chamber that owns this world. We borrow it from those who come behind us in the future, and we owe them a duty to see to it that we return it in proper form.

The bill, as drafted, forbids the Federal Government from seeing to it that all manner of defilement is not dumped into the navigable waters of the United States. This is having an appalling consequence, destroying waters, killing fish, polluting the water sources of our communities and cities. But beyond that, it's doing something else.

A race of unscrupulous people are sawing the tops off our mountains in the Appalachians and other places, and they're taking that spoil and dropping it in river valleys and filling them up, the result of which is that the water flowing through that valley becomes highly acidic, and it produces severe danger, not just to fish and wildlife, but to human beings. These are the waters of the United States that are being defiled.

The amendment would at least afford a moderate level of authority to the Federal Government, which has always been that authority of the Federal Government, to protect one of the greatest treasures this Nation has: its flowing waters.

My colleagues on the other side think that that is a question of jobs. We're going to mine, and we should, but we should do it carefully and wisely and well, with due attention to the future and to our trusteeship of the world that we love.

We do not have the right to defile our waters. We have a duty to protect this land and to see to it that it is returned to future generations of Americans in as good a shape as we have found it, and perhaps, if we can, in a better shape.

What they have done is to change the situation, where now almost anything goes, and the result is a calamity for the future of the United States.

Water is one of the next coming great shortages of this Nation. It's something that is going to be very much missed by our future generations because we have, by adopting this bill without this amendment, defiled those waters, made them unsafe to drink and to recreate in, made them unsafe for all kinds of purposes, including even industrial use of those waters.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by my good friend from Virginia. I urge you, my dear friends and colleagues, to look to the future of the country whose custodians and trustees we are, to see to it that we return this beautiful Nation of ours to the future generations in the condition in which we found it and which is suitable and fitting to the greatest Nation in the world.

We can have mining, we can have all of the other things we need, but all we have to do, under the law, as it has been, is to do it wisely, carefully, prudently and well, with due regard for the future.

This language in the bill stricken by the amendment offered by my colleague from Virginia would defile those waters and defile the future of this Nation.

I beg you, support the amendment. I beg you, strike the section. I beg you, be good trustees of the future and of the great gifts that God has given this Nation, and to strike section 112 so that we can properly protect one of the great blessings that this Nation has, an abundance of water, which the language of the bill, as now drawn, will defile and destroy.

And people in the Appalachians will curse us for what we have done to them by filling stream valleys with muck and corruption, by defiling the waters and the rivers and the streams and the lakes of the United States.

□ 1600

This is not good custodianship. This is a disregard of the greatest opportunity that we have, and that is to return to our future generations this Nation in the shape in which they will want it to be and we want it to be.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Moran-Dingell amendment that gives this and future administrations the flexibility they need should they decide to address the issue of "fill material."

While the Clean Water Act has been a success, we still have a long way to go to fulfill the promise of the Act. According to the EPA, for the first time in many years, the Nation's waters have actually started to get dirtier. The response to this disturbing news should be a renewal of the Nation's commitment to clean water. Unfortunately, the previous administration charted a different course and worked to dismantle the very tools that make the Clean Water Act work.

Through regulatory changes, the previous administration eliminated a 25-year-old ban on dumping mining and other industrial wastes into streams and wetlands, and adopted policies abandoning the long-standing national "no net loss of wetlands" goal. That administration also proposed weakening the Clean Water Act's program that guides the cleanup of polluted waters.

Congress made it clear that the Clean Water Act covers all of these waters. I know this because I was there. In 1972, I spoke on the floor of the House about Clean Water Act and stated for the legislative history that that the bill covers all the waters of the United States. What we in Congress said when the law was passed remains true today: in order for the goal of clean water to be met, all waters must be protected for water pollution to be eliminated at its sources.

We in the Congress knew in 1972, as we know now, that the purposes of the Act—to restore and maintain the integrity of the country's waters—could not be achieved if any of the nation's vital waters are removed from the law's scope.

As a conservationist, hunter and avid sportsman, I see a pressing need to protect and restore our Nation's waterways and wetlands. These valuable systems support a diverse array of migratory birds, as well as many other species of wildlife. These waters are also an integral part of the landscape that serves mankind. Wetlands help prevent floods and are natural filters, removing pollutants from drinking water.

I was proud to play a part in enacting the Clean Water Act. Prior to that landmark legislation, rivers were catching on fire and fishermen dubbed Lake Erie the Dead Sea. We have come too far to allow a roll-back. I ask my colleagues to support both Moran-Dingell amendments.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment to strike section 112 of the Energy and Water appropriations bill. The current regulatory definition of the term ''fill material'' is consistent with EPA and the Corps' longstanding practice and ensures that necessary placement of excess rock and soil generated by construction and development projects in waters in the United States are regulated by the Corps under section 404 of the Clean Water Act. This current rule brings certainty and protects the environment.

Both the EPA and the Corps have stated they are considering revising the definition of fill material. If unelected bureaucrats redefine this important definition, it would have a significant impact on the ability of all earth-moving industries, road and highway construction projects, and private and commercial enterprises to obtain vital Clean Water Act section 404 permits.

Changing the definition of fill material could result in the loss of up to 375,000 high-paying mining jobs and further this administration's assault on over 1 million jobs that are dependent on the economic output generated by these operations. Congress should therefore reject any attempts to add a new, inappropriately narrow definition of the term ''fill material'' that will not only harm existing operations but would also halt many new job-creating projects.

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

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in support of Congressman MORAN's amendment to strike section 112 and to protect the fresh waters of our Nation for future generations.

I note that many of those who have spoken in opposition to the Moran amendment do not live in parts of the country that actually would be affected by the burial of this material.

Section 112 would prohibit the Corps from amending its regulations to change the definition of fill material and discharge of fill material so that discharges of mine wastes and similar materials into the waters of the United States would be regulated under the more environmentally protective regulations and standards issued under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit program in section 402 of the Clean Water Act and administered by the States, along with EPA.

I don't know how many Members actually have had to deal with cleaning up messes in their districts. But I didn't know that, once I became a Member of Congress, how significant the work would be and what I would have to do just in my region of the country to clean up the mess from the past. Well, I've learned too much.

Maybe the districts of those who are standing up in opposition to Mr. MORAN's amendment have never had to do this. But let me tell you there are dead freshwater lakes in Ohio that are very close, in fact, to the gentleman who just spoke in opposition to Mr. MORAN's amendment. There are lakes that have been polluted and no one knows how to clean them up. I have actually had the task of representing a river that is dead with waste that's in the bottom of the river that washed out into adjoining streams in the lake and all the scientists are trying to figure out how to cap it, how to do this, how to do that with the PCBs and everything else. There are Love Canals all across this country. We have to change the way we live for the future generations of this country.

How about trying to clean up beryllium that's moving in streams and washing out and you see rising cancer rates? And why are cancer rates in certain parts of the country more than in other parts of the country? Well, it's the legacy of the past and the messes that aren't cleaned up.

How about unexploded ordnance on the bottoms of streams and rivers and lakes across this country? If you get the Department of Defense charts on what exists in this country that needs to be cleaned up, the defense cleanup costs that are necessary just across this Nation, including in some of our freshwater lakes, is staggering.

If you don't know about the problems, I'm sorry that you don't. But I don't see how adding mine waste to the rest of this mess is going to make the future better than the past.

If you think about the population of the country, we had 146 million people in the country 50, 60 years ago. Today, we have 310 million. By 2050, it's going to be 500 million. But do you know what's not going to increase? The amount of water we have. The amount of fresh water is not an infinite resource. It is absolutely finite. And it's used once and maybe it drops down again in the rain. But nobody is going to give us more water. It's either going to be snowfall or it's going to be rain, and it's going to wash into our streams and rivers. There's not going to be anymore. We're going to have five, six, seven times more people than we had in the past.

Why would we risk burying more junk in our rivers, in our streams, and throwing it out in these riverbeds around the country? If you haven't faced the task of trying to clean it up, then you shouldn't even be voting on this bill. The cost of past cleanups is enormous.

I wish I didn't have to deal with it in my region of the country. I came here to make the parks better. I came here to build better housing. I came here to create jobs. And I'm finding I have these billion-dollar cleanup jobs for which we have no money, no money to clean them up. Why would we add to the problem?

Under the current definition, such discharges are evaluated under the Clean Water Act section 404(b)(1) guidelines, which are not well suited for evaluating the environmental effects of discharging hazardous wastes like mining refuse and similar materials into

jurisdictional wetlands and waters. Further, the current provision does not apply to just this year. It applies to any subsequent energy and water development act, precluding potential changes that may be necessary to protect public health or the environment.

If you haven't seen babies that have tumors in their brains because some company buried waste in parks that those children played in, then somebody better wake up around here and change the way that we do business in this country, because we cannot do this. We cannot continue the bad practices of the past. We have to make life better for future generations that will have more pressures on them simply because of the population growth in this country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Moran amendment, and I commend him for offering it on this bill today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. I rise today in opposition to the Moran amendment.

Basically, at a May Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee hearing on water, I specifically asked the EPA's Acting Assistant Administrator for Water, Nancy Stoner, what specific problems with the current definition of fill material was prompting the agency and the Corps to examine changing their current definition. Administrator Stoner at that time did not identify any problem—this was just recently, in May—with the current definition and instead told me there were no active discussions with the Corps on revising the 2002 definition of fill material.

I do live in an area that this greatly affects. We've got a lot of water in West Virginia, by God's good grace. Given that the EPA official charged with overseeing water problems did not identify any problems with the current definition of fill material in response to a specific question from me, it is difficult for me to see why the EPA and the Corps would attempt to change an established definition.

The current definition of fill material has been in place for over a decade and provides a fair standard for protecting our water while allowing for economic activity. The 2002 definition was the result of a very lengthy rulemaking process that began under President Clinton's administration and was finalized under the Bush administration.

A balance between our economy and the environment is absolutely essential. A balance between protecting our environment and creating jobs is essential. The current definition does just that.

The Federal Government must provide regulatory certainty to job creators and not change definitions without adequate justification. If the administrator had responded differently to the question that I posed to her, I might not be standing here today with this type of opposition. But, in my view, I think that we need to oppose this amendment and keep the current definition of fill material. It's been well researched, well used. It is in effect in the State of West Virginia and is used quite a bit to continue our mining operations and to continue to keep good, solid West Virginians working.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 113. As of the date of enactment of this Act and thereafter, the Secretary of the Army shall not promulgate or enforce any regulation that prohibits an individual from possessing a firearm, including an assembled or functional firearm, at a water resources development project covered under section 327.0 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), if (1) the individual is not otherwise prohibited by law from possessing the firearm; and (2) the possession of the firearm is in compliance with the law of the State in which the water resources development project is located.

Mr. LARSEN of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Connecticut. I want to commend the gentlelady from Ohio and the gentleman from New Jersey for the debate, in general, that we've witnessed on this floor. I think we can all agree in so many respects that infrastructure is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. It's an American issue.

I come here this afternoon to reason, which is a funny word here, I guess, in Congress, but in fact is something that I think we need to do more of. I come here disheartened to see this bill come to the floor that is underinvesting in something that is as critical to the Nation as flood protection. Amongst the many infrastructure issues, it's one that imperils many districts, including my own. We have systems that are 75 years old and have not been addressed in a way that they need to be. All around us, whether it's in my district or anywhere across this country, infrastructure problems abound, whether it's roads, whether it's bridges, whether it's airports, whether it's deep harbors, whether it's school systems, or whether it's levees. They are in need of repair. They are in need of our investment as a Nation.

The great irony is that in these difficult economic times what we need is to put the country back to work. What is required for the country to go back to work is to improve the very infrastructure over which our commerce grows and flows that provides our economy with the kind of boost that it needs that puts our people back to work.

I have heard person after person on the other side get up and cite China, talking about their vast development. How has China moved forward, if not in developing its own infrastructure? Yet here in our country the neglect continues.

Congress cannot continue to sleep while our infrastructure erodes from underneath us. The levees between Hartford and East Hartford have been cited in study after study as needing attention, and the local municipalities have put in their own funding for it, but cannot possibly match what the Federal Government has required. And this is not just in my State and in my district, but all across this country.

A case in point can be made with Hurricane Sandy, where the government spent $60 billion in disaster relief by funding projects, which was the prudent thing to do. But we know that for every $1 spent in preserving and making our districts safe by improving the infrastructure, it's $4 saved in this country.

It's hard for people back in my district, and especially people who gather at Augie and Ray's, a local stand in my district where they serve hot dogs and hamburgers and coffee and breakfast in the morning, to understand why it is that Congress can't get together and reason and understand that by funding the infrastructure, not by cutting back on the Army Corps, not by continuing to cut programs that will provide funding for jobs, but by actually investing in Americans, instead of sitting idly by and watching as other nations, especially our chief competitors, invest in their own infrastructure, improve their own security, while Congress sleeps and watches the slow erosion of what was once the greatest system in the world—and still can be—if we come together and reason and invest in our systems, invest in our people, invest in our security, invest in the protection that will make sure that the American people are safe, secure and, most importantly, back to work.

□ 1615

It's neither Democrat nor Republican. It's fundamentally American.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes.

I actually wanted to come down here in support of this bill, the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. I would like to commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the entire

subcommittee on developing a strong bill that balances the needs of our Nation with fiscal responsibility.

This bill cuts spending by nearly $3 billion from FY13 enacted levels while maintaining critical funding for navigation, infrastructure, and our Nation's domestic energy needs.

One issue of particular importance to me and my home in southwest Washington is the maintenance of our waterways and small ports. Sediment buildup has essentially blocked commerce, leaving communities in Wahkiakum County, Chinook, and Ilwaco without their largest and most critical industries.

When one of these channels is blocked for communities in my district, it's no different than if a town's main highway were completely blocked or washed away. We need to treat the maintenance of our Nation's small ports with the same level of urgency.

The underlying bill makes great strides to alleviate these challenges by including $1 billion from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for Army Corps dredging and no less than $30 million specifically for small ports and waterways. While this will not completely fulfill all of our Nation's needs, it certainly illustrates the chairman's dedication and our dedication to our ports in towns and counties and States across the country like my home in southwest Washington.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am proud to have played a role in securing this funding. I strongly support the bill and encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, it has been an honor to be in this Chamber and listen to the debate that's going on.

My colleagues on the other side, their bill seeks to reduce the role that the Environmental Protection Agency would play. I hear words and phrases like ''an unelected body that makes decisions in the night for no one to see or hear.'' But, Mr. Chairman, it is not an unelected body. We have elections in our country, and we had a Presidential election; and elections have consequences. The EPA is an arm of the administration, an arm of a President who was elected with a commanding victory this past November. And to hear that this is an unelected body and work being done in the dead of night for no one else to know about is just not the case.

I urge my colleagues on the other side—I was a prosecutor. We would have a trial. I would pick a jury. We would put on evidence. I would give a closing argument. The jury would deliberate, and then we would all accept the verdict. We had the same thing for over a year. We had Presidential debate after debate, TV ads that we were all tired of. Now we have a President who was reelected and an agency that the President is charged with administrating. And it really does disturb me, Mr. Chairman, to think that these agencies shouldn't have any teeth or enforcement to protect our children and the future.

But I also rise today to express my concern about the impact that this Energy and Water appropriations bill will have on the important work that our national laboratories are doing. We depend on our national laboratories for the basic scientific research that keeps our country safe and keeps us on the cutting edge of technology.

Our national labs are home to some of the greatest minds in the country, and we all benefit greatly when we allow these great researchers the freedom to do what they were trained to do and to explore the scientific questions that they are passionate about.

I am fortunate that I am able to represent Lawrence Livermore Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratories, which are NNSA laboratories and work on maintaining our nuclear stockpile, but also are participating in research that will provide an all-of-the-above energy solution for our future.

Right now, however, this bill reduces what the laboratories call laboratory directed research and development. Laboratory directed research and development, LDRD, allows the scientists at the laboratory to work on their own experiments in addition to the work that they do at the lab. Now, in the private sector, Google really was the first company to innovate with this, they call it 20 percent time. One day out of the week an employee at Google would be able to work 20 percent of the work, 1 day, on their own projects for Google. Some of the programs that we all use, like Gmail or Picasa or Google documents came from Google's 20 percent time.

Well, the laboratory, their 20 percent time is actually, today, 8 percent time. It's LDRD. This is a way to recruit top talent and retain its scientists with a promise of being able to do publishable work in addition to their classified work. But this bill foolishly cuts LDRD time from 8 percent to 4.5 percent. This will result in less independent science research. It will hurt the ability of our classified labs to recruit and retain top talent and will surely deprive the Nation of scientific discoveries.

Additionally, I am concerned about the cuts to the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory's National Ignition Facility, also known as NIF. Over the long term, NIF is a fundamental part of providing our Nation with energy security. It also, in light of international treaties that prevent us from conducting nuclear tests below or above ground, allows us to use laser science to test and maintain our stockpile while also participating in nonproliferation programs, which makes our stockpile leaner and meaner.

America should be a leader in the area of fusion research. Russia, China, and France have accelerated investments in their efforts to compete in inertial confinement fusion, but they remain behind this premier U.S. endeavor. Ceasing support for NIF would be ceding to those countries or others American leadership in what could be the energy industry of the future. Considering our national security threats and limited domestic energy sources, this is no time to be cutting its capabilities.

Unfortunately, jobs at NIF have already been cut and the capacity has been curtailed because of reductions in fiscal year 2013 and the sequester. The funding levels in this bill would make the situation much worse.

We must ensure that the United States does not fall behind our competitors and continues to build upon the investments already begun. It is crucial that NIF gets the funding it needs to continue this crucial work.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the damage that these cuts would do at our national laboratories and consider the value of preserving our country's leadership and our role in maintaining our nuclear stockpile and investments in the future of our country through laboratory directed research and development.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

For carrying out activities authorized by the Central Utah Project Completion Act, $7,425,000, to remain available until expended, of which $1,000,000 shall be deposited into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission. In addition, for necessary expenses incurred in carrying out related responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior, $1,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

For fiscal year 2014, the Commission may use an amount not to exceed $1,500,000 for administrative expenses.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The following appropriations shall be expended to execute authorized functions of the Bureau of Reclamation:

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For management, development, and restoration of water and related natural resources and for related activities, including the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of reclamation and other facilities, participation in fulfilling related Federal responsibilities to Native Americans, and related grants to, and cooperative and other agreements with, State and local governments, federally recognized Indian tribes, and others, $812,744,000, to remain available until expended, of which $28,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $8,401,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund; of which such amounts as may be necessary may be

advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund: *Provided*, That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriation under this heading: *Provided further*, That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities that can be financed by the Reclamation Fund or the Bureau of Reclamation special fee account established by 16 U.S.C. 6806 shall be derived from that Fund or account: *Provided further*, That funds contributed under 43 U.S.C. 395 are available until expended for the purposes for which the funds were contributed: *Provided further*, That funds advanced under 43 U.S.C. 397a shall be credited to this account and are available until expended for the same purposes as the sums appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided herein, funds may be used for high priority projects which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1706.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. NOEM

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chair, my amendment would ensure that we're placing a higher priority on completing some ongoing rural water projects in the Great Plains region and in the West.

My amendment takes $15 million from the Department of Energy's administration budget and $15 million from the solar energy programs. $25 million of this would go into the Bureau of Reclamation's Rural Water Projects; the remaining $5 million would be left for deficit reduction.

Mr. Chair, I recognize that we have limited funds to go around. This is why we need to work so hard to make sure that our priorities are addressed. It's why we make sure that we can agree that water should be a priority, that drinking water for people that live in this country should be a priority.

There are places in this country, especially in the rural areas, that people are still waiting for a stable water supply. There are towns that would like to grow, but they don't have enough water or basic infrastructure to find new businesses and bring new families in. They're waiting for the Federal Government to complete projects that have already been authorized, that have already been started, and that those communities have already invested in.

As we go through the appropriations process, I think supplying our rural areas with water should be a top priority. I think it is shocking; it's shocking that some of these authorized projects have been waiting years to see the promised Federal dollars to complete the projects. Many of these local communities have already funded their share of the projects. Some of the administration's funding proposals for these projects don't even keep up with inflation.

So as representatives, we absolutely need to be responsible with taxpayer dollars. When the Federal Government makes a promise to provide basic infrastructure, they need to follow through. This amendment is just a small step in getting where we need to be.

It is common sense to make sure that something as basic as water supply is available in all areas, urban and rural. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the amendment to ensure that these very essential projects are on their way to completion.

I would like to thank the chairman and the committee for their hard work on this bill. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to speak on this amendment, and I would urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Representative NOEM's amendment.

I think that there is a worthy objective of providing freshwater to all parts of our country. We talked about that earlier today. The problem is her amendment takes funds from other accounts to try to move some of those dollars to rural America.

Frankly, our fundamental problem is that this bill is $2.8 billion under what was being expended in this fiscal year of 2013, and it's $4 billion under the administration request. So what she's essentially doing is taking money from something else in order to move it to rural areas of the country. I represent some of those. They're very worthy. Some of them do receive funds through the Department of Agriculture. Some smaller communities also have associations with the Environmental Protection Agency. But to cut funds, to take money from the Renewable Energy account—$15 million from there—and from other water-related accounts and to cut departmental administration really is sort of picking off very scarce bones. And I have to oppose the amendment on that basis.

The Renewable Energy accounts, which are America's future—they're a major part of our downpayment on the future—have been cut 60 percent. You are withdrawing additional funds from those accounts to try to move toward needed rural water needs. But, frankly, these accounts have been severely cut, and the gentlelady's amendment harms them more. We simply can't cut more from those accounts.

I support more funding for the rebuilding of America's urban water systems, which are leaking all over this country. In fact, we just had a collapse in my home community. For some reason, a major intersection just imploded because the water systems underneath weren't properly attended to. This is happening from coast to coast.

So our urban water systems are severely constricted. There are all kinds of problems there. And in parts of rural America, obviously we are still trying to extend lines, trying to clean water, trying not to pollute water anymore in order to make sure that citizens who live there and the livestock that is there has sufficient freshwater resources.

So I identify with what you're trying to do, but not where you are taking the funds from. Those dollars simply can't be cut any further. So I have to oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to the gentlelady's amendment.

Perhaps we can work in other ways in the future, but the fundamental problem is the bill has been cut $2.8 billion, and some of that is coming from the dollars that would be available for rural water programs.

So I strongly oppose the amendment, not because it isn't worthy, but simply because she's raiding other accounts that are cut, literally, to the bone.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Noem amendment.

□ 1630

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague and neighbor from South Dakota for authoring and offering this amendment, which I support and urge my colleagues to support. It really re-prioritizes the spending and the good work that the Appropriations Committee has already done just a few million dollars. It re-prioritizes it in a way that recognizes the changing of our Nation in recent years because so much of the policy and the appropriations of our Energy Department are based on an old order that recognizes our country as having a scarcity of natural resources for energy development.

That, Mr. Chairman, is no longer the case. We are now a Nation of abundant energy resources, but we are still, especially in the West, a Nation of scarce water resources, water resources that are important to the development of many of our rural communities and our tribes and our farms and ranches, water for drinking, water for industrial growth, water for irrigation. So I think this re-prioritization of a few million dollars is appropriate and recognizes how different our world is.

With that, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment, and yield back the remainder of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

For carrying out the programs, projects, plans, habitat restoration, improvement, and acquisition provisions of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, $53,288,000, to be derived from such sums as may be collected in the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund pursuant to sections 3407(d), 3404(c)(3), and 3405(f) of Public Law 102–575, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to assess and collect the full amount of the additional mitigation and restoration payments authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102–575: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for the acquisition or leasing of water for in-stream purposes if the water is already committed to in-stream purposes by a court adopted decree or order.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For carrying out activities authorized by the Water Supply, Reliability, and Environmental Improvement Act, consistent with plans to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which such amounts as may be necessary to carry out such activities may be transferred to appropriate accounts of other participating Federal agencies to carry out authorized purposes: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for the Federal share of the costs of CALFED Program management: *Provided further*, That CALFED implementation shall be carried out in a balanced manner with clear performance measures demonstrating concurrent progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the Program.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of policy, administration, and related functions in the Office of the Commissioner, the Denver office, and offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation, to remain available until September 30, 2015, $60,000,000, to be derived from the Reclamation Fund and be nonreimbursable as provided in 43 U.S.C. 377: *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted as policy and administration expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles, which are for replacement only.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. (a) None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that—

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

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by this Act;

(4) restarts or resumes any program, project or activity for which funds are not provided in this Act, unless prior approval is received from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate;

(5) transfers funds in excess of the following limits:

(A) 15 percent for any program, project or activity for which $2,000,000 or more is available at the beginning of the fiscal year; or

(B) $300,000 for any program, project or activity for which less than $2,000,000 is available at the beginning of the fiscal year;

(6) transfers more than $500,000 from either the Facilities Operation, Maintenance, and Rehabilitation category or the Resources Management and Development category to any program, project, or activity in the other category; or

(7) transfers, when necessary to discharge legal obligations of the Bureau of Reclamation, more than $5,000,000 to provide adequate funds for settled contractor claims, increased contractor earnings due to accelerated rates of operations, and real estate deficiency judgments.

(b) Subsection (a)(5) shall not apply to any transfer of funds within the Facilities Operation, Maintenance, and Rehabilitation category.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term ''transfer'' means any movement of funds into or out of a program, project, or activity.

(d) The Bureau of Reclamation shall submit reports on a quarterly basis to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing all the funds reprogrammed between programs, projects, activities, or categories of funding. The first quarterly report shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit until development by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of California of a plan, which shall conform to the water quality standards of the State of California as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to minimize any detrimental effect of the San Luis drainage waters.

(b) The costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the costs of the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program shall be classified by the Secretary of the Interior as reimbursable or nonreimbursable and collected until fully repaid pursuant to the ''Cleanup Program-Alternative Repayment Plan'' and the ''SJVDP-Alternative Repayment Plan'' described in the report entitled ''Repayment Report, Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, February 1995'', prepared by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. Any future obligations of funds by the United States relating to, or providing for, drainage service or drainage studies for the San Luis Unit shall be fully reimbursable by San Luis Unit beneficiaries of such service or studies pursuant to Federal reclamation law.

SEC. 203. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until the pipeline reliability study required in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012, is completed, and any necessary changes are made to Technical Memorandum No. 8140–CC–2004–1, the Bureau of Reclamation shall not deny approval, funding, or assistance to any project, nor disqualify any material from use, based, in whole or in part, on the corrosion control used, if the corrosion control meets the requirements of a published national or international standard promulgated by the American Water Works Association (''AWWA''), ASTM International, the American National Standards Institute (''ANSI''), NACE International (''NACE'') or the American Society for Testing and Materials (''ASTM''). The Bureau shall allow any project initiated during the study to use any corrosion control meeting the above standards.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY PROGRAMS

RENEWABLE ENERGY, ENERGY RELIABILITY, AND EFFICIENCY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for energy efficiency and renewable energy activities, and 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, $982,637,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $76,926,000 shall be available until September 30, 2015, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,518,000)''.

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

Page 31, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $22,586,500)''.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, nuclear weapons production played a pivotal role in our Nation's defense for decades, helping to end the Second World War and to end the Cold War. Implementing these programs resulted in a large volume of radioactive waste that the Federal Government has a legal responsibility to clean up.

Today, there are indications that nuclear waste is leaking out of the underground tanks at Hanford in my congressional district, with higher levels of contamination now being detected in the surrounding soil.

The amendment that I offer, Mr. Chairman, would restore a portion of the reduction for the Environmental Management program that would so greatly impact the Richland Operations Office and help enable the cleanup to move forward safely, efficiently, and in a timely manner.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would be happy to yield to the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I appreciate your longstanding commitment to Hanford, and I support this amendment, which is aimed at strengthening environmental management in the Richland Operations Office. EM is a priority for the subcommittee. I look forward to returning to Hanford, as I have in the past, to get a firsthand look at the latest challenges and progress, and we know there are lots of challenges.

As you know, Representative HASTINGS, the Department of Energy has not yet provided confirmation of probable tank leaks, a Record of Decision on the potential for tank TRU waste, or a plan for the waste treatment plant. This information will be required as Congress completes the appropriations process for the Office of River Protection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, thank you for your support for this amendment and for your position on Yucca Mountain in the underlying bill, which is the ultimate solution for Hanford's high-level tank waste.

I would like to remind the chairman, I am meeting with Secretary Moniz later this week, and I will reiterate the need for this information that you have just outlined for WTP.

I also recognize the discrepancy in allocations between the House and Senate bills.

I want to ask the gentleman: How do you anticipate that these differences will be resolved, particularly as they pertain to EM, in the event of a continuing resolution?

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In the event of a continuing resolution, the Department of Energy has the flexibility in determining funding levels for individual programs and projects, including EM.

Mr. HASTINGS, I am pleased to support your amendment and I wish its success.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I hope we don't get to a CR, but thank you very much for that information.

At this time, I would like to yield to my colleague from southwest Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER), the gentlelady from the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Hanford, as the gentleman mentioned, was the reactor used for the Manhattan Project and was used to build the U.S. nuclear arsenal during the Cold War.

I recently had an opportunity to tour Hanford with the gentleman and so firmly believe in this amendment because this is a Federal Government responsibility, this wasn't a choice by a local community. The cleanup just is simply beyond the scope of the communities involved. This matters to people in my district and up and down the Columbia River, which is adjacent to your area.

I would urge my colleagues, this isn't somebody's pet project, this isn't somebody's good idea. This is a responsibility. The gentleman said ''a legal responsibility''—I would add to that a moral responsibility—of the Federal Government to put this money here and help aid the cleanup at Hanford.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentlelady for her remarks.

Again, I urge adoption of this amendment because this is a legal obligation.

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

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would say to Congressman HASTINGS that I rise with sympathy toward the situation you face at Hanford, but must oppose your amendment.

The amendment essentially would cut funding from energy efficiency and renewable energy, specifically the weatherization program, which affects dozens and dozens of communities across this country, many of them very low income, as well as departmental administration, which has already been cut to the bone, to move money to Hanford.

It is true that the communities that contributed to the Manhattan Project cannot be left with the remnants of that war effort. We have a moral obligation to clean up these sites. Without question, the bill is inadequate to meet the commitments to States and local communities faced with cleanup.

However, we cannot take those dollars out of the hides of elderly people who might live in Newark, New Jersey, in the wintertime, or in Portland, Oregon, or places where they can't afford their energy bills, or we can't divert money from administration, which is already cut to such a low level at the Department in order to move dollars to Hanford.

Hanford already receives over $2 billion a year—$2 billion. I wish my community received $2 billion. I wish your communities received $2 billion a year.

Those dollars come from the River Protection program, over $1.2 billion, plus an additional $877 million, well over $2 billion a year. That's more than most communities represented by Members here can even imagine coming to their region of the country.

The defense waste cleanup in Ohio is extraordinary. We don't get $2 billion a year. So to say to senior citizens across this country we are going to take it out of your weatherization program so you can't put plastic around your windows in the wintertime and try to retrofit your houses, or we are going to take it out of departmental administration where we risk accounting for the funds properly for all of these programs that the Department has to administer, including the cleanup, some of these contracts that we've had problems with in that Department, I simply can't support the manner in which the gentleman and the gentlelady have identified where they are taking the money from.

So while I agree with their intent, as I've said many times, the allocation for this bill is $2.8 billion under last year and $4 billion under the administration's request and is simply insufficient. We can't keep picking the bones off the most needy parts of our country to try to divert additional dollars to efforts at Hanford that are spending well over $2 billion a year already.

I would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment. I reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment. But in being fair and looking at all the accounts, we simply can't keep picking from the bones of other programs at the Department.

I ask my colleagues to vote against the Hastings amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $992,620,780)''.

Page 26, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $430,029,400)''.

Page 26, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $233,250,000)''.

Page 31, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,655,900,180)''.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I object.

Would the gentlewoman be able to identify the amendment which she is proposing?

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I withdraw my objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The objection is withdrawn.

Without objection, the reading is dispensed with, and the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to restore the significant cuts to the critical science and energy research and development programs that were made in this bill, including an 80 percent cut to ARPA–E and a 50 percent cut to the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. These programs, along with the Department of Energy's Office of Science, are vital to our national security, our economy, and our environment in the decades to come.

It is really worth us thinking about the fact that we have seen how government research can pay off when it comes to energy development. DOE-supported research was key to the development of high-efficiency gas turbines, for coal plants, nuclear reactors developed at Federal labs, and the directional drilling and hydraulic fracturing practices that have led to the shale gas boom today. But we should remember that those achievements require decades of Federal investment, the overwhelming majority of which was focused on fossil and nuclear energy.

I continue to support research to make today's technologies cleaner and more efficient, but I believe that it is

time for a level playing field. I introduce a real competition to our markets. That is where the priorities set by Congress come into play. We have to find the greatest value for our investment of the taxpayer dollar. Today, it is the emerging energy technology sectors that can most benefit from government support.

I have heard it said that this bill has been cut to the bone, and I know that. It is important that DOE's Office of Science is actually the largest supporter of basic research in the physical sciences in the country, and it 30 national scientific user facilities whose applications go well beyond energy innovation.

□ 1645

Our Nation's top researchers from industry, academia, and other Federal agencies use these facilities to examine everything from new materials, which will better meet our military's needs, to new pharmaceuticals, which will better treat disease, to even examining the fundamental building blocks of the universe. I believe that this stewardship of unique scientific research, which includes the Nation's major national user facilities, is another important role that I hope the Department will continue to make one of its highest priorities.

It is no secret that Congress' inability to date to come to an agreement on a sensible budget plan has led to some devastating cuts to many of these important programs, with serious impacts on our Nation's future. To restore these research funds, I certainly would not wish to make these proposed cuts in my amendment which may slow down our ability to meet the Nation's defense environmental cleanup obligations this year. However, I believe that these research programs are the seed corn of our future. Some things we know we have to wait to do, and perhaps we can prolong that cleanup.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely plead that we not cut this type of money from the research we have going. Research is our Nation's future. We cannot give up on our Nation's future, so I am hoping that we can support this amendment and allow some of this research to go forward, and I ask for support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. This amendment increases funding for science, ARPA-E, and renewable energy, energy reliability and efficiency by a total of $1.7 billion, using defense environmental cleanup as an offset.

Defense environmental cleanup provides funding to clean up the legacy of the Manhattan Project, as we discussed earlier, which is a huge task that will take years to do. It will be a major expense and will take significant resources. We heard part of the Washington State story, but there is part of it in other parts of the country as well.

The Federal Government has an inherent responsibility to address this legacy and to ensure that the materials created to build our nuclear weapons stockpile do not endanger the public health and the environment. There are also some other daunting technical challenges in cleaning up this waste, and this amendment would, frankly, completely gut those types of programs. It is doubtful that this level would even sustain the basic operation and maintenance of the facilities, let alone allow for any progress in the cleanup effort. The cleanup effort needs to be sustained.

Our allocation has made, as I said earlier in the afternoon, for very tough choices. We placed the highest priority on activities on which the Federal Government must take the lead. While the applied energy and advanced research programs are down substantially, admittedly, there is a strong interest in advancing these areas of research, and the responsibility for conducting that research can shift, in many ways, to the private sector. Therefore, I strongly oppose the amendment, and I urge other Members to do the same.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you for your explanation. I don't disagree with you, but I do feel that we cannot cut our research and think that we will have a prosperous future.

So I would ask you to help me find a spot in which we, perhaps, can use the dollars and postpone some of the cleanup. This is urgent and it is needed, and I would ask you to agree to assist in our restoring some of this research.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In reclaiming my time, we know that the gentlewoman's heart is in the right place. We know of your heartfelt views. We would be happy to work with you to see what we can do to assist in these other areas, but this environmental cleanup, in some respects, is court-ordered besides there being, obviously, the potential for human health to be adversely affected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I, too, rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

I do appreciate the gentlelady's concerns, particularly about science funding. However, Mr. Chairman, increasing funding for optional programs, as valuable as they may be, cannot come at the expense of the Federal Government's meeting its existing legal obligations to clean up the waste created by our Nation's nuclear defense programs. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that these were programs that won World War II and that largely won the Cold War.

At Hanford, in my district, the Federal Government has 56 million gallons of radioactive nuclear waste stored in 177 underground tanks. Today, it appears likely that some of these tanks are leaking, and higher levels of contamination have now been detected in the areas surrounding one of the most recent leakers. In addition, there is also a large quantity of radioactive waste at Hanford that was never put into tanks. That, too, must be dealt with as well as the nuclear waste at other sites across the country, like at the Savannah River, Oak Ridge, and Idaho.

Again, it is nuclear waste that was created by programs of the Federal Government for defense purposes. Cutting $1.7 billion from the EM program would essentially halt most nuclear waste cleanup work, and it would put the safety of our cleanup sites at risk and end any chance of the Federal Government's meeting its existing legal cleanup commitments to the States.

Mr. Chairman, let me be more specific about Hanford. I mentioned 56 million gallons of nuclear hazardous waste stored in 177 underground tanks. Those tanks range in size from a half a million gallons to a million gallons. Now, when you go out to the site, of course you can't see the tanks because they're underground. All you see are gauges on top that monitor what activity is going on in those tanks. If you want to quantify how much 56 million gallons is, picture this: if one were to put 56 million gallons here, it would take over 21 House Chambers to fill 56 million gallons of waste. That's how much radioactive waste is at Hanford, which needs to be cleaned up. It's the result of the defense weapons program.

Now, the distinguished subcommittee chairman and I and others have mentioned the legal obligation. In Washington State, that legal obligation is called a tri-party agreement. It has set deadlines for cleaning up Hanford, including the waste that I just mentioned. It's a legal agreement between the Federal EPA, between the Federal Department of Energy, and between the State Department of Ecology. It's a legal agreement with time lines, and if you don't meet the agreements, of course you're going to be sued. Every time there has been a threat to be sued or there has been a disagreement on the time lines, the State has always won.

So why would we want to defund this program and put all of that at risk, which, of course, would cost a whole lot more money in the future?

While I recognize the gentlelady and her passion for science funding—and I, too, understand that as I have a national lab in my district, for example—56 million gallons, or over 21 House Chambers, of nuclear hazardous waste

needs to be cleaned up, and it's the responsibility of the Federal Government. So I oppose the gentlelady's amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of my colleague's, the gentlewoman from Texas.

It is vital we support our basic scientific research. As the ranking member of the Science Committee, she carries great weight in these matters, and I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I clearly understand the explanation.

This amendment does not strike all of the funds. It strikes about a third. I know the dangers of having all of the waste that needs to be cleaned up, but I also think that it's important not to close the doors on the future of this Nation while we do it. I really think that research has been the element that has brought us here thus far and that it is going to be research and innovation that carry us forward. We cannot close the door on research while we talk about cleaning up waste. We are only asking for a third of that money.

So I want to make another appeal that we not close the door on the future of our Nation by shutting down our research.

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

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

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. To my colleagues in this great House, my name is CHUCK FLEISCHMANN. I represent the Third District of Tennessee, which has a great city. That city is Oak Ridge, the birthplace of the Manhattan Project.

My colleagues, Oak Ridge has a great history. We won the Cold War there, and we won World War II there, but this was a time that the Federal Government in the manufacturing of nuclear weapons was not as careful as it could have been. We didn't know. We had to win those wars—and we did—but as a result of that legacy, we have a problem.

DOC HASTINGS, my colleague from Washington, talked about the problem in Hanford—and there are 500 square miles in Hanford that need to be cleaned up—but in my community in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, there are populations of churches, schools, people all around in a highly condensed area. We have there, across the DOE complex, a tremendous legacy that needs to be cleaned up, and I want to talk about that briefly.

We've got nuclear waste that needs to be cleaned up across the complex, and that's being done. We also have a mercury problem. There is an estimated 2 million pounds of mercury in the soil and in the water. This is a real problem for American citizens. This is a Federal obligation to clean this legacy up. There is no question about that.

Across this great Nation, whether it's in Oak Ridge, at the Savannah River, in Hanford, or in Idaho, we have an obligation to the American people to clean this up. We won World War II and we won the Cold War, but we must do this. This waste is dangerous. It's expensive to clean these things up. It's not a matter of ''if''; it's a matter of ''when.'' The longer we take to do this, we expose the people in these communities all across America to the hazards of this nuclear waste.

So, Mr. Chairman, as an advocate for Oak Ridge and as an advocate for environmental cleanup, we must get this done. We have decades' worth of work to go. We have got to do this. As we honor Oak Ridge and other communities with a great national park, which is coming forward and which was voted for in this great House, we can never forget the legacy that's left behind. Environmental cleanup is a must. It is a Federal obligation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I appreciate the comments of my friends from Tennessee and Washington.

In Colorado, in my district, we have two of those plants which are World War II and Cold War legacy plants—Rocky Flats and the Rocky Mountain Arsenal—so I appreciate the comments and the need to clean these sites up. It is long overdue. I agree with you, and I look forward to that.

The problem we have here, on the one hand, are substantial cuts to the Energy Department's budget and, on the other hand, an increase to this line item above and beyond the President's request. As I understand it, the committee recommends to the House $345 million, which is $23.5 million over the administration's request.

Although I agree completely with the need to clean up, the majority party is requesting more than is needed at this point, and it is to the detriment of the rest of the budget of the Energy Department. Particularly, the one that I'm concerned about is renewable energy, such as the National Renewable Energy Lab, and I will have an amendment to that point coming up later.

So, to my friends, I agree with you that the cleanup needs to go forward. It should be done at the full amount the President requested and not at the $23 million more that has been suggested by the committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1700

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. This debate is a perfect example of why this bill's funding is so inadequate.

What is really being debated is whether we are going to trade off the science of the future, which is so essential to America's competitiveness in the global economy, to take care of necessary past cleanup. Who can make that choice? They are both essential. Are we going to sacrifice the future for the past? That's really what this debate is about.

We know that this bill is $4 billion under the administration's request and over $2 billion under what we spent in this fiscal year of 2013. So we really have an argument that nobody wins. If we fund the past cleanup, we sacrifice the future. If we sacrifice the future, do we really take care of all the past cleanup? We hardly do what's necessary, even with current funding.

So I think it's a perfect example of where the sequestration process is so counterproductive and moves America backwards. We have very imperfect choices here and actually very dangerous choices that we're being forced to make. I think the majority would be much better suited to come back to us with a budget that allows us to do the job that the Energy and Water Subcommittee is charged with doing.

We simply can't try to solve the problem internal to the resources we've been given. It's an impossibility. So somebody is going to lose; and I guarantee you in the past amendment that just came up, some of the people that were the losers have no lobbies here in Washington. The poorest people in our country, who are getting weatherization assistance in order to stay a little bit warmer in the wintertime, they just lost money. They've got no lobby here. They've got none of those people from these various nuclear sites to come in here and lobby for them. Yet they just lost out in a prior amendment.

They have a right to an existence in this country, but we are seeing inside the strictures of this set of choices that we've been given that somebody is always a loser. Actually, the country is a loser because of sequestration and the fact that our subcommittee has been given a mark so far below what is reasonable and frankly what we could do if we had a budget that allowed us to move the country forward, rather than create a can't-do Nation. We can't do science, we can't do cleanup because of what we were handed by, what, a Budget Committee whose members don't even appear on the floor to argue their positions during this debate?

I feel sorry for our country, and I feel sorry for those who have to come down here and take from one another during this debate and hurt people across this country because our allocation is simply too insufficient to meet the needs of the Nation.

So I want to thank the gentlelady for rising on this very important point of

science of the future versus cleanup of the past, but we simply don't have the funds in this bill to do both and it puts us in a very destructive position for the interests of our Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

Mr. TAKANO. 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 22, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $245,000,000)''.

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $245,000,000)''.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2014 Energy and Water appropriations bill to increase funding for the Department of Energy's advanced manufacturing program. My amendment increases funding for the renewable energy, energy reliability, and efficiency account by $245 million to meet the President's budget request for advanced manufacturing.

If we are to remain competitive in the global marketplace, we must fully invest in, develop, and commercialize the emerging technologies that will create high-quality manufacturing jobs in the United States. These investments are crucial to accelerate the advancement of ideas and allow American manufacturers to continue to innovate and compete. By matching the President's request, the Department of Energy will be able to move forward with plans to develop interagency manufacturing innovation institutes that will develop best practices and help manufacturers meet common challenges. These institutes will enable innovation, create a dependable talent pipeline, and improve the overall business climate.

It requires a diverse array of partners if advanced manufacturing is to accelerate and thrive in the United States. A Federal commitment to these emerging and efficient technologies is the catalyst that will help bring educators, workers, and businesses, as well as local and State partners, to the table. Federal investments in advanced manufacturing will help create more jobs, increase our competitiveness, and allow the United States to continue to be a leader in advancing energy-efficient technologies.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I understand he may be offering some other amendments similarly related later on the floor. Suffice it to say that my remarks here will also pertain to those amendments.

This amendment would unacceptably strike funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration's weapon activity by $245 million in order to increase funding for renewable energy, energy reliability, and efficiency activities. Ensuring funding to maintain our nuclear stockpile is our highest priority in our Energy and Water development bill. Historically, it always has been and will continue to be. We have put off for too long the investments that are needed to ensure that we maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile in the future.

Because of this historical underfunding, there's been strong bipartisan support for increasing weapons activities. Our bill takes a responsible approach to meeting those needs, reducing funding $193 million below the request for nonessential activities within the weapons activities account that are not required to maintain the nuclear weapons stockpile, but there are no further savings available. A reduction of this magnitude would severely impact the National Nuclear Security Administration's ability to ensure the continued reliability of our weapons, something which the Secretary of Energy has to do to our Commander in Chief each and every year.

I support the programs championed by my colleague. That's why we worked hard to increase the advanced manufacturing program by $5 million over fiscal year 2013 within an account that is cut by $971 million.

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

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Let me say to the gentleman from California that I am sympathetic toward his efforts on the renewable energy activities at the Department of Energy as they are critical for America's energy future, and I'm torn as I listen to his arguments.

I just wanted to demonstrate a chart here that shows the relative superiority of the United States in the nuclear weapons field, the largest total inventory in the world, with Russia right behind. We have a significant nuclear capacity, much greater than nations that follow: France, China, the United Kingdom, Pakistan, North Korea. The United States has quite significant nuclear complexes, and we must maintain them, and we must provide security for them.

I think that the President's negotiations with Russia provide us with a very important opportunity to cut the systems and to do so in a responsible way that continues our superiority and our security, while bringing down the possibilities of reducing these weapons globally.

The gentleman's amendment would actually move funds—$335 million from our weapons accounts—and move them to energy efficiency and renewable energy, which is a move that I would like to support at a future date—the sooner, the better. I appreciate him offering the amendment.

Though I agree with his intent, as I've said many times before, the allocation for this bill is simply insufficient, and we're robbing one account to try to put funds in another account.

I must very reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think he's moving in the right direction, and I think that this helps our Nation move in a more constructive direction for the future. We have a responsibility on the nuclear security front. Hopefully, with ongoing negotiations, we'll be able to make this move in the very near future.

I want to thank him for his leadership in moving the country forward and showing us a new path. Let's hope that with the administration's engagement, we can move to that path sooner rather than later.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. The NNSA's weapons activities program is the core of the U.S. nuclear modernization efforts. Reductions of this magnitude, the $245 million being proposed in this amendment, will endanger the nuclear deterrent by delaying or canceling key warhead life-extension programs and facilitate modernization programs. These cuts will also cost taxpayers more in the future because the modernization program that the Obama administration has requested must be done and will only get more expensive with time.

President Obama committed to request robust funding for nuclear modernization to win Senate ratification of his New START treaty program. But unfortunately, to date, he's $1.6 billion behind in that commitment for FY 12 through FY 14. Without these robust funding levels, our ability to safely reduce the New START levels is in question.

The President's 2010 nuclear posture review says:

> These investments are essential to facilitating reductions while sustaining deterrents under the New START and beyond.

With this tight budget, we must provide every dollar we can to nuclear modernization efforts and prevent the draconian further reductions required by this amendment.

NNSA is the only national security spending in this bill. Taking money from NNSA to pay for renewable energy directly undermines our national security to subsidize energy technologies that can't stand on their own in the market.

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. TAKANO).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. 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 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $31,000,000)''.

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $31,000,000)''.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, we've had a continuing debate about American energy independence. One way for America to achieve real energy independence is to utilize our own renewable and clean energy resources.

Currently, there are over 800 dams across the Nation waiting to generate power. The dams are already sitting there, sitting on our Nation's rivers all across the country, waiting to generate power, just waiting. From Sacramento to Savannah and right on the Susquehanna River where I live, the power and the consistency of the water flow on these rivers is truly impressive and, as I said, consistent.

The energy created from this immense water flow is something that America should harness for the use of individual and commercial power. In that vein, this amendment would increase the water power energy program by $31 million. Again, this applies only to the water power energy program.

The Water Power Program is a vitally important program to reducing our dependence on Middle Eastern oil or fossil fuels for many folks on the other side of aisle and the administration who seem desperately opposed to it.

□ 1715

It will allow us to become a more energy independent Nation and do so in an environmentally sound manner. While you sleep, while you work, while you drive, while you talk to your family and watch TV, the rivers are flowing, the tides are moving in and out; power can be generated without any more than that. It doesn't take us digging anything up, dumping anything in, dredging anything up. It just happens.

The water power program is designed to develop water technologies and address barriers to hydropower, barriers like the permitting process that we currently undergo in this Nation which takes companies that want to do this 10 years, minimum, 10 to 15 years to receive a permit. Who invests in something that takes that long, that kind of money? The problem is that increasingly no one does. So what's right under our feet, what's going right past us in our homes, our towns, our rivers, is not being utilized, and it's right there. Eight hundred dams currently in this Nation could be generating power at this moment.

Hydropower is available in every region of the country and is America's largest source of clean, renewable electricity. It accounts for 67 percent of domestic renewable generation and 7 percent of total electricity generation. And it creates good-paying jobs. I mean from the bottom to the top, everyplace on the spectrum of job creation, hydropower creates work for people. It's reliable, proven, and domestic technology that can expand in environmentally responsible ways. It can be put to work in rivers, harbors, and coastal areas to capture energy from currents and tides. Harnessing this energy will create a truly renewable and green source of energy.

I would like to thank the chairman and the committee for the work they have done to bring this bill to the floor, and I ask all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise to oppose the gentleman from Pennsylvania's amendment. First of all, I want to salute him for being a strong advocate for water power. I think those of us on the committee are as well.

His amendment would increase, as we're aware, funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy by $31 million using the Department's administration account as an offset to restore the water power program to the requested level. Our allocation, as I've said a number of times, made for some really tough choices. Our bill cuts applied energy and advanced research programs to allow more funding for inherently Federal responsibilities.

While I support the program championed by my colleague, we can simply not afford to increase energy reliable activities so significantly by diverting funding from other essential activities within the Department of Energy. One of the issues within the Department of Energy is they've had management issues. They need money to better manage a lot of the activities. They have a new Secretary of Energy. He needs the resources to do it. If we keep tapping from this account, there will be no money to pay for the management and operation and the accountability we expect from the chief executive of this Department. Therefore, I reluctantly oppose his amendment and urge Members to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's well-intentioned amendment and again reiterate that our budget is simply insufficient in our subcommittee to meet all of the needs of the country.

What the gentleman is proposing is to take an additional $31 million out of the Department's administrative accounts and to shift them to renewable energy systems relating to dams and small dam construction. That is a very worthy objective. However, if you know anything about the Department of Energy, one of the challenges we face in the administrative accounts is getting them to manage their contracts in a way that properly oversees taxpayer dollar expenditures. That Department has had some of the worst cost overruns I have ever seen in my career in Congress, on the nuclear side and on the nonnuclear side. So when the gentleman wants to cut administrative costs, my worry is that we will not have the kind of rigor that the chairman and I have been trying to reinfuse in the Department to better manage the dollars that we allow them to spend. And so I think the gentleman's amendment runs a real risk of creating mismanagement there simply because they don't have the personnel to do the job.

And so I think that your end purpose is a very, very worthy one. And, frankly, we have some small dams in Ohio that would benefit from the gentleman's amendment, but I have to come down on the side of rigor and proper administration by the Department in all of their accounts, and the amount of mismanagement and cost overruns in some of their programs is into the billions.

The administrative accounts overall are only $187 million to manage a Department that is over $30 billion worth of expenditures and all kinds of contractors, all kinds of cleanup programs that stand on that thin reed of $187 million for nationwide contract administration and personnel administration.

So I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I understand what he's trying to do, but we simply can't risk improper contract management in that Department at this time. I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PERRY. 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 Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,127,954,000)''.

Page 22, line 8, before the period, insert the following:

: *Provided*, That the amount made available under this heading shall be allocated between programs, projects, and activities previously funded under the heading ''Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' and programs, projects, and activities previously funded under the heading ''Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability'' in the same proportion as such funds were allocated between such accounts in fiscal year 2013 by division F of Public Law 113–6

Ms. CASTOR of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object to waiving the reading, and I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would restore funding for America's renewable energy, energy efficiency, and energy conservation initiatives, restore it to the very modest levels of the last year, 2013. These relate to the Department of Energy's energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives, the Department's electricity delivery and energy reliability initiatives as well.

The problem with the Republican bill is it slashes, it eviscerates America's commitment to renewable energy and energy conservation. They also have something that I characterize, maybe a term of art, rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic, because they take these various accounts and squeeze them in a vise down into a single account; and when you take it all together, it is a 57 percent reduction in energy efficiency and renewable energy. This is outrageous. It is shortsighted, and it is very poor public policy.

The Republican bill slashes clean energy initiatives that are critical to the all-of-the-above energy strategy that I thought we all agreed on is needed for U.S. energy independence, ranging from solar to wind power and new technologies for more energy-efficient buildings and advanced vehicles.

So I have to say, Mr. Chairman, if I hear any of my Republican colleagues say they are for an all-of-the-above approach on energy policy, this Energy and Water appropriations bill belies that. It really pulls the curtain back on what the plan really is on the other side of the aisle.

The administration has objected, and I agree with them. They write:

> The Republican bill would leave U.S. competitiveness at risk in new markets for clean energy industries such as advanced vehicles, advanced manufacturing, energy efficiency for homes and businesses, and domestic renewable energies such as wind, solar, and biomass.

They do this at a time when they are content to leave huge taxpayer subsidies going to the big oil companies, meanwhile slashing very modest investments in renewable energy, energy efficiency, and energy conservation.

Specifically, the impact of these cuts will reduce by 50 percent the homes weatherized to help our neighbors back home reduce their energy bills. And Ranking Member KAPTUR was absolutely correct: those working class neighbors back home do not have big lobbyists here in Washington, D.C. This bill would also significantly delay research on next generation technologies that save energy in our homes, our schools, our hospitals, and businesses.

The Republican bill will hinder the development of cost-effective new technologies and appliance standards that save Americans money by increasing energy productivity. This bill spells a likely demise and ends solar energy job training for students and military veterans at 261 community colleges. The Republican bill will slow efforts to modernize and secure the electricity delivery grid and respond to energy emergencies.

I ask simply that we return the funding levels to the very modest levels of last year. The amendment also directs that funds be allocated in the same proportion as they were in fiscal year 2013.

These clean energy initiatives are critical to achieving energy independence, boosting our economy, creating jobs, and maintaining global leadership. Ranking Member KAPTUR was absolutely right during this debate. She said we are sacrificing our future and not living up to the standards of this great country because you're slashing the investments that make this country go: investing in innovation and technology.

I'm afraid that it really highlights the broader issue, and that is the fact that the Republicans refuse to negotiate on the budget. They passed the budget 100 days ago. The Democrats have appointed conferees. I don't know what the holdup is, why my Republican colleagues are afraid to negotiate on the budget. But in the meantime, here on this amendment, we have an opportunity to stand up for jobs, for clean energy and the future of our great Nation. I ask support of the Castor amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 113th Congress, which states:

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriation bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or a greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

The amendment proposes a net increase in the budget authority in the bill in violation of such section. I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentlewoman is recognized.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I appreciate that there is a point of order brought up, but I think there is a major point of order that faces this House of Representatives, and that's the fact that the Democrats have appointed conferees to negotiate the budget, and my Republican colleagues appear to be afraid to come together and discuss the budget.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will confine her remarks to the point of order.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, at this time, I will insist upon a vote on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New Jersey makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from New Jersey, the amendment proposes a net increase in the budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

□ 1730

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the item relating to ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Renewable Energy,

Energy Reliability, and Efficiency'', after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,826,370)''.

In the spending reduction account, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $9,826,370).''

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today cuts significant amounts from a number of programs which I have traditionally targeted for spending reductions.

Now, I commend my friends, the full committee chairman, HAL ROGERS, and the subcommittee chairman, also a good friend, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for these cuts, and I congratulate them on such.

That being said, we're at a time of a real fiscal emergency. Congress has allowed the sequester to happen, and we can see some of the effects of the sequester in this underlying bill. I opposed the use of the sequester from the get-go because I believe that governmentwide, across-the-board cuts are not a wise way of cutting spending. I believe that it's bad policy.

Instead of furloughing civilian DOD employees and cutting our military, we ought to make targeted cuts where there's room to do so. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, would do just that. It would trim just a small additional 1 percent, or about $9.8 million, from programs relating to renewable energy and energy efficiency, and put that amount toward spending reduction.

The committee report for the underlying bill notes that funding for these programs prioritizes reducing gas prices and supporting American manufacturing. And absolutely, we must be doing those things. Yet, these funds are focused on technologies which are still emerging, like new vehicle technology, hydrogen and fuel cell technology, and bio-energy.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing that these technologies aren't worth studying. What I'm suggesting is that we—and I'm not suggesting that we completely defund them. I'm suggesting we make a mere 1 percent cut towards the proposed spending level.

What I'm saying is that we make this small additional cut and work towards getting our fiscal house in order before pouring scarce funding into new, unproven technology.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move to strike the last word, and oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman from Georgia's amendment would further cut funding for renewable energy and energy reliability and efficiency program by an additional 1 percent from the levels contained in our bill.

The Energy and Water Development bill cuts levels by $2.9 billion below last year's level, including $971 million from renewable energy and energy-efficient activities. In just those accounts alone, that's 50 percent below fiscal year 2013, and 67 percent below the President's request.

To that end, the funding the bill preserves is just as important as the funding it cuts. Our bill focuses the vast majority of remaining funds within this account on programs that can address high gas prices and help American manufacturers compete in the global marketplace. These programs can reduce American manufacturing costs, help companies compete in that market, creating jobs here at home.

Reducing Federal spending is critical. That's why the bill reduces funding for this account to half its current levels. But we also must make strategic investments to address high gas prices and help America compete.

The amendment would eliminate these important programs. I urge Members to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition to the Broun amendment, and really find it somewhat incredible that, in the bill that the majority brought forward, the renewable energy accounts have been cut by over half, over 60 percent already. This gentleman proposes an amendment to cut it by an additional 1 percent. And that equals $9,826,370 to an account that has already just been drubbed.

Now, I want to say something here. Here's a chart that shows America's trade deficit. And energy, imported energy, comprises the largest account. We haven't had a balanced trade deficit since the 1970s, when the job hemorrhage started in this country. And it gets worse every year.

America's future depends on innovation. We can't continue to live like this. Every community you go to in this country, they say, will we have to move somewhere because my child can't find a job?

Or gosh, I just had to get another job and I had my salary cut in half.

It's pretty obvious what's been happening. The major category of trade deficit is energy imports, energy, because we are not self-sufficient in energy production in this country.

Part of the answer lies in new energy systems, systems that even NASA has helped us to begin to invent, yes, in the solar field, yes, in new hydrogen technologies like cryogenic hydrogen, yes, in natural gas.

Thank goodness, the Department invested in fossil fuel technologies. That's where the fracking technologies came from. It came from thinking about the future, not living in the past.

So the gentleman's cutting even further into the bone. We've already cut to the bone, now you're sort of whacking the spine in half and saying, well, let's cut some more there.

Well, either you live in the future or you live in the past. And I, sadly, view the gentleman's amendment as a retreat to the past.

I want to live in an America that's a can-do nation, an America that invents new technologies. And literally, the renewable technologies are going to have to be there when the finite resources of carbon-based fuels aren't there anymore, because they are finite. They're finite globally.

And I stand here also today for every single soldier in our country that's died in the line of duty trying to protect the sea lanes to bring that stuff in here because they're trying to help America hold it together while she isn't energy-independent here at home.

So these investments in the future are vital to the future, if one is capable of thinking forward about what that future might look like.

I've seen a technology, sir, that can take a thin filament invented by the best scientists this country has. They float it in a nitrogen bath and, from point of generation of power to point of use it's 100 percent energy-efficient, unlike the current transmission technologies that we have today, where we lose 25 to 80 percent of our power.

There has to be a majority in here, 218, that are capable of thinking about living in the future and not just the past.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think that he's trying to be a good budgeteer, I guess, but in so doing, he cuts off the nose to spite his face.

America deserves to have an energy future, and it won't happen with amendments like this one.

So I oppose the gentleman's amendment, ask my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

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

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

Mr. LAMBORN. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. COHEN (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent, again, that we consider it as read. I think my friend from Colorado who shares my birth date doesn't understand what is going on. He doesn't want to listen to this. Nobody wants to listen to this.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. COHEN. My amendment, which is worthy of being considered and passed, but not necessarily to be heard, would re-appropriate $50 million from the Weapons Activities account to the Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency account, kind of a compromise about what we've been hearing. It doesn't take too much from nuclear. It gives some back to solar. It's a compromise where we work together.

In this bill, the Weapons Activities account, which had been funded at $7.7 billion, that's more than $190 million over the President's request, and over $95 million more than the account had in 2013. And to offset this increase, which the committee voted, the committee decided to do so by funding the Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability and Efficiency account at only $982 million, slashing that account by almost 50 percent in this budget.

While ensuring the security of the United States is certainly very, very important, the consequences of ignoring climate change trends and data is resulting in a serious and ever-growing threat right here on our own soil.

I know that the goal of everybody here in the House is energy independence, and it's a paramount concern to all of us. However, in order to achieve this goal, we must dedicate ourselves and our budget to the serious business of securing that energy future.

Ensuring that our renewable energy research program is adequately funded is one of the most effective and climate-neutral ways to achieve this goal. For example, solar power is the most abundant energy resource available to the planet, and demand for solar power in the United States is at an all-time high.

As solar prices continue to fall, Americans are reassessing their energy resources. Cutting funding to projects that make this clean energy even more affordable is not prudent, and out of line with the priorities of clean-energy minded Americans.

Renewable energy is secure and domestic, and energy-efficient programs not only result in greater resource supplies but savings for families and businesses alike.

According to the Alliance to Save Energy, the President's climate plan to double domestic energy production by utilizing methods like renewable energy could save the average family household more than $1,000 every year on energy bills.

Investing in renewable energy will result in safer domestic energy, job creation in the clean energy sector, and lower heating and cooling bills across the country.

For these reasons and others, and in the best interest of our Nation's energy security, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment. I would ask you to spend money on finding research to see ways we can come up with renewable energy and improve the savings, and save about the future, save it and yet not cut too much from the nuclear program, which we already have funded higher than the President requested or last year.

I would ask for a ''yes'' vote on this amendment, a compromise amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and speak in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman's amendment, as he said, would increase funding for this EERE account and by cutting weapons activities in the NNSA administration and using that as an offset.

Our bill not only cuts the renewable energy and energy efficiency accounts, it also cuts fossil energy by $84 million, 16 percent, nuclear energy by 14 percent.

As I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, our allocation made for some tough choices. We've placed highest priority on activities in which the Federal Government must take the lead. One of those, of course, the most critical mass is assuring funding for national security. It's our highest priority.

While I support the programs that he outlines, we should not divert to programs from national security. Therefore, I oppose his amendment and ask Members to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1745

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

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

Mr. LAMBORN. I rise in opposition to this amendment. I object to where this money is being cut. The amendment would take another $50 million away from already low amounts for modernizing our nuclear stockpile. The President agreed several years ago that he would modernize our nuclear stockpile in order to secure ratification of the New START Treaty. Under that treaty, both Russian and U.S. forces are being reduced; but we have to modernize the force so that we maintain a credible deterrent with the remaining weapons after the reductions take place.

The President is not fully funding that obligation. That's troubling enough. This committee has lowered what the President recommended to an even lower level, and that's even more troubling. If we take this amendment for a further reduction, we're really getting into serious cuts.

The trouble with not modernizing our nuclear capability is that we will no longer have an effective deterrent. These weapons degrade over time. They lose their effectiveness and reliability. If we have allies who can't depend on our nuclear deterrent, what are they going to want to do? They're going to want to go out and start their own nuclear programs. Countries like Korea and Japan are already talking about that, by the way. Unless you want more nuclear proliferation in the world, you want the U.S. to maintain a serious and credible deterrent and have an effective nuclear arsenal.

So this amendment takes us in the wrong direction. It's not good strategically for the United States. It's not a good savings of money, and I would urge strong rejection of this amendment.

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

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

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

Mrs. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. We've had these discussions. We've got enough money in nuclear weapons to destroy the world thousands and thousands and thousands of times. And I understand defense, but I also understand the future. And the future is energy self-reliance. And that comes from the Sun. It's not going to be taken out of the Earth. It's going to come from the solar energy that God has given us to harness and use for mankind.

So the amendment, in my opinion, is a sound amendment and budgetary use. But even more so—and it's getting off the path—the reality is the distinguished gentleman made his remarks and said there's nothing more important than our Defense Department. I submit to you that we're cutting $1.6 billion from the National Institutes of Health. That's my defense department and your defense department and everybody else's defense department. Because cancer, heart disease, stroke, diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, and AIDS, that's the enemy that's going to get each one of us. And we're cutting $1.6 from NIH, which is our defense department.

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

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

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the item relating to ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency'', after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,751,000)''.

In the spending reduction account, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,751,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. This amendment would reduce the appropriations that are suggested for the energy programs relating to renewable energy, energy reliability, and efficiency by $4.751 million and increase the spending reduction account by that same amount. It is meant to eliminate the committee-recommended increase to funding for facilities and infrastructure under this section of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, we must do everything that we can to rein in spending. We're facing an economic emergency as a Nation. My friends, particularly on the other side, seem to not face the fact that we're headed for an economic meltdown if we don't stop this uncontrolled spending that I believe is irresponsible.

My amendment is not a cut to funding, but to simply eliminate a proposed increase, keeping the appropriated amount at the current level we have right now today.

I believe this is a commonsense amendment, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment. Our bill already cuts the National Renewable Energy Lab, or NREL, within the Department of Energy. We cut it by $15 million below the President's request. That's a 33 percent reduction. Quite honestly, I don't think the facility could take any further reductions that undermine this budget consolidation, which is something we've sought, something which the Department of Energy has gone ahead with. Therefore, I oppose the amendment, and urge others to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia. This is a chart showing U.S. imports of oil since 1973, where America is more vulnerable in every succeeding decade. We know that if gas prices in this country go over $4 a gallon, we go into deep recession.

We live at the edge every year, and we've seen what happens. So I repeat what I've said in prior debates today: either you live in the past or you attempt to live in the future and build a future.

I think that the gentleman's amendment, though it might be well intentioned, is moving America backwards. We simply have to address the fact that we are not energy independent as a country, and the renewable energy accounts are part of that future. We must embrace it. We must move our Nation away from complete dependence on foreign sources of energy and stand on our own two feet here at home.

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

First amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 236, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

AYES—177

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

NOES—236

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp

Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—21

Barber
Bass
Campbell
Conyers
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Grijalva
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Polis
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Young (FL)

□ 1821

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, CULBERSON, ENYART, and DAVID SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. TITUS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. SCHRADER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 226, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

AYES—188

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

NOES—226

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

NOT VOTING—20

Barber
Camp
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Polis
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Young (FL)

□ 1829

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 312, I was in conversation with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee discussing matters important to the Mississippi National Guard. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 152, noes 264, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

AYES—152

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—264

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

NOT VOTING—18

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Polis
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Young (FL)

□ 1836

Mr. CICILLINE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 275, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

AYES—140

Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Connolly
Cooper
Cramer
Cuellar
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Duckworth
Engel
Eshoo
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Gallego
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gohmert
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanna
Harris
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Huffman
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Kuster
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Marino
Markey
Massie
Matsui
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Pascrell
Perry
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Radel
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Ruppersberger
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (SC)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—275

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)

Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pocan
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schwartz
Scott, Austin
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waters
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

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

□ 1843

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. PELOSI was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONGRATULATING THE HONORABLE EDWARD MARKEY

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chairman, I rise with the greatest respect, admiration, and appreciation to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), who has served nearly 4 decades in the House of Representatives.

Two weeks ago, in their wisdom, the people of Massachusetts elected him to the United States Senate. I'm pleased to yield to the skillful leader, this person of great vision, a legislative virtuoso, a person who has served with great values. It is a bittersweet moment for me to yield for the last time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Thirty-seven years ago, I stepped off a plane here, and it was my first visit in my life to Washington, D.C. I had never been here before, and I was sworn in as a Congressman on my first visit to this city 37 years ago.

I am so proud to have been a Congressman here in this Chamber along with all of you. For me, the House is democracy in action, all of us declaring our love of country and our desire for a better future for all of our constituents and for our Nation.

I am honored to have served here. I am blessed to have made so many wonderful friends here. And I am humbled by the dedication of all of you to this great Nation. As I have represented Massachusetts, so too have each of you represented your States with your conscience.

I now go to serve in the Senate, but there is a big part of me that will always be a man of the House after 37 years having served here in this great body.

With that, for the last time, I say: Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 153, noes 257, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

AYES—153

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cotton
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stockman
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—257

Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz

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

NOT VOTING—24

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

□ 1855

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

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

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

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

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

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

□ 1900

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

Every month, by about $40 billion, we are importing more goods and services than we are exporting. In many cases, that is because of the crude oil that we have to import month after month after month because we are not meeting our own energy needs. And the United States, at our peak production, optimal peak production, we only have about 3 percent of the world's crude oil. However, our country, our consumers, our people, we consume about 22 percent of the world's crude oil.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This amendment cuts all such subsidies.

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

□ 1915

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

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

Where would we be?

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By golly, I'd fight for these Americans any day of the year because I know the next generation will be more independent than today's generation because of what they are doing, and I will do anything in my power to help them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Madam Chair, 2 years ago, on September 8, 2011, San Diego and much of southern California, Arizona, and parts of Mexico suffered a huge electric power failure. This was the biggest electric power failure in the history of California.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment. The amendment would increase Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability and Efficiency by $10 million using, once again, as others have before him, the Departmental Administration account as an offset.

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1930

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERLMUTTER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

power disruption and improved efficiency.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1945

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Madam Chair, this bill would be fine if we were still living in the 1950s, in a world where we had few energy limitations, no knowledge of the fact that burning fossil fuels would alter the chemistry of our atmosphere and the trajectory of our Earth's climate. We lived in a world where energy was much more affordable and a world where the United States was the dominant economic and manufacturing power. It was also a time when there were two nuclear powers, and we believed that nuclear weapons were a guarantee of security.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

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

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

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NUCLEAR ENERGY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2000

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2015

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment to increase funds for the Department of Energy Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup account. As I conclude, I believe it is critically important that Congress provide funding to clean up areas contaminated by past Department of Energy activities and mistakes. I urge Members to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

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

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

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

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

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

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

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

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for non-defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $194,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REED

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I applaud our subcommittee chairman for the work that he has done in regard to this bill, and I ask our subcommittee chairman to support this amendment as well as for all fellow Members on both sides of the aisle to stand with this amendment in a commonsense way in order to save taxpayer dollars in the long term and, at the same time, get rid of a true problem, which is this non-defense nuclear waste that is now located at facilities across America. With that, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 2030

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

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

SCIENCE

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment that I'm offering restores basic science research to the enacted levels, and it offsets this change with funds from the $7.7 billion appropriated for nuclear weapons, which is an increase of $98 million, 1 percent over the enacted level. The Congressional Budget Office says that this amendment has zero impact on budget authority and actually reduces 2014 outlays by $22 million.

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

□ 2045

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I do oppose the amendment because it would increase funding for the Office of Science, not because I don't support the Office of Science, but it would hit our National Nuclear Security Administration's weapons activity account. I do support the basic science programs championed by our colleague. We worked hard in our committee to prioritize basic science. As I said earlier, this bill actually increases the Office of Science's budget by $32 million above the current post-sequester level, but we still make national defense the first priority in our bill, and so I oppose this amendment and urge others to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

I want to make it clear that the intent of this amendment is not to reduce the large amount of high-quality research that goes on in NNSA-supported programs; but a large fraction of the funding in this account goes to production and future production facilities for weapons systems that serve no clearly defined strategic purpose in today's geopolitics, or they go to programs for which the cost estimates, the project management, or both have come under repeated criticism when they come under external independent review.

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

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

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

Earlier this year, the GAO added that NNSA was:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2100

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

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

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

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

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

But science has been a way that America has proven her greatness because we've allowed those with talent and opportunity to be able to share that talent in advancing the quality of life, not only for Americans, but humankind.

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This appropriation bill simply decimates that budget, that critical investment in today and tomorrow, and in the economy of the future. Our ability to deal with climate change, our ability to deal with energy, are just stripped, gutted and actually set aside as a result of this appropriation bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As the committee report notes, ARPA-E works on ''developing energy technologies whose development and commercialization are too risky to attract significant private sector investment but are capable of significantly changing the energy sector to address our critical economic and energy security challenges.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2115

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. I also want to thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Colorado for their enthusiasm about this important project. The amendment that my colleague from California is bringing forward is modest in scope. I'll say to my colleagues who want to see spending reduced, we're talking about the difference between an 81 percent cut, as is in the chairman's mark today, to a 74 percent cut, if we add this $20 million back in. It's a modest number, but it's an important number because the committee could only do what the committee could do. And I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman. I know he is committed to this research.

I hate to hear folks describe the commitment to advancement, Mr. Chairman, the commitment to next-generation technologies as a Republican or a Democrat commitment. I think it's an American commitment. It's certainly a House commitment, and it's one that the chairman and the ranking member tried their best within their allocations to satisfy.

What are you going to take the money away from, Mr. Chairman? Look at what we're dealing with in this appropriations bill. We're talking about nuclear security. We're talking about environmental cleanup. We're talking about uranium enrichment, decontamination, and decommissioning. The choices we have here are tough choices. And the amendment that's before us now, knowing that we want to put the money where it's going to do the most good, says let's take the money out of administration. That's not to say that there doesn't have to be administration. That's not to say phones don't have to be answered and electricity doesn't have to be turned on. But when you have to make tough choices, the one that the gentleman from California is asking us to make today is: Are we going to invest in the bureaucracy or are we going to invest in that opportunity to make tomorrow so much more different than today?

If my colleagues haven't had a chance, look at those project teams like the one my colleague from Colorado mentioned and what they are researching. Mr. Chairman, I come from coal-burning country. And the work that ARPA-E is doing on carbon sequestration could change the debate about American energy independence forever.

ARPA-E isn't working on what is going to happen tomorrow. They're working on what's going to happen in the next generation; what is it going to be that changes the debate forever. Those are the kinds of ideas that this $21 million will support.

Mr. Chairman, it's the commitment to fundamental research, the commitment to game-changing ideas that is a bipartisan commitment. It's one that goes from coast-to-coast, from north to south, and on both sides of the aisle.

Again, I'm grateful to the gentlelady from Ohio and the chairman from New Jersey for all they have done to try to support these accounts. It is my great hope that my colleagues here in the House will support the gentleman from California's amendment and we'll get this $20 million plus-up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCNERNEY. I rise in support of the Schiff amendment, which makes sure that we continue investing in quality energy research programs that will benefit the United States.

Energy innovation, research and development are essential for our country, especially if we truly want to move forward with reducing our energy dependence on fossil fuels. One important component of this goal is the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, or ARPA-E. Since 2009, ARPA-E has funded over 275 potentially transformational energy technology projects. Many of the research projects are occurring in my own State of California.

These companies, national labs, and educational institutions are working on items that will greatly benefit the energy security of our country. Some projects include Distributed Power Flow Control Using Smart Wires for Energy Routing; Low-Cost Biological Catalyst to Enable Efficient CO_2 Capture; Large-Scale Energy Reductions Through Sensors, Feedback, and Information Technology; Highly Dispatchable and Distributed Demand Response for the Integration of Distributed Generation; and Carbon Nanotube Membranes for Energy-Efficient Carbon Sequestration.

Our Nation faces significant energy challenges in the years ahead, both from a production and reliability standpoint, but also from the effects of climate change. Climate change's effects include severe storms, sea level rise, and the extremely poor air quality that continually plagues California's Central Valley. We must become more energy efficient, reduce the release of CO_2 and other harmful greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, and improve our electric grid and its ability to meet peak demands. ARPA-E projects aim to solve these problems and at the same time will help reduce blackouts, reduce energy costs, and improve both environmental and public health.

ARPA-E initiatives help facilitate future private investments by helping companies reach their potential in the early stages. In fact, the American Energy Innovation Council, which consists of some of America's largest companies, like Lockheed Martin and Microsoft, has called for ARPA-E to be funded at 10 times the proposed level. Unfortunately, the bill today provides only $50 million for ARPA-E, which is $215 million less than what was enacted the last fiscal year and $329 million less than the President's request.

ARPA-E project successes have attracted more than $450 million in private investments. It's this return on investment that must be continued, not cut back. The Schiff amendment aims to correct this error in the underlying bill.

The only reason I can think of to reduce ARPA-E funding is to help prop up fossil fuel industries, and that's going to get us more global warming and cause us more problems. We need to reduce global warming. Global warming is a threat to our national security. We need to fight it. ARPA-E is going to give us the tools to do that.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE 17 INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

Such sums as are derived from amounts received from borrowers pursuant to section 1702(b)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 under this heading in prior Acts, shall be collected in accordance with section 502(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided*, That, for necessary administrative expenses to carry out this Loan Guarantee program, $22,000,000 is appropriated, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided further*, That $22,000,000 of the fees collected

pursuant to section 1702(h) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16512(h)) shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account to cover administrative expenses and shall remain available until expended, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $0: *Provided further*, That fees collected under section 1702(h) in excess of the amount appropriated for administrative expenses shall not be available until appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Department of Energy shall not subordinate any loan obligation to other financing in violation of section 1702 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16512) or subordinate any Guaranteed Obligation to any loan or other debt obligations in violation of section 609.10 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM

For administrative expenses in carrying out the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program, $6,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates the remaining funding for the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan program, transferring $6 million to the Spending Reduction Account. Since 2008, the U.S. Government has been in the business of lending money to build cars that no one wants to buy. For instance, $50 million went to the Vehicle Production Group for natural gas minivans. That company failed. Meanwhile, $190 million went to Fisker Automotive to make electric cars that catch on fire. For instance, the Karma, Fisker's hybrid-electric luxury sedan, which cost around $100,000 apiece, was recalled to fix a hose connection that allowed coolant leaks into the battery chamber, causing an electrical short. Fortunately, no one was hurt before production was ended. Unfortunately, taxpayers got back only a fraction of the payout.

Mr. Chairman, I'm 100 percent supportive of the automobile industry producing more fuel-efficient automobiles. However, there's simply no good reason that the Federal Government should be subsidizing billion-dollar companies at a time when our Nation is broke. It is time that we begin to reverse this disturbing trend of energy loan programs for companies and let the automobile industry succeed or fail in the marketplace on its own merits. We have to stop these kinds of subsidies, particularly in these hard times when our Nation is in an economic emergency.

I urge support of this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. While I appreciate the gentleman's position on the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan program—and certainly some of his knowledge of the program is entirely accurate—the elimination of this funding would hurt Federal oversight of the more than $8 billion in loans already given. As our committee report states, there are no new applications for this program, and the Department of Energy doesn't expect any. The committee recommendation includes the $6 million as a reasonable amount to provide oversight and direction to the existing loan portfolio, and no more.

So I must oppose the gentleman's amendment in order to ensure proper oversight of taxpayers' funding that's already out there in the form of loans, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $30,000, $187,863,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): *Provided*, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total $108,188,000 in fiscal year 2014 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95–238, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $79,675,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,200,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 2130

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to add my appreciation to the committee's work. It's tough work. It's important work because this is how we serve the American people.

I ask my colleagues to discuss with me—or follow my discussion on the importance of the amendment that I offer because it is an amendment that takes its funding from a source of funding that has been discussed previously, and that is the Atomic Energy Defense Activities, National Nuclear Security Administration. But it does take these moneys and it uses them in a very constructive manner. It is moneys to maintain for environmental justice that go to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, minority-serving institutions, tribal colleges, and other organizations. This is imperative in preserving sustainability and growth of a community and environment.

Mr. Chairman, that is the intent, the simple intent, that alongside of the important work of this appropriation of the Energy and Water there is a constant need to be assured that our communities are protected. Let me cite just a few examples as we proceed.

Many of us understand the recent tragedy that occurred—not in this country, but recently occurred in Canada where areas were wiped out. This is an important highlight for what environmental justice is all about.

Many of us have heard in the years past of the Buffalo Creek disaster. This is what environmental justice does; it is to fund programs that are vital to ensuring that minority groups are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environment and the continued preservation of their homes.

But it goes further. It is underserved areas. It is as much important to preserve areas in Appalachia, in the Delta, in places where poor communities cannot, if you will, represent themselves. Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and our citizens can improve their surroundings.

What better group than Historically Black Colleges, minority-serving institutions that include Hispanic-serving institutions and tribal colleges; why are they the best to move in that direction? Primarily because they communicate with those underserved communities.

Funds that would be awarded to this important cause would increase youth involvement in STEM fields and also promote clean energy, weatherization cleanup, and asset revitalization. These improvements will provide protection to our most vulnerable groups.

Many people believe environmental justice has to do with lawsuits. It has to do with outreach and information.

This is simply a small program that allows the Department of Energy to focus on this constituency and ensure the coverage and the protection.

This program provides better access to technology for underserved communities. Together, the Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture distributed access to information which generates a recognition of protecting the environment. Community leaders are able as well to participate in environmental justice.

In our communities, in urban areas, there's a need for environmental justice. Again, what better institutions than those institutions that draw their population from the communities, that draw their population from the reservations or from the communities that our Native Americans are engaged in?

So I ask my colleagues to look at this program, look at the, if you will, fiscal responsibility that I've utilized in drawing from the program to invest in environmental justice. It's a fair way to give resources to these vital institutions that, to be frank with you, Mr. Chairman, they don't have the resources, but they do good work.

Texas Southern University had an environmental justice clinic located in Houston in the 18th Congressional District. But let me be very clear, this is not an earmark. These are resources that can be used by the Department of Energy that will respond to this broad depth of universities, Historically Black Colleges, tribal institutions, minority-serving—which include, of course, the Hispanic-serving institutions.

Let me quickly say that since 2002, the Tribal Energy Program has also funded 175 energy projects. But again, this is limited to environmental justice. I believe this is an effective utilization of these funds and would ask my colleagues to ensure that we have the funds to ensure the good work of these particular entities.

Let me conclude by asking my colleagues to support the education of our young people in the environmental protection area that enhances the communities from which they have come, making America better. I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I must oppose the gentlelady's amendment. This is, though, a very important program, and I support it, our committee supports it. But this program is primarily funded within the Office of Legacy Management. That office receives substantive funding in this bill under the account for other defense activities.

Funding for the Legacy Management increases $3.4 million over fiscal year 2013. The Office of Legacy Management is the correct office to provide stewardship for the legacy sites. They are the experts. And I am happy to help ensure that this very important program receives support within available funding for Legacy Management.

I look forward to working with Ms. JACKSON LEE to support this program as we move on through the appropriations process, but I oppose the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to yield to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady, and I thank my good friend from New Jersey. But I do want to cite that nearly 10 years ago, President Clinton produced Executive Order 12898, thereby highlighting the importance of not only giving greater attention to our underserved communities, but also how we can help our citizens by educating them on the areas in which they live. That falls under the particular account that I'm utilizing, and I would therefore like to go forward in this instance.

Let me just be very appreciative of my good friend, the chairman of this subcommittee, and the ranking member. I am very appreciative of how difficult it is under sequester. But what I would say is that these entities—Historically Black Colleges, minority-serving and tribal colleges—in the course of what we're trying to do, these resources, added to what the gentleman has already indicated, the $3.2 million, $3.4 million is meager in what they could do with protecting communities, educating communities about their environmental needs.

So that's environmental justice. It is expanding the reach so that communities are far more protected than those that we've seen.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady for bringing this issue before us during this debate.

You know, when I look at the executives that come and appear before our subcommittee from the Department, I would have to say that the gentlelady brings a very important concern to our subcommittee.

I would not say that if I look at those who have come, they are completely representative of our country. So I'm not sure that the consciousness exists at the highest level for assuring that all communities in America are engaged in the activities of the Department.

I don't know—I heard the chairman, and there is a concern about which accounts have been included in the gentlelady's amendment. I would hope that, as this legislation moves forward, we could find a way to accomplish the gentlelady's objectives in a way that would not raise concerns on the other side.

So I think that she has really brought an important proposal before us here, and I would hate to see that it would not be considered simply because a wrong account has been identified, for example. So I would just like to remain open to the gentlelady's proposal in a manner in which it could be considered and ultimately approved.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentlewoman yield for a moment if you still have time?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me sort of clarify, because the chairman has made a point about a certain area where it is referencing Historically Black Colleges. They are referencing several areas. I am speaking specifically to environmental justice, which is represented in the Departmental Administration account. So I'm focusing on the important work that these colleges can do as it relates to educating our poor, impoverished communities and communities of which they have a direct ability to communicate with.

I will tell you, bringing forth environmental experts out of these jurisdictions—tribal colleges, minority-serving, and Historically Black—is a great asset to improving the quality of life of all Americans. So I would ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

So mine is one of the references. There are many references where Historically Black Colleges are, but this is specifically dealing with environmental justice.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would also say to the gentlelady that in many communities that are contaminated around this country and have problems, oftentimes they are in neighborhoods and places where people who are minority, who are tribal, people who are not necessarily represented broadly within the Department live. So I think that we have to be conscious in all parts of the Department, that there should be an inclusivity.

So I think that the gentlelady has done a service, as always, by raising our consciousness to all of the activities of the Department and that they be sensitive to all parts of America, including environmental justice. So I would hope that as we move forward, we could find a way to support the gentlelady's concerns.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,500,000)''.

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $9,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the appropriations for the Department of Energy's salaries and expenses by $9.5 million and place that amount in the spending reduction account. When combined with the reduction included in the underlying bill, this amount would represent a 25 percent cut from current levels.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that this may seem somewhat drastic. However, I've spoken again and again today about the fiscal emergency facing our country.

There are legitimate constitutional functions of the Federal Government which must be funded, particularly those that relate to our national defense. Yet even those functions are facing cuts—deep cuts. This means that prioritization is necessary so that we may determine our wants versus our needs.

We need to open up access to new sources of energy. We need to stop being dependent on foreign oil. The Department of Energy has done very little to further either of these goals. In fact, according to its original purpose of being stood up, it has been a dismal failure.

Certainly, there are advances to be made in current technology. But in the here and now, we know that we are sitting on vast resources that are so tied up in red tape it could be decades before they could come to fruition.

The House has passed several bills—and will continue to pass bills—to lighten the Federal burden and bring true energy freedom to this country. But the Senate and the administration disagree with us. They would rather throw millions upon millions towards new sources of clean energy, some of which have turned into highly publicized wastes of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Chairman, we need to prioritize developing the resources that we have now. Unfortunately, the Department of Energy has proven time and again it is out of touch with the needs of our country. The bureaucrats responsible for putting the Solyndras of the world above traditional sources of energy pull in more than $100,000 a year on average, all the while doing little to lighten costs for American families. In fact, despite a supposed hiring freeze, the Department of Energy's Web site, right now today, is currently advertising 31 job openings paying over $105,000 per year.

□ 2145

This is ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, and it must stop.

My amendment would force the Department of Energy to reevaluate its priorities and put our current needs first rather than hoping that new, clean sources of energy will pan out eventually.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, our bill had many competing priorities with a low allocation, and I appreciate my colleague's commitment to finding more savings in the bill. He is ever persistent, and I salute his willingness to challenge us each year on the floor when we do this energy and water bill, and we are not the only bill where he makes these challenges.

However, the Department Administration account in our recommendation was already suffering a $49 million cut from last year's level. Earlier amendments that we did this afternoon and this evening have taken another $60 million. There is not a lot of money left to run the department.

While some may want to close down the department, the department has some pretty incredible responsibilities in terms of nuclear safety and national defense and things that relate to cleanups and things of this nature. If they had to respond—if you will pardon the expression—to some of the emergencies that we might have as a Nation, and we know our deficit is an emergency situation, they might not be able to respond on our behalf.

Therefore, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I kind of think back to the movie Titanic. There is one scene where the captain—evidently the captain—comes out on the deck just about as the Titanic is going to hit the iceberg. I can remember the blank look on his face and thinking what had he been doing before all this happened. We saw the tragedy that occurred. Sometimes if you don't have captains in the pilot house you can really run aground, you can really have trouble.

Already, the majority this evening has cut—I think we are down to $146 million in administration in the Department of Energy, a vast department. That kind of level of cut is going to cause big mistakes. There will be accounting mistakes, there will be contracts that won't be overseen. In a way, you are seeding a very bad future for the management of the funds that we do vote for here tonight.

I think the gentleman, perhaps, isn't really familiar with everything the Department does. You can come down here and be kind of cavalier and propose amendments, but in the end, we can't absorb these cuts at the Department because you're going to have problems that are caused by no captains being at the helm.

I think that's really a big mistake, because this Department has to manage over $30 billion—billion dollars—of tax dollars on the energy and water front. These are big contracts, they are major projects that are undertaken by this Department, and to act otherwise is to really, I think, perform naively.

I think the gentleman has an objective, but I really think that he is going to cause great harm to the Republic by this amendment. Obviously, I oppose it, urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $42,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed one ambulance, $7,675,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,700,000)''.

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $23,700,000)''.

Mr. QUIGLEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment with my friend from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Our amendment is very straightforward. It simply cuts the $23.7 million from the B61 nuclear bomb not requested by the Department of Energy.

The National Nuclear Security Administration requested a 45 percent increase for a gold-plated upgrade plan for the B61 nuclear bomb. The committee provided the 45 percent increase in funding for a portion of the most expensive $10 billion upgrade plan. Then they provided an additional $23.7 million. Our amendment simply cuts these additional funds provided beyond what the agency requested.

Let me back up for a minute and explain what the $560 million in this bill is actually going to pay for. At a time when we are slashing funds for research at the NIH, failing to fund our crumbling infrastructure, and underinvesting in our children's education, we are increasing funding to keep hundreds of nuclear bombs in operation that we will never use.

The Cold War is over. Mr. Chairman, I thought today that I was back in a ''Twilight Zone'' episode—well, they're all like this—where you woke up in the morning and it is 50 years earlier—it's 1963. The Cold War is still raging.

Despite the fact that security experts of all political stripes, including conservatives Henry Kissinger and George Shultz, have called for deep cuts to our outsized nuclear stockpile.

General Cartwright, former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said the ''military utility'' of the B61 is ''practically nil.''

As the U.S. and Russia work to reduce their nuclear stockpiles and shift funds to meet today's threats, the B61 in Europe will be one of the first weapons cut. Just last month in Berlin, the President stated that he wants to ''seek bold reductions in tactical weapons,'' aka the B61, in Europe.

My friends on the other side of the aisle claim they want to reduce the deficit. I agree, but if we are actually going to reduce spending, everything has to be on the table, including defense. This amendment is a tiny, thoughtful cut to an outsized nuclear budget for weapons that do little to keep us safe.

I hope my colleagues will join me in cutting funds not requested by the Department of Energy for nuclear upgrades not needed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. QUIGLEY for bringing forward this important amendment. There has been growing concerns, in fact, raised by the Air Force's 2008 Blue Ribbon Review regarding the effectiveness and vulnerabilities of the B61s.

The B61 bomb was originally developed and placed in Europe during the Cold War for Cold War-era threats. Today, according to General James Cartwright, former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the military utility of the B61 is ''practically nil.'' Let me repeat that: According to General James Cartwright, the military utility of the B61 is practically nil.

Despite the lack of utility, the price tag continues to rise. As it rises, some of our allies, like Germany, have called for the B61s to be removed from their borders. There is no reason that we should spend more and more taxpayer dollars on programs that aren't even needed or wanted by our NATO allies and don't contribute to our national security.

These missiles are a kind of saving opportunity that we need to take advantage of. Given our fiscal restraints, we need to ensure that taxpayer dollars are not wasted on programs that don't protect our national security.

This amendment is simple: it cuts the B61 program back to the agency's own request level, saving $23.7 million. To me, this is about as much of a no-brainer of a cut that we can find. Let's do it.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes'' on the Quigley-Polis amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Our bill provides $560 billion for the B61 Life Extension Program, $23.7 million above the request.

I understand there are concerns about the cost of the refurbishment of the B61 and the committee shares those concerns. As a result, this bill contains a provision that requires that NNSA provide a full analysis of the alternatives that were considered. But failing to move forward without the full support of the B61 refurbishment will put that program even further behind what is already a tight schedule.

The Government Accountability Office conducted a study of the B61 Life Extension Program in 2011 and reported there was no room left in the refurbishment schedule. If the Life Extension Program slips further behind, there will be gaps in the United States commitment to our NATO allies.

In fiscal year 2012, NNSA performed a full cost estimate for the B61 refurbishment, and the Department of Defense Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation validated those costs. This was the most comprehensive and accurate performed by the NNSA on a life extension to date—aka the administration was behind the most comprehensive and accurate report on the program to date—and the costs, by everybody's admission, were admittedly staggering.

Those costs were ultimately verified and provided to the committee in a cost report. The amount of funding in this bill is consistent with that cost report and provides $23.7 million above the amount requested, which fell slightly short of the validated figures.

The National Nuclear Security Administration explained the shortfall away by stating they would find unspecified ''efficiencies in the program,'' hence the additional money.

While I do support a concerted effort that will lower the cost of this program to the taxpayer, we never received any plan on how the NNSA—aka the administration—proposes to find savings. This is not the first time this has happened.

The administration has as a stated goal to reduce the overall cost of the W76 Life Extension Program. The Department of Energy's inspector general reported there was no credible plan to make savings and that the lower funding levels being requested would simply lead to delays in the refurbishment.

We cannot allow the B61 Life Extension Program to be further delayed given the important role it serves in providing a nuclear umbrella to our allies.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to agree with what the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the subcommittee, has just said, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, we have debated similar concepts recently and we rejected them. This would be harmful to our national security. The reason, besides what the chairman from New Jersey has already said, these weapons are forward deployed in Europe to support NATO and are employed also by U.S. strategic forces in the continental United States.

If we do not extend the life of the B61, here is what the Department of Defense has said:

> Failure to fully fund the B61 Life Extension Program will be viewed by NATO and other allies as a weakening in the overall U.S.-extended deterrence commitment, potentially prompting certain allies to pursue their own nuclear program.

Unless you want other countries in the world to start their own nuclear programs from scratch to develop their own weapons systems, increasing proliferation, then you want to reject this amendment, because that will potentially be the result if the U.S. deterrence is weakened. That's what this amendment does.

It is important that we do the Life Extension Program also because under New START, which this country entered into recently with Russia, it was determined that we would be upgrading the remaining weapons. We are making dramatic reductions in the amount of the nuclear weapons in our stockpile, so those that remain have to be more reliable or we made a bad deal.

To make sure that those remaining weapons are more reliable we do the Life Extension Programs. The B61

weapons we are talking about are 30 years or more old. They are degrading. They are using sometimes obsolescent parts, so they are not as secure as they could be. We need to do the Life Extension Program for that reason as well.

For all these reasons, I would ask that we strongly oppose and reject this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2200

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I respect and have enjoyed this thoughtful debate that we've had in the last few minutes about this issue, particularly because it raises critical issues about our relationships with our NATO allies, but let's look at the big picture here.

The 2010 START Treaty with Russia, which passed the Senate in 2009, requires that Russia and the United States reduce their stockpiles to a maximum of 1,550 nuclear weapons by 2018. Let's look at what people are talking about now, people we respect.

General James Cartwright, retired vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former commander of the U.S. nuclear forces; Richard Burt, a former chief nuclear arms negotiator; Chuck Hagel, current Secretary of Defense; Thomas Pickering, a former ambassador to Russia; and General John J. Sheehan, a former senior NATO official, all issued a report noting that the United States' nuclear deterrence could be guaranteed with 900 nuclear weapons.

According to General Cartwright:

> The world has changed, but the current arsenal carries the baggage of the Cold War . . . What is it we're really trying to deter? Our current arsenal does not address the threats of the 21st century.

Let's talk about our NATO allies.

Steve Andreasen, the Director for Defense Policy and Arms Control on the National Security Council, recently argued:

> Wouldn't it be more reassuring and wiser burden-sharing to spend this money on weapons and capabilities that are more relevant to the threats NATO faces today? Indeed, why would allies be reassured by an investment that provides no real military capability and no modicum of deterrence beyond that already provided by the U.S., Britain, and France, each of which has nuclear arsenals capable of obliterating any adversary?

The biggest concerns for NATO right now include threats from Mali and Syria, nuclear proliferation and terrorism. The B61 can do nothing to address those threats.

I close by reminding us that four great American statesmen—George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn—argued for the elimination of these short-range nuclear weapons designed to be forward deployed—that is, the B61—in their landmark 2007 op-ed.

Ms. KAPTUR. In reclaiming my time, I would like to lend support to the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois.

His amendment would cut funding from the weapons account in the amount that was added to the President's budget request for the B61. In these tight fiscal times, all programs must find efficiencies, and the $23.7 million was the amount that the administration estimated could be achieved for this activity.

So I want to thank the gentleman very much for his efforts and for waiting all day. We have to proceed in order.

I know it's excruciatingly difficult for such an athlete, like yourself, with all that pent-up energy and drive, to have to wait until this late in the evening, but we thank you for the contribution you have made in many ways, including in offering this amendment tonight.

I ask my colleagues to support his efforts, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment by Mr. SWALWELL of California.

Amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. PETERS of California.

Amendment by Mr. PERLMUTTER of Colorado.

Amendment by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment by Mr. HECK of Nevada.

Amendment by Mr. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 241, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

AYES—168

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—241

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines

Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—25

Barber
Campbell
Cole
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Heck (WA)
Horsford
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McDermott
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

□ 2228

Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. POSEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. POCAN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 256, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

AYES—158

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cotton
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stockman
Stutzman
Thornberry
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—256

Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Barber
Campbell
Esty
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Heck (WA)
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2232

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 317, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 213, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

AYES—201

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—213

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Heck (WA)
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2235

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 318, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 115, noes 300, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—115

Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cotton
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lankford
Latta
Long
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nugent
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross
Royce
Sanford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—300

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo

Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—19

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Heck (WA)
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2239

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 223, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

AYES—191

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—223

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Grijalva
Heck (WA)
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2242

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERLMUTTER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) on which further proceedings

were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 238, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

AYES—177

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—238

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Heck (WA)
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2246

Mr. WESTMORELAND changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 242, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

AYES—174

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2249

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 252, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

AYES—164

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—252

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2252

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 250, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

AYES—166

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—250

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2257

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 81, noes 325, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—81

Amodei
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Capuano
Cartwright
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
DeFazio
DeGette
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Garamendi
Grayson
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kennedy
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
Nadler
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pocan
Polis
Rohrabacher
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Scott, David
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman

NOES—335

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney

Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

□ 2301

Messrs. DUNCAN of South Carolina and MORAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. LEE of California and Ms. CLARKE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 266, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

AYES—150

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—266

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schwartz
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2304

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 273, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

AYES—143

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)

Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Hultgren
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—273

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Barber
Campbell
Franks (AZ)
Garcia
Gosar
Horsford
Hoyer
Hunter
Kirkpatrick
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Salmon
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sinema
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2307

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $14,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $16,546,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for the work they've done on this bill; but I especially want to thank the Appropriations Committee staff for helping me fine-tune this amendment very quickly at the last minute.

My amendment transfers $60 million from the International Material Protection and Removal Activities within the Global Threat Reduction Initiative to a program that will help secure our nuclear materials here at home. This year's budget request included funding for a project to construct a security perimeter around the Nevada National Security Site. Additionally, this funding was authorized by this House when we voted to pass H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act of 2014. However, the bill under consideration fails to provide funding for this critical project.

I agree that we must work with other nations to ensure their nuclear material does not fall into the wrong hands, and applaud the committee's efforts on this front. However, we should not neglect priorities to secure nuclear material on our own soil while providing $20 million in excess of what was requested to help foreign countries secure their nuclear materials.

I'm simply requesting we transfer a relatively small sum—$16 million out of a total $2.1 billion—from a portion of the bill that provides funding to other countries to secure their nuclear materials and instead use that money to secure our own facilities containing nuclear materials. This funding will be used for the DAF/Argus project, which will provide a state-of-the-art perimeter intrusion detection and assessment system at the Nevada National Security Site's Device Assembly Facility.

As I mentioned, this project is a priority for the Nevada National Security Site and was included in the President's budget request and authorized by this House just last month. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which will prioritize national security concerns here at home while still providing adequate funding to ensure nuclear material in other countries does not fall into the hands of those who wish to do us harm.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in reluctant opposition to the gentleman's amendment and I salute, obviously, his desire to protect all of our nuclear sites. I certainly share the gentleman's concern for the security of nuclear weapons infrastructure.

The security incursion at Y–12 in Oak Ridge in July of 2012 revealed some disturbing problems with Federal oversight that directly impacted the effectiveness of the protective forces. In particular, a botched security upgrade project caused an excessive number of false alarms, which distracted the security forces. And poor maintenance practices meant the security cameras where the protesters entered the high-security area were not working.

There is also a second security upgrade project at Los Alamos that was installed incorrectly. The National Nuclear Security Administration is still working on getting that project back on track.

We need to be able to upgrade our security systems, but I have concerns that taking on a third project in 2014 will lead to more problems.

□ 2315

Our report has directed NNSA to wait a year before starting the project at Nevada. Given the problems, I feel this is the most prudent path forward and will give the administration some time to implement the reforms that are so urgently needed in security oversight and project management. So I must reluctantly oppose the amendment at this time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. While the amendment is a modest one in terms of the funding in the account, which is over $400 million, I cannot support further cuts in this program.

The budget already has cut $16 million from the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, and that means nuclear material that exists globally in places that we know we need to remove it. So even though the gentleman's amendment is well intended, I think that we can't predict the consequences of this in terms of what we face globally to remove this material.

I think it's very important to recognize that there are some unfriendly actors on the face of this Earth. And we want to remove material as best as possible, working with others around the world, as the program indicates, to reduce global threats that might result from those who shouldn't have this material in the first place.

So I don't think that this is moving us in the right direction globally. I don't really think it's necessary. I thank the gentleman for bringing it to the attention of the body, but I think that nonproliferation in general is $600 million below last year's activities when you compare it to past accounts.

So I think that this is not in the best interest of the country and not in the best interest of national security. So I oppose the gentleman's amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

Mr. POLIS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $13,072,000)''.

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $13,072,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I'm offering an amendment that will reduce the funding level for the W76 by $13 million, back down to what the agency requested.

The W76 is a 1970s-era submarine-launched ballistic missile that was first introduced into the stockpile by the Navy in 1978. This bill actually increases funding by $13 million to increase funding levels above those required by the New START Treaty.

If the New START Treaty levels are in effect, it requires us to have 1,550 nuclear weapons—plenty to deter any nuclear threat, plenty to obliterate any enemy, plenty to end life on Earth as we know it. Even if we were to reduce our stockpile to 1,000 nuclear weapons, the Arms Control Association stated that it would save over $39 billion. Now, this amendment doesn't even come close to going that far, but this puts that in perspective. If we reduced our number of nuclear weapons from 1,500, enough to obliterate any enemy and destroy life as we know it on Earth, to 1,000, enough to obliterate any enemy and end life as we know it on Earth, it would save $39 billion. This amendment very simply reduces funding by $13 million, back to what the agency itself requested. It doesn't detract from nuclear preparedness at all.

These missiles are a continuing relic of Cold War policies that spend billions of taxpayer dollars every year. And it's a great opportunity for Congress to save taxpayer money while maintaining our national security. In fact, the current bill actually spends millions more than the military needs, and passage of my amendment will encourage a focused, agile, lean military policy.

In fact, a total of $1.8 billion is projected to be spent on W76 by 2016. That's a lot of money to support a very dated set of preparedness. My amendment makes a small dent in that by reducing the funding back to what the agency itself has requested.

When we have these kinds of opportunities to maintain our national security and create savings for our country and reduce our budget deficit, we need to take it.

Hans Kristensen of the Federation of American Scientists has argued that while the W76 is important for national security, we could ''probably reduce the refurbishment production by half and still retain enough W76 warheads on the submarines for a credible retaliatory capability.'' Again, my amendment doesn't even come close to the marker that was set by Hans Kristensen. It simply returns funding to the level that the agency itself has asked for and reduces funding by $13 million.

The GAO has been critical of the cost, schedule, and risk involved with the W76 program. It is an area that is ripe for a relatively minor cut like this, which will help reduce our budget deficit by $13 million.

My amendment would create $13 million in savings for taxpayers while maintaining our national security. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

The primary goals of the extension program extends the life of the original warheads from 20 to 60 years, addresses the aging issues, and refurbishes the system in a managed fashion. However, all these goals are accomplished under the funding levels that have been requested by the agency. And yet here in Congress, we're second-guessing the agency's own funding requirements and saying let's give you more money, take a few million more, take a few million more—a few million more while we cut ARPA–E, a few million more while we cut science programs, a few million more while we shortcut our own Nation's renewable energy future. And yet here's a few million more, $13 million more than an agency is even requesting, to maintain nuclear deterrents at the level of 1,550 nuclear weapons, and maintaining these particular W76 warheads from the 1970s, deployed by submarines, that we don't even need the $13 million to accomplish.

So, again, I think this is some commonsense savings. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this smart cut, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

The W76 life extension program is a critical ongoing program to extend the life of that warhead. This warhead supports the mission of our Navy's ballistic missile submarines, the most survivable leg of our nuclear deterrent.

Our nuclear deterrent posture relies heavily on this Navy mission, but the President's budget request proposed to cut production of the W76 by nearly 20 percent. I'm very concerned that these reductions to the W76 were proposed without fully explaining the force structure implications or the impacts to national security.

Therefore, this bill restores full funding for the W76 to the levels previously provided to the committee last year in the NNSA's last acquisition report. Even the Department of Energy's inspector general provided a report that stated that the National Nuclear Security Administration's plans to try to reduce costs of the ongoing W76 program would not be achieved. That IG concluded the NNSA would need additional funds above the request to stay on track with their production requirements. This bill resolves those funding problems by increasing funding $13 million above the request.

I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $2,100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Energy may make available from funds provided under this heading in this Act not more than $48,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out domestic uranium enrichment research, development, and demonstration activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $48,000,000)''.

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $48,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, at a time when the Federal Government is having to make tough, painful choices on how to prioritize taxpayer dollars, this Congress has yet to learn the lessons of the past as to where we waste the most money. In fact yet again this year, as in so many years past, the bill before us insists on throwing good money after bad. It's time to put an end to that wasteful habit.

This amendment would strike $48 million from the Nuclear Nonproliferation account, which is an earmark for a bailout to a failing uranium enrichment company, the United States Enrichment Corporation, known as USEC. This $48 million would be put towards deficit reduction.

Look, opponents of the amendment are going to claim that this money is necessary, vitally necessary, for national security when, in fact, that could not be further from the truth. In fact, the question of whether the United States Enrichment Corporation is truly necessary for our national security needs is actually being reviewed right now by the Government Accountability Office, which is expected to release a report on both the national security question as well as the economics of sending further taxpayer dollars to the United States Enrichment Corporation.

Because the report is pending, it is in the best interests of hard-earned taxpayer dollars that we suspend any further aid to USEC until we have more information as to what the company is doing with the money that it is receiving.

Indeed, the United States Enrichment Corporation is so poorly run that, last May, the New York Stock Exchange threatened to delist USEC due to its desperate financial health. Articles over the years have documented USEC's financial woes, including the near-monthly collapse of its stock prices. During the June shareholders meeting just a few weeks ago, 80 percent of USEC's shareholders voted to approve a reverse stock split due to its rock-bottom share prices. It's shocking to most observers that the company has avoided bankruptcy thus far, and it's only done so because of the continued bailout by Congress year after year in the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

As if USEC's financial troubles were not enough, just last month the company filed a Federal lawsuit against the United States for more than $38 million. This House is contemplating giving $48 million to USEC; they've got a lawsuit for $38 million.

Two decades ago, Congress created, by charter, the United States Enrichment Corporation, believing that USEC could better run the uranium enrichment facilities than the government itself. But by now, it should be intuitively obvious to the casual observer that Congress was wrong.

Since its inception, USEC has squandered billions of dollars in Federal bailouts, running its operations to near insolvency because of poor decisions. Yearly, they come to the Congress and the executive branch, hat in hand, begging for millions of dollars in bailouts to continue operation sites that are technologically out of date.

It is time that the Federal Government stop the endless bailouts to a failing enterprise.

Moreover, USEC has been a bad-faith actor in its negotiations with the uranium mining industry, which provides the needed raw materials to be enriched at these facilities. And what motivation does USEC have to negotiate in good faith with the miners when it knows that if it doesn't get everything it wants from the miners it can simply go to the Department of Energy and receive a handout, time and again, either in the form of a direct cash payment or in the form of spent uranium tails?

The Department of Energy has had a longstanding agreement with the uranium mining industry not to dump more than 10 percent of the market's worth of uranium in handouts to USEC at any given time. Yet it has become increasingly clear that the Department of Energy is willing to ignore that agreement and provide any bailout that USEC requests or desires.

This betrayal of the mining industry threatens thousands of jobs across the western United States—States like Texas, Nevada, New Mexico, Illinois, and Wyoming, to name a few. Arguments that USEC is the only facility that can supply tritium to the Department of Defense ignores the plain language of the Washington Treaty and the U.S.-India Nuclear Agreement, known as the 123 Agreement.

□ 2330

The Department of Energy has in its possession enough highly enriched uranium and tritium to last for 15 years, costing hundreds of millions of dollars less than the continued bailouts that USEC is currently receiving from the country.

It is time that Congress stood up against the continual bailouts of a failed business model. Propping up one failed company at the expense of an entire industry is not how we should operate in Congress. Let's end the bailout, let's return the money to the Treasury, let's give the hardworking taxpayer a break. It is time we did the right thing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. This is the final year of funding to a project to construct a limited number of centrifuges in order to demonstrate this technology can provide a domestic capability for enriching uranium. This capability is needed to ensure adequate supplies of enriched uranium for our defense needs.

Domestically enriched uranium is needed to supply tritium for the nuclear weapons stockpile and will eventually be needed to fuel the nuclear reactors on board our submarines and aircraft carriers. Even though we have found a way to supply all our needs for the next few years, there is still no plan on how we will fulfill our defense requirements after the limited amount of fuel has been expended.

In every future scenario, we will ultimately need to make an investment to ensure unencumbered enriched uranium is available. There is no reason to cut off funding for a project that is showing progress.

The total cost of this project was originally estimated to cost $300 million, but the project is proceeding extremely well, it remains on budget, and is on schedule for completion this December. Because of these and other expected cost savings from uranium transfers, the overall cost to the taxpayer has been reduced and could be reduced further.

The bill provides the Department with special reprogramming authority to fund the final $48 million installment, instead of direct funding. Providing the Department with flexibility on how to fulfill its portion of the cost-sharing agreement could reduce the overall costs of the program if that same progress continues and the full funding amount is not ultimately needed.

This is a responsible approach that meets our defense needs while potentially saving taxpayer dollars.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

First of all, the American centrifuge project is the only source of domestic enriched uranium—the only source. I think that is important for us to understand America is fighting for its manufacturing future on many fronts, including this one.

One needs enriched uranium in order to make tritium. Tritium is essentially for our nuclear weapons complex and enriched uranium is necessary for commercial operations. This single facility is really important because our country is running out of what we would call ''U.S. flag material,'' material that can be used for these distinct purposes.

As Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN has said, this program is currently on schedule and within budget. That is in stark contrast to some of the other programs that we've been trying to get control of in our subcommittee.

While foreign-owned facilities exist, and there are some in this Chamber who represent those facilities, there is a true need for a domestic supplier. The program in question was proposed by the Department of Energy to meet crucial national security and nonproliferation needs, and DOE has certified completion of two of the five program technical milestones. There are remaining three and they, as the chairman has said, are scheduled for completion in December and are completely on track.

This is an important program, I would say an essential program, to our country. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend from Texas.

First and foremost, my opposition to this amendment is about national security. Since the 1940s, the United States has had a U.S.-owned and -operated uranium enrichment entity in place. This allows the U.S. to control its uranium stockpile, to be a signatory to nuclear weapons treaties, and make sure that we do not rely solely on foreign-owned companies for our uranium needs.

This amendment would put this streak of nearly 70 years in jeopardy if it were to pass and would leave the U.S. without any domestic producer of enriched uranium.

Some will say that we can rely on a foreign-owned company in New Mexico to supply our uranium needs. First, the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of State have made it clear that we will never be able to rely on a foreign-owned company for our nuclear weapon triggers, to fuel our nuclear military fleet, or for any other national security purpose, period, end of story.

Even if we could rely on a foreign-owned company for these purposes, I have serious concerns about this company. This company in question is the former employer of AQ Khan, the man responsible for giving away nuclear secrets to North Korea, Iran, and Pakistan. The company did not have the controls in place to safeguard their secrets. As we now know, Pandora's box was opened because of AQ Khan and the lack of oversight of this company.

How can we now consider giving them sole control of our country's uranium enrichment process? This would put our national security at risk if we ever changed our laws to allow foreign-owned outsourcing of uranium enrichment.

Furthermore, if this amendment passes, it will likely cost the taxpayers billions more in the long-run. The United States Enrichment Corporation is a publicly-owned corporation that has invested and will invest billions of private sector money into developing new and improved enrichment technology. If USEC is not able to finish their research program and goes belly up, the Federal Government will be forced to start a new enrichment program from scratch and spend hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars to start up its own uranium enrichment program.

So we can either spend $40 million plus now and leverage billions of dollars of private investment, or we can be here a year from now appropriating billions of dollars more. I will take $40 million today over billions of dollars tomorrow any day.

In addition, the taxpayer is protected from failure of this research program. The Department of Energy is both the owner of the intellectual property of the centrifuge machines and even of the machines themselves. DOE will be able to recoup any taxpayer money that goes into the project. But make no mistake: if this project is stopped, DOE will have to spend billions more of taxpayer money to get the project up to scale as opposed to billions of dollars coming from the private sector.

Finally, this amendment, if passed, would be a jobs killer. The American Centrifuge Project currently employs over 1,000 people in multiple States. Furthermore, the project utilizes over 160 American supplier companies in at least 28 States. All of that would go away if this amendment were to pass.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that a similar amendment was offered last year on the Energy and Water appropriations bill with my friend from Texas and the new Senator from Massachusetts, ED MARKEY. It was easily defeated because of all of these very same reasons. Nothing has changed in the last year.

I urge all of my colleagues to again defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I join with the chairman and ranking member, a fellow Ohioan, in opposition to this amendment.

I strongly oppose the gentleman from Texas' amendment, as it would seriously undermine our national security.

Specifically, this amendment would strike a provision providing the Department of Energy with the authority to use existing funds for domestic uranium enrichment technology development. Let me emphasize that there is no direct funding in the bill for the project. The provision simply provides the authority to transfer existing funds from other Department of Energy programs.

In the last Congress, as we have previously spoken, the Congress beat two amendments that were offered that were similar, both with strong opposition to these amendments.

According to the National Nuclear Security Administration, in the near future, the United States will need a fully domestic source of unrestricted enriched uranium, based on domestically-developed technology, to support the nuclear weapons program and Navy nuclear reactors program.

The United States is prohibited from seeking this material internationally. Regardless of the agreements, the United States must never rely on foreign companies for such a critical component of our nuclear deterrent. Simply stated, we need U.S.-owned domestic supply of enriched uranium, and the use of a foreign supplied material would violate these long-standing policies and agreements.

This has been defeated twice before, and this is really simple. It has been defeated because this is a critical component of our nuclear deterrent. Do we want to depend on foreign or do we want to have a domestic source? Congress has twice said it would be crazy to jeopardize our nuclear deterrent and rely on foreign sources. Congress should again for the third time defeat this amendment because we need to rely on domestic in protecting the United States nuclear deterrent.

I urge my colleagues to once again oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This funding, which supports our Nation's domestic uranium enrichment capabilities, is vital for our national security and our energy security and independence. The RD&D program, located in the American Centrifuge Plant in Piketon, Ohio, is the cornerstone for a domestic source of enriched uranium.

American Centrifuge is necessary to support our national defense program needs, including supporting tritium production requirements for the U.S. nuclear stockpile. USEC has received no bailouts. It is inaccurate and misleading to use this politically-charged term in connection with an important national and energy security technology. I strongly believe that American Centrifuge is too important to our Nation's national and energy security to abandon now.

It is vital that the United States maintain a domestic technology to provide enriched uranium for national security purposes.

We must have a U.S.-owned domestic supply of enriched uranium. With the closure of the 1950s-era Paducah enrichment plant, American Centrifuge is the only available technology to meet the Nation's future national security needs for enriched uranium.

Thankfully, we don't have to rely on foreign sources. The RD&D program is within budget and on schedule for completion by December 2013. This funding is not an earmark, as it was included in the budget request and there is no direct funding in the bill for the project. The provision simply provides the authority to transfer existing funds from other DOE programs.

The Burgess amendment would remove the final piece of funding needed to complete the RD&D program, shutting down operations and essentially wasting the $200 million that has already been spent.

I urge you to support domestic uranium enrichment technology and oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 6, strike the colon and all that follows through ''activities'' on line 11.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, this is a continuation of the previous amendment. I was advised by the Parliamentarian it had to be split into two parts. So not to belabor the issue because of the lateness of the hour, the first amendment that was just voted on will remove the funding. This removes the language from the bill, the words ''provided that the Secretary of Energy may make available from funds provided under this heading in this act not more than $48 million for the purposes of carrying out domestic and uranium enrichment research development and demonstration activities.''

It is apparently necessary to remove that language as a separate amendment. It could not be included in a single amendment. So this is a continuation of the discussion that we just had.

Recognizing the lateness of the hour, I will yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2345

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Following the doctor's lead, for the reasons I opposed this amendment the last time, I oppose this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, the committee has done a considerable amount of work on one of the very expensive facilities we have in the nuclear arena. This is the MOX facility in South Carolina.

In the current report language, the committee deals with the problem that this facility has. It's over budget, isn't going anywhere, will ultimately produce a product that nobody wants. So what I'm trying to do with this amendment is to take this thing one step further in order to try to find a solution to this very, very expensive problem. If I might just quote the committee's report here:

Despite the influx of additional funding, the NNSA has been unable to recover its schedule and is now facing another $2.8 billion in additional costs. Instead of its fulfilling its responsibility to address these rising costs through reforming its management of the project and conducting an independent cost estimate to quantify these cost increases, the NNSA wrote ''TBD''—which I suspect means ''to be determined''—in its budget justification and removed all project funding from its 5-year plan while it carries out a strategic pause.

This program is in deep trouble, and it is a hole into which the U.S. taxpayers continue to pour money. I am pleased that the committee is taking steps, but I'd like the bill to take an additional step, and that's what this amendment does. Let me explain what it is all about.

Technically, the bill takes $1 million from the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation and reinserts the same amount into that account. This is done in order to avoid a point of order. The legislative intent of the amendment is therefore to remove the $1 million from the funding from the MOX facility at the Savannah River site and then direct the NNSA to instead use these funds for:

One, an independent report to analyze the potential cost-effective alternatives for plutonium disposition, including a detailed assessment of technologically feasible costs; and, two, a study examining whether there are other potential uses for the facilities already built and for the Savannah River site more generally.

While not legally binding, the Agency should comply with this legislative intent if this amendment is adopted.

The amendment is consistent with an amendment that I offered earlier with regard to the NDAA, and the language would be similar. I would urge the adoption of this. We really need to try to figure out the very best way to deal with this sinkhole of taxpayer money.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Our bill supports the most responsible path forward for dealing with this ongoing and troubled project.

The National Nuclear Security Administration has stated it is conducting a strategic pause to pursue other alternatives to the MOX plant in light of what are very large cost increases. However, it has not provided any information on what new alternatives are available which have not already been exhaustively considered. While there are considerable and valid concerns about the project's management and cost growth, the United States must fulfill its end of the plutonium disposition agreement, and more delays will only raise costs.

It is time for the Department of Energy to fix these issues and to get back

on track with meeting its commitments. There is no value in prolonging this study into fiscal year 2014.

I urge Members to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Let me just say that I normally agree with the gentleman from California on many issues. On this particular one, we will part company, but I certainly appreciate his commitment.

In the report, we state that we provide no additional funding to continue studying the alternatives to the MOX plant and that the NNSA has not described any alternatives which have not already been exhaustively considered or which are likely to resolve in any substantial cost savings to justify this pause, particularly with no permanent nuclear waste repository available after the Department's decision to unilaterally terminate Yucca Mountain.

So there are reasons for the MOX facility. We have made an enormous investment in it, and thousands of jobs are at stake. I am very sorry that we have to part company on this, but I have the highest respect for you and your work.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I appreciate the respect. You and the chairman have made a very good argument for my amendment, and I thank you for that.

My amendment doesn't do anything that you're not already trying to do. It simply gives some more specific direction to the Department, specifically to seek outside analysis of the alternatives that might be available.

Clearly, the Department has not been successful in running this project, and they are not in the process of seeking outside help. They're going to try to do it inside. I think that would be a mistake. There are people out there—there are companies and there are actually researchers outside—who could provide that outside view of what's going on.

Secondly, there are other ways of dealing with this problem. This is an aqueous process that's being used there, and it simply isn't working. There are other ways of disposing of the plutonium and of the highly enriched uranium that are proven to work—I discussed this earlier this day—and we need to study whether that can be used at this facility. We're not talking about jobs. We are actually talking about making this facility work and possibly using a different technology, but we really need to have somebody outside take a look at this whole thing.

Both you and the ranking member and the chair have adequately explained why my language should be adopted. I thank you for the committee's looking at this thing in a very hard, structured way. It has to be dealt with.

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL REACTORS

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for naval reactors activities to carry out the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition (by purchase, condemnation, construction, or otherwise) of real property, plant, and capital equipment, facilities, and facility expansion, $1,109,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $43,212,000 shall be available until September 30, 2015, for program direction.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator in the National Nuclear Security Administration, including official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $12,000, $382,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 46, line 15 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed one sport utility vehicle, three lube trucks, and one fire truck for replacement only, $4,750,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $280,784,000 shall be available until September 30, 2015, for program direction.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses, necessary for atomic energy defense, other defense activities, and classified activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $830,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, $122,734,000 shall be available until September 30, 2015 for program direction.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93–454, are approved for construction of, or participating in the construction of, a high voltage line from Bonneville's high voltage system to the service areas of requirements customers located within Bonneville's service area in southern Idaho, southern Montana, and western Wyoming; and such line may extend to, and interconnect in, the Pacific Northwest with lines between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest, and for John Day Reprogramming and Construction, the Columbia River Basin White Sturgeon Hatchery, and Kelt Reconditioning and Reproductive Success Evaluation Research, and, in addition, for official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $5,000: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2014, no new direct loan obligations may be made.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, including transmission wheeling and ancillary services, pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, and including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500, $7,750,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, up to $7,750,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southeastern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation estimated at not more than $0: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $78,081,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500 in carrying out section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the Southwestern Power Administration, $45,456,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), up to $33,564,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southwestern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014

appropriation estimated at not more than $11,892,000: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $42,000,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That, for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7152), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500; $299,919,000, to remain available until expended, of which $292,019,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), and section 1 of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1939 (43 U.S.C. 392a), up to $203,989,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Western Area Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation estimated at not more than $95,930,000, of which $88,030,000 is derived from the Reclamation Fund: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $230,738,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

For operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams, $5,330,671, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund of the Western Area Power Administration, as provided in section 2 of the Act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of that Act and of 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $4,910,671 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services from the Falcon and Amistad Dams shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the hydroelectric facilities of these Dams and associated Western Area Power Administration activities: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation estimated at not more than $420,000: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2014, the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration may accept up to $865,000 in funds contributed by United States power customers of the Falcon and Amistad Dams for deposit into the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund, and such funds shall be available for the purpose for which contributed in like manner as if said sums had been specifically appropriated for such purpose: *Provided further*, That any such funds shall be available without further appropriation and without fiscal year limitation for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission for the sole purpose of operating, maintaining, repairing, rehabilitating, replacing, or upgrading the hydroelectric facilities at these Dams in accordance with agreements reached between the Administrator, Commissioner, and the power customers.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $3,000, $304,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $304,600,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 2014 shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this account, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 2014 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $0.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 301. (a) No appropriation, funds, or authority made available by this title for the Department of Energy shall be used to initiate or resume any program, project, or activity or to prepare or initiate Requests For Proposals or similar arrangements (including Requests for Quotations, Requests for Information, and Funding Opportunity Announcements) for a program, project, or activity if the program, project, or activity has not been funded by Congress.

(b)(1) Unless the Secretary of Energy notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 3 full business days in advance, none of the funds made available in this title may be used to—

(A) make a grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling $1,000,000 or more;

(B) make a discretionary contract award or Other Transaction Agreement totaling in excess of $1,000,000, including a contract covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation;

(C) issue a letter of intent to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B); or

(D) announce publicly the intention to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the first business day of each quarter a report detailing each grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling less than $1,000,000 provided during the previous quarter.

(3) The notification required by paragraph (1) and the report required by paragraph (2) shall include the recipient of the award, the amount of the award, the fiscal year for which the funds for the award were appropriated, the account and program, project, or activity from which the funds are being drawn, the title of the award, and a brief description of the activity for which the award is made.

(c) The Department of Energy may not, with respect to any program, project, or activity that uses budget authority made available in this title under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs'', enter into a multiyear contract, award a multiyear grant, or enter into a multiyear cooperative agreement unless—

(1) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award; or

(2) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement includes a clause conditioning the Federal Government's obligation on the availability of future year budget authority and the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 3 days in advance.

(d) Except as provided in subsections (e), (f), and (g), the amounts made available by this title shall be expended as authorized by law for the programs, projects, and activities specified in the ''Bill'' column in the ''Department of Energy'' table or the text included under the heading ''Title III—Department of Energy'' in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act.

(e) The amounts made available by this title may be reprogrammed for any program, project, or activity, and the Department shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 30 days prior to the use of any proposed reprogramming which would cause any program, project, or activity funding level to increase or decrease by more than $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, during the time period covered by this Act.

(f) None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that—

(1) creates, initiates, or eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(2) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds are denied or restricted by this Act; or

(3) reduces funds that are directed to be used for a specific program, project, or activity by this Act.

(g)(1) The Secretary of Energy may waive any requirement or restriction in this section that applies to the use of funds made available for the Department of Energy if compliance with such requirement or restriction would pose a substantial risk to human health, the environment, welfare, or national security.

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of any waiver under paragraph (1) as soon as practicable, but not later than 3 days after

the date of the activity to which a requirement or restriction would otherwise have applied. Such notice shall include an explanation of the substantial risk under paragraph (1) that permitted such waiver.

SEC. 302. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be available to the same appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Available balances may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 303. Funds appropriated by this or any other Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2014 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 304. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for the construction of facilities classified as high-hazard nuclear facilities under 10 CFR Part 830 unless independent oversight is conducted by the Office of Health, Safety, and Security to ensure the project is in compliance with nuclear safety requirements.

SEC. 305. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to approve critical decision-2 or critical decision-3 under Department of Energy Order 413.3B, or any successive departmental guidance, for construction projects where the total project cost exceeds $100,000,000, until a separate independent cost estimate has been developed for the project for that critical decision.

SEC. 306. Section 20320 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007, Public Law 109–289, division B, as amended by the Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007, Public Law 110–5, is amended by striking in subsection (c) ''an annual review'' after ''conduct'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''a review every three years''.

SEC. 307. None of the funds made available by this or any subsequent Act for fiscal year 2014 or any fiscal year hereafter may be used to pay the salaries of Department of Energy employees to carry out the amendments made by section 407 of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

SEC. 308. Notwithstanding section 307 of Public Law 111–85, of the funds made available by the Department of Energy for activities at Government-owned, contractor-operated laboratories funded in this or any subsequent Energy and Water Development appropriation Act for any fiscal year, the Secretary may authorize a specific amount, not to exceed 4.5 percent of such funds, to be used by such laboratories for laboratory directed research and development.

SEC. 309. Notwithstanding section 301(c) of this Act, none of the funds made available under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science'' may be used for a multiyear contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement of $1,500,000 or less unless the contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award.

SEC. 310. Not later than June 30, 2014, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a tritium and enriched uranium management plan that provides—

(a) an assessment of the national security demand for tritium and low and highly enriched uranium through 2060;

(b) a description of the Department of Energy's plan to provide adequate amounts of tritium and enriched uranium for national security purposes through 2060; and

(c) an analysis of planned and alternative technologies which are available to meet the supply needs for tritium and enriched uranium for national security purposes, including weapons dismantlement and down-blending.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that section of the bill?

Hearing none, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 311. (a) The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than December 1, 2013, a report which provides an analysis of alternatives for each major warhead refurbishment program that reaches Phase 6.3, including—

(1) A summary of the overall cost, scope, and schedule planning assumptions for the major refurbishment activity;

(2) A full description of alternatives considered prior to the award of Phase 6.3;

(3) A comparison of the costs and benefits of each of those alternatives, to include an analysis of trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives against each alternative considered;

(4) An assessment of the risks, costs, and scheduling needs for each military requirement established by the Department of Defense and/or any requirement established to enhance safety, security, or maintainability;

(5) Identification of the cost and risk of critical technology elements associated with each refurbishment alternative, including technology maturity, integration risk, manufacturing feasibility, and demonstration needs; and

(6) Identification of the cost and risk of capital asset and infrastructure capabilities required to support production and certification of each refurbishment alternative.

(b) The Secretary of Energy or the Secretary's designee shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that—

(1) No less than three feasible and distinct alternatives are considered prior to the award of milestone Phase 6.3 for any major warhead refurbishment program; and

(2) Appropriate trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives have been made to ensure that the program is affordable when considering the per unit cost and the total acquisition cost in the context of the total resources available during the period covered by the most recent stockpile stewardship and management plan and the future-years nuclear security plan submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made.

(c) In this section, the term ''major warhead refurbishment program'' includes all nuclear weapons life extension programs, alterations, and modifications carried out for the life cycle management of the nuclear weapons stockpile, and all non-routine nuclear weapons stockpile activities that are estimated to cost over $1,000,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, beginning on line 16, amend section 311 to read as follows:

SEC. 311. The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees (as defined in 10 U.S.C. 101(a)(16)) not later than December 1, 2013, a report that provides an analysis of alternatives for each major warhead refurbishment program that reaches Phase 6.3, including—

(1) a summary of the overall cost, scope, and schedule planning assumptions for the major refurbishment activity;

(2) a full description of alternatives considered prior to the award of Phase 6.3;

(3) a comparison of the costs and benefits of each of those alternatives, to include an analysis of trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives against each alternative considered;

(4) an assessment of the risks, costs, and scheduling needs for each military requirement established by the Department of Defense or any requirement established to enhance safety, security, or maintainability;

(5) identification of the cost and risk of critical technology elements associated with each refurbishment alternative, including technology maturity, integration risk, manufacturing feasibility, and demonstration needs; and

(6) identification of the cost and risk of capital asset and infrastructure capabilities required to support production and certification of each refurbishment alternative.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a noncontroversial amendment, worked out jointly with the minority and the authorizing committees.

It would amend the existing section 311 to require only the report on analysis of alternatives for major weapons programs to be submitted to both the authorizers and appropriators. This is a change requested by the authorizers, and I am happy to be able to include it. I ask that this amendment be supported.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. We have no objection to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, notwithstanding 40 U.S.C. 14704, and for necessary expenses for the Federal Co-Chairman and the Alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission, for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $70,317,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100–456, section 1441, $29,915,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading,

$850,000 shall be made available to procure Inspector General services from the Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Delta Regional Authority and to carry out its activities, as authorized by the Delta Regional Authority Act of 2000, notwithstanding sections 382C(b)(2), 382F(d), 382M, and 382N of said Act, $11,319,000, to remain available until expended.

DENALI COMMISSION

For expenses of the Denali Commission including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment as necessary and other expenses, $7,396,000, to remain available until expended, notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 306(g) of the Denali Commission Act of 1998: *Provided*, That funds shall be available for construction projects in an amount not to exceed 80 percent of total project cost for distressed communities, as defined by section 307 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (division C, title III, Public Law 105–277), as amended by section 701 of appendix D, title VII, Public Law 106–113 (113 Stat. 1501A–280), and an amount not to exceed 50 percent for non-distressed communities.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Northern Border Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, $1,355,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be available for administrative expenses, notwithstanding section 15751(b) of title 40, United States Code.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 59, line 9 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, $250,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, including official representation expenses (not to exceed $25,000), $1,043,937,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated herein, not more than $9,500,000 may be made available for salaries, travel, and other support costs for the Office of the Commission, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which, notwithstanding section 201(a)(2)(c) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 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 $920,721,000 in fiscal year 2014 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2014 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation estimated at not more than $123,216,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be for university research and development in areas relevant to their respective organization's mission, and $5,000,000 shall be for a Nuclear Science and Engineering Grant Program that will support multiyear projects that do not align with programmatic missions but are critical to maintaining the discipline of nuclear science and engineering.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $11,105,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $9,994,000 in fiscal year 2014 shall be retained and be available until September 30, 2015, for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2014 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation estimated at not more than $1,111,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100–203, section 5051, $3,400,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

For necessary expenses for the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act, $1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That any fees, charges, or commissions received pursuant to section 106(h) of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (15 U.S.C. 720d(h)) in fiscal year 2014 in excess of $2,402,000 shall not be available for obligation until appropriated in a subsequent Act of Congress.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

SEC. 401. The Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission may not terminate any program, project, or activity without a majority vote of the Commissioners of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission approving such action.

SEC. 402. The Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 1 day after the Chairman begins performing functions under the authority of section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1980, or after a member of the Commission who was delegated emergency functions under subsection (b) of that section begins performing those functions. Such notification shall include an explanation of the circumstances warranting the exercise of such authority. The Chairman shall report to the Committees, not less frequently than once each week, on the actions taken by the Chairman, or a delegated member of the Commission, under such authority, until the authority is relinquished. The Chairman shall notify the Committees not later than 1 day after such authority is relinquished. The Chairman shall submit the report required by section 3(d) of the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1980 to the Committees not later than 1 day after it was submitted to the Commission.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS AND RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913.

SEC. 502. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to eliminate or reduce funding for a program, project, or activity as proposed in a President's budget request for a fiscal year until such proposed change is subsequently enacted in an appropriations Act, or unless such change is made pursuant to the reprogramming and transfer provisions of this Act.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 504. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 505. (a) None of the funds made available in title III of this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriation Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(b) None of the funds made available for any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may be transferred to accounts funded in title III of this Act, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriation Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committees on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(c) The head of any relevant department or agency funded in this Act utilizing any

transfer authority shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a semi-annual report detailing the transfer authorities, except for any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality, used in the previous 6 months and in the year-to-date. This report shall include the amounts transferred and the purposes for which they were transferred, and shall not replace or modify existing notification requirements for each authority.

SEC. 506. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994 (''Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations'').

SEC. 507. None of the funds made available under this Act may be expended for any new hire by any Federal agency funded in this Act that is not verified through the E-Verify Program as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note).

SEC. 508. (a) Of the unobligated balances available from prior year appropriations for the following accounts, the following amounts are hereby permanently rescinded:

(1) Under the heading ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Department of the Army'', $200,000,000, to be derived by the Secretary of the Army from funds made available for ''Construction, General'', ''Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee'', ''General Investigations'', ''Construction'', ''Investigations'', and ''Mississippi River and Tributaries''.

(2) ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'', $157,000,000.

(3) ''Department of Energy—Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities'', $142,000,000.

(4) ''Department of Energy—Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation'', $20,000,000.

(b) No amounts may be rescinded under this section from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to this section?

Hearing none, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 509. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to conduct closure of adjudicatory functions, technical review, or support activities associated with the Yucca Mountain geologic repository license application, or for actions that irrevocably remove the possibility that Yucca Mountain may be a repository option in the future.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, lines 10 through 16, strike section 509.

Ms. TITUS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to ask my colleagues to join me in protecting the fiduciary interests of the American taxpayer and in preserving the safety of my constituents in southern Nevada as well as of all of those who live along the proposed route for Yucca Mountain waste.

My amendment would remove misguided language included in this bill that injects politics into a very serious and consequential debate surrounding the issue of nuclear waste disposal. This amendment would simply strike the language included in this bill that tries to restart the failed Yucca Mountain project by prohibiting the DOE from moving forward with plans to close Yucca Mountain and develop proposals for its alternative use.

When the Department of Energy made the correct decision to put an end to the misguided Yucca Mountain project in 2010, they did so after decades of debate with nothing to show for it except for $15 billion wasted and a big hole in the ground. According to the Government Accountability Office, had the project been completed, it would have cost more than $80 billion. Those figures don't even take into account the cost of transporting 75,000 metric tons of highly radioactive nuclear waste thousands of miles across the country, through nearly every State in the Union.

Now, this waste wouldn't just magically appear in Nevada. It would travel through many of your congressional districts—through backyards all across the country, near schools, homes, parks, and businesses—nor does this enormous cost figure account for the significant security expenditures required to protect the contents of Yucca Mountain from those seeking to cause our Nation harm.

Mr. Chairman, if a nun with a pair of bolt cutters were able to break into one of the most secure nuclear facilities in the world, how can we ever expect to protect all of the Nation's waste in just one location?

Let's not forget that Yucca Mountain is less than 100 miles from one of the Nation's largest cities that hosts more than 40 million visitors a year.

In January of 2012, the Department of Energy's bipartisan Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future, led by former Congressman and 9/11 Commission Vice Chairman Lee Hamilton and former National Security Advisor Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft stated in its final report: ''The need for a new strategy is urgent.''

The key concept here is ''new,'' but, instead, this bill tries to turn back the clock, back to an old, flawed strategy. It's Groundhog Day here in the United States House of Representatives.

On the subject of Yucca, Congressman Hamilton stated: ''Nuclear waste storage at Yucca Mountain is not an option.''

General Scowcroft said the Commission will ''look forward, not back.''

It appears that that message didn't make it all the way up the steps of the Capitol and that some Members of Congress have not gotten the message that Yucca is dead.

□ 0000

We cannot continue to throw good money after bad ideas and go down the same failed path that Congress put us on when politics targeted the people of Nevada in the development of the Yucca Mountain project decades ago.

Although I don't agree with everything that's included in the bill, I applaud the bipartisan group of Senators who have introduced legislation to enact the recommendations of the Commission and have an actual debate that doesn't target communities like Nevada.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment. It's time to have a serious debate over the safe disposal of the Nation's nuclear waste and develop an alternative plan that doesn't throw away billions of taxpayer dollars, endanger citizen safety, or threaten economic development projects in southern Nevada.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

The House has repeatedly had overwhelming votes in support of continuing the Yucca Mountain Repository. The language that this amendment would strike, we have been carrying for years as a way to keep the will of the House alive, and the American people support what we're doing.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 510. The Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a comprehensive report compiled in conjunction with the Government Accountability Office that details updated missions, goals, strategies, and priorities,

and performance metrics that are measurable, repeatable, and directly linked to requests for funding.

SEC. 511. It is the sense of the Congress that the Congress should not pass any legislation that authorizes spending cuts that would increase poverty in the United States.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 512. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a medical mandated recovery.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending the memorial service in Arizona for the Prescott Fire Department's Granite Mountain Hotshots.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 793. An act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes, Committee on Financial Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, July 10, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2195. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 657. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to improve the management of grazing leases and permits, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–145 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 819. A bill to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–145 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 292. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness (Rept. 113–147). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 657 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NUNNELEE (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 2628. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to United States Route 78 in Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2629. A bill to provide an exemption for low-revenue companies from certain SEC regulations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2630. A bill to require a report from the Comptroller General of the United States regarding implementation of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2631. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to criminalize unlawful presence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 2632. A bill to amend section 399Z-1 of the Public Health Service Act to extend for 5 years the authorization of appropriations for operational grants under the school-based health centers program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 2633. A bill to require the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Sesquicentennial Anniversary of the adoption of the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which officially marked the abolishment of slavery in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2634. A bill to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. BONNER):

H.R. 2635. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Hank Aaron, in recognition of his contributions to the national pastime of baseball and his perseverance in overcoming discrimination and adversity to become a role model for all Americans; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2636. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Hudson River Valley, New York; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENISHEK (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. CAMP):

H. Res. 290. A resolution recognizing the centennial of Camp Grayling Joint Maneuver Training Center in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. DESANTIS):

H. Res. 291. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Republic of Argentina's membership in the G20 should be conditioned on its adherence to international norms of economic relations and commitment to the rule of law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H. Res. 293. A resolution expressing support for designation of August 2013 as ''Blue Star Mothers of America Month''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H. Res. 294. A resolution congratulating the Miami Heat for winning the 2013 National Basketball Association Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. NUNNELEE:

H.R. 2628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 17.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. This is the 'necessary and proper clause' that grants Congress the authority to make all laws necessary for enforcing the Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. This is the 'necessary and proper clause' that grants Congress the authority to make all laws necessary for enforcing the Constitution.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce, as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5

The Congress shall have Power to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 2634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 55: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 127: Mr. YOHO and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 176: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 207: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 269: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 303: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 310: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 352: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 449: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 460: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 495: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 498: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 523: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 526: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 543: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 556: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 574: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 647: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 679: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 685: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 690: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 702: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 721: Mr. VELA, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 724: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 755: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. MENG, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 760: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 769: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 792: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 805: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 822: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 831: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 855: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 874: Mr. SIRES and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 963: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 975: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 991: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 997: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1010: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1014: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1020: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 1024: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BARTON, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1025: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1101: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1129: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 1176: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 1179: Mr. KEATING, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 1209: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 1248: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1254: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1274: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1309: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1318: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1354: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1386: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1394: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1414: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1416: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1428: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1463: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1473: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1494: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1502: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 1521: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1527: Mr. COHEN and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 1528: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1582: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1595: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 1620: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 1629: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1692: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1717: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1731: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 1748: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 1756: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1759: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1761: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1771: Mr. OWENS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1775: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 1779: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1781: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1784: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1789: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1790: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1795: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1806: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1814: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 1824: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1825: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BARR, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1827: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1830: Mr. GARDNER, Ms. MENG, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1842: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1848: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1852: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1869: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 1875: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 1920: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 1921: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1940: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1974: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1980: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1992: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2000: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2009: Mr. TERRY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2011: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 2019: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 2022: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2027: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2028: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2044: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2051: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 2053: Mr. BARR, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 2085: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2088: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2122: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 2157: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2164: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 2184: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2221: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2224: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2238: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2239: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2268: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2283: Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2300: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2305: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 2315: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2328: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2360: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 2361: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2385: Mr. COTTON and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2407: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2423: Mr. HOLT and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2424: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2429: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WESTMORELAND, MR. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOHO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2445: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 2449: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2458: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 2482: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2501: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 2506: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2507: Mr. SANFORD.
H.R. 2510: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2511: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 2520: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2541: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2546: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 2560: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2565: Mr. DUFFY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. COOK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COLE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. REED, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 2571: Mr. COTTON, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2574: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2575: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2578: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2579: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2590: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2611: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2615: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2616: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2618: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.J. Res. 28: Mr. HALL.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. LATHAM.
H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. JOYCE.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. STIVERS.
H. Con. Res. 41: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 30: Ms. SINEMA.
H. Res. 36: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H. Res. 109: Ms. HANABUSA.
H. Res. 112: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Res. 187: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. Res. 213: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H. Res. 222: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ENYART, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 231: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. CRAMER.
H. Res. 236: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 238: Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 272: Mr. HOLDING.
H. Res. 282: Mr. SIRES, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Ms. FUDGE.
H. Res. 284: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. KINGSTON.
H. Res. 285: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. Res. 289: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. TURNER

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the nuclear forces of the United States in contravention of section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573(b)).

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,127,954,000)''.

Page 22, line 8, before the period, insert the following:

: *Provided*, That the amount made available under this heading shall be allocated between programs, projects, and activities previously funded under the heading ''Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' and programs, projects, and activities previously funded under the heading ''Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability'' in the same proportion as such funds were allocated between such accounts in fiscal year 2013 by division F of Public Law 113–6

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. REED

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1)''.

Page 25, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $18,956,000)''.

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,478,000)''.

Page 31, line 1, after the second dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,477,999)''.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. REED

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 25, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $18,956,000)''.

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,478,000)''.

Page 31, line 1, after the second dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,478,000)''.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals:

(A) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(B) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in subsection (A); or

(C) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Page 6, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Page 22, line 8, before the period, insert the following:

: *Provided*, That the amount made available under this heading shall be allocated between programs, projects, and activities previously funded under the heading ''Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' and programs, projects, and activities previously funded under the heading ''Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability'' in the same proportion as such funds were allocated between such accounts for fiscal year 2013 by division F of Public Law 113–6.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT NO. 17: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B)) with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT NO. 18: Page 30, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $48,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $48,000,000)''.

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $48,000,000)''.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMENDMENT NO. 19: Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 17, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMENDMENT NO. 20: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to develop or submit a proposal to expand the authorized uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund described in section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 10, line 21, after the period insert the following: ''Further, the Army Corps of Engineers, in coordination with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park

Service, and the United States Geological Survey, shall lead a multiagency effort to slow the spread of Asian Carp in the Ohio River basin and tributaries by providing high-level technical assistance, coordination, best practices, and support to State and local government strategies to slow, and eventually eliminate, the threat posed by Asian Carp. To the maximum extent practicable, the multiagency effort shall apply lessons learned and best practices such as those developed under the Management and Control Plan for Bighead, Black, Grass, and Silver Carps in the United States, November 2007, and the Asian Carp Control Strategic Framework.''.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 22: Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $731,600,000)''.

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $362,329,000)''.

Page 23, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $450,000,000)''.

Page 23, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $115,753,000)''.

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,543,929,000)''.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 23: Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $992,620,780)''.

Page 26, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $430,029,400)''.

Page 26, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $233,250,000)''.

Page 31, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,655,900,180)''.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 24: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities'', and increasing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies'', by $10,000,000.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. QUIGLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 25: Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,700,000)''.

Page 60, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $23,700,000)''.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. BARROW OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any authority, in any preceding provision of this Act, to use funds for the purchase or hire of motor vehicles.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 27: Page 30, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 28: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities'', and increasing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction'', by $100,000,000.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MS. BASS

AMENDMENT NO. 29: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce, with respect to hydraulic fracturing operations in the Inglewood Oil Field—

(1) the exclusion in section 1421(d)(1)(B) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300h(d)(1)(B));

(2) section 261.4(b)(5) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(3) the limitation in section 402(1)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(1)(2)).

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMENDMENT NO. 30: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to develop or submit a proposal to expand the authorized uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund described in section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9505(c)).

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. HIGGINS

AMENDMENT NO. 31: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to relocate or consolidate general and administrative functions, personnel, or resources of the Buffalo and Chicago Districts of the Corps of Engineers Great Lakes and Ohio River Division.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. WALBERG

AMENDMENT NO. 32: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 801 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17281).

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 33: Page 30, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. LYNCH

AMENDMENT NO. 34: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development'' and by increasing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Department of the Army—Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction'' by $29,425,000 and $19,425,000, respectively.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MS. TITUS

AMENDMENT NO. 35: Page 59, lines 10 through 16, strike section 509.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2013 No. 97

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TAMMY BALDWIN, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord God almighty, recreate our hearts to love You above all. Rule our lives, creating in us a passion to do Your will. Give our lawmakers renewed strength and resilience to honor You in their work. May they do their best today as an expression of love and gratitude to You. Lord, replace weariness with well-being, anxiety with assurance, and caution with courage.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TAMMY BALDWIN, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. BALDWIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

KEEP STUDENT LOANS AFFORDABLE ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 124, S. 1238, Senator REED's student loan bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1238) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following my remarks and those of my Republican counterpart, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

At 11 a.m. the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Jennifer Dorsey to be U.S. district judge for the District of Nevada. At noon there will be a rollcall vote on confirmation of the Dorsey nomination. I would add that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has asked that we hold that vote open until 12:30 p.m. today because they are having a confirmation hearing on the new Director of the FBI, Mr. Comey. We will do that, and the vote will end at 12:30 p.m. rather than 12:15 p.m. or 12:20 p.m.

Following that vote, the Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for our weekly caucus meetings.

In America, this great country of ours, a quality education is the surest path to the American dream. When I was a boy, we always looked at that American dream as getting a college education, which, from where I came from, wasn't going to happen very often. Now the American dream is more than just getting an associate's degree or a bachelor's degree. It involves many other occupations, all of the things available in health care now, such as nursing, nursing assistants, all of the technicians, the people who do physical therapy—not physical therapists but people who help doctors do what they need to do. We have programs to become a physician's assistant. There are many programs that are important to be able to fulfill that American dream. There are all different kinds of programs for computer training separate and apart from getting a bachelor's degree. Those programs are extremely important. The reason they are important is we as Americans have decided that with the cost of education skyrocketing as it is, students should get some help, whether they are seeking a degree in engineering or getting into a program to begin some computer training to have jobs they want for the rest of their lives.

College has never been more expensive and further out of reach for American families. That is why it is critical that we keep interest rates low on Federal student loans so more promising students can realize their dream of an education.

Last month Republicans rejected the Democrats' plan to freeze student loan interest rates at current levels for 2 years without adding a penny to the deficit. Because of this obstruction, loan rates doubled on July 1, piling thousands of dollars more on debt that more than 7 million students owe. Republicans are instead pushing a plan to balance the budget on the backs of struggling students. But if either the legislation passed by House Republicans or the plan proposed by Senate Republicans becomes law, student loan rates will more than double over the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

next few years as interest rates increase.

Speaker BOEHNER says that the House has acted and now the ball is in the Senate's court. We talked about that yesterday. What is he talking about—they have acted and now we should act? I guess we could talk about what they didn't do last year on the farm bill. I guess we could talk about what they didn't do last year on post offices. I guess we could talk about what they haven't done this year on the farm bill. We could talk about what they haven't done that is so devastating to small businesses around America, and that is having people who are online and don't build a single building, rent a single building—they get a different rate of return than do those in brick-and-mortar buildings. They do that because they don't have to pay sales tax. We could talk about why the Speaker is refusing to take up something that is meaningful.

As I say about this student loan issue—and I just had a meeting that ended a few minutes ago—if you can explain to me why these proposals the Republicans have are better than just having the rates double, please do that. But they go into all these gyrations about whether it is a T-bill, overnight T-bill, or 30 days or 6 months or—all this complicated stuff, and it is factual. I met with someone from the White House. I said, OK, tell me what happens in 3 years. The response was, oh, well, the rates will be above 6.8 percent. That is appalling. If someone can show me how all these programs they are coming up with are better than just letting things double, tell me.

We have a better proposal. Instead of pushing a plan to balance the budget on the backs of struggling students, I think we should support a plan that would be better for students, not worse for students. I repeat, we can't support a plan that would be worse for students than doing nothing at all.

They have to take action. The rising price of higher education means too many young people are deferring higher education. I hear all the stories. College education used to be cheaper. Well, because of what has happened here in Washington with the obstruction, we have to help people. There has been less support of higher education from the States. Tuition costs have risen significantly because of this. Students need help. We have to take action. The rising price of higher education means too many young people are deferring higher education, and it has saddled many who do get a degree with unsustainable debt—debt that causes them to delay buying their first home, having children, or starting a business. Americans have more than $1 trillion in student loan debt. The average graduate owes more than $25,000. In fact, Americans have more student loan debt than credit card debt. They simply can't afford to pile on even more.

We are going to continue to fight to keep the student loan rates low and hold back the rising price of education. Tomorrow the Senate will vote on whether to even begin debate on our plan to keep loan rates low for an additional year.

I very much admire the work done by Senator STABENOW, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee. She is someone who is very effective in conveying a message. She has led the message for Democrats as to why we shouldn't let these rates double, and she will continue to do that.

As I indicated earlier, we made a proposal to keep rates where they are for 2 years. We have made changes to our proposal in an effort to meet Republicans in the middle while protecting students. Our plan shortens the extension from 2 years to 1 year, and it doesn't add a penny to the debt.

I spoke with the chairman of the Finance Committee today. I said: MAX, explain how we are paying for this. It is so simple. It is inherited IRAs, that people would pay after 5 years—they wouldn't get the tax deduction after 5 years. What our program does is it closes this obscure tax loophole that allows a few very wealthy individuals to avoid paying taxes on inherited retirement accounts. This is why Senator BAUCUS came up with this as a pay-for.

So I hope Senate Republicans won't block a second commonsense plan in investing in our economy by keeping college affordable. We have reduced it to 1 year from 2 years. It would be great if we had a long-term solution to this, but we can't do something that hurts students very quickly. Some have said: Well, it is going to be for a year or two, and there will be lower interest rates. Yes, but after that it will be ''Katy, bar the door.'' We all know interest rates are going to go up.

DORSEY NOMINATION

Before the lunch, as I have indicated, we will consider the nomination of Jennifer Dorsey to be U.S. district judge for the District of Nevada. She will be a valuable addition to the Federal court system. She is a Las Vegas native. Her father was stationed at Nellis Air Force Base and after Vietnam decided that was where he wanted to make his home. He started his family there.

Ms. Dorsey graduated from Chaparral High School and graduated cum laude from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. She was also the first member of her family to graduate from college. She served as a congressional intern for my friend and former colleague Senator Richard Bryan. She attended Pepperdine University School of Law, where she was a member of the Pepperdine Law Review.

After graduation she returned to Las Vegas and excelled, first as an associate and now as a partner, at the firm Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, a longtime brave, proud Nevada law firm. She is the first and only female partner in that firm. She specialized in civil litigation, complex commercial disputes, appeals, and class actions.

I am very impressed with her dedication to the State of Nevada, her community, and the legal profession. She will make an outstanding Federal judge for Nevada. I look forward to her confirmation.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

STANDING FOR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Over the years we have seen repeated instances of indifference to the rule of law on the part of this administration. It is a consistent and worrisome path. The most recent example, of course, was last week's announcement that the President had simply decided not to enforce a major piece of his health care law—that is, until after the midterm election. What the President was saying in effect was that if he doesn't want to implement the law he has signed, he doesn't have to.

I agree it is a terrible law. I understand why people harmed by it would want it changed. In fact, I think we ought to repeal it altogether and opt instead for real reforms that actually would lower costs. But the fact is—for now, at least—it is the law and it is the President's constitutional duty to enforce the law. Yet, instead of fulfilling this basic duty of his office, the President seems to believe he gets to decide who is subject to the law. He gets to decide who is subject to the law and who gets a pass. So last week businesses had their ObamaCare sentences delayed. Maybe next week it will be some other group, but it is his call. He will decide what the law is. He did it with immigration, he did it with welfare work requirements, and he did it with the NLRB when he took it upon himself to tell another branch of government when it was in recess. He is doing it again with his own signature health care law.

Imagine that the current occupant of the White House was not President Obama but a Republican. Imagine that. Pretend that this Republican had come to office promising an era of inclusion and accountability, but as the years wore on he simply had grown tired of the democratic process.

Imagine that this President, despite securing confirmation for nearly every nominee he submitted, couldn't understand why the elected Senate didn't simply rush them all through even quicker. He couldn't understand why Senators insisted on fulfilling their constitutional obligations to scrutinize each nominee.

Visualize for a moment that this President decided to urge Members of his party to break the rules of the Senate so that he could appoint whomever he wanted regardless of checks and balances. Imagine the outrage in the media, online, and especially on the other side of the aisle. They would claim the President was a dictator. They would say he was ripping the Constitution to shreds, basically everything they said for so many years

about President Bush. But, of course, President Obama isn't a Republican, and so Washington Democrats seem just fine with it. In fact, it appears they are even ready to help this President—actually help him—in his partisan power grab.

I know Washington Democrats are getting a lot of pressure from big labor bosses and from other far-left elements of their base to do this. These folks have told Democrats it is time to pay up, and they do not have much time for things such as the democratic process or the rule of law. They have raised a ton of money for the Democrats and now they want the special interest treatment they believe is owed to them. That is why we see the other side cooking up phony nomination fights. They are cooking up a phony nomination fight because they want to go nuclear, but they know the facts simply aren't on their side to justify doing so. They know their core argument, that President Obama's nominees are being treated less fairly than those of President Bush, is essentially at odds with reality. It is a complete fiction. They have gotten burned by the fact checkers already. President Obama's nominees for Secretary of Transportation and Energy were unanimously confirmed. Secretary of State? Confirmed. Treasury? Confirmed. Interior, Defense, Commerce? Check, check, check.

Already in this Congress the Senate has approved 27 of President Obama's lifetime appointments. That compares to just 10 at a comparable period in President Bush's second term. And, by the way, my party controlled the Senate at this point in President Bush's second term. He got 10, President Obama has 27. In other words, President Obama has just settled back into office and already he has secured nearly three times—three times—more comparable judicial confirmations.

Look, to justify doing something as extreme as the left wants, you better be prepared to make a rock-solid case, and this is the best they can come up with, that we need to change the rules of the Senate because big labor bosses say so; that the left should be allowed to fundamentally change our democracy because the President is only getting nearly everything he wants—nearly everything he wants—rather than everything he wants at the exact moment he wants it? Let's get real here. This is not how a democracy functions.

If this were a Republican President and the shoe were on the other foot, does anyone seriously believe Washington Democrats would be going along with something so utterly preposterous? Of course not. Remember, the current majority leader once said the nuclear option would ''ruin our country.'' That was said by the fellow who sits right over here, the current majority leader of the Senate. And a former Senator from Illinois named Obama said if the Senate broke the rules to change the rules ''the fighting, the bitterness and the gridlock [would] only get worse.'' Boy, he was right about that.

What I am saying to President Obama and his friends on the far left is this: The facts show you are getting treated pretty darn well on nominations as it is. But if you would like more confirmed, if, for instance, you want the Senate to confirm your nominees to the NLRB, then don't send us nominees who have already been declared illegal by the courts. We have already said that is not going to happen. You know you can't look Americans in the eye and say you would vote for such a thing if you were in the minority so don't expect us to. But if you send us fresh picks, we will happily give them a fair hearing, just as we have been doing all along with all of the rest of the President's nominees. Almost all of them have been confirmed. Most have been confirmed almost unanimously, because we in America know that majorities of either party will never get absolutely everything they want. That push and pull is the hallmark of a healthy democracy. And one day—maybe not in the too-distant future—when our Democratic friends in the majority are invariably returned to the minority, they will thank us for standing up for those democratic rights.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first half.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise today because tomorrow in the Senate Chamber we will vote on whether to let student interest rates double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. This should not be controversial. This should have been done before July 1. Now we are trying to retroactively fix this.

We have attempted to bring this to the floor and vote on it before on a number of occasions. We have seen a Republican filibuster blocking us from doing that. This week I am hopeful we can get the necessary bipartisan vote to overcome the filibuster and be able to send a very strong message to students across the country that we understand this is a huge issue for them and their families, a huge cost, and that raising the rates will only be another barrier to creating opportunity for students in the future and, frankly, having a middle class in this country.

What is happening to the students and the debt involved is very serious, and it is stopping many young people from being able to move ahead and achieve their dreams. At a time when interest rates for everything else are at historic lows, why in the world would we double the interest rates for young people or older people going back to school who are trying to get an education and the work skills they need? Why would we allow that when we can get mortgage rates right now from 3½ to 4 percent or a car loan for about 4 percent? I could go on and on.

Here is the shocking thing. If the rates are doubled—if in fact what kicked in on July 1 is allowed to stand—it will mean a huge profit for the Federal Government. That also makes no sense. It will mean some $50 billion for the Federal Government, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Why should the government profit off the backs of students who are struggling to get an education so they can get ahead?

We have a fundamental disagreement in this body between the majority of Democrats and the majority of Republicans on that question. It is a fundamental difference about what we should pick as a priority for our country. Frankly, for nearly 300,000 students in Michigan who will be forced to pay an extra $1,000 on their loans this year, it makes no sense.

I remember growing up in a little town in northern Michigan, working hard, getting good grades in my small class of 93 people, being at the top of the class, and wanting to go to college. But my dad became very ill and we couldn't afford for me to go to school. I was the first one to get a college degree in my family. I managed to go to school because the State of Michigan and the Federal Government at that time placed a value on educating kids like me, who didn't have a lot of money but had worked hard and had good grades and thought we ought to have a shot. I had a tuition and fee scholarship, and so I was able to go to college.

I put that scholarship together with working on campus and with student loans and I was able to get a bachelor's degree. I was then able to go on and get a master's degree and came out of school having to pay off the student loans. But because some folks—who didn't know this redheaded, freckle-faced kid from Clare—decided this was an important value for America, this was an important value for our State, I had a chance to work hard and follow the rules and make it. And who would have thought then I would have the opportunity to be here today?

I want that same opportunity for every young person in Michigan and every person going back to school in this country. Fundamentally that is what this is about. It is not about numbers. It is not about numbers. It is about whether, when we subsidize all kinds of other things—banks, and even the farmers I fight for, to help them with their crop insurance, and subsidizing rates for insurance to do things because it is good for the economy—why in the world would we walk

away from that most basic set of values when it comes to our students?

Colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: Let's do something where we peg a rate. It is like a credit loan teaser rate. Sign up now at zero interest or 3 percent, let's put it there, and then over time it balloons like crazy and you are stuck. Those are the kinds of proposals we have gotten from the other side of the aisle. It sounds good now, but it is horrible later. I know a lot of folks who signed up for variable rate mortgages and balloon mortgages who ended up in the same situation. We are saying: No, we want a fixed rate. We want it low and we want to make sure students are placed as a priority.

So after all kinds of negotiations, we have said: OK, you don't want to continue the rate for 2 years. Let's do this: Let's continue it for 1 year at the low rate of 3.4 percent, and then let's all get together to figure out what to do about helping out with this $1 trillion in student loan debt right now. That is the student loan debt across this country. We need to help them figure out how to refinance that lower rate and then we can deal with the long-term cost. That is what we are trying to do. It doesn't make sense, when student loan debt in the country is over $1 trillion, when students are already sacrificing and scraping together the money to get an education, to double the rates on those student loans.

So when we look at this, we are looking not only at today but over time. In every proposal that has been put forward—and there are a lot of folks working, and I know there are conversations going on with folks who want to solve this problem—they all end up with the rates going up higher than even doubling the rate to 6.8. Why does that make any sense? Why would folks propose that? We have a fundamental difference in how we view this issue of the cost of college and whether there is a role for the Federal Government.

Do we as a country have a stake in keeping costs as low as possible, interest rates as low as possible? I would argue, yes, we do. And if we want to stop subsidizing things, I can think of a whole long list of what we could stop subsidizing. We could stop subsidizing the top five wealthiest oil companies in the country, which have more profits than anyone in the world. We could stop subsidizing them. We could stop the loopholes that are taking our jobs overseas. We could stop doing that. There are a lot of things we could stop that would save money. We should not put all this on the backs of students. We should not say that somehow we should make a profit to pay down the debt on the backs of students, when in fact there are so many other areas where we should be asking people to chip in a little bit more, not those who are already working hard to get a basic education.

We know we have to have a comprehensive approach, but until that work is done we should keep interest rates low. We should keep them where they are. And I have great confidence in Chairman HARKIN and his committee, and Senator JACK REED, who has taken so passionately the lead on this. Senator KAY HAGAN and Senator REED are our leaders on the bill we will be voting on tomorrow. Senator WARREN, and so many others—Senator BOXER I know has spoken out so many times, as has Senator SANDERS, and on and on, as well as the Presiding Officer. We all care passionately about creating a long-term solution for students that keeps costs low so we can keep dreams high and success high in achieving those dreams.

I wish to thank so many for signing petitions and sharing their stories with us. I would urge folks to get involved in the conversation by joining us on Twitter, with the hash tag ''don't double my rate.'' There is a lot of conversation going on and information that folks can find out about what we are doing.

I want to read two e-mails from constituents of mine. Corey, a student at Central Michigan University, sent me an e-mail about how this would make it difficult for him to continue his education.

> As one of the taxpayers that you represent, I am asking you to please not allow my student loan rates to be doubled. I am a hard-working and respectful student. I make all of my payments. I go to class and do well. I work hard and am grateful for the chance to get a higher education, but if student loan rates go up I would be left to make a decision whether or not school will be affordable.
>
> From the time we first start learning, we are encouraged to attend college and get a good job so that we can be a part of helping this country grow. I am simply asking you to help continue to make this an affordable option for me, and many others like me.

That story can be replicated all across Michigan and all across the country: Will young people be able to stay in school? Will they be able to come out of school and get the job they want versus aiming for a job that relates to their ability to pay back their student loans?

Then an e-mail from Matthew in Royal Oak:

> Students are not asking for a bailout like the one that Wall Street got, just an opportunity to obtain an affordable education so we can compete in the global economy.

That is what this vote is about tomorrow. The Keep Student Loans Affordable Act simply says we are going to tackle this very serious issue for families across the country in two steps: keep the interest rates low where it is for a year, and then make a commitment to work together to fix the larger issue of the cost of college going forward.

I don't think there is a more important issue for the future of maintaining or recreating a middle class in this country than making sure we can allow everyone who wants to go on to college and get the skills they need to be successful in tackling and meeting their dreams than to make sure that college is affordable. A big piece of that is the interest rate on the loans that millions of students are taking out right now and counting on us to make sure they are affordable.

Tomorrow the question will be whether a filibuster continues on this issue. I think folks probably scratch their heads. We had a majority of people who voted—all Democrats—before to continue the interest rates at the current level of 3.4 percent. Because of the nature of the Senate and how things work, if there is an objection we have to go through this process to be able to overcome what is essentially a filibuster and we have to get 60 votes. So tomorrow we are going to have to get 60 votes, which means we need a handful of Republican colleagues to join with us to make a statement that we should continue interest rates at the low level while we work together in a bipartisan way to solve the long-term problem.

We have over $1 trillion in this country in student loan debt. It is more than credit card debt. I was surprised to see that. We have to help families tackle that debt. I would like to see refinancing options when interest rates are so low, and many of those are much higher interest rates. We need to tackle that. We need to tackle the overall costs of going to college and what is happening for low-income students as well as middle-class students.

There is a lot to get done, but it has to start by doing no harm. And that is the vote tomorrow: Do no harm. Let's make sure we at least keep the rates low now. We know there is a philosophical difference about whether we should actually help subsidize student loans. I think, of all the things we could subsidize, I would start with education.

Tomorrow the question is, Do we do no harm? Do we keep the interest rate where it is while we work out a long-term solution? Do we make a very strong statement that if we are going to set something as a priority for this country, if we are going to outcompete and outeducate in a global economy, it has to start with making sure advanced higher education is affordable for everyone who wants to work hard and play by the rules and go to college?

That is what the fight is about. That is what the vote is about tomorrow. I hope we will have an overwhelming bipartisan vote. If not, we are going to continue to do everything possible to tackle this issue because I think families across America are counting on us.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, over the July 4th recess I had the opportunity to talk with a number of young families about the crisis of student debt. Without exception, this is what they said: Please do not double the interest rates on subsidized Stafford loans from 3.4 to 6.8 percent.

Please make college financing more affordable, not more expensive.

This is an issue which not only impacts millions of families, it impacts our entire future as a nation and our economy. Right now, working-class families all over this country are asking themselves a very simple question: Does it make sense for them to go $40,000, $50,000, $100,000 in debt in order to get a college education? Many of these young people and families are saying: No, it doesn't make sense.

So in a competitive global economy, we are saying to families all over this country that we do not want their kids to get a college education. We don't want them to become doctors, nurses, businesspeople, scientists, and teachers. We don't want them to expand their intellectual capabilities and make us a competitive nation in this highly competitive global economy.

Now, if that makes sense to somebody, it surely does not make sense to me. The doubling of student loan interest only makes an existing crisis even worse. According to a report by the Consumer Financial Protection Agency, the total student loan debt in the United States now exceeds $1.1 trillion, which is nearly triple what it was in 2004. The average loan balance for American graduates has increased by 70 percent since 2004.

Average student debt is near $27,000. In Vermont, it is even higher—over $28,000.

The burden of student loans is making it much harder for young people to get mortgages and buy homes. Home ownership rates for young adults are among the lowest in decades. Young people are putting off marriage and having children partly because of the burden of student debt.

Over the last several months I have asked Vermonters—and people, in fact, all over the country—to send me their experiences, to tell me what this crushing debt of student loans means to their lives. We received over 700 responses from all over America. What I would like to do is very briefly read to you some of the responses I received from the State of Vermont.

Emily Decker from Colchester, VT writes:

> Watching the interest eat away my savings every month is hard to swallow. To the point where we are not saving any money because we put anything extra toward my loans so we can pay them back ASAP. This is putting our plans for having a family on hold because we want to have our finances in better order before doing so.

In other words, Emily writes they are hesitating having kids because they can't afford to do so at the current time.

Andrew Craft from Burlington, VT writes:

> I am a 25 year old full-time college student at Champlain College. I am a single mother. I am already $20,000 in debt and I still have one more year to go before I graduate. I am currently at an internship working part-time on top of school and parenting, but I often feel like I am not ever going to be able to ''get ahead'' and ''make it'' in spite of my advantages.

Allison LaFlamme from Johnson, VT writes:

> I cannot refinance my house, because even though my cars, home, and credit cards are perfect on my credit score our debt to income is too high because of our student loans.

Melissa Weber from Rutland, VT writes:

> I have found myself struggling to survive independently as a 25 year old with a Master's Degree. Yes I have achieved a degree, of which I am proud, but I have also accumulated an immense amount of debt that will likely haunt me for the majority of my life. As a result of my daunting loan payments I find myself barely surviving on an income that should easily support a small family.

Evan Champagne from St. Albans, VT writes:

> My wife and I both have $50K–$60K of loan debt each. We both have good jobs, but a large percentage of our income is used to pay back student loans. There are no low interest consolidation options available. If there were, that would also help. The education process should be rewarding and create opportunities. For my wife and I, it did the opposite.

The American people want us to come together and solve this problem now, not make the situation worse. When we tell people who are struggling with these horrendous debts that the Stafford subsidized loan rate is going to double and there are proposals out there that make a bad situation worse, they respond in disbelief. They remember in 2009 when Wall Street collapsed because of their greed and illegal behavior, we bailed them out. They understand that today we are providing large Wall Street institutions with interest rates of less than 1 percent. They are asking: If you can bail out Wall Street—people whose greed caused the current recession—how come you can't protect working-class and middle-class families and enable their kids to get an affordable college education?

The Republicans in the House passed a proposal. Unfortunately, it is a proposal which makes a bad situation worse. Under the House Republicans' proposal, all student loans would have variable interest rates, exposing graduates to market conditions. Even though the House Republicans' proposal caps interest rates, the Congressional Research Service estimates that students who take out the maximum subsidized student loan amount will pay nearly $6,000 more over the life of that loan than they would if rates are kept where they are today.

The so-called bipartisan student loan bill being discussed in the Senate would also be a terrible deal for students, especially in the coming years. It provides no cap to protect students for the first time in the history of the student loan program. If this proposal were to pass, according to CBO projections of interest rates, by 2018 student loan rates will go up significantly.

Short term, we have to keep student loan interest rates at 3.4 percent. Long term, we need a national solution to make sure college is affordable for all Americans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, last week our Nation celebrated America's Independence Day, and the Obama administration took advantage of the holiday to slip out a couple of announcements about its health care law. The first one came late one day as the media and most of the Nation were distracted by their plans for the Fourth of July. The administration finally had to admit to all of America that their health care law is unraveling before their eyes. Several months ago Senator BAUCUS predicted that the law was headed for what he called a train wreck, and last week we saw the train go off the rails. What happened was the Treasury Department put out a blog post, written by an assistant secretary late in the day on July 2, that said it would postpone the implementation of the employer mandate part of the health care law until 2015.

This was one of the signature parts of the President's health care law. Under the law, every employer with more than 50 people working 30 hours or more a week was going to have to offer expensive government-mandated health insurance. Now we have a 1-year delay of this extremely unpopular and damaging Washington mandate. Anytime you see the Obama administration leak news like that late in the day right before a holiday with the President out of the country, you can bet it is bad news for him and for them. Presidents do not delay things that are popular and that actually people want and like. When you see them try to hide it in a blog post, that is another sign. Here is what the New York Times said, front page:

> Crucial mandate delayed a year for health law.
>
> Large companies won't need to offer plans until 2015. GOP seizes on shift.

The Washington Post ran a headline, page 1:

> Health-care rule is delayed a year. A setback for Obama law.

The Wall Street Journal said:

> Health law penalties delayed.

The Obama administration has tried to hide its bad news, but it failed. It also tried to spin the collapse of one of the law's most important features as good news. But as we see it here, Washington Post, ''A setback for Obama law.''

The Treasury Department's blog post claimed it was implementing the law ''in a careful, thoughtful manner.'' If they were interested in careful and thoughtful, Washington Democrats never would have pushed through this reckless law in the first place, a law that many of them admit they never even read. Using that much Washington spin when it tries to sneak out bad news is another sure-fire sign that

the White House is trying to hide the train wreck. The President and his supporters have been bragging about this part of the law for years. Now here they are quietly dropping it for a year and pretending things are going well for the law.

What does this announcement mean? First of all, this is a clear admission that the President's health care law is unaffordable, unworkable, and unpopular. Second, it may be too late. Here is a headline from CNN Money yesterday. They wrote:

For Fatburger and others, Obamacare delay came too late.

The article says for many small businesses such as fast-foot franchises, they have already begun adjusting to the law's burdensome requirements. One business owner said the delay won't help his employees. He said:

All it's doing is causing confusion, anxiety, and the workers are paying the price.

The workers are paying the price. Now the mandate's a moving target. It's very, very challenging.

For a lot of businesses, the adjustments they had to make included cutting back workers' hours. Let's look at the latest employment numbers released last Friday. In June, the number of people working part time—these are people who actually want to work more—soared by over 322,000. There are now 8.2 million Americans working part-time jobs because their hours were cut back or because they could not find full-time work. Republicans have been warning this would happen because of the Democrats' health care law and that is exactly what has been happening for months now. The White House admitted as much when it said employers needed relief from the logistical mess the law created.

If the law makes it so bad for businesses that they can't handle it in 2014, I will tell you it is still going to be bad for them in 2015. If it is bad for employers, it is going to be bad for men and women on the street, the hard workers of America. When do they get relief? Will the administration now postpone the requirements that every man, woman, and child in America has to buy expensive government-mandated insurance? I hope they do. You can bet labor unions and other special interest groups are going to step up their lobbying to postpone the parts of the law that hurt them. Even the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is asking for a waiver from portions of the law.

Let me be clear. I think it is a good thing for employers that they will not have to face this job-killing mandate next year, but why should they have to face it at all? Is the Obama administration finally seeing the light on what a disaster it will be to implement or is it another gimmick? Well, as Ronald Reagan once said:

They only come around on your side when they want to get their hands on your wallet.

This 1-year postponement is not a real solution. It is not designed to help job creators or taxpayers. It is designed to delay the train wreck until after the 2014 elections. This 1-year postponement, in my opinion, is a cynical political ploy to try to fool the voters one more time.

Don't just take my word for it, because CNBC asked Peter Orszag about it the other day. People know he headed President Obama's Office of Management and Budget in the President's first term. He was a big proponent and supporter of the law. He told CNBC that White House officials ''by definition,'' he said, thought that delaying the employer mandate would help them politically ''or they wouldn't have done it.''

''By definition,'' therefore, they thought it would help them ''or they wouldn't have done it.''

If they didn't expect it to help them politically, ''they wouldn't have done it.'' That is an incredible admission by a member of the Obama administration, his inside team. Just because the President thinks this is good for him politically doesn't mean it is good for the country.

On Friday, the Obama administration also tried to sneak out another admission that its health care law is not working. Remember, even though employers have another year before their mandate kicks in, all the people still have to buy expensive Washington-approved, Washington-mandated insurance and they have to do that by this upcoming January 1. To try to hide some of the costs, taxpayers are going to subsidize the higher premiums some people have to pay.

The Wall Street Journal just last Monday:

Insurance Costs Set For A Jolt. For the healthy, rates could soar under new law.

Insurance Costs Set For A Jolt.

To try to hide some of the cost, taxpayers are going to subsidize the higher premiums some people would have to pay, but the prices are going to go up so high subsidies may cover some but not all. If someone wanted the subsidy, the government, of course, will have to verify those people deserve the subsidy.

Not anymore, because now, under the administration's new policy, buried away in 606 pages of regulations, on Friday, they said nobody is going to check those answers.

In an editorial yesterday, the Wall Street Journal called these ''ObamaCare's liar subsidies.'' The paper agreed that managing the law's rules and regulations was complicated:

''Yet,'' the editors of the Wall Street Journal wrote, ''this is the system Democrats installed when they passed the law, which is not supposed to be optional due to administrative incompetence.''

Administrative incompetence is exactly what this is. It is also a recipe for rampant waste, fraud, and abuse. And it is an abuse in the taxpayer subsidies.

I have criticized the complicated process the administration was setting up to verify people's subsidy applications. That is because I think it is a tremendous example of government overreach and because Washington bureaucrats at the IRS and other agencies have shown they can't be trusted with that kind of information. The solution now, apparently, is to scrap the verification system. We should be cutting the cost of insurance. That is what people wanted. That is why we had health care reform, to get down the cost of care, not driving up the costs, giving subsidies to a select few people and giving Washington more power to watch over the whole system. The American people do not need to put off the wreck until the train goes around one more bend. They want to stop the train wreck from happening at all.

The American people want more than a temporary delay of one part of this terrible health care law. They want a permanent repeal of the whole thing. Now that the Obama administration has admitted its law is too complicated and would have too many negative side effects, it is time for it to set aside the political games and do what is best for the country. It is time to repeal this bad law and replace it with health care reform that will work.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I come to the floor to ask my Democratic colleagues to take another look at the student loan issue that will be before us tomorrow. We are playing with real lives here. These are about 11 million students who are going to college in the fall. They will be taking out 18 million loans for this year. Taxpayers will be loaning them over $100 billion. The only proposal we are going to be voting on tomorrow appears to be one that will leave over 7 million middle-income college students swinging in the wind, paying about twice as much in interest rates as they should be paying.

At the same time, we have a proposal that is based upon a recommendation by President Obama that is like legislation already passed by the Republican House of Representatives that is supported by an Independent and two Democratic Senators and three Republican Senators that would lower student loan interest rates on every single one of the 18 million new loans that would be taken out next year and cut nearly in half the interest rates on loans for undergraduate students, which make up two-thirds of the loans.

I ask the question, why would we do a 1-year political fix that only helps students taking 40 percent of the loans, when we have before us a bipartisan proposal that is close to the idea of the

President and the House that would help every single student, and especially why would we do that when we leave middle-income students twisting in the wind, paying hundreds of millions of dollars more in interest rate than they should be paying over the next 10 years?

The student loan issue is becoming like what we call the doc fix, where Congress, for political reasons, every year rushes around and makes a temporary patch. There is no need to do that here, no need whatsoever.

I ask my friends on the Democratic side to look at what the President has proposed and the reasoning behind it. It was in his budget. Look at what the House of Representatives has done. They actually passed a bill that lowers rates. Then look at the proposal by Senator MANCHIN, Senator CARPER, Senator KING, Senator BURR, Senator COBURN, and myself in the Senate. What our proposal would do is provide a long-term solution: if you are an undergraduate student at the University of Tennessee, instead of your rate being 6.8 percent, it would be 3.66 percent. The Democratic proposal, I repeat, does nothing for over 7 million middle-income students who are going to be paying 6.8 percent when they should be paying, if they are undergraduates, 3.66 percent under our proposal. That is nearly half as much. There is no need for that.

This is like other political situations, we have some misinformation going back and forth across the aisle. I hope my colleagues will take a look at the Burr-Manchin proposal. The right thing for us to do is to say to these 10 million students, all of them, every single one of them, that when you go to take out your 18 million loans this year you are going to be paying a rate that is fair to taxpayers and fair to students. It is fair to taxpayers because it will not be costing the government any money and it is fair to students because the government will not be making any money. It will not be reducing the deficit on the back of the students. That is the principle upon which we can agree—fair to taxpayers, fair to students; doesn't cost the taxpayers, doesn't balance the budget on the backs of students. On that basis we can say to students: Take advantage of these low rates. You can get a 10-year loan if you are an undergraduate at 3.66 percent. There is no need to pretend we are helping students when the alternative proposal only addresses 40 percent of the students. These are the subsidized loans. These are the loans for the low-income students, who already get, for the most part, Pell grants, who already have their interest paid while they are in school—that is a big subsidy. It is over $50 billion in the next 10 years. We leave the middle-income students over 7 million of them—over the next 10 years paying hundreds of millions of dollars they shouldn't be paying. I don't know why my friends on the other side want to leave the middle-income students of America twisting in the wind, paying higher interest rates than they should.

So let's step back and look at the facts. Let's look at the President's proposal, look at what the House passed, and look at the bipartisan Burr-Manchin proposal. I respectfully urge the majority leader to allow us to vote on that. I urge my colleagues on the other side to coalesce around that idea. Let's say to the students of America: As the Senate, we know a good idea when we see one, and the Burr-Manchin proposal is such an idea.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JENNIFER A. DORSEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jennifer A. Dorsey, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour for debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDENT LOANS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are here today because, unfortunately, the financial burden on our Nation's college students dramatically spiked overnight 8 days ago, including for over 100,000 students across my home State of Washington, where 56 percent of college graduates leave school with a student loan debt, and the average amount they owe is more than $22,000. Just when they are getting started on their careers, instead of buying a house or buying a car or just paying the bills, their student loan bills are piling up with interest.

Now interest rates for Federal student loans, which have been kept at a low rate of 3.4 percent, have doubled to 6.8 percent. For these students and for millions of students across the country, that is a tax hike of $1,000. That is not fair to students, and it is certainly not good for our economy. Congress has to act to fix it.

This isn't just an abstract issue for me; it is very personal. Pell grants and student loans were what allowed my six brothers and sisters and I to go to college after my dad got sick and had to leave his job. They are what made college affordable, and they are what allowed each one of us to pursue a career and give back to our communities. Because our government was there to help my family and help us through hard times, those seven kids in my family grew up to be a firefighter, a lawyer, a computer programmer, a sports writer, a homemaker, a middle school teacher, and a Senator. In my book, that was a good investment by our country and our government.

My family's story is far from unique. In fact, last week I traveled around my home State of Washington listening to student after student after student describe the real-life impact this rate hike would have on them. Students such as Elizabeth from Vancouver, WA: She is a sophomore at the University of Washington. She comes from a family of five children with immigrant parents who work hourly low-wage jobs.

She told me growing up, the idea of paying for college was overwhelming, but thanks to scholarships and grants and loans she is able to pursue her dream of becoming a broadcast journalist. However, her part-time work-study position barely covers her bills, and she says she is constantly plagued by stress as she worries about how she is ever going to overcome what she calls her ''debt sentence.''

The reality is this is a simple issue. College is already too expensive for students such as Elizabeth, and Congress shouldn't make it worse. So I am very proud to join my colleagues in supporting the Keep Student Loan Rates Affordable Act to extend the 3.4 percent interest rate, and I urge our friends on the other side of the aisle to join us and pass it.

With student loan debt now exceeding $1 trillion, students and their families deserve due process and thoughtful consideration of issues such as financial aid. Students have already contributed billions to deficit reduction, but the problem is the Senate Republican leadership has insisted in all of their proposals that we balance the budget on the backs of struggling students and their families. So far, they have refused to put the interest of students and tomorrow's middle class ahead of Tax Code spending that benefits the wealthy.

What they have introduced is a bill that includes no cap on how high student loan rates could go—something CBO tells us would mean students could be locked in at rates over 8 percent in just a few short years. In effect, it would be better to do absolutely nothing now than to take up and pass the Republican bill.

I bet everybody listening knows a family member or a coworker who is up to their neck in student debt. It is a weight that keeps them from helping to grow our economy or start a family or take risks with their careers, and it is a weight that is not easily shed.

We can't continue to do this to generation after generation of college students and expect to be able to compete in the 21st-century economy. We have to do everything we can to remove barriers to education, not erect new ones.

The clock has run out. We need to act now because for millions of Americans, affordable college has been the ticket to the middle class, and we can't allow it to slip away. We can't allow access to college to become unattainable for so many of our families.

I urge our Republican colleagues to join us in investing in America's future by reversing this student loan increase and making college more affordable for America's middle class.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am glad I stayed to hear the Senator from Washington speak because I think this highlights the issue. That is a terrific political speech, but it bears no resemblance to what is actually happening in the student loan debate.

The distinguished Senator from Washington talked about rates going up. Rates are going up for over 7 million—7 million—middle-income students in America who are going to be taking out loans this year, and the Democratic proposal does nothing for them. Their proposal does nothing for them.

All the Democrats are trying to do is a political fix for 1 year for students taking out 40 percent of the loans who are already the beneficiary of Pell grants, as she so ably expressed, who have their interest paid while they are in college. These students are borrowing subsidized loans. These students may receive a Pell grant of up to $5,550. They have their interest paid while they are in college. This accounting system used by the Congressional Budget Office is very generous to students as opposed to taxpayers, because it is done under the Federal Credit Reporting Act, which is more generous to students, in this case, than taxpayers.

What about the over 7 million middle-income students who are just swinging in the wind under the Democratic proposal? It does nothing for them.

On the other hand, we have the President of the United States, a Democrat, and we have the House of Representatives, a majority of Republicans, and they fundamentally agree on one idea: Let's have a permanent solution. Let's figure out what it costs the taxpayer to allow the government to issue loans—the government is lending over $100 billion a year—and loan it to the students at no profit—at no profit—so the students can use it—all of them, not 40 percent of them, not just low-income students but middle-income students as well—and all of them will have their rates lowered.

So what will the effect be? Their proposal would fix at 3.4 percent for 1 year the student loan interest rate on 40 percent of the loans. Our bipartisan proposal would fundamentally—as does the President's proposal and the proposal passed by the House of Representatives—lower the rate to 3.66 percent for all undergraduates. It would be not just for the students borrowing 40 percent of the loans but for all middle-income students and graduate students as well. Their rates would be lower than 6.8 percent.

What is good about a short-term political fix that makes middle-income students and graduate students pay hundreds of millions of dollars more over the next 10 years? What is good about that? All it does is provide an opportunity to make a well-rehearsed political speech about student loans.

We all want to encourage students to go to college. We are looking for a way to give them some predictability and some certainty so students don't have to worry, when they graduate from Maryville High School in Tennessee where I went, that Congress isn't going to do its job. All the other side is going to do is stand up and make political speeches that have nothing to do with the issue.

In this case, the President has done his job by recommending a long-term solution. The Republican House of Representatives has done its job. It passed a long-term solution that lowers rates for everybody. A group of six Senators are doing our jobs. We have introduced a bipartisan proposal that reduces rates for everybody, and it is a long-term solution, while a number of the Democratic Senators are playing political games. They are ignoring reality. They are going to freeze for 10 years higher interest rates on loans for over 7 million—7 million—middle-income students across this country who are headed to college—rates that are nearly twice as high as the bipartisan proposal here, which is fundamentally like the proposal by the President and the proposal by the House of Representatives.

What is the wisdom in that? I don't see it, and I don't think the students will see it.

As far as balancing the budget on the backs of students, the only people around here who have done that are the Democrats when they passed the health care law. They put in that law a takeover of the Federal student loan program and, according to the CBO, they had an amount of savings of $55 billion, and they used part of it to reduce the debt.

So the CBO says these are savings because the Democrats took over student loans and the Democrats said they will use it to reduce the debt, use it for the Pell grant program, and they used it to help pay for the health care law. Every single year for the next several years, students are being overcharged to help pay for the health care law.

So if we want to get into a big political discussion about who is overcharging students in order to reduce the deficit or pay for the health care law, we can have that. But that is not what we want to do. We want a result, and we have suggested to the Senate—and I am going to say it one more time: Instead of a 40-percent political fix for 1 year, we have suggested a long-term solution for 100 percent of the students. It reduces their rates. It cuts nearly in half the interest rate for every single undergraduate loan—every single one, which is two-thirds of the loans—and it is based on an idea that was in the President's budget, that has already been passed by the House of Representatives, and that has been introduced by three on that side of the aisle and three on this side of the aisle.

A Senate that is interested in a result instead of political gamesmanship would be sitting down and trying to work that out. That is what we want to do.

We can play games, too, I suppose. I can go get my statistics and come back to the floor and say those over on the Democratic side, when they passed the health care bill, did it on the backs of students. When they balanced the budget—which they haven't done—they tried to do it on the backs of students. And when they found some money for Pell grants, they overcharged the students to whom they were loaning money. That is true. I could do that, and I could say that, but I didn't come here to spend all my time saying that. I came here to get results.

So this is not a game for 11 million students across this country. They are trying to figure out how they are going to pay for college. Just as the Senator from Washington said, it is not easy to do. They expect us to come here with our backgrounds and say: We are going to do the best we can. Instead of making this similar to what we call the doctors fix, where every year we play a little politics and add a little money to pay doctors who work with Medicare patients—that is a terrible thing to do, but we do it every year—and now we are going to treat student loans in the same way. In a Presidential election year, everybody will make a big speech about it. Eleven million students will sit around wondering how they are going to pay for college, waiting for the people in Washington to make a decision about that. We should not be doing that.

We have great promise here. We have a President making a long-term solution, the House of Representatives of a different party agreeing with him, and six of us on both sides of the aisle proposing a solution that is a permanent solution for 100 percent for the 11 million people who will be borrowing over $100 billion this year.

Why would they on the other side of the aisle insist on a solution that forces 7 million mostly middle-income students to pay 6.8 percent when they could be paying 3.66 percent? Why would you do that? Because you have not thought about it, I think.

A lot has been going on. We have had an immigration debate and a number of other things, so maybe Senators have not taken a look at that. I have. I have had a chance to do that. I have been the president of a university. I have been the Education Secretary. I know

something about the student loan program. I did not like it when the Federal Government took it over. I admire our U.S. Secretary of Education. I do not think he ought to be the banker of the year. I think we have banks to make loans, but that is not the way it is. The taxpayers now make all the government loans—over $100 billion a year.

Students are making their plans. They are going to be arriving at colleges in August and September. We have a bipartisan proposal that will lower interest rates for every single student taking out a student loan. Yet our friends on the other side want to leave middle-income students out of it, force them to pay twice as much as they should be in interest rates for the next 10 years. That makes no sense. We ought not do that.

Tomorrow what we ought to do is pass the Burr-Manchin proposal that is supported on both sides of the aisle. To the extent it differs with the President's proposal—which is very slight—and with the proposal of the House of Representatives—which is not much—we should then sit down, work something out over the next 3 days, pass it and send it to the President and go on to the next issue. Instead, we have political speeches about how hard it is to go to college. We all know how hard it is to go to college. It is difficult to do. We all want to help. But if we have a solution, we ought to adopt it.

I could play politics too. I know how. Every one of us in this room knows how, otherwise we would not be here. This is not a time for playing politics. This is serious business; 11 million students getting 18 million loans, $100 billion-plus from the American taxpayers. We have a proposal before us that is fair to the taxpayers—it will not cost them any money—it is fair to the students—it does not balance the budget or pay for the health care program or any other thing on the students' backs—and it gives students, many of whom who have no credit rating, no other way to get money, a chance to get several thousand dollars a year at one of the lowest possible rates available in the country. The proposal that is before the Senate that is bipartisan is a permanent solution. It says to the student going to the University of Tennessee or Alaska or Minnesota: If you get a loan this year from the government and you are an undergraduate, the interest rate is 3.66 percent. Your rate on that loan won't change. If you are a middle-income student, the Democrats' plan says it is 6.8 percent, and they say: Wait. Wait for what? Wait for rates to go up?

Why don't we establish this program for students at a time when rates are low? That is to their advantage. Let's have a permanent solution at a time when rates are low. They may go up and, therefore, students may pay more, but they will pay a lot less than they would in the private market. They will have a lot more certainty than if we just come around and play politics with this every year to try to gain some advantage with this student group or that student group.

So we have an opportunity before us. The immigration bill passed before the recess. It showed a good deal of the ability of people on both sides of the aisle to work together. We did that with the farm bill. We did that with the water resources bill. I would submit this is 100 times easier than any of those bills.

When I went home to Tennessee before the Fourth of July recess, I said to somebody who asked me: We are that far apart and we have the President and the Republican House and a bipartisan group of Senators all in about the same place. This ought to be easy to do.

It is still easy to do, but I would implore my Senators to look at the facts—those on the other side of the aisle—and realize I do not think they want to go home and explain why they are leaving over 7 million middle-income students twisting in the wind, paying twice as much on interest rates for the next year as the proposal that they are about to vote against tomorrow. I think that will be pretty hard to explain, and I will bet there will be a lot of explaining to do if that is the end result.

So I pledge—as I have been working with Secretary Duncan, with the White House, with Democrats and Republicans—to try to get a result here. I think we can still do it in the next few days. I would hope we can have a vote on both proposals tomorrow. My guess would be both would fail at this point, but at least that would show we are seriously working toward a solution, and we can sit down and merge these small differences that exist between the bipartisan group here, the Republican House, and the President of the United States.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the immigration bill we passed a couple weeks ago. It was a significant achievement. I have already congratulated all of those in the so-called Gang of 8 who put together the initial draft. It was an example of bipartisanship and recognizing that the other fellow has a point of view—that you respect that—and then you work out your differences. That was an example of the Senate at its finest and what we ought to be doing on every piece of legislation around here.

The final result: 68 votes to 32 votes. Its prospects we know not what because of the different approach in the House and the inability on so many things we have passed here to go to the conference committee to iron out the differences between the House and the Senate.

So I am very appreciative, and I have given my congratulations to all of those who have participated in that immigration bill.

There is a huge flaw. It is a huge flaw in not recognizing that when we want to secure the border, as supposedly was done in order to gain 14 Republican votes to get us to the huge vote of 68 votes for the bill, a major amount of money was added for border security. That is not the flaw. Some may question the amount of money. Indeed, there was $6.5 billion in the initial Gang of 8 compromise for border security. But when it came with the Corker-Hoeven amendment, there was $46.3 billion more, of which over $44 billion was for border security. That is not what is the flaw, although one can argue it.

The flaw is that the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Mississippi and me was not even allowed to be considered, which was to increase not some $50-plus billion for border security—which was the land border—but to add a mere $1 billion for maritime security. That is the flaw. As a matter of fact, if you want border security, it is a fatal flaw. Why? You put up an impenetrable wall—whether it be a fence, an electric fence, an electronic fence, whether it be UAVs, more Border Patrol agents—as a matter of fact, in the Corker-Hoeven amendment, $30 billion of that additional border security was just for Border Patrol agents—all of which is going to make it fairly effective in border security of not allowing people to pass, but it is the land border.

So what is going to happen? You go right around the land border on the maritime border.

It is either going to be on the west coast, on the Pacific, or it is going to be on the east coast, either the Gulf of Mexico and all the Gulf States or the Atlantic, including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Because if someone can be smuggled into one of them and therefore get an identity, then they have free access. Puerto Ricans are American citizens. They have free access to get to the rest of the United States.

So maritime security becomes paramount. But we could not get people here who wanted to spend over $50 billion on border security, which is the land border, which, in fact, is in the bill—they would not allow a Republican Senator, Mr. WICKER, and me to add $1 billion for maritime security.

Specifically, under our amendment, it would have addressed just that part of border security with regard to the Department of Homeland Security. But if we want an effective border security, we have to then get into a whole host of things other than Customs and Border Patrol. We have to get additional

resources for the Coast Guard. We have to consider not only UAVs being flown by the Department of Homeland Security, through Customs, et cetera, over the maritime border, we have to put more Coast Guard out there.

I would suggest a new platform that would be very effective would be what the Navy is testing right now, which is blimps. It is a very cost-effective, long dwell time, that gives enormous coverage at sea by one blimp. I have ridden in those blimps.

The Navy is testing them. I went with the Navy out of Fernandina Beach as they were doing the testing for Mayport Naval Station. It is incredible what you can do on the dwell time of a blimp. Of course, the fuel used is de minimus. The cost of an entire mission for a blimp, some 24 hours of fuel, is the same as cranking up an F–16 taxing out to the runway. That amount of energy, fuel spent is what would be spent on a blimp for an entire 24-hour period as it is doing surveillance.

So if we are going to be sincere about border effectiveness, then, in fact, we are going to have to pay attention to the maritime border as well as the land border. Why are Senator WICKER and I concerned about this? He comes from a Gulf Coast State, Mississippi. I come from the State that has the longest coastline of any State save for the State of Alaska.

My State of Florida has over some 1,500 miles of coast. It is a place that will be a haven for smugglers of people and drugs. If we think we are tightening border security by over $50 billion being applied to the land border, where are the smugglers going to go? They are going to go right around. It is just like water will flow and it will meet the place of least resistance. It will continue to flow. So, too, will the smugglers.

I wish to say I am disappointed that people on that side of the aisle would not allow Senator WICKER's and my amendment to be considered in the last minute. It obviously is not controversial. Yet, for whatever reason, it was denied. I hope as we proceed on the immigration bill—and I hope we are able to proceed if the House will act—I hope in the final product it will be considered and added so we can truly have a secure border, a maritime border as well as a land border.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, soon we will be voting on a district court nominee. I rise in opposition to the nomination of Jennifer Dorsey. That is for the U.S. district judgeship for the District of Nevada. Before I outline the basis for my opposition, I wish to inform my fellow Senators and the American public regarding facts on judicial nominations.

We continue to hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about how we are obstructing nominees or treating this President differently. Those complaints are without foundation. I will quantify my answer to prove my point. There is no crisis in the manner in which we are confirming nominees. This is all part of a larger strategy to justify breaking the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate.

The fact is that after today the Senate will have confirmed 199 lower court nominees. We have defeated two. That is 199 to 2. Who can complain about that record? The success rate happens to be 99 percent for the nominees sent by President Obama, considered on the floor of the Senate.

We have been doing it at a very fast pace as well. During the last Congress we confirmed more judges than any Congress since the 103rd Congress. That Congress sat from 1993 through 1994. This year we have already confirmed more judges than were confirmed in the entire first year of President Bush's second term.

So far this year we have confirmed 27 judges. If confirmed today, Ms. Dorsey will be the 28th confirmation this year. Let's compare this with a similar stage, which would be President Bush's second term, when only 10 judicial nominees had been confirmed. So we are now at a 28-to-10 comparison, with President Obama clearly ahead of where President Bush was. But somehow we are hearing complaints.

As I said, we have already confirmed more nominees this year, 28, than we did during the entirety of the year 2005, the first year of President Bush's second term, when 21 lower court judges were confirmed. After today only three article III judges remain on the Senate's Executive Calendar; two district nominees and one circuit nominee.

Yet we hear the same old story. Somehow our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Senate majority, the Senate Democrats, cite this as evidence of obstructionism. Compare that to June 2004, when 30 judicial nominations were on the calendar, 10 circuit, 20 district.

I do not recall any Senate Democrat complaining about how many nominations were piling up on the calendar, nor do I remember protests from my colleagues on the other side that judicial nominees were moving too slowly.

Some of those nominees had been reported out of committee more than 1 year earlier and most were pending for months. Some of them never did get an up-or-down vote. The bottom line is that the Senate is processing the President's nominees exceptionally fairly. I do not know why that message cannot get through. It is an excuse to abuse the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate.

President Obama certainly is being treated more fairly in the beginning of his second term than Senate Democrats treated President Bush in the first year of his last term in office. It is not clear to me how allowing more votes so far this year than President Bush got in an entire year amounts to ''unprecedented delays and obstruction.'' Yet that is the complaint we hear over and over and over again from the other side.

I wanted to set the record straight. It is a sad commentary that I have to spend so much time when figures speak for themselves. But I will set the record straight again before we vote on the nomination of Ms. Dorsey.

I have concerns with this particular nominee. I think all Members are aware of the press accounts of campaign contributions which were made at the time this nomination was under consideration. We have not received a full explanation of what happened. Nevertheless, I am concerned about the appearances of these contributions and how such actions might undermine the public confidence that our citizenry must have in the judicial branch of our government.

I also have concerns about Ms. Dorsey's qualifications to be a Federal judge. She has no criminal law experience. She has participated in only six trials, one as a sole counsel, one as first chair, and four as second chair. I am concerned that her lack of experience will be a problem when she gets to the bench.

It is not surprising to me that the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave her a partial ''not qualified'' rating. I am also concerned with her understanding of the proper role of a judge.

While in law school, she wrote a note that praised the Justices who wrote Roe v. Wade. She praised them for the willingness to ''forge ahead to create a just outcome without regard to the usual decisional restraints.'' Then, she said, ''The majority made the just decision and then forced history and stare decisis to fit that decision.''

Ms. Dorsey praised judges who made their decision—and I want to use her words—''without regard to the usual decisional restraints.'' Those words are not the kind of words judges should be using. That is not the kind of judges we want, those who are activist judges who impose their own policy preferences rather than in following enacted law or precedent.

What do we want? We want judges who will be restrained by precedent and by the laws Congress passes. Although Ms. Dorsey said she no longer supports what she once wrote, I am unconvinced she will be able to lay her policy preferences aside when they conflict with what the law dictates she ought to do.

For all the reasons I mentioned above, I cannot support the nominee. I have two news articles that describe the campaign contribution issue I discussed earlier. I ask unanimous consent that those articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Las Vegas Review-Journal, May 3, 2013]

DONATIONS TO REID-CONNECTED PACS LEGAL, BUT DON'T SEEM QUITE RIGHT

(By Jane Ann Morrison)

U.S. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid didn't break laws when he asked Las Vegas attorney Will Kemp to donate to the Senate Majority PAC to help elect Democrats in the 2012 cycle.

The senator, a lawyer himself, knew Kemp and Robert Eglet had won a huge verdict of $182 million from Teva Pharmaceutical Industries in a case in which large vials of Propofol were partially blamed for a hepatitis outbreak.

Kemp wasn't new to donating to Reid. He had been a donor to Friends for Harry Reid in the past 2010 cycle and had given $4,800. According to opensecrets.org, Kemp's largest donation in the past three years was for $8,500 to the Democratic Party of Nevada. And while he leaned Democratic, he also gave to some Republicans.

However, ethical questions abound about whether Reid's latest judicial nominee, Jennifer Dorsey, a partner in Jones, Kemp and Coulthard, could have seen—or hoped to see—her chances for an appointment enhanced by a series of contributions from Kemp and his partner, J. Randall Jones.

It's the time line and the size of the amounts that are creating that sewage smell.

Despite that, Reid said Friday he believed she would be confirmed by the U.S. Senate.

Check out what happened when:

October 2011: Kemp wins his big Teva case, not his first big payday as a longtime trial attorney.

Jan. 9, 2012: Kemp donates $8,500 to the Democratic Party of Nevada, generally considered the party designed to elect Reid first and foremost and other Democrats as an afterthought.

Sometime in January or February 2012, according to Kemp's statements to political analyst Jon Ralston, Reid asks Kemp and his partners to donate to the Senate Majority PAC. It's unclear whether his donation to the party fell before or after Reid's request. Kemp didn't return a call Friday to clarify the time line.

March 31, 2012: Dorsey donates $2,500 to Friends for Harry Reid. Sometime that month she expressed her interest in a federal judgeship. The same day, Kemp contributes $2,500 to the Friends of Harry Reid.

April 30, 2012: Reid returns her money but keeps Kemp's.

May 1, 2012: The day after Dorsey's money is returned, Kemp donates $100,000 to the Senate Majority PAC, and law partner Jones donates $5,000 to the Democratic Party of Nevada.

May 14, 2012: Two weeks later, Jones donates $50,000 to the Senate Majority PAC.

June 12, 2012: Reid recommends Dorsey to the White House.

Aug. 23, 2012: Jones donates $8,000 to the Democratic Party of Nevada.

Sept. 19, 2012: She is nominated by President Barack Obama.

Oct. 23, 2012: Jones makes a $10,000 contribution to the Democratic Party of Nevada.

At a meeting at the Las Vegas Review-Journal on Friday, I asked Reid to address the perception that the donations were made for a purpose.

He answered, ''It's too bad that her being a member of that law firm is causing some problems for her.'' He noted he had known Kemp for decades. ''He's one of the finest trial lawyers in the country, and that's not just hyperbole, that's true.''

Reid went on to condemn the Citizens United decision in January 2010, which allows unlimited corporate and labor money in campaigns as independent expenditures. Reid called it one of the four or five worst decisions in the history of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Reid said he abides by the rules and does not control the Senate Majority PAC. He asked Kemp to donate, but PAC officials dealt with the lawyer after that.

By my tally, based on the Open Secrets website, in 2012, Kemp and Jones between them gave $150,000 to the Senate Majority PAC and $28,500 to the Democratic Party of Nevada, and Kemp gave an extra $2,500 to Friends of Reid, for a total of $181,000.

In previous years, Kemp and Jones had given but not at that level.

In 2010, Kemp gave Reid $4,800; Jones gave him $11,700. Kind of a big jump from $16,500 to Friends for Reid in one cycle to $181,000 to Reid, the Majority PAC and the Democratic Party in the 2012 cycle.

That's a lot of Democratic lovin'. Especially for two lawyers who also pony up for Republicans.

Reid mentioned the nearly $150 million that Las Vegas Sands Corp. boss Sheldon Adelson had given to elect Republicans in 2012 and how a Rhode Island man made a federal judgeship though he and his wife donated $700,000 to Democrats since 1993.

While $150,000 sounds like a lot to me, Reid said it's all relative because the Senate Majority PAC raised more than $60 million.

Reid must be conflicted. He competes successfully at raising money, whether it's for his own campaign, the party or various PACs. Yet he says, ''I think this whole campaign finance thing has gotten way out of hand.''

Later he mused, ''It may not corrupt people, but it is corrupting.''

Dorsey, 42, said she doesn't talk to reporters. But if she knew her partners were donating all this money at the time she was seeking a judgeship (and how could she not know), she should have stopped it. But then she did donate $2,500 after asking for the job. Maybe she thought it was expected. Or maybe the judicial candidate's judgment about perception isn't so keen.

When her partners had never donated in such large sums before, it smacks of old-style payola. It may be legal, but it's not right.

However, I suspect the canny Reid is correct, Dorsey will get confirmed. Senators of both parties won't want to see their own donations restricted as they themselves race for the almighty dollar.

[From www.reviewjournal.com, Apr. 26, 2013]

JUDICIAL NOMINEE'S LAW FIRM GIVES $150,000 TO PAC LINKED TO HARRY REID

(By Steve Tetreault, Stephens Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON.—As U.S. Sen. Harry Reid was considering Las Vegas attorney Jennifer Dorsey for a federal judgeship in May, two senior partners at her law firm made $150,000 in contributions to a political action committee associated with the Nevada senator, records show.

While apparently legal, the donations were called ''problematic'' by a legal expert, who said they could be perceived as attempting to buy a judicial appointment as Dorsey's confirmation is pending before the Senate.

Dorsey also made a personal contribution of $2,500 to Reid's campaign committee in March 2012, shortly after they initially spoke about her interest in becoming a federal judge, according to Senate records. Reid returned that contribution a month later, as he proceeded to check out her credentials and experience as a litigator.

In June, Reid agreed to recommend Dorsey to the White House for a post on the U.S. District Court, and she was nominated by President Barack Obama in September.

Reid in a statement said Dorsey's ''academic background and courtroom experience speak for themselves. She has great respect from her peers and colleagues in Nevada and I am confident she will serve the bench with distinction.''

As Dorsey was being vetted by Reid, senior partners at her firm, Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, made contributions to Senate Majority PAC, a super PAC created by former Reid strategists to elect Democrats to the U.S. Senate. Reid, the Senate majority leader, and other leading Democrats traveled extensively last year to raise money for the PAC, which is co-chaired by a former Reid chief of staff.

Founding partner Will Kemp made a $100,000 contribution on May 1, 2012, according to campaign finance records. Founding partner J. Randall Jones made a $50,000 contribution on May 14, 2012.

Reid declined comment on the firm's contributions to the political action committee. His spokeswoman, Kristen Orthman, emphasized that Dorsey's personal contribution to Reid's campaign was returned as the senator weighed her possible nomination and wanted to avoid an appearance of conflict.

Dorsey did not respond to requests for comment Thursday and Friday. A secretary at her office said the attorney usually does not comment to reporters.

Neither Kemp nor Jones responded to calls or to email queries made through their secretaries on Friday.

Lawyers making contributions to politicians and their causes is commonplace. Nor is it unusual for lawyers to want to see friends and legal partners ascend to the prestigious federal bench.

It's when the two appear to mix that problems can arise, legal experts said.

''This feels problematic to me,'' said Charles Geyh, John F. Kimberling professor of law who teaches and writes on ethics at the University of Indiana Maurer School of Law. ''There's no denying a perception problem here. Politically it seems like a dangerous thing to undertake.''

Carl Tobias, the Williams Professor of Law at the University of Richmond, cautioned against jumping to conclusions.

''I can't draw a cause-and-effect relationship'' between the partners' donations and Dorsey's nomination, said Tobias, a former professor at the Boyd School of Law at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. ''I think people could ask whether it appears that they were trying to promote one of their partners. You'd like to have the answers to those questions.''

Sen. Dean Heller, R–Nev., declined to comment on Friday. In recent weeks he has declined comment on Dorsey's nomination, saying he prefers to let the confirmation process move forward before saying how he would vote.

This week Heller declined an invitation to appear at Dorsey's confirmation hearing. Although Dorsey was nominated in September, only last month did Heller return the customary ''blue slip'' to the Senate Judiciary Committee, signalling that he did not object to a confirmation hearing.

Heller and Reid clashed earlier over Clark County District Judge Elissa Cadish, whom Reid had nominated to a federal judgeship but whom Heller had blocked over a gun rights dispute. Heller allowed Dorsey's nomination to proceed a few weeks after Cadish withdrew her nomination, leading to speculation that he and Reid had struck a deal.

Dorsey, who turned 42 on Friday, appeared Wednesday before the Senate Judiciary Committee for her confirmation hearing. The Las Vegas native obtained degrees from UNLV

and Pepperdine University School of Law. She became a partner at Kemp, Jones and Coulthard in 2004, where she has specialized in complex civil litigation.

Dorsey answered questions about her experience and her approach to the law posed by Sens. Mazie Hirono, D–Hawaii, Charles Grassley, R–Iowa, and Mike Lee, R–Utah. The senators seemed satisfied with her performance, said Tobias, who watched a webcast of the session.

Dorsey was introduced to the committee by Reid, who called her a ''fine woman who will be a great addition to the bench in Nevada. She has really a sterling reputation among her peers.''

Reid said Dorsey's nomination was in line with his desire to place more women on the federal bench. If confirmed, Dorsey would join District Judges Miranda Du and Gloria Navarro as Reid-backed Nevada federal court appointees.

In 1998, Reid backed attorney Johnnie Rawlinson for a District Court judgeship in Nevada, and two years later promoted her confirmation to the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

Dorsey has received a mixed rating from the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, a 15–member panel that rates federal judge nominees on integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament, and on a scale of ''well qualified,'' ''qualified'' and ''not qualified.''

In Dorsey's case, the ABA said a ''substantial majority'' (10–13 members) rated her ''qualified'' while a minority rated her ''not qualified.''

Reid declined this week to comment on the rating, which matched ratings for Du and Navarro when they were under Senate consideration. He had made no secret of his disdain for the ratings, which he said rely too heavily on prior judicial service as opposed to ''real world'' qualifications.

In 2010, Reid said the examiners should ''get a new life and start looking at people for how they are qualified and not whether they have judicial experience.''

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM M. ''MO'' COWAN

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today to say a few words about my friend who is leaving the Senate this week, Massachusetts Senator MO COWAN. I have to admit that when he first arrived I was excited because I was no longer going to be 100th in seniority. That job went to MO, and I would be 99. However, quickly after he was sworn in, I realized he was one of the nicest and smartest Members of this body. During his recent farewell speech, MO referred to me as the North Dakota sister he never knew he had. I already have six siblings, but I would welcome him into the Heitkamp family any day.

In all seriousness, MO was an excellent addition to this body. After the Boston massacre tragedy, he showed incredible leadership skills. He was a source of guidance and comfort to countless folks from Massachusetts in the weeks and months that followed that horrific act of terrorism.

During his short tenure, MO has distinguished himself in this body. First, MO listens more than he talks. His acute observation skills have made him a trusted adviser to many. Equally important, MO's observations are without judgment; rather, MO listens and tries to understand how he can advance the issue and not judge the speaker's motivations.

MO is a serious thinker, always trying to find a path forward to resolve the important issues of our time. I can only imagine the important and great legislation MO would have advanced if he had more time here.

Although MO is a serious guy, he also loves to laugh—mostly at his own expense. MO's desk in the Senate was often the gathering site for many freshman Senators because everyone was just a little happier and a little smarter after spending time with MO.

MO is also an extraordinarily humble human being—not the false modesty of a seasoned politician but the humility that comes from a deep faith and a lifetime of self-reflection. One should never mistake that humility for a lack of self-confidence. MO is very sure-footed and anchored in the one great belief that his job is and always will be to make the world a more just place for his sons and for all the children of our country.

So beyond the ritual of carving a name in a desk and his recorded roll-call votes on important issues like immigration, what will be MO COWAN's Senate legacy? History may mark his time here in a footnote, but MO's impact has been much greater. I cannot speak for others in this body, but because I served with MO COWAN, I will be a better Senator. I will listen more and talk less. I will always remember not to judge the motivations of others; instead, seek solutions with others. I will redouble my efforts to make our great country a more just place for our children.

I will miss you, Senator MO COWAN. You are a great Senator, but more importantly, you are a wonderful and kind human being. Thank you for your service to our country.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on the nomination of Jennifer Dorsey to be a judge on the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

Jennifer Dorsey has spent her entire legal career at the Las Vegas, NV firm of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP, where she has been partner for the past 9 years. She has diverse experience in civil and criminal matters, trial and appellate work, and State and Federal courts, and has tried more than a dozen trials to verdict. The committee has heard from Judge Deanell Tacha, who was nominated by President Reagan to the Tenth Circuit and is now the dean of Pepperdine University School of Law, in support of Jennifer Dorsey. She wrote:

> I am well acquainted with Ms. Dorsey and can say, with full confidence, that she is an outstanding candidate for the federal judiciary who would serve with great distinction . . . She is a distinguished lawyer, a highly respected member of her community, and a true servant of the public good.

Her qualifications notwithstanding, Jennifer Dorsey has been the target of a false controversy over political donations made by her law firm colleagues. It is ironic that the same Senate Republicans who have filibustered any attempt to regulate or scrutinize political donations, and who objected to my request during the Bush administration to include political campaign contributions by nominees in the committee questionnaire, are now using donations by a nominee's colleagues to smear the nominee. These donations that the ranking member claimed he was concerned about were not even known to the nominee until they were reported in local newspapers. Ms. Dorsey has answered the ranking member's questions on this issue under oath and I consider it settled. Senate Republicans did not ask such questions of President Bush's nominees, even nominees who themselves made donations to President Bush or their home State Republican Senators after they knew that they were being considered for a judgeship. Perhaps now Senate Republicans think we should look at donations made by nominees' friends and neighbors?

This is just one more example of Senate Republicans playing games with President Obama's judicial nominees, rather than actually looking at the nominees' records. False controversies about nominees like Paul Watford, Patty Schwartz, Andrew Hurwitz, Caitlin Halligan, and Jeffrey Helmick over who they represented, or who they clerked for, demean the confirmation process.

Jennifer Dorsey is one of the 33 judicial nominees who needed to be renominated this year. Unfortunately, the Senate is not able to consider another district of Nevada nominee, Judge Elissa Cadish, whose nomination was withdrawn after the Republican Senator from Nevada refused to return his blue slip on her nomination. The concern with Judge Cadish seemed to be that in 2008 she had accurately stated existing Second Amendment jurisprudence. Judge Cadish was originally appointed to the Nevada bench by a Republican Governor, and in a 2011 judicial performance evaluation, conducted

by the Las Vegas Review-Journal, 88 percent of the lawyers who responded said she should be retained on the bench, which was among the highest of all judges evaluated. So I remain disappointed that her nomination was withdrawn and that the Judiciary Committee and the Senate were not permitted to consider it, especially since the vacancy to which Judge Cadish was nominated is now a judicial emergency vacancy.

In addition to the 33 renominations at the start of this year, President Obama has nominated another 28 individuals to be circuit and district judges this year, and has now had more nominees at this point in his presidency than his predecessor did at the same point. Senate Republicans are nonetheless criticizing President Obama for making too few nominations while protesting that the fact that many vacancies do not have nominees cannot possibly be the fault of Senate Republicans. These Senators are saying that they have no role in the process. Of course, only a few years ago, before President Obama had made a single judicial nomination, all Senate Republicans sent him a letter threatening to filibuster his nominees if he did not consult Republican home State Senators. They cannot have it both ways.

I take very seriously my responsibility to make recommendations when we have vacancies in Vermont, whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican, and other Senators should do the same. After all, if there are not enough judges in our home States, it is our own constituents who suffer. It should be only a matter of weeks or months, not years, for Senators to make recommendations. Republican Senators who demanded to be consulted on nominations should live up to their responsibilities, and fulfill their constitutional obligation to advise the President on nominations. They should follow the example of Democratic Senators: the administration has received recommendations for all current district vacancies in States represented by two Democratic Senators. When Senate Republicans refuse to make recommendations for nominees, and then delay votes on consensus nominees, they are not somehow hurting the President, they are hurting the American people and our justice system.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all remaining time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HAGAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jennifer A. Dorsey, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 170 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Reid
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kaine	Sanders
Cardin	King	Schatz
Carper	Klobuchar	Schumer
Casey	Landrieu	Shaheen
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Levin	Tester
Cowan	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—41

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Scott
Chiesa	Isakson	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	Kirk	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	McConnell	Wicker
Cruz	Moran	

NOT VOTING—5

Begich	Flake	McCain
Coats	Graham	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid on the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

KEEP STUDENT LOANS AFFORDABLE ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, the Senator from Utah be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. I wish to thank the Senator from Utah for graciously allowing me to proceed.

While the Republicans failed to join us in an effort to avert the doubling of the interest rate on need-based student loans, there is still time to act to make things right for students. On July 1, the interest rate on subsidized Stafford loans doubled from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. Instead of allowing us to take up a vote on an extension of the lower rate, the other side continues to push a so-called long-term solution that would saddle students with even more debt in the future.

Students and advocates from across the country have been very clear. On June 21, they wrote to Senate leadership, and in their words: ''A bad deal that is permanent for student borrowers is worse than no deal at all.''

We need time to work together to develop a good deal for students—one that is comprehensive, one that touches not on just rates but on incentives to lower the costs of a college education and on ways in which students can refinance their existing debt and their future debts. As we all understand, we have reached a point where student debt has exceeded credit card debt. It is the second largest household debt—$1 trillion—and it is saddling this generation and future generations with burdens they well might not be able to discharge.

In the meantime, at this moment, we should take up and pass the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act which I have offered, along with Senator HAGAN and 41 of our colleagues, to ensure that students with the greatest financial need do not see the interest rate on their loans double. Again, at the heart of our student lending program has been a special concern to allow young men and women with talent from low and moderate incomes to go to college. That is why we created the subsidized Stafford loan program. That is what we have to keep our focus and emphasis on today. Forty-nine organizations representing students, educators, colleges and universities, and workers from across the country have asked us to do this. These are the students, the universities, and the people who have most at stake and they are telling us, again, that a bad deal is worse than no deal at all.

We should take a step back and remember why we offer student loans in the first place. When President Lyndon Johnson signed the Higher Education Act into law in 1965, he said: ''And it is a truism education is no longer a luxury. Education in this day and age is a necessity.''

His words are truer today than they were in 1965. According to Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, we will fall 5 million

short of the workers with postsecondary credentials we will need by 2020. We already know there is going to be a gap between the workers we need with advanced degrees and the jobs available by 2020. Nearly two-thirds of new jobs will require a college degree or similar credential. So by saddling this generation with additional costs and thereby inhibiting those who may well have the talent but not the resources to go to college, we are going to create an even bigger divergence between the demand for skilled workers and the talent Americans need to develop to fill those jobs.

President Johnson again referred to the Higher Education Act as a promise the Nation was making to its young people for generations to come. The promise was that this Nation was not going to allow financial barriers to keep willing and able young people from a college education. But, today, that promise is at risk.

As I have indicated, the job market increasingly demands postsecondary education simply to achieve middle-class earnings. At the same time, college is getting more and more expensive. As I said also, student loan debt is accelerating, second only to mortgage debt for American households. This is going to have a huge impact on the overall economy of this country. It is not going to be just individual students and families struggling. The Federal Reserve of New York and others have reported that this debt is dragging down our economy especially for young families as they try to establish themselves.

The primary tools in the Higher Education Act to help students pay for college are grants, work study, and low-cost loans. The Pell grant, which I must say we are so proud of because it was authored and championed by our great Senator Claiborne Pell, is less and less able to fund a college education. In the 1970s, it covered a large part of tuition and fees for a year in college. Today, the percentage of costs it covers is shrinking, even as we try to expand it. As a result, more and more students have had to rely on loans, and that is why we have seen this huge explosion of debt.

Today, instead of aiding students with low-cost loans, the Federal Government, ironically, is reaping profits from these students. We have to change this.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that between now and 2023, student loans will generate $184 billion in revenue for the Federal Government. At a time when students are struggling and when they are seeing their debt explode, we are making money off of them—not investing in them but putting them under a huge financial burden.

As we seek to solve these complex problems, I think the most sensible and the wisest thing to do is to keep the subsidized loan rate at 3.4 percent and use the year to engage and successfully complete the complex task of looking at several different aspects of this problem.

However, we are blocked from doing so because our budget rules basically require us to replace the revenue and the other side has been unwilling to consider revenue from other sources. We propose to offset the cost by closing a tax loophole. We have to look carefully not only at what we will do to make the student loan programs cheaper and more effective for students but also how we will pay for it.

We also have to recognize that for many years our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have targeted some of these subsidized loans, wanting to make them more expensive. From the Contract With America in the 1990s to the Ryan budgets, they have suggested things such as, for example, eliminating the in-school interest subsidy on student loans. For subsidized student loans, we pay the interest while the student is in college pursuing their educational goals, and they have suggested eliminating that. These are some of the reasons why I think we have to be skeptical of proposals that are being advanced in order to provide relief for students.

The so-called Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act would add nearly $1 billion in additional revenues from student loans to the government coffers. It may be a short-term fix, but it creates a much larger long-term problem: The teaser rates in the first few years mask the uncapped rates students would face in the following decades.

This chart is very revealing. This demonstrates the undergraduate Stafford loan interest rates under the so-called Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act. This green line is the graduate Stafford loan, and this is the PLUS loan for parents. As we can see, they accelerate dramatically because of the 10-year Treasury bill rate chosen by supporters of the other proposal and because of the likely increase in that rate. It reaches the point here where interest rates exceed current law in 2016. So by 2016, these loans will be much more expensive. This is a classic case of enjoying 2 or 3 years of low interest, but having to be prepared to pay a lot more for education in the future. It is eerily reminiscent of those proposals to refinance one's house with an adjustable rate uncapped mortgage and get rid of that old-fashioned fixed rate which was so prevalent in the first decade of the 2000s and which caused so much havoc, and still is causing so much havoc.

CBO estimates that if we look from 2017 to 2023 alone, students will pay $37.8 billion more under the so-called Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act.

Students are smart. They can figure it out. But I think there is something else we have to add to the mix. This chart shows an estimate of the rates that was made a few weeks ago on the previous chart. Here is the change in the daily yield for the 10-year T-note. This is the benchmark rate. We can see where it begins on May 1 of 2013. It is going from about 1.6 percent all the way up to about 2.6 percent. This rate is rising dramatically. Why? Well, for one reason, the Federal Reserve has indicated they are going to begin to taper off their quantitative easing program. One reason is as we see signs of growth in the economy, interest rates will rise naturally. So what we could find is that this chart actually underestimates the potential growth in interest rates and students could end up paying maybe much more.

In the Republican proposal, there is no cap on these rates.

They talk about the fact that there is a consolidation process, but that consolidation process can only be entered into after a student has gone through school, begun repayment, accumulated interest at increasing rates each year, and then, indeed, when a student goes into the consolidation phase, all of the interest is capitalized and the loan is stretched out over many years, meaning they end up paying more. So it is not a rate cap at all. Frankly, without a rate cap, I think we are exposing students and their families to vast uncertainty. In fact, the only thing that seems to be certain is these rates are going up.

We have to approach this problem in a thoughtful way. That is why I introduced the Responsible Student Loan Solutions Act with Senator DURBIN. It is a long-term proposal. It would base student loan interest rates on the actual cost of running the student loan programs—not on arbitrary rate but the actual cost to the government—and it will protect students by capping interest rates on each of the individual loan programs. Our proposal would, in effect, pass on the savings to students that the Federal Government accrues from the low cost of borrowing relative to other borrowers, our ability to absorb risk relative to others, and the economies of scale for loan servicing for students across this country.

Additionally, by increasing in this legislation the loan limits on subsidized loans, we will allow students of low and moderate income to receive more help and not require them to borrow unsubsidized loans at higher interest rates and, as a result, I think, help bring down the whole cascading issue of student debt.

Finally, our legislation would provide relief to students with outstanding loans—that is upwards of $1 trillion nationally—by allowing them to refinance to a lower interest rate.

These are some of the key elements for a true long-term solution.

We also need to address the cost of college, which is going up astronomically. The institutions have to have a lot more at stake. They have to be very careful that they are not only selecting well-qualified students, but also that they are preparing them for the workforce of this century and that they can

have certainty, and the students can have certainty, that the skills they master in college will be rewarded with a job in our economy.

Finally, we have to establish a true Federal-State partnership. Federal grants and loans can't keep pace with these rising college costs. We have to work with every level of government to try to address these issues.

What I would suggest is that we work together. First, we extend the 3.4-percent interest rate, then, consciously, deliberately, and expeditiously, I hope, move forward to fix these complex issues, protect our students, allow education to be once again the engine that moves the country ahead, and allow every American, regardless of their wealth, to get aboard that train and go forward.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each and that Senator HATCH be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Senator HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1270 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I take the floor today to follow up on what my good friend and colleague Senator REED from Rhode Island just spoke about; that is, the looming interest rate hike on student loans that is confronting us in this country.

To recap a little bit, in 2002 the Congress passed a fixed rate. We had variable rates before, but it passed a fixed rate on student loans of 6.8 percent. In 2007 it was lowered. That lasted for about 5 years, and then it was going to go back up to the fixed rate of 6.8 percent last year. The Congress passed a 1-year extension of that at 3.4 percent. It is that 1-year extension which expired on July 1 of this year. So if the Congress does nothing, the interest rates go back up to 6.8 percent.

In the midst of all of this, a lot of ideas have been floating around about what to do on student loans and the interest rates. Well, I think we have to keep in mind that if we go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, that is a doubling. More than 7.2 million college students will be required to pay an average of $1,000 more in interest per loan if we let it go back to 6.8 percent. Again, that is real money for our Nation's students.

Student loan debt currently exceeds $1 trillion. It is second only to mortgage debt in the United States, and it is higher than credit card debt. The average student now graduates with more than $26,000 in student loan debt. So now is really not the time to make them pay even more.

Now, luckily, we again have a window of time to act before the doubling causes any real harm. It doubled on July 1, but we had the Fourth of July week, so if we were to again extend the 3.4 percent for another year, it would do no harm. It would do no harm to anyone.

That is why I am urging my colleagues to support S. 1238, the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act of 2013. This responsible, fully paid for legislation, introduced by Senator REED of Rhode Island, Senator HAGAN, Senator FRANKEN, myself, and many others, is a viable solution to keeping student loan rates affordable for our middle-class students and families struggling to afford college.

I might add that this bill is supported by 49 student, youth, consumer, civil rights, and educational organizations across the country. Here is a letter they sent to Leader REID and Senator MCCONNELL dated June 28 to support S. 1238. They said:

> We applaud this bill, which creates a workable solution to maintaining current low rates while Congress seeks to reauthorize the Higher Education Act to reach a comprehensive solution to the student loan crisis that is good for students. We expect a vote on S. 1238 on July 10, 2013, allowing the proposal to take effect in time to protect incoming and returning students this fall.

That is what is happening tomorrow. Tomorrow we will vote on cloture on this bill—cloture, so that then we can get an up-or-down vote on whether we are going to extend the 3.4-percent interest rates until next July. I will in a moment say why that is so important.

The letter goes on to say:

> Many of the other proposals being discussed would result in even higher costs to students than if interest rates were simply allowed to double.

That is, to go to 6.8 percent.

> The bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act put forth by Senators Manchin, Burr, Coburn, Alexander, King and Carper would drive up borrower costs by $1 billion and tie interest rates to the market without a cap to protect students. This proposal would pay down the deficit on the backs of students, trading national debt for student debt. It is unacceptable to use student loans as a vehicle for deficit reduction, especially when the Federal Government is projected to make $51 billion on student loans just this year.

So that will be the vote tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter, along with the list of the organizations supporting the 1-year extension, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 28, 2013.

Support S. 1238, the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act of 2013.

Senator HARRY REID,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Senator MITCH MCCONNELL,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: We the undersigned student, youth, consumer, civil rights and education organizations urge you to support S. 1238, the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act of 2013, put forth by Senators Jack Reed (D–RI), Kay Hagan (D–NC) and 36 others, which will keep interest rates low for millions of students going to school this fall. If Congress fails to act by July 1, interest rates on federally subsidized Stafford student loans will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, and over 7 million students across the country will see the cost of college increase by $1,000 per student, per loan.

Considering the enormity of the student debt problem and the significant number of students and borrowers impacted, it is clear that we need a comprehensive overhaul of federal student loan policy. However, with just 3 days left until the deadline, it is unlikely that Congress can come to an agreement on comprehensive reform that is better for student loan borrowers than if the rate doubled to 6.8 percent.

We applaud this bill, which creates a workable solution to maintain current low rates while Congress seeks to reauthorize the Higher Education Act and to reach a comprehensive solution to the student loan crisis that is good for students. We expect a vote on S. 1238 on July 10, 2013, allowing the proposal to take effect in time to protect incoming and returning students this fall.

Many of the other proposals being discussed would result in even higher costs to students than if interest rates were simply allowed to double. The Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act put forth by Senators Joe Manchin (D–WV), Richard Burr (R–NC), Tom Coburn (R–OK), Lamar Alexander (R–TN), Angus King (I–ME), and Tom Carper (D–DE), would drive up borrower costs by $1 billion and tie interest rates to the market without a cap to protect students. This proposal would pay down the deficit on the backs of students, trading national debt for student debt. It is unacceptable to use student loans as a vehicle for deficit reduction, especially when the federal government is projected to make $51 billion on student loans this year alone.

We continue to advocate for a long-term, comprehensive solution that ensures affordable rates for students. If Congress cannot find an acceptable long-term solution before students are forced to pay even more this fall, it must act to prevent subsidized Stafford loan rates from doubling.

Sincerely,

All Education Matters; AFL–CIO; Institute for Asian Pacific American Leadership & Advancement, AFL–CIO; American Association of University Professors (AAUP); American Association of University Women (AAUW); American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; American Federation of Teachers; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance; Center for Responsible Lending; Council for Opportunity in Education; Democracy for America; Demos; Department for Professional Employees, AFL–CIO; Generational Alliance; Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU); Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights; League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC); Minnesota Public Interest Group (MNPIRG); Minnesota State University Student Association; MoveOn; National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs (NASSGAP); National Council for LaRaza (NCLR); National Education Association; National Federation of Federal Employees.

National Priorities Project; National Urban League; New Jersey Students

United; New York Public Interest Research Group (NYPIRG); Oregon Student Association; Our Time; One Wisconsin Now; Progress Now; Roosevelt Institute Campus Network; Sierra Student Coalition; Student Debt Crisis; The Education Trust; The Institute for College Access & Success; The University of California Student Association; UNCF; United Council of UW Students; United States Public Interest Research Group (USPIRG); United States Student Association (USSA); USAction; Vote Mob; Working Families Organization; Rebuild the Dream; Young Democrats of America; Young Invincibles; YP4 Action.

Mr. HARKIN. That is really the vote tomorrow. Are we going to keep 3.4 percent or are we going to allow it to double? That is the essence of the vote tomorrow.

There are a lot of different ideas floating around here about what to do and how to do this, but in just about every single case, every one of those bills, if you project out over the next couple of years, will raise interest rates higher than 6.8 percent. So, again, that is why extending it for 1 year is so important.

The proper place to address this issue is in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. That expires this year. Our committee will be having hearings. We have had some already. We are going to have more this fall. We expect to be able to put together a reauthorization bill for early next year. This is where it belongs. This is where the student loan provision belongs—in the Higher Education Act. Here is why. College affordability is more than just what your loans are costing you; college affordability also has to do with the tuitions being charged by colleges. Why are the tuitions what they are? It also has to do with the lack of transparency from one college to another. What do courses here cost? What do courses there cost?

What is built into that cost per course hour, for study hour at this college compared to this other college?

There are a lot of other costs that go into college affordability other than just the cost of student loans. So to separate out a student loan and treat it as some kind of a separate entity is to kind of ignore all of the other things that affect the cost of college education. That is why it really needs to be part of a comprehensive solution, including Pell grants. Maybe we want to change some of the structure of Pell grants. Maybe we want to take a look at exactly what it is that we as a society want to do in terms of making college more affordable. What kind of interest rate base do we want? Do we want a rate based on the 91-day T-bill, which we have had in the past, or, as others are proposing now, do we want to go to a 10-year T-note rate? What does that mean? That has never been fully fleshed out. That only comes out through hearings conducted by the committee. Should it be based on the 3-month Treasury note? There are all kinds of different ideas floating around, and no one really knows what is the best solution.

I pointed out the necessity for a cap on these loans. I think about my own experience when I started college in 1958 when there wasn't such a program. But in 1959 and after that we had what was called the Eisenhower loan program, the National Defense Education Act. I went to a window at Iowa State University and I borrowed money. I borrowed money at 2 percent. I recently looked up the interest rate during that period of time, the 10-year Treasury note at that time, in 1959, 4.43 percent, 4.12 percent, 3.88, 3.95—all the years I was in college. Yet I borrowed money at 2 percent. So our government, our representatives, decided it was worth it for America to subsidize the loans I had, not charging the 10-year Treasury note but actually half of that—almost half of that. Think about that.

Not only did our society, our government, say: We want to have a fixed rate of 2 percent no matter what the market rate is, all the time I was in college—when I was a sophomore, junior, senior—there were no interest charges. The interest rate clock did not run. Well, then I went in the military for 5 years. During the 5 years I spent in the military, there was no interest rate clock. I then got out of the military and went to law school. I spent 3 years in law school—no interest rate clock. Then after I got out of law school, I had a 1-year grace period of no interest rate. So add it up—almost 10 to 12 years that I had no interest rate charges. Not until after I was out of law school for 1 year did the interest rate clock start to run. Then I had to pay back the loans.

That is what our society, our government, our people decided to do for me and for students of our generation in the late fifties and sixties and seventies. That is what they decided to do. Now we hear, well, no, now we have to go to a market rate. We have to go to a Treasury note of 10 years plus something.

I only talk about this to show the contrast between what our country was willing to do for students of my generation and what we are trying to do for students of this generation. We are going to sock them with higher interest rates. That is why student debt is so high. That is why it exceeds credit card debt in this country—because we got away from understanding that subsidized rate was an investment in the future of our country. It was an investment in getting kids through college and not putting a mountain of debt on their heads so that when they got out, they could get married and raise families, start to make money and buy good consumer items such as cars and homes and all kinds of things rather than paying back their debts for the next 10 to 20 years. So we have gotten away from that.

These are the kinds of things we have to kind of think about as we reauthorize the Higher Education Act. What is it that we are willing to do to invest in this new generation of students in terms of getting them an affordable college education?

In moving forward, I appreciate the efforts of others who have come forward with ideas, but there is still a divide here. Here is the divide. I think those of us in our caucus, in the Democratic caucus, have said we have two key principles we want to uphold: Any deal on interest rates should not reduce the deficit on the backs of students. We should not trade national debt for student debt. No. 2, we need to keep in place an interest rate cap—an interest rate cap—as a key consumer protection to shield students from exorbitant rates in the future.

I have the highest respect for our President. I served with him here; he was on our committee. I only wish that perhaps they had talked to us a little bit before they came out with their proposal, but President Obama came out with a proposal on student loans. He was the first President—not Democratic, but the first President, Democrat or Republican—to propose going from a 91-day T-bill rate to a 10-year Treasury note. No other President ever suggested doing that.

Secondly, no President since 1958 has advocated removing the cap. President Obama, in his proposal, proposed removing the cap.

I believe it is safe to say our caucus has said no, we are not going to do that. We are not going to lift this key consumer protection of having an interest rate cap. If we are going to go to a 10-year Treasury note, then what is it that we do? Do we do it as they did for me where they subsidize it below it? Do we add something onto it, and how much do we add onto it?

Again, we have, as I said, two key items. Interest rates should not reduce the deficit on the backs of students, and we need to keep in place an interest rate cap as a key consumer protection.

I might point out, this has happened before. We had an interest rate cap in the 1990s when we had a variable rate. The cap was at 8.25 percent. Five times in the 1990s interest rates went above that. The cap protected students five times.

That is why the bill that has been put up by the Republican side, S. 1241, fails to meet both those principles. Their bill, like the House GOP bill and S. 1003, is worse for students over the long term than if we let rates double. S. 1241 would raise nearly $1 trillion by charging students higher interest rates over 10 years, using net revenue for deficit reduction. This bill lacks an interest rate cap, an essential protection for students, as I said, that has been in place since 1958.

According to the CBO projections of the 10-year Treasury note—and that is what we have to live with, the CBO projections—under the proposal of S. 1241, which I think Senator ALEXANDER

and others have put forward, graduate students relying on Stafford and PLUS loans will see higher interest rates starting in 2016, right here.

I saw a card about this that said under this bill the graduate student loans would be 5.21 percent. That is true here. Then it goes up in 2014, 2015, and then in 2016 it goes above the fixed rate of 6.8 percent and keeps going up to 8.6 percent from then on.

Students understand this. They looked at this and said: Well, gee, here, this is kind of like bait and switch. We get a couple, 3 years here where they are lower, and from then on everything is higher for us. We don't want this.

By 2018, on the undergraduate loans, subsidized and unsubsidized loans, it is at 7.1 percent. It is even more than the 6.8 percent that is in permanent law.

Again, I repeat, we have always had an interest rate cap. For as long as we have had student loans, we have had an interest rate cap. Even when we had a variable interest rate from 1992 to 2006, as I pointed out, five times we bumped up against that cap, so students were protected.

I have read in S. 1241 the authors stated there is a cap. Does this plan have a cap? It says yes.

There is a consolidation cap which we already have in law, by the way. We already have a consolidation cap in law. They keep it. But a consolidation cap is not a substitute for an interest rate cap. It is apples and oranges. One is a repayment mechanism. That is a consolidation cap. The other is a consumer protection called an interest rate cap. A consolidation cap is not a real cap.

Look at it this way. Let's say interest rates go to 10 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent. It is not unheard of. We have had that in the recent past. A student is in college, and that student takes out loans at 10 percent, 11 percent, or 12 percent when they are a freshman, a sophomore, junior, or senior. During the time they are in school, interest is accruing on their loan at 10 percent, 11 percent, or 12 percent. They can't consolidate until after they graduate. Then they say they can consolidate all of their loans at an interest rate that is equal to 8.25 percent or the weighted interest rate of their loans, whichever is lower.

I pointed out that under S. 1241, the Republicans' bill, if you took out a basic loan under the basic program we have had for 10 years, at the maximum, under present law, you would pay back about $21,000 in interest and payments. Under S. 1241 you would pay back $28,000, $7,000 more. Get this—for the same loan under consolidation you pay back $69,000.

Consolidation—and that is why a lot of students aren't consolidating, because they know they are going to pay a lot more in interest charges for a longer period of time. Think about a 15-year mortgage versus a 30-year mortgage on your house.

Maybe a student would say: OK, I will consolidate. My monthly payments will be lower, but the total amount I pay back will be three, four, five times more than what it would be if I don't consolidate.

Consolidation may be useful to some students as a repayment mechanism, but it is not the same as a cap on interest rates.

The bottom line is that an interest rate cap is the only way to ensure all borrowers are shielded from exorbitant rates in the future, and consolidation is simply not a substitute.

Let's take a look at the base rate in S. 1241. That is the 10-year Treasury note. I asked my staff to take the provisions of the Alexander bill, S. 1241, and let's go back in time. What would students have been paying in interest rates? I looked at 1980, 1990, and 2000, every 10 years. Under S. 1241, undergraduate Stafford is 13.31, graduate Stafford is 14.86, and 15.86 on the PLUS loans. For 1990, undergraduate Stafford is 10.4, graduate Stafford is 11.9, and PLUS loans are 12.9. In 2000, undergraduate Stafford is 7.88, graduate Stafford is 9.43, and PLUS loans are 10.43. All of them are above the 6.8 percent that is permanent law right now, permanent in every single case because there is no cap. We have seen in the past 10-year Treasury notes as high as 14 percent.

There is no cap, so you take the 10-year Treasury note plus 1.85 percent or 2 percent, and you can see where students without a cap are going to be paying a lot more money. The 10-year Treasury note is already on the rise as the economy gets stronger. We know those interest rates are going up and that is what CBO tells us. Without a cap in place, students are highly vulnerable to this.

Again, I want to go back to this chart here. This is why consolidation is something students need to think about. This is $41,000 in Stafford loans borrowed over 2 years by a graduate student enrolling in 2018. Under current law, they would pay back $21,716 in interest payments. Under S. 1241, they would pay more, $28,607.

But then they say: Well, you can consolidate. If you consolidate, you are going to pay $69,185. Look at the difference.

As I say, a consolidation cap is just a way to stretch out your repayments, which means you are going to pay a lot more money over time. I am not certain that is what we wish to do to students over the next 20 to 30 years, burden them with even more debt for over 20 to 30 years.

Again, as I have said before, I think S. 1241 is not good for our students, it is not good for the middle class, and for America's competitiveness in the future. I think we ought to take the time to do it right.

People say: Well, gee, we had an extension of this last year until this year and you didn't do anything, so we should not extend it again. There are probably a lot of reasons why Congress didn't do it. Last year was an election year. We were gone a lot of time in the fall for people to campaign for reelection for both the House and the Senate, and it was a Presidential election year. Nothing was done, basically, from October on.

Then there was the whole deficit reduction measure that had everybody tied up in knots, and the sequester. We were trying to work that out the first of the year, and the budget bill, getting that done. There are a lot of reasons why this was not high on the agenda. There was a lot of significant legislation going on here, plus, as I said, last year was an election year and a campaign year.

What is different about next year is this: The Higher Education Act expires this year. We need to reauthorize it. We need to reauthorize it in a timely fashion.

As I said, this whole issue of student loans is only one part of it. There are a lot of other parts, such as college accountability. What are their graduation rates? What is their charge for per-course study hour? How do they figure that amount of money? What are colleges doing to keep tuition rates low? What are States doing to support higher education?

We have had a number of hearings in our committee already on the increasing cost of college education and what is causing it. There are a lot of different factors, but the one factor that overrode them all, the one consistent, overriding factor of why college costs are going up, Federal costs—why Federal costs of college education are going up—is because over the last 20 to 30 years States were reducing their support for higher education.

State legislatures have figured this out. They figured out that if our State government doesn't put more money into higher education, students are going to get Pell grants. They will get these loans. The Federal Government will back them up. What has happened is States have reduced their support for higher education and shifted it to the Federal Government.

What should be the States' responsibility in higher education? What should be our partnership with the States in supporting higher education? That is, again, an issue for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and what we are going to do about student loans in the future is a part of that.

That is why I argued for an extension for 1 year, because we can look at it in a comprehensive, systemic way as to what we ought to do about college affordability. This is why I say the best course of action to follow right now, both for students, for middle-class families, and for our country, for getting a better higher education bill that addresses all of this—the best thing to do is a 1-year-more extension.

As Senator REED said earlier, there is a loophole in the law that deals with individual retirement accounts. IRAs were meant for retirement, but now

there is a loophole in the law that allows millionaires and billionaires to take IRAs and give them to a younger generation, which they then take over a period of years—and a lot of times escape paying taxes for years and maybe even for decades. Everyone agrees it is a loophole. It was never intended to be there for IRAs. By closing that loophole, we can pay for the 1-year extension at 3.4 percent. It seems to me the students need this loophole in IRAs more economic-wise than the top one-tenth of 1 percent in our country. So that is why I think we just need to take a deep breath and quit trying to rush to judgment.

There has been more bad legislation in my 39 years here that has happened because we wanted to rush to judgment on a deadline rather than taking the time to go through the committee structure, having the hearings, working things out on both sides of the aisle through our committee, and then bringing decent legislation to the floor.

Quite frankly, I think we can point to the immigration bill. That is what was done there. This immigration bill didn't just pop up on the floor. It went through a long process in committee, with hearings and witnesses and debate and amendments.

That is what we need to do here. Don't rush to judgment. I am afraid if we rush to judgment the losers will be the students and middle-class families and, quite frankly, our economy in the future if we move to a system that is going to cause higher and higher interest rates way out into the future for students just entering college.

So I plead with my colleagues to support the cloture vote tomorrow to give us this 1-year extension. Let the committee do its work properly and bring a proper bill to the floor that will be open for amendment. People will be able to amend it at that time. I believe that is the deliberate, thoughtful, and the responsible way to address this issue—not just to vote something out that is separate and apart from everything else that adds to the burden of student debt in this country.

So I plead with my colleagues to do the responsible thing and extend the 3.4 percent for 1 year, and we will address this next year in the Higher Education Act.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I want to echo the words of my colleague from Iowa about the upcoming vote this week, which is so important. We know a lot of what has happened with student loan debt, which now exceeds $1 trillion—that is 1,000 billion dollars. It is more than credit card debt in this country. It is more than auto loan debt. It is also second only to mortgage debt of 300 million people of this great country.

According to the Wall Street Journal, the average student loan debt for a college graduate who borrowed to finance a bachelor's degree this year is nearly $30,000.

My wife, who graduated some years ago from Kent State University—the first of her family to go to college—graduated with just $1,200 in debt. Her father carried a union card, worked at the local utility company in Ashtabula. Her mother was a home care worker. They had no real money to put into her education or the education of her two younger sisters and younger brother. Yet she graduated with only $1,200 in debt, getting a 4-year degree from Kent State University and going on to a very good career in journalism.

For students such as the young man named Amish Patel, who works two jobs to pay tuition at that same university, Kent State, Stafford loans are important. Stafford loans are essential to helping students such as Amish achieve their goal of obtaining a college degree.

Just 7 days ago, because of inaction by Congress—as we know so well from the comments of Senator HARKIN and others on the floor—the Stafford interest rate doubled from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

We have a chance to address this private student loan market today also. My legislation, introduced not so long ago, helps those 2.9 million students across the country with more than $150 billion in private student loan debt. Overall, student loan debt is $1 trillion. Most of that is with the direct lending program—the Stafford loan program from the Federal Government. But $150 billion, or about 15 percent, which burdens about 2.9 million students, is private student loan debt. Private loans typically have higher interest rates, sometimes topping 15, 16, 17, 18 percent. They are more difficult to refinance, and they offer fewer payment options than those loans administered by the U.S. Department of Education.

Recent graduates with private loans, such as Lynsay Spratlen of Macedonia, a community in northeast Ohio, are living with their parents because their heavier debt burden often means they are unable to buy a home, to start a business, to buy a car, or to go on to graduate school. So along with Senator HEITKAMP, I am introducing legislation to help stop the fleecing of college graduates who are stuck under a mountain of private student loan debt.

Often these banks will not refinance these loans. They are paying much higher interest rates. Sometimes they are cosigned, other times they are not cosigned, by a family member, by a parent, typically. But either way they are a huge burden, and a significantly lower interest rate would be available if they could refinance these loans.

The legislation authored by Senator HEITKAMP and myself—Refinancing Education Funding to Invest for the Future Act—addresses this problem by authorizing the Treasury Department to make the private student loan market more efficient.

I want to read a couple of letters. We come to the floor of the Senate and talk about statistics, but we don't often enough illustrate or recite notes and letters and stories and discussions from people we meet or who write our office or we meet on college campuses or around our States.

This is a letter from Chad, age 25 from Toledo. He is from the University of Toledo:

> I am currently pursuing a Bachelor's Degree in electrical engineering at the University of Toledo. I live 15 minutes away from there so I am a commuter living at home. My parents don't have the funds to help me pay for college, so in order to attend I must work full time to cover expenses. The Federal aid I receive helps me cover a good portion of the tuition costs. Increasing the interest rate for my loans would be devastating to me on a financial level. It is hard enough to pay them at the rate they are now; increasing them would only make things a lot worse.

They are now at 3.4 percent. He wrote this before it had gone up to 6.8.

> Mr. Brown, if there is anything you can do to prevent this from happening please do so. I am not the only one that will feel the major effects.

That is why this upcoming vote is so important.

Let me share one other letter from Oregon, OH, also near Toledo. It is from Mlynek:

> I have been a single mother of twin boys since 1989. They were born October 1, 1986. I co-signed on loans for both of them so they could further their education in the field they love ''music.'' Jason Mlynek went to Ball State University for 2 years and then transferred to Carnegie Mellon University for his BA and obtained his Master's Degree in arts management. Jason is working in New York City for Distinguished Concerts International, but due to the loans he incurred and the cost of living barely has enough to buy food. He is paying $1,300 a month on his loans.
>
> Shawn Mlynek received his BA from Carnegie-Mellon and then went to the University of Miami 1 year and then transferred back to the University of Cincinnati Music Conservatory and received his Master's Degree in vocal performance. He works as a singing waiter and has voice students but is in the same situation. His income for 2012 was under $20,000, but he is paying over $900 a month on his loans.
>
> I work full time, have been at the same company 19 years, make $35,000 a year, have good credit, own by own home . . . and wanted to refinance. I was told I have too much outstanding debt due on the loans I cosigned for my children. Too much debt to ratio so I cannot refinance to lower my payments.

So not only do these burdensome student loans with interest rates too high—if they double to 6.8 percent, but with costs already too high—affect the student when she or he graduates and wants to buy a house or start a business, but they affect the whole economy, and they also affect the debt burden of parents, such as this mother—Jason and Shawn's mother—who couldn't refinance her own mortgage because of the debt burden she was carrying because she cosigned on student loans for her sons.

Finally, she writes this:

The American Way is to help our children and they would not have been able to accomplish their dream of an education in the music field if I hadn't cosigned for their educational loans.

Mr. President, I think that sums it up. These two letters—the one from the University of Toledo student and from the mother of the twins—sum up in so many ways why this issue is so important and why the Senate needs to act, and act quickly, because the interest rates on student loans doubled last week.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR OPTION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it seems as if the majority leader and some others are rattling the cage once again in favor of the so-called nuclear option. For those who may not follow this topic closely, this is simply breaking the Senate rules in order to impose majority will on the minority party by changing the procedures by which the Senate functions. In other words, it refers to a process by which the rules of the Senate are broken in order to change the rules themselves.

As the distinguished majority leader has pointed out in the past—right here on the Senate floor in front of his colleagues and constituents and all the American people, Senator REID affirmed that the proper way to change the Senate rules was through the procedure laid out in those rules. The majority leader, Senator REID of Nevada, went on to say that he would oppose any effort in this Congress or the next to change the Senate rules other than through the regular order, and he recommitted himself to this proposition in a colloquy with the Republican leader earlier this year.

So I would ask the majority leader: Do you plan on keeping your word or are you going to resort to brute political force and break the Senate rules in order to change the rules and fundamentally transform the nature of the U.S. Senate?

Should the majority leader break his promise, I believe he will inflict lasting and perhaps irreparable damage to this institution. And during a time when cooperation is very important—as it always is—to try to actually solve some of the Nation's biggest problems, poisoning the well by exercising this so-called nuclear option would be the opposite of what we ought to be doing, which is coming together in a bipartisan way to address some of the Nation's biggest challenges.

I would also ask my Democratic colleagues, how do you reconcile your desire for a filibuster-free Senate with the simple fact that Democrats will not always be in the majority in the Senate? As we know, what goes around comes around, and the shoe will always be on the other foot. I can think of a number of legislative proposals that Republicans on this side of the aisle would happily advance with a simple majority—let's say, for example, a full repeal of ObamaCare. That would be a good place to start. As the senior Senator from Tennessee Mr. ALEXANDER recently pointed out, we could finally establish the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste facility in Nevada. But the truth is that prudence and a healthy respect for the fleeting nature of power in the Senate, as well as a healthy respect for the voices represented by the minority in the Senate, compel a different course of action because, as we know, the shoe will always be on the other foot at some day in the future.

I think it is worth pausing to examine the source of the majority leader's renewed interest in the so-called nuclear option. On the heels of the President's judicial nominations, many of our friends across the aisle are renewing their wayward cries of Republican obstructionism in the Senate, but the facts simply don't bear this out. The facts do not support this conclusion.

Indeed, as the Washington Post Fact Checker recently pointed out, from nomination to confirmation, President Obama's district court nominees have moved through the Senate at only a marginally slower pace than his predecessors, while his appeals court nominees have sailed through at a much faster clip than President Bush's. The Senate has confirmed 28 of the President's judicial nominees so far this year. By this point in President Bush's second term, this body had confirmed only 10. Twenty-eight under President Obama and 10 under President Bush at this point in their second term. In total, 199 of President Obama's judicial nominees have been confirmed and only 2 have been defeated. That doesn't sound like obstructionism to me.

Meanwhile, the President has failed to produce nominees for 65 percent of the vacant judicial seats, many of which are in my home State in Texas. As the distinguished Presiding Officer knows and as the American people know, it is the President who nominates Federal judges, and then it is the responsibility of the Senate to advise and consent on those confirmations. That is in the Constitution. But if the President doesn't nominate people for these vacancies, then the Senate's role is never engaged on those 65 percent of vacant judicial seats where the President has not even nominated an individual to serve. I would argue that is the true reason for the majority of vacancies and one that calls for the President's immediate attention.

So I hope that during the remaining few weeks here in July before the August recess, we don't see a manufactured crisis over how the Senate operates on nominees. We have some very controversial nominees—for example, three of whom were unconstitutionally recess-appointed by the President. And don't take my word for it. In the case of the National Labor Relations Board, the court of appeals held that those were unconstitutionally appointed in order to circumvent the Senate's constitutional role.

It is true that the U.S. Supreme Court has taken those cases, and we will soon hear—perhaps by next summer—what the Supreme Court's view of the recess appointment authority of a President might be. But we know that at least three of them—two at the National Labor Relations Board and the so-called Consumer Financial Protection Bureau nominee—were recess-appointed and, I think it is pretty clear, in violation of at least the court of appeals' view of what the President's constitutional authority would and should be.

We also have other nominees, some of whom are more controversial than others. We have Gina McCarthy, who has been nominated for the Environmental Protection Agency. We have James Comey, who was this morning before the Senate Judiciary Committee and who I believe will enjoy broad bipartisan support as the next FBI Director. We have other more controversial nominees, such as Thomas Perez to the Department of Labor. That is in part due to his activities as head of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, where he was harshly criticized by the inspector general for politicizing what should be a nonpolitical position, enforcing the civil rights laws of the United States.

So we are going to have plenty to talk about and a lot to do, but this should not be used as an excuse by the majority leader to break his word when it comes to changing the Senate rules through this nuclear option process. That would be a disservice to the country. It would certainly irreparably damage the Senate as a deliberative body. It would poison the well when we need to work together as much as we can to try to get other important work done. And it would be extremely shortsighted because majorities can be fleeting, and those who are in the majority today will find themselves in the minority in the future. I think that recognition would caution prudence and temper the political ambitions of the majority leader when it comes to jamming through some of these nominees.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I would like to talk about the Affordable Care Act. I have long been concerned that this is an act that simply won't work. I think the premise the bill was built around is a premise that won't work.

I know things like guaranteed insurance sound very popular—that you can get health insurance no matter what your health condition is—but the problem with getting insurance after the fact as one of the potentials is that it discourages getting insurance before the fact. Getting insurance after you are sick is like getting fire insurance after your house is on fire. You could probably get fire insurance after your house is on fire, but it would sure cost a lot more than it would have cost under what we would see as traditional insurance. So I have always thought that premise was a problem.

I have always thought the requirements in the bill that depend heavily on young people who are healthy buying insurance at higher rates than young people have ever looked at before—and remember, that is probably the biggest uninsured component in this society because young and healthy people think they are young and healthy, and the truth is that they normally are young and healthy, and they don't need insurance like many members of this body might need insurance because they just simply don't and they know it.

Frankly, now that the least likely to be healthy among us can't pay more than three times the most healthy—we have never had that requirement before—doesn't mean the cost of insurance goes down for unhealthy people as much as it means it goes up in cost for people who are healthy. And I think those young healthy people will be smart enough to figure out that it is probably not in their best interests, either their health or their finances, to buy the insurance they don't need rather than to have the ability later to buy insurance if it turns out they need it. It just never made much sense to me.

Meanwhile, as we see that happening, from insurers to doctors to employers, people are looking at this law and figuring out if this is a place where they still want to focus their energies. I met with a number of doctors this morning who talked about how doctors are selling their private practices to hospitals and how specialty doctors are not going into specialty medicine because the cost is too high for the reward they might get.

I have talked to employer after employer who said: We have done all we could to provide the insurance we have provided, but we can't meet these new benefits and still stay in business. And even more employers have said: We may not let anybody go who is a full-time employee, but in the future we are going to hire more part-time employees because we don't have to cover those part-time employees under the law.

Then, as people are leaving health care behind and they are leaving their obligation to help provide health care behind, they keep getting different messages from the Federal Government itself. Not too long ago the supporters of this act—and I have never been one of them, I will admit that right upfront—but the supporters of this act are saying we are going to stick with this, we are going to implement it, we are going to stay fully committed to it. But while we were gone last week, the administration announced that in fact—they did it on a blog post, which I suppose is a way to announce something that is as consequential as this. It certainly got a lot of attention. But the blog posting said the insurance reporting rules and penalties for employers would be delayed for another year.

Suddenly, one of the wheels on this bicycle is gone. The employer who was going to have to provide insurance or pay a penalty now does not have to do it. But apparently the individuals who are going to have to buy insurance for themselves, if it is not provided at work, have to.

At the same time the administration announced the income verification to have taxpayers help pay for a person's insurance would be waived. Remember, the income verification for any person or family at less than 400 percent of poverty—which is a pretty big number; it is around $90,000 for a family of 4—you get some taxpayer assistance to pay for your insurance. But now you do not even have to verify your income to get that. You can just say here is my income and whatever it is I want to have the taxpayer insurance based on what I believe my level of income would be that I am willing to tell you about.

Suddenly the money the Government is spending is going to people who are getting taxpayer-paid insurance. There is no penalty for people who do not provide insurance at work as the law requires. So, for a law I have had problems with all along, I have even more problems with it now. It is like: Never mind the employer mandate. Never mind the individual income verification to get taxpayer assistance. How could you take those two principles out of that law and expect it to be implemented in a fair way?

The new plan apparently is let the Government sign up as many new people as they can for government-assisted insurance. I understand why that might be the most popular aspect of this bill. One of the great principles of society and people is when somebody is giving you something you are usually more glad to get it than you are when somebody is taking something away from you. But in this case you are taking money away from taxpayers to give to individuals to pay for their insurance and not fulfilling the rest of the commitments of the bill.

The administration obviously believes that paying the bill will make an unpopular piece of legislation more popular. In fact, many of the administration's advocates are talking about how politically smart it is to put off the implementation of this bill for employer-based insurance until after the next election. You can hardly find a story about this without it talking about how shrewd it is, putting this off until people have voted one more time before they find out what is in it.

There were no real rules that came out until after the 2012 election, and then suddenly after the 2012 election, between then and the end of the year, there are 20,000 pages of rules, rules that nobody saw before election day, but suddenly the 20,000 pages of rules, 7½ feet high—7½ feet of rules that will be challenging to comply with but, more importantly, nobody saw them before the 2012 election—now nobody has to have a penalty as an employer until after the 2014 election.

I think I am getting to see a pattern develop here and the pattern is when people find out what is in this law they are not going to like it. If it was believed they were going to like it, I think we would be rushing to implement the law before the 2014 election, not after. I think we would be rushing to have the 20,000 pages of regulations out before the 2012 election, not after it. They had 3 years to get the regulations out before the 2012 election, 3 years, but they all come out after November. Now we are told we do not have time to implement this. It has been 3½ years since the bill was signed into law. If this is ever going to work, how much time is it going to take to implement it?

This is a determined effort to get further and further down what I think may be the wrong road before people find out what has happened to their insurance, before people know what has happened to their doctor, before people know what has happened to their health care. And when they find out, I think they are not going to like it.

Since the passage of the bill, the law has had 8 interim final rules, 3 final rules, 20 requests for comment, 21 proposed rules—according to the Wall Street Journal, 1 information collection request, 2 amendments to the interim final rules, 6 requests for information, and 1 frequently-asked-questions document.

The administration announced about a year ago that the long-term care provisions of the bill, the so-called CLASS Act, simply wouldn't work. I remember when this was before the committee in the House of Representatives, when it was said: Look, there is no way this can possibly work. The advocates said no, this is actually going to make money. But once the bill was signed into law and was out there for about a year, the Department of Health and Human Services said this long-term care thing was not going to work; even though it is in the law, we are not going to implement it.

Then they announced we are not going to have the small business exchange available in January 2015; it

will be at least another year for that. The very same week they said we are not going to have income verification, we are not going to have the employer mandate, there is another 606 or so pages of new rules and regulations. The rules and regulations seem to come out, but nobody seems to want to implement the law. There were 3½ years to get ready. Now they can't get ready until after the next election.

If employers should have a delay, so should individuals and so should families. In fact, I think what we should have is a permanent delay while we look for a plan that works, that can be implemented, that makes sense, that is based on good health care and good health care decisionmaking. I hope this Senate and this Congress and this administration will try to find a plan that works instead of constantly saying: You know, we are not ready to make this plan—which has been out there for 3½ years now—work and work to meet the needs of the American people.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.]

SYRIA

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, last week I led a bicameral delegation that visited the Syrian border with Turkey. What we witnessed on the ground highlighted the critical nature of events and the desperate need for American leadership and eventually a negotiated resolution to the Syrian civil war.

This civil war is now in its 29th month. More than 100,000 people have been killed, including at least 36,000 civilians, and 1.7 million people have been forced from their homes, fleeing for their lives as the chaos escalates. To describe this conflict as anything less than a regional disaster is to ignore the magnitude of its impact.

According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the violence has pushed over 400,000 refugees to Turkey, almost 500,000 refugees to Jordan, 160,000 to Iraq, 587,000 to Lebanon, and 88,000 refugees to Egypt—a stunning development. The people of Turkey and Jordan, including Prime Minister Erdogan and King Abdallah, should be specifically applauded for their generous support of these refugees.

I also point out there are now secure locations inside Syria where refugees can be housed within their own country.

There is noted international support to prevent the spillover of violence. At the request of the Turkish Government and in fulfillment of our NATO obligations, the U.S. Patriot missile batteries at Gaziantep are one example of efforts to deter the threat of ballistic missiles beyond the Syrian border. Additionally, the Dutch and Germans have deployed batteries to Turkey.

American troops are working diligently to strengthen our regional security and protect innocent lives in harm's way. Our delegation was able to meet and visit with troops in Gaziantep last week. These highly educated and motivated men and women are proudly serving American interests, and I commend them for their dedication to a critical mission.

Turkey must have the support it needs to defend its population and territory from the raging civil war next door. Without robust cooperation among NATO allies, the stability of this entire region is at risk.

During our visit to a refugee camp in the town of Killis near the Syrian-Turkish border, roughly 40 miles from Gaziantep, we saw firsthand the dire situation facing the countries that have accepted Syrian refugees and the challenges these individuals now face. At the refugee camp, our delegation met with a women's group, children in school, and with the elected camp council. Our conversations were insightful—and heartbreaking. Over and over, the same question emerged: Why aren't the Americans helping to bring down Asad? Why are the nations of the world allowing the slaughter of innocent people to continue? Is there no outrage over the displacement of more than 1.5 million people from their homes?

Frankly, these questions are very difficult to answer.

So far, the Obama administration has been reluctant to help in contrast to the aggressive military and humanitarian aid provided by some of our NATO allies such as Britain, France, and Turkey. I wish to emphasize: No one is asking for American boots on the ground. No one is asking President Obama to put troops in Syria. America is understandably war-weary from Iraq and Afghanistan, but our hesitation to provide adequate arms to the anti-Asad rebels is hard to justify, especially when multiple red lines have been crossed.

Those who share President Obama's reluctance to assist opposition forces point to the uncertainty surrounding those who might assume control of Syria if the rebels win. They ask: Which faction will emerge? The more moderate rebels under the Free Syrian Army or a radical Islamist band of opposition rebels?

While caution is definitely called for in this dangerous and volatile situation, our reluctance to act reminds me of Shakespeare's Hamlet who once observed that men ''rather bear those ills we have, than fly to others that we know not of.''

I would remind Members—and the administration—that Hamlet's hand wringing and indecision ultimately led to his demise. In bowing to a fear of uncertainty and choosing disengagement, the implication is essentially that the world is somehow better off with a known quantity—even a known quantity in the person of Bashar al-Asad. I disagree.

Here are a few facts about the ''ills'' we know regarding the Syrian dictator known as Bashar al-Asad:

No. 1, Asad is supported by the extreme Islamist regime in Iran, with a supply of Iranian Revolutionary Guards to embolden his rampage.

No. 2, his grip on power has been serviced by Syria's client-state relationship with Russia, which continues to defend its military aid to him. President Vladimir Putin refused to join other nations at last month's G8 Summit in explicitly calling for an end to the Asad regime.

No. 3, Asad has tolerated—if not overseen—the killing of at least 36,000 civilians in his own country, and this is according to numbers from the Syrian Observatory for Human Rights. More than 3,000 of these have been women and more than 5,000 were under the age of 16.

No. 4, under Bashar al-Asad's rule, the number of refugees has topped 1.7 million, with thousands more seeking safety every day.

No. 5, Bashar al-Asad has targeted the villages of his enemies in a merciless attempt to eradicate any who oppose him.

No. 6, following in his father's ruthless footsteps, he has shown that he is willing to use every tool at his disposal to hang on to power, and that includes the use of chemical weapons, a development President Obama once called a red line, as well as rocket attacks on his own people.

No. 7, we have every reason to conclude that Bashar al-Asad is a calculating strategist and student of history who has learned from what he views as the mistakes of Iraq's Saddam Hussein or Libya's Muammar Qadhafi.

With Russian and Iranian assistance and arms, Asad has succeeded in stopping the momentum of the rebels. But with sufficient military support, the pendulum can, in fact, swing back toward the rebels.

I strongly disagree with those who suggest that the opposition rebels could somehow turn out to be worse than the nightmare that has unfolded.

Increasing America's assistance to Syrian rebels, short of boots on the ground, must be decisive and strategic in order to be effective. That does not mean we send arms freely to all rebels. I challenge the notion that in sending military aid, we forfeit the authority to choose which rebel leaders to support. I would also point out to Members that both the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Martin Dempsey, and former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta have testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that within the administration, they argued in favor of arming the rebels.

General Salim Idris, chief of staff of the U.S.-backed Supreme Military Council, has emerged as anything but a

radical Islamist in presiding over the armed opposition and serving as a conduit for military aid. A New York Times profile described him as ''soft-spoken and humble compared with many military men.'' He defected from the Syrian military after an attack on his village last year—the same village where he and his eight siblings were raised by a grain farmer.

In a recent letter to the United Nations Security Council, General Idris's pleas for the Syrian people were clear and simple: ''Syria should not be allowed to become the Rwanda of the 21st century.''

As I emphasized when speaking with Syrian refugees at the camp in Killis, a negotiated settlement will ultimately require reconciliation by representatives of all factions of the Syrian society—Alawites, Sunni, Shia, and Christians. They must be prepared to negotiate with and eventually forgive their fellow Syrians who have made war against them. But I do not believe that can happen as long as Asad and his Russian and Iranian backers see the momentum going their way. Russia will never agree to back a meaningful peace negotiation if the Russian leadership thinks Asad can win outright. A leading-from-behind strategy will not expedite the overthrow of the Asad regime. There is still an urgent need for American leadership.

There is no peaceful future for the Syrian people if Asad remains in power—only one of more violence, oppression, and regional instability. Should he prevail, the impact could have drastic implications on America's national security interests, including the prospect of increased sectarian violence in the region, the rise of al-Qaida-affiliated groups in Syria, and the expansion of Iran's extremist influence. The United States must not shy away from our potential to make a meaningful difference.

Our Nation led an international coalition to act in Bosnia and Kosovo, and we did so with success. We did not do so, regrettably, in Rwanda—a mistake President Clinton has called his greatest regret.

I do not suggest that one visit to a refugee camp is by any means a comprehensive assessment of U.S. foreign policy in Syria. Military assistance would be fraught with difficulties, and it produces a host of conflicting viewpoints among people for whom I have great respect. But my visit to the refugee camps does have a profound effect, and my observations of what is happening on the ground certainly bring home the enormity of human suffering and devastation this conflict has caused.

Most of those unfairly caught in the crossfire just want to get on with their lives and protect their families. Instead, they have been forced from their homes and from their livelihoods—their entire way of life ripped apart by the bloodshed that no human should endure.

I invite the American press to visit Gaziantep and the refugee camps nearby. The American people are entitled to know what is happening to 1.7 million people. After more than 100,000 deaths, with so many people left without a home, we should not stand by as the horrors continue to mount. The administration's hesitation leaves the fate of Syria's war-torn people to a regime willing to kill and destroy to stay in power.

In summary, we know too much about Bashar al-Asad to maintain the status quo. Backed by Russia and Iran, he has overseen the massacre of innocent lives, boldly crossed red lines, and violently suppressed any who challenged him. To suggest we cannot do any better—that Asad is somehow more acceptable than the opposition forces—falls short of taking an honest, realistic look at what is happening.

The question now is not whether America puts boots on the ground. We should not and will not do that. The question is whether the administration will strengthen the capabilities of Asad's adversaries. The question is whether the administration will trade its reluctance for resolve and—like that of our NATO allies—respond with robust military aid. So far, efforts in Geneva have failed to bring about a consensus among major world powers that outlines a lasting political transition. Without changing the momentum back to the rebels, the current situation will not change, and the threat to regional stability and to American interests will continue.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, on July 1, interest rates on subsidized Stafford loans rose from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. This means for students across the country, the annual cost of their student loans will go up by as much as $1,000 a year. This makes no sense. The cost to the government is not 6.8 percent. In other words, the government will be making money on the student loans. That was never our intent, and that makes absolutely no sense.

I hear many of my colleagues talk about how we do not want to increase tax burdens on American families. Now we are taking our most vulnerable—students who need affordable higher education—and telling them they are going to have to pay more money for their student loans. And, by the way, the government is going to make money off of that? We have to do something about that.

Let me talk a little bit about the size of student loans today. Total student debt passed the $1 trillion mark last year. There is more debt in student loans than there is in credit cards in America. Sixty percent of the students must borrow money in order to afford a college education. Thirty-five percent of America's 35 million students are behind on their loan payments. This is an enormous problem, and on July 1 it became a more difficult burden for American families because of the higher interest rates.

Senator HARKIN, the chairman of the education committee, is absolutely correct that we should take up a revision of how we charge students for loans and the availability of loans and the cost of education when we take up the Higher Education Act reauthorization. That committee will be taking it up shortly. But in the meantime, we should take action to prevent the increase in these student loans from going forward. That is why I am a cosponsor and urge my colleagues to support S. 1238, the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act of 2013. That act is pretty simple. It just says we are going to extend the 3.4 percent for another year. In other words, the government will not make that money off the backs of our students. I hope all of us would agree that we need to get that done now so the increased burden, the increased costs, and the unnecessary costs to students are avoided.

Now, because of our budget scoring rules, S. 1238 needed to be paid for. It is fully paid for. In other words, because current law would allow interest rates on subsidized loans to go up to 6.8 percent, to take it back to 3.4 percent, the budget scorekeepers say we have to pay the cost of that difference, even though the government would be making money at the 6.8 percent. So S. 1238 is fully paid for. We take a provision that the Senate Finance Committee has been looking at, known as the stretch IRAs that basically deal with inherited individual retirement accounts, and we require that those funds be taxed in a more timely way than they are today—a noncontroversial provision. It provides the money.

I must tell you that I do not necessarily agree that the 3.4-percent continuation should not be baselined. Why do I say that? I hear so many of my colleagues say, when we have a tax bill and we extend tax relief, that if we do not extend that tax relief, that is raising taxes on individuals. In other words, what they are saying is that the temporary tax relief is really baselined and that if we do not extend that, we are increasing taxes. Well, here, for students, the 3.4 percent was the law. Why now, just extending that, do we all of a sudden have to come up with a different standard on how we pay for it? That being said, S. 1238 is fully paid for.

What I think is wrong is for us to allow interest rates to go up where the government is making money off the backs of our students. We should not be doing that. Higher education is already too expensive. We should be looking at ways to make college education more affordable for American families. For generation after generation, we have been telling our children that the American dream is achievable to those individuals willing to pursue an education and work hard. Are we now prepared to tell millions of students that

we are pushing the American dream beyond their grasp?

Let me give one example. Amanda McIntosh wrote me a letter. She is a first-generation college student who holds a college degree from Christopher Newport University, a master's degree from Columbia University, and a graduate certificate from Johns Hopkins University. Amanda is not from a wealthy family, so she has over $100,000 in student loan debt. Amanda would like to earn her doctoral degree so that she can conduct research that influences policy regarding access to higher education for historically underrepresented populations, but she is buried under student loans and unable to continue her education, unable to afford a car or make a downpayment on a home or otherwise invest in the economy. She simply cannot afford to take on more loans.

What is the message here? What are we telling the future generations of Americans? We are saying: You need education in order to succeed. You need education so we can have a competitive workforce. And then we tell them that the cost of education is out of their reach. And then we are going to tell them that the loans are going to be more expensive.

In Amanda's case, she would like to do something with her future that could be extremely helpful to our country and to herself. She may not be able to do that because of the cost of higher education. And then so many students graduate with such large debt today that they have to look at paying off their debt and it affects their career choice. These might be gifted scientists who could really do something to help discover the answer to dread diseases, how we could cure them, but instead they have to opt out for a short-term career decision to pay off their student loans.

We need to have a policy that makes higher education more affordable, not more costly. Yet increasing the cost of the Stafford loans from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent will make it more expensive for families to be able to afford a college education.

Obtaining a college degree is not a luxury; it is an economic imperative. Affordable access to higher education means more scientists, doctors, nurses, engineers, computer programmers, and other highly skilled workers our economy will need to fill the high-tech jobs of the future. A well-educated, highly skilled workforce is vital to sustain our national security and prosperity in a globalized 21st-century job market.

So I urge my colleagues to support S. 1238, the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act of 2013, as a commonsense approach to protecting students at no additional cost to the taxpayer. As I said earlier, this bill would simply allow the 3.4 percent to remain in effect until our committee has the time to pass reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and they could then take into consideration not just the availability and the cost of student loans but the cost of higher education, the transparency in the cost of higher education, the concerns we have about different types of schools and whether we are getting value for the dollar. All that can be done as we reauthorize the Higher Education Act. But in the meantime we should keep the loan cost to students at 3.4 percent and not allow it to increase as it did on July 1. We will have the opportunity to do that, I understand, tomorrow on the bill on the floor. I would urge my colleagues to support that effort.

TRIBUTE TO JODI SCHWARTZ

On a personal note, let me point out that a very valuable member of my staff, Jodi Schwartz, will be leaving us at the end of this week. She is our education person in my office who has been so helpful to me not just on the student loan issue but on all educational issues—affordability of education, the quality of education, the opportunity for everyone to have the great dream of America. She has been a very valuable asset to our staff. I will certainly miss her in my Senate office, and I wish her only the best.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. THUNE. Last week on July 2, the Tuesday before the Fourth of July Independence Day on Thursday, the administration made an announcement that they were going to delay implementation of a key component of the ObamaCare law. I think that came as a surprise to a lot of people because the expectation has been all along that in January of this next year many of the provisions in that law were going to go into effect.

Tomorrow, a majority of the Senate Republican conference will be sending a letter to President Obama asking for a permanent delay of the employer mandate. I say permanent delay because they talked about delaying it for 1 year. In making the announcement about the delay of the employer mandate, the administration unilaterally acted and failed to work with Congress on what is a very significant decision.

This action finally acknowledges some of the many burdens this law will place on job creators. I believe the rest of this law should be permanently delayed for all Americans in order to avoid significant economic harm to American families.

In response to questions about the administration's decision, the President's senior adviser Valerie Jarrett said, ''We are listening,'' while referring to the concerns of the business community over the onerous employer mandate that will result in fewer jobs and employees working fewer hours.

We have been listening as well. As more employers have attempted to understand the burdensome requirements in the President's health care law, the louder their outrage has become. In particular, small- to medium-sized businesses are simply drowning, drowning in their efforts to understand all of the regulations.

We are also listening to the views of the American people. A recent Gallup poll from this week showed that a majority of Americans still disapprove of the health care law. The survey showed that 55 percent of respondents disapprove of ObamaCare. A Gallup survey last month revealed for every one person who believes they will be better off under ObamaCare, two believe they will be worse off.

Opposition to the health care law is growing and it will continue to grow as more Americans realize the law is built upon broken promises and will result in higher health care costs and more taxes.

Under the individual mandate, the IRS, which is still under multiple investigations for unfairly targeting conservative groups, will play a central role in the implementation of the health care law in our country. Last fall the Congressional Budget Office estimated nearly 6 million Americans, primarily in the middle class, will have to pay a tax under the individual mandate, which was 2 million more than were initially estimated.

When the Affordable Care Act is fully implemented, the average individual mandate tax will be nearly $1,200, which clearly—clearly—contradicts the President's previous statement that the individual mandate is ''absolutely not a tax increase.''

Further, families are facing significant increases in premiums. The Wall Street Journal recently published an analysis of premiums and concluded under the health care law some Americans will see their premiums double or even triple, which is the opposite of the promise that was made by the President that premiums would go down by $2,500 for American families.

Given the widely held belief by the American people the Affordable Care Act will not fulfill its promises and will result in higher costs for American families, I believe this law should be permanently delayed. This law is unworkable, harmful to the economy and to American families, and action to delay the employer mandate is an acknowledgment of that very fact.

Public opinion about the Affordable Care Act has been consistently low. Perhaps Americans don't like it because it is affecting their jobs. Four in ten small business owners say they have held back in hiring, and one in five owners says they have let employees go due to the health care costs associated with the Affordable Care Act. As implementation of the law continues, the number of small business

owners who take these steps could increase.

Employers are also cutting back on hours in anticipation of the mandate. Even though enforcement of the employer mandate may be delayed, employers still know this is coming down the pike and will continue to make adjustments to their workforce in anticipation of the new mandates.

A new mandate will also be imposed on individual Americans. On January 1, Americans will be forced by their government to buy a product—health insurance—for the first time ever. This mandate will be enforced by tax penalties administered through the Internal Revenue Service. The Obama administration has requested over $400 million in funding and nearly 2,000 bureaucrats for the IRS to implement the individual mandate and 46 other statutory provisions.

The blizzard of ObamaCare rules and regulations continues. Regulators have now written over 20,000 pages of ObamaCare-related rules and notices in the Federal Register. And just this last week another 606 pages of new regulations were released that were designed to assist in implementing this massive law. It is no wonder the public outcry from employers was so loudly opposed to the employer mandate.

American families are also struggling to understand how this complex, burdensome law will affect them. It is critical the President and his administration listen to the American people and permanently delay this law.

I would add that if we look at the impact on the economy, not only is this about higher premiums for middle-class families in this country, not only is it about higher taxes that are going to be imposed upon medical device manufacturers, on health insurance plans, pharmaceutical companies—all of which, by the way, will be passed on to individual consumers—it is also about the impact this will have on jobs and the economy. If we look at the numbers that came out last week and what they said about the impact of policies coming out of Washington, DC, and the impact they are having on jobs in this country, the number of people working part time for economic reasons—sometimes referred to as involuntary part-time workers—increased by 322,000 people to 8.2 million total people in the month of June. These are people who are working part time because their hours have been cut back or because they were unable to find a full-time job.

The real unemployment rate, or what we call the U–6 rate, is 14.3 percent for June of 2013, which is an increase of one-half percentage point over the previous month. That is the total percentage of unemployed and underemployed workers, making the real number of unemployed Americans in this country 22.6 million people. These are people who are unemployed, want work but have stopped searching for a job, or are working part time simply because they can't find full-time employment.

I would add that when policies coming out of Washington, exemplified by the ObamaCare mandates, are imposed on the American economy, it makes it harder for job creators and employers in this country to create the jobs necessary to affect these numbers in a positive way, to get Americans back to work, and back to work in a full-time way and back to work in a way where they are actually increasing their take-home pay rather than having it decreased by higher costs for everything they have to spend their income on, including the cost of health insurance coverage.

We have been saying for a long time and there is study after study that comes out that talks about how the health care law is going to cause health insurance premiums to rise, and there have been a lot of people who have gotten up here in the Senate, others in the administration, in an attempt to defend the ObamaCare law who have said: Oh, no, no, no, that is not going to be the case; it is actually going to drive premiums down. We continue to hear that, but more and more evidence comes in, and not just studies being done out there but real-life examples of the impact this law is having on insurance premiums.

In fact, there are some actuarial studies that have estimated premiums in various States around the country and what the impact on premiums would be. For the State of Colorado, in the individual market, the estimate by the actuaries is that the insurance premium rates are going to go up by 19 percent; the State of Indiana by 95 percent in the individual market, by 10 percent in the small group market; the State of Maine, the estimates are the individual market premiums are going to go up by 40 percent, 9 percent in the small group market; the State of Minnesota, in the individual market, a 42-percent increase in premiums and 20 percent in the small group market; the State of Wisconsin, a 30-percent increase in the individual market. In the State of Ohio, last month the Department of Insurance announced the average individual market health insurance premium in 2014 will cost 88 percent more. According to Ohio insurance regulators, the department's initial analysis of the proposed rate shows consumers will have fewer choices and pay much higher premiums for their health insurance starting in the year 2014.

Well, it shouldn't be any big surprise when we look at the requirements in the new health care law. The new health care law says you have to have a certain kind of coverage. You can't continue to offer coverage available to people who might want to have different choices about what types of things they want covered, what they want their copays or their deductibles to be. Basically, the law says if you are going to offer a plan, you have to offer this plan, it is a government-approved plan, and it has to have these sorts of coverages and these sorts of things and these bells and whistles.

The new law also says you can get insurance after you get sick. It is called the guarantee issue. No longer is there any requirement to go out and get insurance to protect yourself and prevent yourself from having to be in that situation when illness strikes. Now, if you get sick, you can go out and buy insurance.

It also requires community rating, which changes the way in which health care costs are distributed across the range of people who are covered by health care premiums in this country, making it more expensive for younger people to get their health insurance coverage. That is why we are seeing these steep increases in the individual market.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to continue for a couple of minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. So when we look at all the mandates, the new requirements in the legislation, the new taxes in the legislation, and when we look at all the States trying to deal with and cope with this, and all the small businesses—and small businesses, obviously, weighed in heavily, which is why, as I mentioned earlier, the White House said, look, we are listening, we got the message, and so they waived this, they delayed this at least for 1 year for the small businesses under the employer mandate—all we are simply saying is: Look, there are lots of problems associated with this law. This was a bad law. It is based upon broken promises. It promised lower premiums; we are seeing higher premiums. It includes higher taxes. We are going to see effects all across the economy when it comes to jobs as people cut back and start forcing people into part-time jobs so they are not hit with the employer mandates under this legislation.

So the law affects jobs and it affects the economy. We have a sluggish economic growth rate that has now been adjusted down to 1.8 percent in the last quarter, and we continue to sort of muddle along. One of the reasons for that is because we here in Washington, DC, continue to pile more and more costs on employers trying to do business. So until we understand that to create jobs and grow the economy we have to make it less difficult and less expensive for employers and job creators to create jobs, we will continue to see this trend in the future.

I would simply say to my colleagues here in the Senate, and to the administration, if we are going to delay implementation of the employer mandate for a year, let's delay the individual mandate as well, and let's not just do it for a year, let's permanently delay this. Let's start over and do this the right way, in a way that actually reduces premiums and health care costs for people in this country, that makes it less expensive and less difficult for small businesses to create jobs and

grow the economy, and to get Americans back to work in good jobs that pay well, that increase the take-home pay so they can provide in a better way for their families.

Madam President, with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I wanted to speak in a little detail on another topic, and that is the direction we are going on the student loan crisis, I guess. It is a shame we have come to this. A year ago, I voted for the extension. We were told at that time that due to the political atmosphere, we had the big election year coming up, that we couldn't get into the details and fix it the way it maybe needed to be fixed and should have been fixed back then. So a lot of us went ahead and voted for the extension, and now we find ourselves in the same position this year as we were last year. There will be another election in 2014. So it seems as though we are always in an election cycle, and if we allow that to continue to direct what we do and how we do it, we would get little done here, which is what the public is getting frustrated with.

A few of us got together, myself, Senators ALEXANDER, CARPER, and KING, and we decided maybe we could come together and work on something. There is no perfect fix for anything here, I have found, and this is complicated and confusing if you don't delve into it. So I started looking into it more this year than I had before.

I think a lot of our colleagues, and a lot of people in the country, believe the so-called ''doubling of the rates'' from 3.4 to 6.8 meant everybody's rates had doubled. First of all, there was just a small percentage of the loans we loaned out that were getting the advantage of the 3.4 if we extend it. Seventy-five percent of the loans—75 percent of the money out there—is at the higher rate of 6.8 or above.

I have tried to understand, the best I can, all the different aspects of the loans we have out there. We have the subsidized loans. Because of family income and participation someone is able to get a subsidized loan. What that means, if we break it down, is the first year you qualify for a subsidized loan you can borrow up to $3,500, and $3,500 in today's higher education world doesn't go very far. You are also allowed to borrow $2,000 of unsubsidized money, which means you would have been paying 3.4 percent on the $3,500 and 6.8 percent on the unsubsidized.

So as you can see, it is not all clear-cut. Then, in the second year, you can borrow $4,500 subsidized and $2,000 in unsubsidized; and then it goes to $5,500 and stays at $5,500 for the fourth year.

The thing that happens is the unsubsidized loans, if we are looking at the unsubsidized loans at 6.8 percent, they are staying. We have had some say it is better to leave it alone, do nothing. Let it go ahead and double at 6.8 and leave it where it is. We worked out a proposal along the lines of the President's proposal. Also, we had the so-called House Republican proposal.

Our proposal is much different. This is not a Republican or Democratic piece of legislation. It is a bipartisan piece. We looked at all aspects of what we have to deal with in today's market.

On July 1 the rates went up. If we are able to come to agreement this week or maybe the first of next week, we can retroactively bring those back so that when you go to school this fall you will know exactly what your rates will be. We came to a bipartisan agreement that those rates could be 3.66 percent, and that is for all undergraduates.

Now if you are getting a subsidized or unsubsidized loan, a 1-year extension goes from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. Under our proposal, everything is at 3.66 percent. That will save about $9 billion this year in interest that students would be responsible for paying—$9 billion for the youth of this country trying to get a higher education. If we just do the 1-year extension, that is only a savings of $2 billion. So there is a $7 billion savings beyond what the 1-year extension would do. We are just dealing with the facts that we have in front of us.

So let's say you are going to a graduate unsubsidized Stafford loan, which many people in graduate school get. Right now, that is at 6.8 percent. Under our proposal, that goes to 5.21 percent.

If you have a PLUS loan—that is parents and graduate students—today you are paying 7.9 percent, and you have been paying 7.9 percent. Our bill takes that to 6.21 percent. You can see the savings.

Some might say, well, the interest rates will go up after 3 or 4 years, and then you will be at a higher rate. We put also, the same as in the law right now, an 8.25 percent cap. So if you borrow money this year at 3.66 percent, that is locked in for the life of the loan. That is what you pay for the money you borrow this year for the life of that loan. Now, next year it could be 4.5 percent. It could go up with inflation.

When I was in school, and later on, inflation kicked up to 16 or 17 percent. That is outrageous.

In the Senate, Republicans and Democrats have come to an agreement that we don't think the policy of this country should be that we should make a profit on the loans that students are receiving to educate themselves to have a better quality of life and opportunity. We have come to that agreement. That is not the bill we got from the House. They want to use profits to pay down debt.

Now, I understand there is a lot more that needs to be done on the profit end of it and how we get to the true cost. The Presiding Officer has been working hard on that, and I am willing to work with her. But the agreement we have in front of us today is that we are not going to make any profit that will go to debt reduction. If there is a so-called profit, it should go to reduce and give the lowest rate we could possibly offer. That is what we have agreed on. We agreed on fixing the rates for the life of the loan. That is not what came from the House.

So when I say it is a bipartisan bill, these are things we are agreeing on that make a better piece of legislation.

People might say: But 4 years from now it might go up higher than 6.9 percent. In the 3 or 4 years that we know we will have tremendous savings, there is a difference of $36 billion versus maybe $8 billion if you just keep extending 1 year at a time. A $2 billion savings here, a $9 billion savings here. It is not hard to do the math.

Then, talk about a comprehensive education bill, I pray to God that we can get a comprehensive education bill, but I am not sure the American public believes we are able to get any type of a consensus on any type of comprehensive bill.

When I first got here, they told me we were trying to get our financial house in order. Then we had the sequester coming at us. The sequester basically was a penalty we voted on, but no one ever thought we would let it get that Draconian, to the point we couldn't come to an agreement and we would have to have this type of a punishment put on ourselves. So we put a supercommittee together for the purpose of getting a superdeal so we could get our financial house in order. It wasn't that super. It didn't work.

So then the sequester kicked in and the Draconian cuts across the board. You don't run your life that way, your business that way, whether it is small or large. You don't cut everything. You have your priorities and necessities you have to maintain in your life on a daily basis. Then you have excesses you can do without. So you make adjustments and you pick and choose.

That is not working right now, and what is happening is people are suffering needlessly because we cannot come to an agreement to get our financial house in order, to find a budget that works for this country, to find a tax system that is fair and equitable that people believe in. We haven't been able to do that.

We are being told: Let's go ahead and extend the 3.4 percent for the smallest portion of the amount of loans that we loan out, and everyone else can pay the higher rate.

I am not willing to do that. I think we can do better. I think we are better than that—on both sides of the aisle. Chastising each other and saying one wants to raise rates and one is insensitive toward students, and it is a Republican or Democrat plan, doesn't fix anything around here. It hasn't since I have been here, and I don't think it is going to. It will if we put our country first. And we know one thing: By putting our country first, we put our students first.

Without educating the populous, we have nothing. We can't compete in the world of economics. We can't compete in the world of science and technology. We just can't.

The best investment we can make is in our youth. The best investment we can make is in education. We might buy a car and think that is a great investment. We might buy a piece of property or a house and think that is a great investment. The best investment we will ever make is in education. We want to make it as affordable and doable as humanly possible, and that is what we have worked on together, on a bipartisan basis. We are hoping we can find common ground.

We have talked about caps. The caps are inherently built in. Let's say you graduate, get a degree, and find a job that pays $40,000—which is not a lot in today's market for the money invested—and get married and have a child or two. With the system we have built in right now, you only pay 15 percent of your disposable income. That breaks down to about $142 a month that you will pay on your student loan to make it affordable. If you are not able to pay that off at the end of 25 years, it is exonerated and wiped out.

Pell grants. If a person is in need because of their income, they can get up to $5,645 a year free. Those are grants we give out, which are excellent, helping students who don't have an opportunity or chance, with any support from their family, to be able to get a higher education. We are doing an awful lot of things to help. The bottom line is that we have come to an agreement that it shouldn't be subsidized, there shouldn't be a profit made, and it should be affordable—and it has to run efficiently.

I think $36 billion in savings over 4 years is pretty substantial compared to us doing nothing. I also think those who say let the rates go up to 6.8 percent are misinformed. I don't think they have been told the facts or the truth.

What we are asking for is basically a level playing field, looking at what we can do that is positive, getting more groups to sit down and sincerely work toward what I think is going to be a good outcome and a good process.

Extending what we have doesn't work. Not being able to come together to make sure our loans are affordable is not acceptable. I think if we continue to strive to work toward finding a reasonable outcome, we will be able to succeed.

Tomorrow we will have a vote, and there will be more discussions about student loans. The bottom line is we want rates to come down for everybody. Every student in every category should have the benefit of the lower rates that are available to the public today.

Madam President, I yield the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, over this past week I had the opportunity to visit with many students, many faculty and staff of our colleges, both private and public, all around the State of Connecticut.

I know the Presiding Officer has led very strongly in this effort. What I found is that students and teachers of Connecticut and around the country absolutely understand how destructive and lastingly harmful this doubling of interest rates will be for people of all ages in America.

Never before has higher education meant more to earning potential and employment, now and in the future. Never before have the faculty, staff, and students of America been more united in their understanding of how critical higher education is—not only to them but to our economy. Our students are the ones who will buy homes, build families, start businesses, and contribute to our economy. They will do more to give back and contribute if they have the great advantages of higher education spared from the financially crippling debt that threatens them now.

In fact, financially crippling debt is a reality for more than 73,000 people who owe an average of $29,000 in Connecticut alone. That debt is a burden for our entire economy as much or more as it is for those individuals. So there is a strong societal and national interest in this issue.

I didn't need to tell the students of Connecticut what the consequences are of doubling the interest rates, and I didn't need to tell them what it would mean for their future. They told me.

They told me at Middlesex Community College, where I spoke to the community college sector—I discussed the issue with the president of that college, Anna Wasescha, along with public officials, students, and financial aid people.

They told me at Northwestern Connecticut Community College, where I spoke with the president Barbara Douglass and individuals there, students and faculty, who noted to me that 51 percent of their students received some kind of financial aid, including Stafford loans.

All around Connecticut I spoke to faculty and students, such as Sam Chaney, who is a 2010 graduate of Quinnipiac. He said to me when students graduate:

> . . . you're not just paying rent, you're paying as much or more in student loans. . . . I hope they're not in the position I was in, being told not to worry about the sticker price of college.

I heard from Irene Mulvey, the president of the Connecticut chapter of the American Association of University Professors. Her organization is constantly in touch with student borrowers and knows just how much subsidized Stafford loans mean to them. As she said to me, ''As faculty members, we see the impact that student loan debt has on our students and their families every day.'' She called this doubling of interest rates ''indefensible.''

She is correct. It is indefensible, unconscionable, unacceptable. Even at 3.4 percent, as the Presiding Officer well knows, our Federal Government profits from the student loan program. It profits in the amount of $51 billion a year. Doubling the interest rate simply means more profits for the Federal Government.

There is a fundamental principle at stake; that is, whether our Nation is going to continue profiting from student loans, which should be regarded not as a benefit to the students but an investment in our Nation, not as a charitable or eleemosynary program but as a vital investment in the skills and talents and the major resource our Nation has as a free and democratic society, the talents and skills of our people.

Freedom from student debt should be a fundamental national interest as important as any that this body addresses. It is as vital to the future of the country as our national defense.

I did not need to tell the students of Connecticut what this doubling of interest rates would mean to them—$31 a month, $1,000 a year. They know. They do the math. They get it better than people in this Chamber or in the House of Representatives. They told me what the $1,000 would mean to them. Elizabeth Tomasco: ''Textbooks and start saving for my very own car.''

Gina: ''I would use $1,000 to pay for books. Don't double my rate.''

Across Connecticut, students are telling us: Don't double my rate.

I did not need to tell them as well that there are a lot of borrowers in this country who get a pretty good rate, a lot better than 3.4 percent. In fact, those borrowers are the biggest financial institutions, the big banks who borrow from the Federal Reserve at a discount window at less than 1 percent—.75 percent often.

They are angry about it; that they are worth less in these financial markets, in the view of our Federal Government that loans money, than the big banks and big institutions that, in fact, are sometimes regarded as too big to fail. Students are failing to pay back those debts, but the nation is failing our students and it is failing itself because our national interest is in the student loans and talents and skills and opportunity it provides, not just in the next year or couple of years but for a lifetime and for the long term of our Nation.

I am a proud supporter of the Bank on Student Loan Fairness Act, which would give them the same kind of fairness, equivalent fairness that our big banks enjoy when they borrow from the Federal Reserve. But in the meantime, we need a solution for this next year, and it is the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act. It is a remedy of short duration, I hope, that will in the end be accompanied and followed by longer term reforms that will give students the benefit of those lower rates, lower even than 3.4 percent, so our Federal

Government ceases to use students as a profit center and ceases to take advantage of them.

I am not against smart cuts to reduce our debt and our deficit. These kinds of burdens on students, using them as a deficit solution, is not a smart cut. That is an understatement. In the long term, we need to reduce the cost of higher education, which has increased over the last few decades by 1,000 percent. That is the result of year after year overinflationary increases in tuition which over time have managed to make a college degree unaffordable to all but the most well off unless they use that kind of financially crippling debt to attend.

The age of supporting oneself through a 4-year college degree is past for most. This unfortunate trend has been coupled with more and more employers requiring a bachelor's degree for even consideration in the hiring pool. So the doubling of interest rates is indeed indefensible, as Irene Mulvey told me. It is indeed unacceptable in the greatest nation in the history of the world—which must continue the quality and affordability of higher education if we are to remain the greatest nation in the history of the world.

I hope my colleagues will join the Members of this Senate who have supported the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act and will support a reasonable measure keeping these rates at 3.4 percent. To allow variable rates and, in effect, teaser loan levels that can rise beyond affordability, without caps, without protection is, in fact, against the national interest. This measure will help us keep students in school and spare them the kind of financially crippling debt that all too many of our young people have when they leave college.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask I be permitted to speak in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TIME TO WAKE UP

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am here for my 38th weekly ''Time to Wake Up'' speech, and today I want to ask the question: What if?

What if climate change is real? What if the 30-plus gigatons of carbon pollution mankind is dumping into the atmosphere every year makes a difference? What if it is warming the planet and changing the weather? What if it is warming the seas and raising their level and making them more acidic? What then? What if this is serious?

What if this is serious and we are not? What if this is serious and we are sleepwalking when we should be awake? What if this is deadly serious and we are reckless when we should be responsible?

What if we are completely missing this moment in history? Winston Churchill talked about ''sharp agate points upon which . . . destiny turns.'' What if our destiny will turn based upon what we do about carbon? What if we have been warned? What if we have been thoroughly and convincingly and reliably warned? What if we have been warned by virtually every climate scientist—at least 95 percent of them—by the scientists who work for the United States of America at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, by the vast majority of scientific societies, such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Geophysical Union, and the American Meteorological Society, among others?

I ask unanimous consent to have a letter from a great number of those organizations printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

What if we have been thoroughly and convincingly and reliably warned by thorough, convincing, and reliable scientists and have chosen instead to listen to the cranks and the polluters?

Let's play this out a bit. Foresight is supposed to be a capability of our species. What if it turns out the world will care about this? We Americans have held ourselves out as a beacon of light to other nations. We have proclaimed we are a shining city on a hill. What if that is true? What if President Clinton was right; that the power of our American example is, indeed, greater than any example of our power? What if Daniel Webster was right; that if the example of our great democratic experiment ever became an argument against that experiment, it would sound the knell of popular liberty throughout the world? What if our political and moral failure to address carbon pollution became, in fact, an argument against our American example, an argument against our American example punctuated by the exclamation points of local climate change happening right there in towns and barrios, hills and hamlets, on coasts and farms all around the world?

What if the world takes notice of that? What if the world takes notice of what is already happening all around them and takes notice of how we blew it at dealing with carbon pollution and, as a result, turns away from our great American experiment because of this conspicuous and consequential failure of American democratic governance and leadership?

Let's really push it here. What if Abraham Lincoln was right, was not just making it up when he said America was ''the last best hope of Earth.'' The last best hope of Earth. He was not alone. Thomas Jefferson too in his first inaugural said this American Government was ''the world's best hope.''

What if we are, indeed, the last best hope of Earth, a hope which it is up to each American generation to, as Lincoln said, ''nobly save or meanly lose''? What if we in this generation of Americans meanly lose such a measure of that American light and hope in the world? What if we, the children of the ''greatest generation,'' were to blunder into history as the ''vilest generation'' because we failed so badly at this plain and present duty?

In sum, what if the deniers, the mockers, and the scoffers are wrong? What if they are wrong? Someone has to be. There are two sides to this. What if it is the deniers and the scoffers and the mockers who are wrong? What if the evidence keeps piling up and the tide of public opinion keeps going out and the deniers are left stranded with their inadequacies plainly visible?

Please, let's look at the two sides. On the side of waking up and doing something about carbon pollution: the President of the United States of America, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and our military leaders, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, the National Council of the Churches of Christ, and many faith groups and leaders. On the side of waking up: icons of our American corporate community, including GM, Ford, Coke, Pepsi, Nike, Apple, Walmart, and hundreds of others. Also on the side of waking up: the property casualty insurance and reinsurance industry and many in the electric utility industry and the vast majority of national scientific societies. In particular, I wish to mention the scientists at NASA who right now are driving an SUV-sized rover around on the surface of Mars. That might be an organization whose scientists actually know what they are talking about.

What if it turns out that the other side of the argument is actually phony?

What if it turns out that the other side of the argument is a few cranks, a lot of people and organizations on the payroll of the polluters, and a cynical propaganda campaign intended to mislead and deceive?

What if it is the argument that climate change is a hoax—which we hear around here—what if it is that argument that is the real hoax?

What if the so-called climategate scandal was no fraud at all, but the whipped-up allegations were the fraud and the so-called climategate was really climategate-gate?

What if that cynical, polluter-driven propaganda campaign is one of the biggest and most successful frauds ever perpetrated on the public—a fraud that, when it is ultimately exposed for what it is, will change the way we think about political information and trust in corporations, just as my generation seeing the Cuyahoga River burn changed the way we thought about the environment?

What if the great climate denial fraud will stand in the annals of American scandal beside Watergate and Teapot Dome and the corruption leading up to the great crash of 1929 as a dark smear across the pages of our American history?

There was an iconic recruiting poster for World War I. I wish I had it with me, but I don't. It is a picture of a fellow sitting in his armchair with two little children, and they are asking him: ''Daddy, what did you do in the Great War?'' And he is looking sadly out at the viewer of the poster because clearly he had not done his part in the great war. That was the message of that poster—''Daddy, what did you do in the Great War?'' What if we have to be asked by our children and grandchildren, when they are studying this disgraceful episode in their history classes, ''Mommy, what did you do in the great climate fraud? Grandpa, what did you do in the great climate fraud?''

Why do I come every week to give these speeches? Because these questions stick in my craw. These are the questions that haunt me and that I can't shake. And upon the answer to these questions, to these what-ifs, the future may depend, destiny may turn. I have asked them today as questions, but many of the answers are already clear. Many of the answers are crystal clear. Many of the answers are so likely clear that no rational person would bet against them. And many of the answers carry stakes so high that they cry out for prudent choices to be made.

Many of the answers are crystal clear—as clear as measurement. For at least 800,000 years the concentration of carbon dioxide in the Earth's atmosphere held between 170 and 300 parts per million of carbon dioxide—for 800,000 years, always in that range. Now it is 400 parts per million and climbing. That is a measurement. Oceans are already 30 percent more acidic than before the Industrial Revolution and getting more so. That is a measurement. The winter water temperature of Narragansett Bay has risen 4 degrees since the 1960s. That is a measurement. Millions of acres of western pine forest, once protected by cold, have been ravaged by the pine beetle. That is a measurement. Thirteen of the past 15 years are among the hottest 15 years on record. That is a measurement. Being against science is one thing. Being against measurement, that takes us to a new extreme.

Many of the answers are so likely clear that no rational, prudent person would bet against them. The principle that carbon dioxide and water vapor in the atmosphere create a greenhouse effect that warms the planet goes back to the time of the American Civil War. It is firmly established science.

The head of the World Bank recently said, ''If you disagree with the science of human-caused climate change, you are not disagreeing that there is anthropogenic climate change; what you are disagreeing with is science itself.''

I submit that my denier colleagues in their own personal lives would never take the wild risks, the reckless risks they are asking us to take on carbon. If they went to 100 doctors and 95 or more of the doctors told them that their child or grandchild needed treatment and it was urgent, I doubt very much they would go with the three or four who didn't. In fact, it would probably be a matter for their State child welfare services if they ignored that kind of warning about the health of a child or a grandchild. But that is what they want us to do on carbon pollution.

Many of the answers carry stakes so high that they plead for prudent and rational choices. The downside is so deep that the balance has to be toward precaution if we are indeed a rational species. We are talking about fundamental changes in the habitability of our planet, with considerable human dislocation and disorder a likely result. We are talking about measurements of basic planetary conditions veering outside the entirety of human experience, to measurements whose antecedents are found only in geologic time and which we find there in the geologic record, associated with massive disruptions, upheavals, and die-offs.

The facts are clearly measured, the principles are solid and sound, and the stakes are very high. Yet we sleepwalk on the precipice, refusing to listen, refusing to speak of it, refusing to act when duty calls us to act. It is time to wake up—or perhaps I should say, what if it really is time to wake up and we are just missing it, sleepwalking on the lip of the precipice, listening to the lullabies of the polluters, and ignoring the facts and consequences that are plain to our sight and reason, plain in front of our faces? What then?

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, October 21, 2009.

DEAR SENATOR: As you consider climate change legislation, we, as leaders of scientific organizations, write to state the consensus scientific view.

Observations throughout the world make it clear that climate change is occurring, and rigorous scientific research demonstrates that the greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are the primary driver. These conclusions are based on multiple independent lines of evidence, and contrary assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer-reviewed science. Moreover, there is strong evidence that ongoing climate change will have broad impacts on society, including the global economy and on the environment. For the United States, climate change impacts include sea level rise for coastal states, greater threats of extreme weather events, and increased risk of regional water scarcity, urban heat waves, western wildfires, and the disturbance of biological systems throughout the country. The severity of climate change impacts is expected to increase substantially in the coming decades[1]

If we are to avoid the most severe impacts of climate change, emissions of greenhouse gases must be dramatically reduced. In addition, adaptation will be necessary to address those impacts that are already unavoidable. Adaptation efforts include improved infrastructure design, more sustainable management of water and other natural resources, modified agricultural practices, and improved emergency responses to storms, floods, fires and heat waves.

We in the scientific community offer our assistance to inform your deliberations as you seek to address the impacts of climate change.

[1]The conclusions in this paragraph reflect the scientific consensus represented by, for example, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and U.S. Global Change Research Program. Many scientific societies have endorsed these findings in their own statements, including the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Chemical Society, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, and American Statistical Association.

Alan I. Leshner, Executive Director, American Association for the Advancement of Science; Timothy L. Grove, President, American Geophysical Union; Keith Seitter, Executive Director, American Meteorological Society; Tuan-hua David Ho, President, American Society of Plant Biologists; Lucinda Johnson, President, Association of Econsystem Research Centers; Thomas Lane, President, American Chemical Society; May R. Berenbaurn, President, American Institute of Biological Sciences; Mark Alley, President, American Society of Agronomy; Sally C Morton, President, American Statistical Association; Kent E. Holsinger, President, Botanical Society of America; Kenneth Quesenberry, President, Crop Science Society of America; William Y. Brown, President, Natural Science Collections Alliance; Douglas N. Arnold, President, Society of Industrial and Applied Mathematics; Paul Bertsch, President, Soil Science Society of America; Mary Power, President, Ecological Society of America; Brian D. Kloeppel, President, Organization of Biological Field Stations; John Huelsenbeck, President, Society of Systematic Biologists; Richard A. Anthes, President, University Corporation of Atmospheric Research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, before my friend from Rhode Island leaves the floor, I wish to thank him for coming to the floor of the Senate every week to give a message that we need to hear all the time about a serious worldwide crisis. I thank him for his passion and for calling on us to remember that when it is time for our children and grandchildren to ask where we were, I want to say I was with Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE and those of us who care deeply about solving these problems. So I thank the Senator from Rhode Island very much.

I thank all of our colleagues who have come to the floor today and have spoken on the issue of keeping student loan rates low. I know Senator BLUMENTHAL was here a few minutes ago. Our chairman, Senator HARKIN, has come to the floor, as well as Senator BROWN, Senator SANDERS, and Senator REED, who has been such a passionate advocate and leader on this

issue. I thank as well our Presiding Officer from Massachusetts for her passion in keeping us on point. I thank Senator BOXER and Senator MURRAY and others who have come to the floor, including Senator KAY HAGAN, who is leading this fight with Senator JACK REED in what we intend to do tomorrow, which is focus on a very simple issue: Let's not do harm to students as it relates to student loan rates going up, while we fix the larger problem of affordability of college.

Let's be very clear. The majority of the Senate voted on June 6 to keep student loan rates at 3.4 percent—the majority. When we run for office, if one person gets one more vote than the other person, that person wins the election, and that is a majority. So it is unfortunate that a majority could not have ruled here, but because of the rules of the Senate, because of the rights of the minority and the filibuster and so on, there have been objections from Republican colleagues, and we have had to now go through this other process to overcome a filibuster.

We had the vote, and the majority of the Senate voted to keep rates low for students. Let's make that very clear. However, in order to overcome a Republican filibuster, we need 60 votes to block that filibuster. So tomorrow is about that vote.

We all know that on July 1 the interest rate for students jumped from 3.4 to 6.8 percent. Let's all look at what is happening around in our communities with our families right now as well. Keep in mind, you can get a mortgage or a car loan for about 4 percent. So we are now seeing student loan interest rates higher than that. Under proposals we have seen predominantly coming from the other side of the aisle that would have those rates go up and up based on ''the market,'' we could see those rates go to 7, 8, 9, 10 percent in the future. It makes no sense.

If you can get a car loan, if you can get a mortgage for about 4 percent, what about students? Why are we now in a situation where college students are seeing their interest rates on their student loans double—double—or higher, which has been proposed by many in this body?

To add insult to injury, if we do not fix this the Federal Government will start to gain huge profits, as our Presiding Officer has reminded us over and over—more than $50 billion just this year on the backs of students and families.

So what we are looking at right now is billions of dollars in profits on the backs of students if the rate is doubled. If it goes higher, if it goes to the 7 or 8 percent being talked about in the Republican proposals or the 8.5 percent that was passed in the House, we are looking at over $100 billion—more than that—in profits by the Federal Government on the backs of students and families, right at a time when they are just trying to hold it together.

They want to go to college. We want them to go to college. We want them to get an education. We benefit as a country from making sure we can outcompete and outeducate the competition around the world. Yet those who say they care about students are proposing options that would increase costs for students and profits for the Federal Government. We should not be making profits on the backs of students who are trying to go to college. So our proposal that we will be voting on tomorrow would lock in the 3.4-percent interest rate on student loans to make sure students and families can afford college.

I would like to share a couple of e-mails I have received out of thousands. I want to thank students and families all across Michigan who have engaged in this effort, who have gone to DontDoubleMyRate to get information and tell their story, who have come to my Facebook page and have called us and e-mailed us to tell us how this impacts them.

Corey, a student right now at Central Michigan University in Mount Pleasant, MI, wrote to me about this issue and said:

> I am asking you to please not allow my student loan rates to be doubled. I am a hard-working and respectful student. I make all of my payments. I go to class and do well. I work hard and am grateful for the chance to get a higher education, but if student loan rates go up I would be left to make a decision whether or not school would be affordable.

Whether or not school would be affordable—that is what this issue comes down to.

If we do not fix this, and fix it in a responsible way that keeps costs low, students like Corey and 7 million students across our country will have to rethink their college plans.

This issue should not be controversial. This is not a partisan issue. If I were to pick a partisan issue on the floor of the Senate, it would not be student loan interest rates and the cost of college. I would think this is one of the areas on which we could come together.

Just last year we kept the interest rate low. We passed, for a year, an extension of the 3.4-percent rate. It was good enough to do last year; I do not know why we cannot keep that going while we tackle the long-term solutions. This should not be partisan. I know there are people of goodwill on both sides of the aisle trying to figure out something. But, unfortunately, because of the desire of the other side of the aisle and the desire of the House to have this market based and float with the marketplace and go up with market interest rates, we find ourselves in the situation where it is even worse to pass one of the proposals that has been made rather than just allow the rates to go back up to the fixed rate of 6.8 percent, which is really crazy.

Republicans, in what we see in the House of Representatives, cap the rates at 8.5 percent and 10.5 percent. Now, again, remember, right now you can get a car loan—you know, 15, 20 years, however long you finance your car: 10, 15, 20 years—at 4 percent; have a 30-year mortgage at 3.5, 4 percent, 4.5 percent, 5 percent—all less than what we are talking about for a student to be able to get a loan to be able to go to college, which we all say we want them to do.

We are lending to banks at a much lower rate, as our Presiding Officer has reminded us over and over. I do understand it is a 24-hour lending rate. I do understand it is a different structure. But, still, if we can lend to banks at 0.75 percent, we cannot even fix a rate of 3.4 percent for students, when we have a tremendous stake in their willingness to go to school and work hard and be successful?

So under the plans we are seeing on the other side of the aisle and the plan we have seen in the House of Representatives, we would see rates go to 7, 8, 9 percent; some of them tapped out at 10.5 percent—10.5 percent. It makes no sense.

Corey from Central continues with his e-mail:

> From the time we first start learning, we are encouraged to attend college and get a good job so that we can be a part of helping this country grow. I am simply asking you to help continue to make this an affordable option for me, and many others like me.

Our country will not grow without a strong middle class, and we will not have a middle class if people cannot get an education to get the skills they need, go to college, dream big dreams, and know they can be successful in attaining those dreams.

We are saying we need to do everything possible to make sure students can afford to go to college and that they do not come out with $20,000, $30,000, $50,000 of debt. I talk to medical students coming out with $100,000, $150,000 of debt. You could buy a house for that. Then, rather than making a decision maybe to go into primary care, where we certainly need doctors, they have to decide to go into a specialty because they have to pay off their student loans. There are stories like that all across our country—judgments being made.

So I have a very different view in terms of how we go about this—not just in the short run but what we lock in for the long term. The proposals on the other side lock in rates that will go up as interest rates go up. I do not think we should be doing that.

Here is another e-mail from Matthew in Royal Oak:

> Students are not asking for a bailout like the one Wall Street got, just an opportunity to obtain an affordable education so we can compete in a global economy.

That is what we are talking about: Corey and Matthew and 7 million other people.

Let me conclude by saying that for me, this is very personal because I would not have been able to go to college, I would not have been able to be

the first one to get a 4-year college degree in my own family if people I did not know in Michigan and in Washington had not decided that an affordable education was important to have.

My dad was very ill when I was in high school. I had great grades, but we did not have very much money. Because of a tuition-and-fees scholarship I received and student loans I was able to go to college. I want to make sure that every young person who wants to go to college can do that, and that whether we know them or not—we know their name, we know where they live—it does not matter. Nobody knew this red-headed, freckle-faced kid from Clare, and yet because somebody put a value on education and its importance to our country, I have had the opportunities I have had in my life.

I think that is what this vote is about. Tomorrow is about keeping the rates low, giving us time to address the broader issues around affordability. There is a lot of work to do. We can do that on a bipartisan basis, but first we need to start by doing no harm. That is the vote tomorrow.

I hope we will see a ''yes'' vote on the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I wonder if I might ask, through the Chair, the Senator from Michigan a question. I notice her chart on 7 million students, and I wonder which 7 million students she is talking about.

My understanding is there are 11 million students who will take out new student loans this year, I believe that 2 million of them are low-income students who get subsidized loans, and that the Democratic Senator's proposal would help those 2 million students by keeping their rate at 3.4 percent instead of 6.8 percent. So who are the 7 million students the Senator from Michigan is talking about?

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, if I might respond, this number comes from the Joint Tax Committee. I would be happy to follow up with the Senator on that, but that is where the number comes from.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

It could be my numbers are wrong. I think the 7 million student figure is actually a very good billboard for why not to support the Democratic proposal but to support the bipartisan proposal because what the proposal of the Senator from Michigan will do is keep rates high for 7 million middle-income students whom her proposal does not help.

There are 11 million students across this country who are going to college this fall. They will take 18 million loans out. They will borrow over $100 billion. What happened on July 1 was that the rate went back up to 6.8 percent for the loans that are for the lower income students—only those. For the loans that go to the middle-income students—and my understanding is there are about 7 million of those—it stays right where it is: 6.8 percent.

Under the bipartisan proposal, their rates would be 3.66 percent. In other words, the bipartisan proposal would not only create a permanent solution, but it would lower rates—it would lower rates almost half—for the 7 million middle-income students who otherwise would be twisting in the wind for the next 10 years paying higher rates—hundreds of millions of dollars of higher rates.

So the number 7 million, I believe, is correct, I would say to the Senator from Michigan, but that is the number of middle-income students who are going to be paying higher interest rates under her proposal. I am glad she brought up the number. If I am mistaken about that, I need to know it before tomorrow's vote because I believe there are 2 million students with subsidized loans. That is who the Senator seeks to help. There are 7 million students who are undergraduates who have loans that are unsubsidized. Those are middle-income undergraduates. They are going to be paying 6.8 percent under the Senator's proposal. They are going to be paying 3.66 percent under the bipartisan proposal.

Ms. STABENOW. Would my friend from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would be happy to, Madam President.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the Senator. First, in prefacing this in terms of the number the Senator asked me about before, we will check. I do know there are about 300,000 students in Michigan affected, over 500,000 in California. So that is almost 1 million. So the 2 million the Senator is talking about seems low if those two States together have about 850,000. But certainly we will check. We want to make sure the numbers are right.

My question would be: The number the Senator quotes as the interest rate in his proposal, is that a fixed rate or will that go up?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is a fixed rate for the students who borrow the money this year.

Ms. STABENOW. For next year, though?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, if you are 1 of the 11 million students who borrow money under the bipartisan proposal—let's say you are an undergraduate, and that is two-thirds of the loans—your rate would be 3.66 percent this year, next year, and for the next 10 years.

Next year it will be whatever it costs the government to borrow money. The government will loan it to the student, without overcharging the student, in order to reduce the debt to pay for government programs or any other reason. So the formula would be that we would not add any cost to the taxpayers, but we would not overcharge the students to reduce the debt or to pay for a program. Next year the interest rate might be higher. The next year it might be higher. But those would be for new loans.

Then, of course, there are already two caps in the law that would be continued under the bipartisan proposal. One says that any student at any time can consolidate his or her loan at 8.25 percent. So the loan cannot go higher than that.

The second says while you are paying off your loan, you will not pay more than about 10 percent of your income. If after 20 years or so you have not paid off your loan, it is forgiven. So these are two caps that are already in the law.

Ms. STABENOW. Do I understand correctly, though, that for a student next year who took out a loan, it might be higher? If a student took out a loan in year 3, it might be higher? It is my understanding that over time, over the next 3, 4, 5 years, we are looking at rates at least of doubling, if not more. The Senator is saying cap it at 8.25. That is a lot more than doubling of the rates that will happen right now.

But is it accurate to say if the year in which you are taking out the loan, depending on whether it is next year, the year after, the year after, that it would be in anticipation that the interest rate would rise?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would say to the Senator through the Chair, she is correct. The idea of this is instead of Congress playing political ''fix it'' during every election, we have turned this into a sort of doc fix where we are treating students the same way we treat doctors who serve Medicare patients. We run in here and have a big political fight about what we should be paying. Instead of doing that, we have a permanent solution that is based on what the market rate actually is. We say whatever it costs the government, whatever it costs the taxpayer, we loan it to the students at that level.

The Senator is correct; if it costs the government more to borrow the money because the rates are higher that year, the rate will be higher that year. But there is the 8.25-percent cap. Throughout the history of the student loan program, there have been caps in the past. There was a 10-percent cap for about 15 years. There was a 9-percent cap for about 20 years. If the Senator is suggesting there be a cap on the loan at a lower level than that, then the Senator will have to raise a lot of money.

For example, if we had a 6.8-percent cap on all loans going forward, my guess would be that it would cost $50 billion or $60 billion over a 10-year period of time. I do not know where we will get that money. So the President made the proposal that we have a permanent solution. He suggested that we take the amount of money—ask the Congressional Budget Office. This is not some Republican or Democratic figure. Ask the Congressional Budget Office: What does it cost to borrow the money and to make the loans? Let's then loan it to the students. Let's not overcharge them for any purpose. That is the proposal.

So my question would be, why would we do a short-term fix for 1 year that

benefits a small percent of students, and leave 7 million middle-income students twisting in the wind, paying an interest rate that is nearly twice as much as they would pay under the bipartisan permanent solution that is based on the very same idea the President proposed, that the House of Representatives has passed, and that a bipartisan group here has proposed?

I think the more Senators look into this and understand the cost of it, they will agree the goal is to say, we do not want to add any cost to the taxpayers, and we certainly do not want to overcharge the students on a loan, that they will come out with something about like what the bipartisan proposal is and what the House passed and what the President proposed.

If I could make one other comment, the Senator from Michigan was talking about large loans for students. I agree that is a problem. I am a former university president. I am a former Education Secretary. I have watched this for a long time. I think a lot of students are borrowing too much money. We need to think about ways to change that. Right now, they are entitled to borrow certain amounts, even if the college thinks it is unwise for them to do that. Maybe we need to change that. Maybe colleges need to have some skin in the game when they make a loan, whether they are a public, or nonprofit or a for-profit college. That is something we ought to look into.

But what we are debating this week is a simple question of what is a fair rate? What is a fair rate? The bipartisan proposal is an 8-page bill that says: Let's take what it costs the government to borrow the money, that is whatever the Congressional Budget Office says it is, let's loan it to the students without any profit, and let's have two caps on it going forward. One would be 8.25 percent. Any student could consolidate any loans at that level if it goes higher. The other would be a cap on how much you have to pay each year as you pay your loan back. I hope my friends on the other side recognize that unless I am mistaken, their proposal does help, for 1 year, 2 million low-income students who already have their interest paid by subsidy by the taxpayers, who also are eligible, for the most part, for Pell grants. But it does nothing for 7 million middle-income undergraduates whose rates on new loans will stay at 6.8 percent.

The bipartisan proposal would lower those rates to nearly half that level. Why would we leave those middle-income students—those 7 million middle-income students—twisting in the wind, paying twice as much in interest rates as they need to pay? That is the question. I hope after the vote tomorrow that we can sit down, talk this through, and come to a result. We should not be having political gamesmanship about this. We are talking about 11 million families here, 18 million loans, over $100 billion. We are talking about people who are making their plans to go to college. It is not easy to go. Many Senators have talked about that.

People might have $100,000 in loans, but they cannot get it through the subsidized loan program. You can only receive up to $23,000 that way. We can look at all of that at some point. But we need to pass this 8-page bill, set a fair rate, spare the taxpayers, spare the students. There is no need to deal with ''some of the loans,'' when we can lower rates for ''all of the loans'' and put it on a permanent fair basis, very much in the way the President recommended in his budget, very much in the way the House of Representatives passed it, and very much in the way the bipartisan group has suggested.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I am going to be brief, because things went a little longer. First, I have a great deal of respect for my good friend, and he truly is my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee. I understand what he is getting at. I certainly agree with one part of his comments that the unsubsidized and subsidized students should be given good treatment. We should not just aim at 2 million when there are 7 million more. I am on board with that.

I would make three points in reference to my colleague's comments and in reference to the bill, and why I am a sponsor of the Jack Reed bill. First, the bottom line is, we here are in this mystical world of baselines. Under present law, the government actually will make about $180 billion from students over the next 10 years. It is revenue neutral in the budgetary sense, but not in the family sense, in the sense that families are actually going to end up paying more.

My good friend from Tennessee and many on his side—and they are budget hawks—say they do not want to see that baseline changed. So they have come up with a fine proposal if you believe that you should not change that baseline. But if you believe, as I do, that actually the government should not be making extra money from the students as they pay, even if it means dipping into our Federal accounts to make that happen, then it is not such a fine proposal. But let's not confuse budget neutrality with neutrality between what the government does and what students get.

The proposal is indeed budget neutral, as would be letting things expire. The proposal is not family neutral. Students end up paying more, more than the government's cost. That is point No. 1. I know my colleague understands, and that is the dilemma we are in because there are different values here. To me, if I had to do one thing, one of my highest priorities and where the Federal Government ought to help out families, middle-class families, is helping pay for the cost of college.

Revenue neutrality, particularly at an artificially high baseline, 6.8 percent, does not help out families, does not make it worse than the present baseline, does not make it better. I would like to make it better.

Second point. I have spent much of my time in the Senate helping middle-class families pay for college. I am the author of the American Opportunity Tax Credit which gives every middle-class family up to $180,000. So I agree with my colleague's point about the middle class, gives them—I know he is going to want to ask me a question, but I cannot. I will come back. I have a meeting on this issue with some of the people from the White House right now, so I am not going to be able to answer a question. I do not want my colleague to stay.

I believe in this strongly. The tax credit is something I am proud of. That is on the books for 5 years, $2,500 in the pockets of middle-class families to help pay for college. But one of the problems we face is, every time we give the students a break, the colleges raise tuition. So the family is not any easier off paying for college. We need something to deal with that issue. I do not know what it is, but it will not be in any plan we are going to pass in the next week or two. So my view, to extend the present 3.4-percent rate for 1 year, to keep the situation the way it was before July 1 for a year while we come up with that type of solution, makes sense, makes a good deal of sense.

Third. We have another problem. A lot of these for-profit colleges have a high default rate. They raise the rates for everyone else. What are we going to do about those? Some of those are not for-profit. But any college that helps students get a lot of loans, and then has a huge default rate, low graduation rate, makes all the rest of us pay. It is a little like health care, where a few people are making the rest of us pay quite a bit. That was through no fault of their own. Who knows what this is. What do we do about them?

I agree with my good friend from Tennessee, we do not want to keep doing this year to year, like the doc fix. It would be a lot better, just like the doc fix, if we had a permanent solution that deals with these two issues instead of brushes over them. A 1-year extension keeping the present situation, not raising anybody's rates at all, makes sense, because while students will gain some, not probably as much as under present law, under the Reed law, now they may lose a lot later, because there are no caps except for the 8.25 percent when you refinance. But otherwise, the caps are each year. You can be 3.4 this year, and if interest rates go up 3 percent, you will be at 6.4 next year. If they go up 2 percent after that, you will be at 8.4. If they go up 2 percent after that, you will be at 10.4 for your 4 years in college.

We do not know what interest rates will be. It is anybody's guess. But that is why caps are a good thing, so when

it gets too high, we have some limit. I am not sure a cap simply on consolidation is a good enough cap.

I respect my friend from Tennessee, but I would argue there are two reasons that the proposal Senator STABENOW talked about is better: One, it does not make money from students to pay the government, which using the present baseline and being budget neutral we would have to continue to do.

No. 2, it doesn't allow us to get to a long-term solution, which we must do and should do, and maybe now that we are in this dilemma we are importuned for doing.

I wish to have a colloquy with my colleague from Tennessee. I will be back after this meeting if he is still around. I respect him, and I know he is trying to come up with a fair and good solution—one that ideologically or substantively I might disagree with, but I hope we keep moving toward one another so we can gain a good solution.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from New York. I understand he has a previous meeting. I don't want to make him late because maybe it will produce some result. I hope it will produce a result—I don't see an issue that benefits either political party or any Senator.

The questions we who have been working on this have asked the Congressional Budget Office are very simple. We have said our goal is to create a permanent solution along the lines the President recommended, that the House of Representatives has now passed, that neither costs the taxpayers additional money or overcharges the student. Please give us what the interest rates would be and what the type of loan should be.

The Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, goes through all of this and they suggest a variety of options that we have.

What they have told us is that the proposal of the bipartisan group comes as close to being equal as one can get. It is about nearly $1 billion over 10 years which, when you are loaning $100 billion a year, is sort of a rounding error.

The intention is to loan it to the students for what it costs the government to borrow the money, but we are not going to overcharge the students and we are not going to ask the taxpayers to pay an additional subsidy.

Within that, if you accepted that idea, then you could say there are a variety of ways to do that. You could do it as the bipartisan group has suggested or you could try to put a cap on it. Whenever you put a cap on, it costs a lot more to students. A cap at 10 doesn't cost very much because the interest rates aren't estimated to be that high for undergraduates especially. But as you go down to 9, 8, 7 or 6.8, it balloons very rapidly. We could meet that principle, fair to taxpayers and fair to students, but we are going to have to raise a lot of money to do it. I haven't heard anybody suggest where $50 or $60 million more is going to come from.

I think it is better to go ahead and amend the House bill, get a better bill, put the Senate's imprint on it, and send it to the President. Let's let all of today's students take advantage of today's low rates and pass a permanent solution that would reflect what the actual cost is. It may go up; it may go down. That is the reality.

As we know, with low-income students, those eligible for subsidized loans, the taxpayer already pays the interest on those loans while the student is in college. That is about $50 billion over 10 years. Those students are also eligible for Pell grants, most of them are, and that is about $350 billion over 10 years. This is a substantial subsidy.

The Senator mentioned the Federal Credit Reform Act. The Federal Credit Reform Act is the way the Congress has said the CBO should count when it is making these computations, so it does that. It also does it according to a fair value method of accounting. Maybe the simplest way to explain it is to say the Federal Credit Reform Act actually favors students pretty heavily in this computation. The fair market value accounting is more realistic, and favors the taxpayers' point of view. We are using the accounting system—or the CBO is—for this bill that is more generous to students.

I still, after listening respectfully to all I have heard, don't see why in the world we are going to insist that for the next year several million middle-income students are going to have to pay 6.8 percent when they could be paying 3.66. This is what I can't understand. I hope we continue this debate and tomorrow we will have at least one vote on it. I hope after that we have more discussion and that we come to a result because there are a lot of families waiting for us to make a decision.

The President has weighed in. The House of Representatives has passed a bill. We have a bipartisan bill on the floor. We need to come to a result, send it to the President so families can make their decisions about how they are going to pay the college bills.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Last year the most profitable company in America was ExxonMobil. ExxonMobil made about $44.9 billion in profit last year. America's student loan program did better. America's student loan program last year made a profit of right around $50 billion, eclipsing the profit of ExxonMobil, of Apple, of JPMorgan Chase. In fact, of every U.S.-based company, none of them ran a profit as high, as steep, as generous as the U.S. student loan program did.

Why I am coming down to the floor to support a 1-year freeze on student loan rates is because, as you have led this argument, that is the discussion we should be having. Why on Earth do we allow our student loan program to make profits greater than any other American company makes today? Why are our students being asked, more so than almost any other population in our country, to bear the burden of paying down our deficit? It doesn't make any sense.

It is time then that in the context of the Higher Education Act, which we are hopefully going to debate later this year, we have that broader conversation. This bill on the floor now, giving us a 1-year freeze to keep students where they are today, paying a 3.4-percent interest rate, just makes sense—both in the short term to try to make sure students don't have to pay upward of $5,000 over the course of the repayment of their loan but then allows us to start to have a conversation with ourselves as to whether we want to allow the student loan program to be the most profitable company in the United States on the backs of students.

This matters to me because I am one of the millions of young Americans who is still paying back my student loans. My wife and I are paying them back as we speak. Of course, with two young little boys at home, we are also scurrying to save as much as we can to pay for their future college costs.

I am not going to stand here and complain because between my wife and I we make a pretty good salary. We can afford to pay back our student loans, and we can afford to squirrel a little bit away for our two little kids. But our story is not the reality for millions of other young families who can't afford to do both of those things.

The average college graduate in this country has a much lower unemployment rate than other Americans, somewhere around 4 or 5 percent. Young college graduates today stand at an 8.8-percent unemployment rate and an 18.3-percent underemployment rate. That is the stuff we don't talk about enough. There are a lot of young people who are working part-time or temporary jobs that don't bring in enough money in order to pay back their student loans, which on average today are somewhere around $30,000. That is the average. Everybody can point to a neighbor or a friend who is walking out of their undergraduate education today with $100,000 or more.

The fact is there are millions of families in the position of my family. We are squeezed between paying back the debt we owe and trying to put away money so our kids don't have to have the same kind of debt we do. That is money that doesn't go into the main street of our economy, doesn't go to fix up your house and put a carpenter to work, and doesn't go to the local grocery store or to the restaurant around the corner. Instead, it is money that gets sent, by and large, to the big banks. It doesn't make sense. This bill on the floor allows us to have this bigger, broader conversation.

I will say this though. We are fooling ourselves if we think the solution to our higher education affordability crisis is only the interest rate we pay on loans. It is not. Shame on us if coming out of the resolution of this debate, which I hope comes in the next couple of weeks, we don't step back and say there is so much more that this Senate and this Congress can be doing to take on the broader issue of affordability.

Students took out about $113 billion in student loans this last year. That is double what they took out just 10 years ago. We can't afford to have the amount of money being taken out in student loans double on a decade-by-decade basis. That will bankrupt not only our students, but it will bankrupt our country no matter what interest rate we put on these loans.

In the context of the Higher Education Act, we ought to start challenging schools to think out of the box when it comes to assessing the cost of education. Wesleyan University in Connecticut has given the option to students to get a degree in 3 years instead of 4. More and more schools are moving to cheaper but still high-value online education.

It is probably time we stepped back and asked even tougher questions about whether it makes sense to award degrees based on a largely arbitrary number of credits, rather than an assessment of the skills you have gained, maybe over 4 years but, frankly, maybe even over 2½ or 3 years.

If college is about preparing students for the workforce, then maybe we should be awarding degrees and costing out degrees based on whether you are ready to enter the workforce, not just based on if you have gone the requisite number of years or taken the requisite number of courses. Maybe 50 years ago we could afford the system we have, but we can't any longer. We can't have that conversation if we don't settle this one.

My hope is we will be able to extend the 3.4-percent interest rate for the time being and that we can have a serious conversation about the issue of profitability in the long run.

Lastly, I will just say this. Senator ALEXANDER has left the floor, but the Republican proposal is temporary as well. He is right to point out that for a certain subset of individuals who don't qualify today for the 3.4-interest rate, the Republican proposal may, in the short run, provide a different lower interest rate. But we know interest rates are going up. We know their proposal is no less temporary than the 1-year freeze we offered, because ultimately in the long run or, frankly, in the medium run, those students who today might qualify for a lower rate are going to be paying a much higher rate in the not-so-distant future.

We are kidding ourselves if we think the benefit of the Republican proposal is that in the long run students are all of a sudden going to gain the benefit of today's interest rates, which is not how things work. It is not how the trend line is going.

Lastly, about 1 month ago I was sitting with a group of counselors at a local afterschool program in Danbury, CT. They were all sort of working part-time jobs and counseling kids at this afterschool program because they believed in the program. These were community-minded kids. They were the salt-of-the-Earth kids who truly cared about trying to help out disadvantaged youth in their neighborhood, but none of them were going to college.

I asked them: Are you not going to college because of the cost?

They looked at me as if I had three heads. They said: Of course, the reason we are not going to college is the cost. We would love to be in college today, but there is no way we can afford it.

The fact is we are looking at 4.4 million students over the next 10 years who are likely to not be able to afford college simply because of the cost. The difference between 3.4 and 6.8 percent can be $5,000 for some students over the course of the repayment of their loan. That is the difference maker for students. We are kidding ourselves if we don't think that 18- and 19-year-old kids aren't doing the math when they are deciding whether they can afford to go to college. They are much more sophisticated than people on this floor think they are. They understand the deal we are potentially giving them on the floor of the Senate is one that will make college unaffordable for tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of students. Shame on us if we don't have a better answer for those kids in Danbury, CT, and millions of others similar to them across the country who just want a shot at college and wish to make sure that they alone are not asked to pick up the burden of paying down the deficit of the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise this evening in support of Keep Student Loans Affordable, the bill that has been introduced by Senators REED and HAGAN. We have been talking a lot in the last few hours about student loans, about the cost of student loans, and we have talked particularly about subsidized loans.

I just want to start this by pointing out that ''subsidized loans'' is not the right term. No one is subsidizing any of our students. The lowest cost loans the U.S. Government issues today produce a profit for the government. In other words, who is doing the subsidizing? Our students are doing the subsidizing. They are the ones who are creating the profits for the U.S. Government.

Let's talk about those profits. This year those profits, as the Presiding Officer rightly pointed out, will be more than $50 billion. Those are profits made on the student loans that are already outstanding and the profits we are going to start making off the new loans when the interest rate doubles at 6.8 percent.

Under this bill, Keep Student Loans Affordable Act, we are talking about how to prevent making even more profits off our students—a short-term patch to hold interest rates steady for all of our students while we try to attack the core problems.

The problem we have as we deal with this, and the problem with the Republican proposal, is right now the new loans are scheduled to produce $184 billion in profits for the U.S. Government over the next 10 years.

Let me say that again. At the current interest rate of 6.8 percent, which is where it went as of July 1 since Congress didn't act, the U.S. Government will make $184 billion in profits off our students over the next 10 years.

The Republicans have put forward a plan, and they have said in their plan that they want to be ''budget neutral'' or ''deficit neutral.'' They have used both terms. But understand what that means. The proposal they are putting forward, in fact, produces $184 billion in profits for the U.S. Government. In fact, the Republican plan goes just a little beyond that and produces an extra $1 billion in profits for the U.S. Government. That is what the Republicans are putting forward.

How can you sell something that says we are going to make $185 billion off the backs of our students? The answer is, according to the Republicans, to offer them a teaser rate. Tell them that just next year we are going to keep that interest rate low. The year after that, well, it might be a little bit higher, and the year after that it might just be a little higher than that, and don't ask any questions about the years going forward.

But understand this: Senator ALEXANDER, for whom I have deep respect, made the point he just wanted to use the CBO's scoring numbers. That is the neutral arbiter of what things cost. What does the CBO say about the Republican plan? The answer is it will produce more—that is just a little bit more—than the same $184 billion in profits that come from doubling the student loan interest rate to 6.8 percent.

In other words, what the Republicans are proposing is the same thing you got in the mail when you got this zero percent interest teaser rate credit card. Boy, we will give you something cheap up front, but don't read the fine print, and don't see what is going to happen on down the line—or the same thing that happened with the teaser-rate mortgages. They were nice low payments at the beginning, until the whole thing exploded later on.

That is the Republican plan. It is not a fix, it is just a different way to make $184 billion in profits off the backs of our students.

What the Democrats are proposing is a plan that says: Don't raise the interest rates on anybody. Just keep them where they are, including 3.4 percent on our Stafford loans. Let's keep it there.

Here is a point I want to make that I haven't heard anybody talking about. What the Democratic proposal has in it is an acknowledgement that the U.S. Government is going to make less money doing that because there is no back end to make this up. Because the U.S. Government is going to lose money—it is not going to make as much money by doing that—this plan has something in it to pay for it, to offset the cost to the budget. We have proposed closing a tax loophole, raising about $4 billion in new revenues so we don't make that $4 billion in revenues off our kids immediately.

In other words, if we are going to reduce the profits we are trying to make from our kids, there has to be a way to pay for it. The plan proposed by the Democrats is short term. It is a 1-year fix, and it has a proposal to pay for it because it actually proposes reducing the profits the U.S. Government makes.

Take a look at the Republican plan. There is no pay in the Republican plan because it proposes to continue to make that $184 billion over the next 10 years.

So that is what this is about. We know what we need in the long term is to solve two big problems: The first is the $1 trillion in outstanding student loan debt. We have to find a better way to deal with it, a way that is not continuing to produce profits for the U.S. government. The second is the rising cost of college. We have to address that, and it is going to be a hard problem to tackle. We can't solve it in a matter of a few days. It takes time to do it.

So the Democrats propose: Don't raise interest rates on anyone. Don't double my rate. Keep them where they are, and let's buy a year with a short-term patch in order to address the systemic problems we need to address—the outstanding student loan debt and the rising cost of college for all of our students.

This is our chance to help our students. This is a small downpayment. It is a small help for some of our students and a real commitment that we are going to make a difference in the future. It is not a proposal that says we are going to try to fool them, that we are going to reduce prices just for a little while and then sock somebody else on the back end. That is not what this should be about. That is not what the U.S. Government should be doing. It is our responsibility, it is our opportunity to invest in our students.

The Democrats propose we get started on that and we get started on it tomorrow. I support the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act, and I commend Senator REED and Senator HAGAN for their work. I hope tomorrow this body will come together and pass it for our students and for our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING JOHN BREITFELDER

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate John Breitfelder of New Canaan, who was selected to represent Connecticut in this year's Healthy Lunchtime Challenge contest hosted by First Lady Michelle Obama.

Today, John joins 54 students, ages 8 to 12, at the White House for a Kids' State Dinner. These winners hailing from all 50 States, 3 U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia will share a healthy lunch featuring their winning recipes. John's creation, a quinoa ''risotto'' with shrimp and kale was selected from over 1,300 recipes evaluated by a panel of judges, which included representatives from the First Lady's Let's Move!, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Department of Education, DC Central Kitchen, and two student graduates of the Share Our Strength's Cooking Matters Program. The contest ''invited a parent or guardian to work with their child ages 8–12 to create a lunchtime recipe that is healthy, affordable, original, and delicious.'' The winning recipes adhere to the USDA's MyPlate guidelines, featuring each of the food groups.

I applaud John for taking the initiative to enter this contest to explore how healthy foods can also be delicious, and the support of his family. This innovative competition not only combats childhood obesity, but also raises awareness of the importance of cooking for overall health as well as success in the classroom. Children are taught personal responsibility, encouraged to express their creativity, and are inspired to continue to make responsible choices and bring consciousness to each meal. I also thank the First Lady for hosting a Kids' State Dinner to celebrate the importance of parents and guardians spending time together in the kitchen and then sitting around a table and sharing food with each other. This month, Epicurious will offer a cookbook featuring these winning recipes free of charge. I invite my Senate colleagues to join me in recognizing John and his fellow junior chefs for inspiring countless students across the country to try their own recipes and share the gift of healthy eating with their families and communities.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

OUTSTANDING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

• Mr. COONS. Mr. President, Delaware's law enforcement officers do their jobs day in and day out with exceptional courage and dedication.

When the worst happens in our community, our emergency responders rush toward danger while everyone else is rushing away.

It is my honor to congratulate four outstanding law enforcement officers on receiving the Lieutenant Joseph L. Szczerba Service Award, presented to Delawareans who go above and beyond the call of duty.

It is hard to think of more deserving public servants than these four heroes: Officer Justin Wilkers of the Wilmington Police Department and Officers Steven Rinehart, Michael Manley, and Arlene Redmond of the Capitol Police.

Each of their stories is heroic.

On February 3 of this year, Officer Wilkers and his partner pulled over an SUV for a motor vehicle violation. In what should have been a routine traffic stop, the suspect instead raised a gun and fired at Officer Wilkers, hitting him in the face.

Officer Wilkers was treated at Christiana Hospital for his injuries, and when he was released a week later, Delaware police officers lined up outside the hospital in applause.

With typical modesty, he said, "'I don't understand what the big deal is.''

The truth is, this kind of service and sacrifice is a big deal. Just 3 days after Officer Wilkers was injured in the line of duty, we saw once again how our law enforcement officers give us their best in the very worst of situations.

February 12 began like any other day at the New Castle County Courthouse, but that morning, a suspect in the lobby began shooting. Capitol police officers jumped into action and were immediately targeted by the shooter.

Officers Steven Rinehart and Michael Manley were hit in the chest. Thankfully they were wearing bullet-resistant vests that saved their lives. Along with Officer Arlene Redmond, they showed courage when it counted the most.

I will keep working to ensure Delaware's law enforcement officers have all of the tools they need to do their jobs and stay safe, including the kind of bullet-resistant vests that saved the lives of Officers Rinehart and Manley in the Wilmington courthouse that day.

These brave men and women put their lives at risk every time they put on a uniform to protect Delawareans. Almost 2 years ago, my friend, Lieutenant Joe Szczerba, was taken from us

in a senseless crime, an act of cowardice dwarfed by Joe's extraordinary courage and sacrifice.

The Lieutenant Joseph L. Szczerba Service Award helps to ensure that his memory lives on for years to come.

This year, there could be no recipients more deserving than Officers Wilkers, Rinehart, Manley, and Redmond. They have my congratulations and my deepest gratitude for their service and sacrifice.●

ESCANABA, MICHIGAN

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the city of Escanaba celebrates its sesquicentennial anniversary this year. This great occasion will be marked by a host of festivities. Escanaba, like many cities and towns across the Upper Peninsula in Michigan, has added greatly to our State's rich history and cultural heritage. It is through active communities like Escanaba that the spark of innovation and ingenuity has been nurtured for generations.

Escanaba is a city with a natural charm that is impossible to miss. The city is named after the Escanaba River, a 52-mile winding river that is central to the formation and growth of the city. Lured by the majestic river of flat rocks, travelers settled in this region to cultivate the area's many natural features and to live alongside the Little Bay de Noc. These waterways are the lifeblood of this community. The city is full of wonder and opportunity for the families who make this community home. It is also a fertile ground for wildlife and an inviting host for fishermen and outdoor enthusiasts alike.

The first permanent settlement dates back to the 1830s to Louis Roberts, a fur trader. A steady stream of families would follow Mr. Roberts to the area, and soon after, sawmills would eventually spring up along the river. The area that would become Escanaba was surveyed by Eli P. Royce and formally established in 1863. It is from these humble beginnings that this city by the river was formed. The sawmills fueled investment and industry, and the city's population grew as a result. Today, the area is home to manufacturing, lumbering, hardwood flooring, commercial fishing, paper making, and more. As with many cities and towns in the Upper Peninsula, Escanaba's history is both fascinating and full of character. It is steeped in family, faith, and perseverance.

There are many reasons to visit this part of Michigan and to enjoy what makes this area special. In addition to the striking natural wonder that abounds, Escanaba also offers a number of historically significant landmarks, including the House of Ludington, Ludington Park, William Bonifas Fine Arts Center, and Sandy Point Lighthouse. The Sandy Point Lighthouse was built in 1867 to welcome travelers to the city by boat. This vital structure predates the railroad and would serve an integral role in the city's development for seven decades.

The 150th anniversary of Escanaba is a celebration of the important place this proud community holds in the ever-evolving story of our great State of Michigan. It is, indeed, a tribute to the strength and perseverance of its citizens and emblematic of America's working families who form the foundation of sprawling and vibrant communities across our Nation. I know my colleagues in the Senate join me in saluting the residents of Escanaba as they celebrate the sesquicentennial anniversary of this fine city. I wish them centuries more opportunity, advancements, and individual achievement.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. BARRY L. BOOTH

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Barry L. Booth of Spanish Fort, AL. I have had the great fortune to work with Dr. Booth on a variety of projects in South Alabama, including the Honor Flight South Alabama program, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial at the USS Alabama Battleship Memorial Park, and the creation of the Alabama State Veterans Memorial Cemetery in Spanish Fort, AL. They have been remarkable successes, in great part through the leadership of Dr. Booth.

Barry Booth was born and raised in humble conditions in West Virginia. He worked hard, took care of his grades, and was admitted to Auburn University. He hitchhiked to Auburn where he says he arrived with ''empty pockets.'' He enrolled in the Naval ROTC and was commissioned as a lieutenant in the U.S. Navy Reserve upon his graduation from the University of Alabama, School of Dentistry in 1966 and that same year he volunteered for active duty, signed with the Marine Corps in San Diego, and in 1967 volunteered to go to Vietnam as a medical civil action patrol dental officer with the 3rd Marine Division and the U.S. Army 5th Special Forces.

Dr. Booth earned a Gold Parachutist Device, the U.S. Navy Unit Commendation, and the Vietnam Service Medal, among others. He was honorably discharged in July 1969. It is clear that his patriotism has continued to grow since joining the Marine Corps. In fact, in the wake of the terrible events of September 11, 2001, Dr. Booth attempted to rejoin the Marine Corps, at age 60, and had to be officially denied.

Dr. Booth has been a busy and invaluable servant to the veterans in South Alabama. He was vital to the establishment of the Honor Flight South Alabama program. Honor Flight South Alabama has brought over a thousand veterans and their companions to the memorials they earned, including the World War II Memorial, here in Washington, D.C. I have taken great pleasure in having the chance to share in the fellowship of these veterans. They are truly a remarkable breed of patriots. They endured and survived the biggest war in the history of the world, and truly deserve such a great memorial in their honor. I appreciate the considerable good work Dr. Booth, and the rest of his team, have done to bring these wonderful veterans to our Nation's Capital.

Dr. Booth also helped develop the Vietnam Veterans Memorial at the USS Alabama Battleship Memorial Park. Because of this memorial, many people in the Mobile region have had the opportunity to learn more about the sacrifices made by our Vietnam veterans. This memorial will serve as an important reminder of what these servicemembers endured.

In addition, Dr. Booth was pivotal in the creation of the Alabama State Veterans Memorial Cemetery. In addition to his time and resources, he even donated 3 acres of family land for the now-active cemetery at Saluda Hill near Historic Blakely State Park. For 50 years before this, the State of Alabama had not had the space to bury new veterans in a State veteran's cemetery. The new cemetery provides South Alabama veterans a proper, dignified, and peaceful burial area.

Lastly, Dr. Booth has contributed to a number of veteran and service organizations through his active membership. He is a member of the Vietnam Veterans of America Chapter 864, the Navy League, the Military Officers Association of America, the Sons of the American Revolution, and is a life member of both American Legion Post 199 and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. For his commitment, he was named 2009 Veteran of the Year by the Mobile Bay Area Veterans Day Commission and Fairhope, Alabama's Veteran of the Year for 2011.

For years I have enjoyed the kindness and warmth of Barry's friendship. He has been critical to the success of a number of projects we have worked on together. He is a true patriot, and a good man who expects nothing in return for his efforts. He simply understands what our military personnel are called upon to do for their country, he has seen it first hand, he knows the pain of loss and injury, and his loyalty to them compels him to do all he can to honor their service. I would like to thank him for his service to his fellow veterans, to the State of Alabama, and to his country.●

TRIBUTE TO MR. AND MRS. JOHN VICK

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. John Vick of Andalusia, Alabama, and the recent opening of the John & Faye Vick Collection of Alabama & Civil War Postal History at Auburn University's Ralph Brown Draughon Library. This exhibit was unveiled on April 19th and will be on display through the month of August.

Mr. Vick has had a lifelong interest in Civil War, naval, and U. S. Postal Service history. He developed his interest for these subjects while attending

Auburn University, where he graduated in 1962. The items he has assembled over his lifetime represent a broad range of our country and Alabama's history, and the exhibit represents the finest items in the Vick collection. On display is a vast assortment of historic American and international postal stamps, marks, and correspondence, and includes letters from Confederate Marine Corps Lt. Edward Crenshaw of Butler County and Raphael Semmes, captain of the C.S.S. *Alabama*. These items, numbering in the thousands, will be invaluable to researchers for years to come.

This exhibit is currently being displayed in the Special Collections and Archives Department of the Ralph Brown Draughon Library, and is a fantastic showcase of both the generosity of the Vicks and their love for Auburn University. I encourage anyone with an interest in the history of Alabama to visit the exhibition. Again, I thank John and Faye for their kind gift to Auburn University and the people of Alabama.●

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL WILLIE J. WILLIAMS, JR.

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Lt. Gen. Willie Williams for his exceptional service to our Nation of over 39 years in the military and to congratulate him on his retirement tomorrow from the U.S. Marine Corps.

General Williams has had nearly four decades of distinguished and honorable service to our Nation's defense. He joined the Marine Corps with a commission in 1974 from the Platoon Leaders Course after receiving his bachelor of arts degree in business administration from Stillman College in Tuscaloosa, AL. He started out as a supply officer with 11th Marines, an artillery regiment, but would go on to serve in numerous command and staff positions throughout his exemplary career in the Marine Corps.

In the late 1980s, near the end of the Iran-Iraq war, General Williams was handpicked to lead the logistics element in the Marine air-ground task force that was a part of Operation Earnest Will, the mission to escort and protect oil tankers in the Persian Gulf. Lessons learned from that operation laid the foundation for how the corps would approach resupply into the region during the first Persian Gulf war and later during the occupation of Iraq.

General Williams once said that the assignment during the Iran-Iraq war defined him as an ''operational logistician.'' He then went on to command the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit's Service Support Group followed by Brigade Service Support Group 1, both during the mid-1990s. Then, after serving a year as the commanding general of Camp Butler in Okinawa, General Williams took command of 3rd Force Service Support Group in 2001.

From there, he was selected for the top job at Marine Corps Logistics Command in Albany, GA, a hub for the service's worldwide supply chain and equipment maintenance efforts. This hub helped with the logistical operation for as many as 25,000 Marines in Iraq's Anbar province at the time of his command.

For his last assignment, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, then Gen. James T. Conway, called General Williams back to Washington in 2009 to become the director of Marine Corps Staff. He was appointed by President Obama and pinned on his third star, placing him among the select group of only 16 lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps. In this new capacity, General Williams was the principal assistant and advisor to the Commandant and Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps. Additionally, General Williams also maintained influential communication with his counterparts in the Army, Navy and Air Force for the crucial advancement of the Corps' point of view on matters in which all have vested interest.

General Williams embodies everything that it means to be a U.S. Marine. The time he has spent in the Marine Corps has not only had a great impact on the institution, but he also helped professionally develop countless marines over his nearly 40 years of selfless service. Through his example, those marines have come to know and appreciate that only by sacrifice will the freedoms of others, with honor, courage and commitment be secured.

Furthermore, General Williams has been a tremendous asset to me and my staff. He was a reliable source of information and advice in resolving a number of issues that affected Alabama. I got to know him then and to learn of his love for his home State and for her people. I will miss his guidance and leadership with the Marine Corps, but am very thankful that he will be bringing his considerable talents to Huntsville, AL.

On behalf of the State of Alabama and the U.S. Senate, I congratulate Lt. General Willie J. Williams on his retirement from the U.S. Marine Corps and wish General Williams only the best as he takes off the uniform and begins a new chapter in his life of service in Huntsville.●

REMEMBERING DANIEL JOHN MEADOR

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute today to Daniel John Meador, who was born in 1926 in Selma, AL. Mr. Meador attended the Citadel and graduated from Auburn University and the University of Alabama Law School, and received a master of laws from Harvard Law School in 1954. He served in the U.S. Army, first in artillery, then in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in Korea during that conflict. Following the war, he returned to the United States and served as a law clerk to Justice Hugo L. Black of Alabama, then on the U.S. Supreme Court. He practiced law in Birmingham, AL, for a short time before joining the faculty at the University of Virginia. In 1965–66 he was a Fulbright lecturer in England, and from 1966 to 1970 was the dean of the University of Alabama, School of Law, departing just as I was starting law school there. In 1970, he rejoined the University of Virginia law faculty as James Monroe Professor of Law, a position he held until his retirement in 1994. At the University of Alabama, he was a true reformer who wanted the school to be one of national stature. He also was a strong and principled leader for racial progress during those difficult times of discord. We can take pride in the fact that his work paved the way for the school to be one of the very best public law schools in America.

Dean Meador's major professional interest was the State and Federal appellate courts, and he was involved in numerous projects and studies designed to strengthen and improve them. From 1971 to 1975, he served on the Advisory Council for Appellate Justice and in 1977–79 he was an assistant attorney general in the Department of Justice where, at the request of Attorney General Griffin Bell, he organized a new office in the Department—the Office for Improvements in the Administration of Justice. Its mission was to identify problems in the Federal and State courts and develop solutions. In addition, he served on numerous boards and committees working to further improve the Court system in our Nation. He was a good writer. I enjoyed his novel, His Father's House, set in Marengo County, Alabama, and Germany.

Few lawyers have been held in higher esteem, or have received more honors, or participated in more projects for the betterment of the profession than Dean Meador. While Alabama has perhaps produced a few lawyers better known than Dean Meador, few have given more brilliant and sustained service in so many ways to the nurturing and development of the law and the courts than he. The great American rule of law system was enriched by him throughout his life.

He is best remembered by those who knew him as a masterful teacher with a passion for history, friends and family. He leaves behind his wife, Alice, brother, three children, and seven grandchildren. They have been given a great legacy indeed. Dean Daniel John Meador was a great Alabama native, one of its greatest servants of the law, and I am honored to be able to pay tribute to his many contributions to education, the law, and the courts.●

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL RAYMOND REES

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to MG Raymond F. Rees, one of Oregon's most remarkable military leaders. After 51 years of service to our Nation and the State of Oregon, General Rees will retire from the

Oregon National Guard and the U.S. Army next week. I know I speak for Oregonians across the State in thanking him for his service.

General Rees hails from the small eastern Oregon town of Helix, which boasts a proud population of 184. He learned the importance of hard work at an early age, putting in long hours on the family ranch. After graduating from West Point in 1966, he completed airborne and Ranger training, preparing himself for a tour in Vietnam with the 101st Airborne Division. Upon leaving the active Army, he joined the Oregon National Guard where he commanded at every level, serving both within the State and across the country.

Those who know him were not surprised that General Rees held a number of impressive titles over his long and distinguished career. He served as the director of the Army National Guard, the vice chief of the National Guard Bureau, and as the acting chief of the entire National Guard. He also served as the chief of staff for U.S. Northern Command and the North American Aerospace Defense Command at Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado. This month, he steps down as Oregon's Adjutant General, a job he held twice before. In fact, General Rees is the longest serving Adjutant General in the United States, with over 17 years of service to four different Oregon Governors.

General Rees has always been a champion of the Guard, both locally and nationally. Policy decisions he helped shape in the early 1990s enabled the National Guard to better respond after the horrible attacks of September 11, 2001. Under his leadership, the Oregon Guard deployed to Afghanistan and Iraq. And Oregon units were able to respond rapidly in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, sending nearly 2,000 servicemembers within 72 hours.

Nobody worked harder to strengthen the synergy between the Guard and communities across our State than General Rees, or to make sure that our returning men and women receive the vital services they earned. He helped establish the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program, providing critical, sustaining support for Guardsmen and their families before, during, and after deployments. He led modernization efforts across Oregon, providing Guardsmen with the best equipment and facilities. He opened or improved projects across the State, including readiness centers in Pendleton, La Grande, Hermiston, Klamath Falls, Ontario, The Dalles, St. Helens, Clackamas, Gresham, Dallas and Salem. He was instrumental in helping us sign a new lease for the Portland Air National Guard Base, allowing the Air Guard to train and keep the skies safe along the west coast.

Building bridges between the Guard and foreign militaries is another legacy that General Rees will leave behind, and the Guard's State Partnership Program enjoyed no stronger supporter. Under this initiative, State Guard folks are partnering with more than 60 nations to improve regional and cultural awareness, increase security cooperation, and help prevent threats from emerging. I am proud to say that under General Rees' leadership, Oregon has become one of the few States to partner with two countries simultaneously: Bangladesh and Vietnam.

I could go on and on about the contributions General Rees made on behalf of servicemembers, their families, our citizens, and the State of Oregon. So today I want to join folks across the State and the country to stand and offer our congratulations to General Rees on his distinguished career. Whether as a cavalry troop commander, a cobra gunship pilot, or the Adjutant General of the Oregon National Guard, General Rees always shouldered more than his share of the task. We will miss this dedicated soldier, talented leader, and gifted diplomat—but his is a retirement well earned. I commend General Rees for his service to our country, and I want thank his wife, Mary Len, for her tireless support along the way. After decades of service, I wish Major General Rees a long and relaxing retirement. Well done!●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1171. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

H.R. 1341. An act to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to conduct a study of the likely effects of the differences between the United States and other jurisdictions in implementing the derivatives credit valuation adjustment capital requirement.

H.R. 1564. An act to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to prohibit the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board from requiring public companies to use specific auditors or require the use of different auditors on a rotating basis.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1171. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1341. An act to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to conduct a study of the likely effects of the differences between the United States and other jurisdictions in implementing the derivatives credit valuation adjustment capital requirement; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1564. An act to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to prohibit the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board from requiring public companies to use specific auditors or require the use of different auditors on a rotating basis; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1270. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for reform of public and private pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 234

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 234, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 323, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients and other renal dialysis provisions.

S. 325

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 325, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 327

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S.

327, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with State foresters authorizing State foresters to provide certain forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services.

S. 346

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 346, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit veterans who have a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces entitled to such travel.

S. 395

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 395, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide further protection for puppies.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 415

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 415, a bill to clarify the collateral requirement for certain loans under section 7(d) of the Small Business Act, to address assistance to out-of-State small business concerns, and for other purposes.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 424, a bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a National Pediatric Research Network, including with respect to pediatric rare diseases or conditions.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 535

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 535, a bill to require a study and report by the Small Business Administration regarding the costs to small business concerns of Federal regulations.

S. 539

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Helium Act to improve helium stewardship, and for other purposes.

S. 913

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 913, a bill to amend the National Oilheat Research Alliance Act of 2000 to reauthorize and improve that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 971

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 971, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 999

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 999, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life.

S. 1068

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1068, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 1072

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1166

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1166, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for appropriate designation of collective bargaining units.

S. 1171

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1171, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1229

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1229, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to empower the States to set the maximum annual percentage rates applicable to consumer credit transactions, and for other purposes.

S. 1238

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 1238, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1241

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1241, a bill to establish the interest rate for certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, a bill to establish programs with respect to childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer.

S. RES. 151

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 151, a resolution urging the Government of Afghanistan to ensure transparent and credible presidential and provincial elections in April 2014 by adhering to internationally accepted democratic standards, establishing a transparent electoral process, and ensuring security for voters and candidates.

S. RES. 191

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 191, a resolution designating July 27, 2013, as ''National Day of the American Cowboy''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1270. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for reform of public and private pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the pension reform legislation I am introducing today. I am taking this step for a simple reason: America cannot continue sleepwalking into the financial disaster that awaits us if we do not get the public pension debt crisis under control.

The bill I introduce today is called The Secure Annuities for Employee Retirement Act of 2013—the SAFE Retirement Act, for short. In addition to public pension underfunding, the SAFE Retirement Act addresses two other critically important aspects of retirement policy: 401(k) plan coverage and access to professional investment advice for workers and retirees. I will briefly address each part in turn.

I have been working on the public pension underfunding problem, which I call the pension debt crisis, for some time. Two years ago, I stood before this Senate and described the financial challenge public pension plans pose to Americans. I described how the gap between the pensions that have been promised to workers by State and local governments and the money set aside was as much as $4.4 trillion short by some estimates, more than the total amount of municipal bond debt nationwide.

I explained that the problem of public pension underfunding existed before the 2008 recession and any attempt to lay blame for the problem at the feet of Wall Street or big business or some other group was just blame shifting.

I observed how the business world long ago recognized that traditional pension plans—defined benefit plans—had become unsustainable for most private companies and that most had moved toward 401(k)-style plans—or defined contribution plans—because costs are lower and more predictable and they fit well within an increasingly mobile and dynamic workforce. As usual, governments have been slow to innovate, slow to adapt, and when they have acted, their actions have been too limited to solve the problem.

I said at the time I had not settled on the best solution, but that I was working hard and talking to the experts about the best way to proceed. That is what we did.

Last year, after extensive study, I delivered a report about the public pension debt problem titled ''State and Local Government Defined Benefit Plans: The Pension Debt Crisis that Threatens America.'' The study showed that public pension underfunding is a longstanding problem and that thecurrent pension debt crisis goes back more than a decade, if not further. The report explained why public pension debt is a Federal concern, reviewed previous Federal attempts at legislation and more recent State legislative measures focused almost exclusively on new employees and the attempt by the Government Accounting Standards Board to restore a level of discipline to public pension accounting.

At the end of the report, I laid out four essential goals for public pension reform. First, public pension plans must be affordable for public employers and taxpayers. Second, plans must be structured so taxpayers in the future have no liability for past years of employee service. Third, public plans should provide retirement income security for employees. Finally, fourth, a Federal bailout of the States must he avoided at all costs.

As you will see, I listened to people on all sides of the public pension debate, including employee groups who want public plans to provide lifetime income. I could have merely recommended that State and local governments move to a 401(k)-style plan, but I settled instead on a policy of trying to achieve retirement income security as well.

Despite numerous legislative initiatives enacted at the State and local level, the public pension debt crisis has gotten worse, not better. In my report, I warned that examples such as Prichard, AL, Vallejo, CA, and Central Falls, RI, were only the beginning. Sadly, I was right. Since that time, we have witnessed the pension debt crisis descend on much larger cities such as San Jose, CA, Stockton, CA, San Bernardino, CA, and Detroit, MI. Does anyone doubt that a State could be next? How many times does the credit rating of Illinois have to be downgraded before we act? How long can Rhode Island hold out when it is expected to save its struggling cities while it struggles with its own State pension crisis?

The problem is getting more serious every day, and the four goals I outlined in my report cannot be reached merely by fine-tuning the existing pension structures available to public employers. A new public pension design is needed, one that provides cost certainty for State and local taxpayers, retirement income security for State and local employees, and does not include an explicit or implicit government guarantee.

I am pleased to say I believe I have designed such a plan. Title I of the SAFE Retirement Act creates a new pension plan called an annuity accumulation retirement plan. I call it the SAFE Retirement Plan.

The concept of the SAFE Retirement Plan is simple: take advantage of the lifetime income that fixed annuities can provide while mitigating the volatile effect of interest rates on pension levels by purchasing an annuity contract for each worker every year during their career so a worker builds a solid pension year by year during their entire working life.

With a SAFE Retirement Plan, employees receive a secure pension at retirement for life that is 100-percent vested, fully portable, and cannot be underfunded. Employers and taxpayers receive stable, predictable, and affordable pension costs. Underfunding is not possible. The life insurance industry pays the pensions and bears all of the investment risk. Unlike current public pension plans, the SAFE Retirement Plan will be protected by a robust and multi-faceted State insurance regulatory system built to ensure financial strength and solvency and backed by a State law-based consumer safety net. Rather than repairing their pension plans, States that adopt the SAFE Retirement Plan will be upgrading their pension plans.

Remember, there is no Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation backing State and local pension plans, and there never will be. Corporations that sponsor pension plans pay premiums to the PBGC, and their workers and retirees receive a level of insurance in the event the plan does not have assets sufficient to pay promised benefits.

State and local workers enjoy no such protection, so another solution is

needed. The SAFE Retirement Plan, in my opinion, is the answer. It is supported by a well-regulated, highly solvent State insurance system and has a built-in financial backstop that does not rely on State or Federal taxes. Honestly, regardless of which side of the debate Senators have been on to date, they must acknowledge that from a solvency perspective, this is a big improvement over the current public pension system.

I know some will argue my bill will give too much new business to the life insurance industry. That is not how I look at it. The way I see it, my bill takes advantage of the life insurance industry to help Americans solve a serious pension problem. After all, the life insurance industry is the only industry in the world designed from the ground up to manage longevity risk.

Annuity contracts purchased through a SAFE Retirement Plan will be competitively bid upon, on a group contract basis, so the workers receive the highest possible pension in retirement. Government finance officers will be involved in the bidding process to ensure best practices, and life insurance companies will be supervised by their respective State insurance departments. The life insurance industry is reliably solvent because State insurance regulations are strict, with stringent reserve requirements and conservative investment standards. In fact, State-licensed life insurance carriers survived the 2008 stock market meltdown in far better condition than any other part of the financial sector.

The status quo is no longer acceptable. In fact, maintaining the status quo comes with a very high cost. In 2011, S&P downgraded the United States in part because of the enormous debt represented by underfunded State and local pension plans. The credit rating agencies have downgraded Illinois multiple times, and Moody's has begun scrutinizing State and local pension obligations more closely. What will happen when the credit rating agencies see that most State and local governments have no serious plan to address the crisis?

A pension is insurance against outliving the money you have available to pay your monthly bills. It cannot be denied that people are living longer. As wonderful as that is, it also means we need to find new ways to stretch our monthly pension dollars over longer lifetimes. The SAFE Retirement Plan can meet the test.

In addition to public pension reform, title II of the legislation I introduce today has several important private pension reforms. The centerpiece is the Starter 401(k), a new type of 401(k) plan that allows employees to save for retirement while placing minimal burdens on employers. Starter 401(k) plans allow employees to save up to $8,000 each year but do not require employer contributions. This plan will be especially useful to small companies that do not have a retirement plan and startup companies that must devote all of their resources to building their business in the early years.

The Finance Committee has received evidence in hearings that access to a retirement plan at work is the best way to ensure that individuals save for retirement. The policy goal of Congress, therefore, should be to encourage employers to establish and maintain a workplace retirement plan. The corollary is that Congress should not adopt policies that discourage employers from maintaining a retirement plan.

The Starter 401(k) is a winner on all counts. It is targeted at businesses that do not already have a plan for their employees, it allows employers to help employees save their own money in amounts greater than they could on their own, and it has none of the expensive and burdensome testing and contribution obligations for employers associated with other retirement plans. As one of the many supporters of this bill told me: '' [T]he Starter 401(k) is an idea whose time has come.''

In addition to the Starter 401(k), the private pension reforms I introduce today will help employers by simplifying reporting rules, easing discrimination testing safe harbor rules, allowing modernized electronic disclosure options, and encouraging the provision of lifetime income options for employees. These are commonsense and long-overdue reforms to our Nation' s retirement savings laws, especially with regard to small-and mid-sized employers.

Last but not least, title III of the legislation I introduce today will ensure that retirees continue to have affordable access to professional investment advice.

The Acting Secretary of Labor is set to rewrite a 1975 regulation and dramatically expand the ERISA fiduciary duty and prohibited transaction rules applicable to 401(k) plans. The Acting Secretary also intends to apply the new and restrictive rules to IRAs, which will cause investment advisers to stop providing advice to many IRA owners.

I have written to the Secretary of Labor in the past about the issue, but my concerns have not been addressed. In fact, there have been a number of letters from Members in both Houses of Congress and on both sides of the aisle imploring the Department of Labor to reconsider the issuance of the expansive and burdensome regulations. Forty Members of Congress have written the Labor Secretary on this issue just since February, to no avail. In light of the DOL's—the Department of Labor's—intransigence, my bill includes a legislative solution to the problem.

The IRA prohibited transaction rules are codified solely in the Internal Revenue Code and address transactions that involve self-dealing and conflicts of interest. Prior to the issuance of a 1978 Executive Order, Treasury had jurisdiction over the IRA prohibited transaction rules governing investment advice. The 1978 order transferred Treasury' s jurisdiction to the DOL.

The SAFE Retirement Act restores jurisdiction for IRA prohibited transaction rules to the Treasury Department. In addition, Treasury will be required to consult with the Securities and Exchange Commission when prescribing rules relating to the professional standard of care owed by brokers and investment advisers to IRA owners.

The 1978 Executive Order also transferred to the DOL some of the Treasury Department's joint jurisdiction over the prohibited transaction rules applicable to retirement plans. The bill I introduce today restores joint jurisdiction to Treasury and the DOL.

Joint jurisdiction makes sense in light of the DOL proposal to expand the 1975 regulation because Treasury must enforce prohibited transaction violations through the assessment of excise taxes. Treasury should have a role to play in any expansion of the rules because expanded rules will mean more excise tax cases for the IRS to process.

If the Acting Secretary of Labor believes that the 1975 fiduciary regulation that has governed retirement investment advice for nearly four decades should be revisited, then the 1978 decision to grant the Secretary of Labor additional ERISA regulatory authority also should be revisited.

After all, we do not know that the DOL would have been granted additional authority in 1978 if the sensible 1975 regulations had not been issued.

Make no mistake, the position I take today regarding IRA investment advice is not a partisan position. In the last Congress, 124 Members from both sides of the aisle and from both Chambers—including 75 Democrats, I might add—wrote to the Labor Secretary asking her not to take this course of action. The Secretary finally withdrew the proposal last year. But now that the Acting Secretary is again threatening to introduce this ill-conceived rule, dozens of Members of Congress have again written the Acting Secretary asking that IRAs be protected.

I ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. I would like to submit for the RECORD two letters written in March and June of this year by a total of 40 Members of the House Democrat caucus once again asking the DOL to avoid the mistake it is about to make.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, March 15, 2013.

Hon. SETH D. HARRIS,
Acting Secretary, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY HARRIS: As Members of the Congressional Black Caucus and the House Financial Services Committee, we are following-up on the Department of Labor's

progress on a re-proposal defining the term ''fiduciary'' under the Employment Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA). We appreciate the Department's efforts to examine this issue and protect investors from misleading investment advice. However, we maintain concerns that if the re-proposal reflects the Department's initial fiduciary proposal it could disparately impact retirement savers and investment representatives in the African American community.

The African American community has been hurt to a larger degree by the economic crisis and the challenge of day-to-day expenses is making long-term saving difficult. The service that an investment representative provides to these traditionally underserved families is critical for them to feel confident to understand and invest in the long-term retirement vehicles intended by Congress to help them. In fact, a Prudential study finds that for those African Americans who use a financial advisor, ''product ownership and detailed financial planning increase, and confidence in meeting key financial goals typically doubles.''

We are particularly concerned about the effects these regulations will have on savers in individual retirement accounts (IRAs). If brokers who serve these accounts are subject to ERISA's strict prohibitions on third-party compensation, they may choose to exit the market rather than risk the potentially severe penalties under ERISA for violations. If that occurs, it could cause IRA services to be unattainable by many retirement savers in the African American community.

Due to these concerns, we urge the Department to take full consideration of the rule's impact on African American communities in its economic impact study. Also, it is critical that the Department continue to work together with appropriate agencies and stakeholders on a balanced approach to both protect investors and maintain affordable access to retirement savings products during this time of economic uncertainty.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns. We look forward to continue working with you on this critical issue.

Sincerely,

Gregory W. Meeks; Gwen Moore; Emanuel Cleaver; Al Green; Maxine Waters; Wm. Lacy Clay; Terri Sewell; David Scott.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 14, 2013.

Hon. SETH HARRIS,
Acting Secretary, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY HARRIS: We are writing to discuss the Department of Labor's proposed rule to amend the definition of ''fiduciary'' for purposes of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ER1SA). We applaud the Department's efforts to engage on this important subject, but we arc concerned that the re-proposal will disadvantage those it aims to help.

One of our goals as Members of Congress is to work together on issues that affect the minority communities we represent. We write this letter because of our joint concern the re-proposed fiduciary definition could restrict our constituents' access to professional financial advisors.

At a time when many Americans arc struggling to ensure a secure retirement, we have concerns that the Department's re-proposal could severely limit access to low cost investment advice. After years of hard work, often for long hours and at low wages, many of our constituents face the challenge of planning for their retirement without access to professional investment advice and services. We are concerned that a new, more restrictive definition of fiduciary would add yet another barrier to accessing qualified retirement planning services. As you know, studies have shown that even savers with small IRA and 401k balances benefit greatly from the ability to sit with a trusted adviser to help plan for their future. We believe the Department should adopt policies that expand access to advice, particularly in light of the racial and gender disparities that currently exist in retirement savings.

We cannot overstate our desire to ensure that this re-proposed rule enhances investor protection without reducing investor access to affordable retirement advice, products and services. As many of us have expressed to the Department, any attempt to change the existing regulatory structure governing the fiduciary standard should be executed carefully, prudently, and in conjunction with the SEC to avoid uncertainty and disruption in the marketplace. We encourage the Department to learn from its earlier experience by ensuring that the reproposal addresses the concerns raised by a bipartisan, bicameral Congress that caused the Department to withdraw the original proposal in September 2011.

Thank you for consideration of our concerns, and we look forward to closely working with you on this issue.

Sincerely,

Frederica S. Wilson; Corrine Brown; Barbara Lee; Wm. Lacy Clay; Danny K. Davis; Donna M. Christensen; Cedric L. Richmond; Emanuel Cleaver; James E. Clyburn; Bobby L. Rush; Hakeem Jeffries; Gregory W. Meeks; Scott DesJarlais; Maxine Waters; Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.; Bennie G. Thompson.

Hank Johnson; Robin L. Kelly; Marcia L. Fudge; Karen Bass; Joyce Beatty; Jim Costa; Elijah E. Cummings; David Scott; G.K. Butterfield; Yvette D. Clarke; Charles B. Rangel; Eleanor H. Norton; Pedro R. Pierluisi; Ed Pastor; Terri Sewell; Tulsi Gabbard.

Mr. HATCH. These letters are proof positive that opposition to the Labor Department's fiduciary regulation continues to be both bipartisan and bicameral.

As I close, I also wish to have printed in the RECORD copies of the many letters I have received in support of the SAFE Retirement Act of 2013.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BENEFITS COUNCIL,
July 8, 2013.

Re SAFE Retirement Act of 2013.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: On behalf of the American Benefits Council, I am writing to thank you for your leadership regarding the critical challenges facing our private employer-sponsored retirement plan system. Your bill, the SAFE Retirement Act of 2013, includes many provisions that would address important private retirement plan issues and builds on the success of the current system.

Your bill contains provisions that would broaden coverage, increase retirement adequacy, and make plan delivery of information more effective. In particular, the bill provision facilitating electronic communication would allow employers to use forms of disclosure that are far more effective in communicating with participants. Your bill would also facilitate greater use of automatic enrollment, which is critical to increasing the level of retirement savings. There are also many provisions that would broaden plan coverage among small employers, including an enhanced credit for establishing a plan. We believe these proposals are important to further strengthening the private employer-sponsored retirement system and helping workers obtain personal financial security.

We applaud your leadership and we look forward to the opportunity to work with you on this bill.

Sincerely,

LYNN D. DUDLEY,
Senior Vice President, Retirement and International Benefits Policy.

ALLIANCE BENEFIT GROUP—ROCKY MOUNTAIN,
June 24, 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Senate Finance Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: On behalf of the Alliance Benefit Group (ABG), Alliance Benefit Group—Rocky Mountain (ABGRM), and our affiliates, we hereby would like to offer our sincere support of the SAFE Pension Act of 2013.

ABG is a national association of record keepers, third party administrators, and financial advisors dedicated to the goal of helping Americans securely retire through a strong system of public and private retirement programs. Alliance Benefit Group works with over 14,000 Defined Contribution and Defined Benefit plans across the country representing over $51 Billion in retirement savings and 1 million plan participants. We have been serving retirement and welfare plan participants in Utah since our foundation locally in 1980.

As a trusted service provider we deal firsthand with the challenges facing plan sponsors, plan fiduciaries, and plan participants across a wide spectrum. Many of these concerns are addressed by your legislation. We are especially encouraged by the provisions of the Act designed to increase auto enrollment and auto escalation, allow for new timing allowances designed to increased adoption of qualified plans, increase portability, address longevity risks, and provide for a more flexible safe harbor 401k environment.

Thank you for supporting the retirement system that all Americans depend on for their future to come.

Sincerely,

W. JEFFREY ZOBELL, QPA, QKA,
Chief Executive Officer, Alliance Benefit Group—Rocky Mountain.

ACLI,
July 3, 2013.

Re Safer Pension Act of 2013.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: We want to express our appreciation for your leadership on retirement security issues. ACLI member companies offer insurance contracts and other investment products and services to qualified retirement plans, including defined benefit pension, 401(k) and 403(b) arrangements, and to individuals through individual retirement arrangements (IRAs) or on a non-qualified basis. For many years our members and their products have helped Americans accumulate retirement savings and turn those savings into guaranteed lifetime income.

Our members will be eager to study the provisions of the Safer Pension Act of 2013. We support enhancements to the current employer sponsored system with the goal of increasing simplification, coverage, and facilitating lifetime income options. We look forward to working with you on a number of enhancements including:

Facilitating electronic delivery of participant statements;

Expanding the ability of employers to offer annuities in defined contribution plans;

Encouraging multiple employer defined contribution plans; and

Expanding autoenrollment/autoescalation opportunities for workers.

As Congress considers tax reform, we appreciate your continued support of the current retirement security system. ACLI and its member companies look forward to working with you and your staff to improve retirement security for all Americans.

Sincerely,

WALTER C. WELSH.

ASPPA—WORKING FOR AMERICA'S RETIREMENT,

June 24, 2013.

Re Letter of Support for the SAFE Retirement Act of 2013

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER HATCH: On behalf of the American Society of Pension Professionals & Actuaries (ASPPA) and its affiliates, we hereby express our strong support for the SAFE Retirement Act of 2013.

ASPPA is a national organization of more than 15,000 retirement plan professionals who provide consulting and administrative services for qualified retirement plans covering millions of American workers. ASPPA members are retirement professionals of all disciplines including consultants, investment advisors, administrators, actuaries, accountants, and attorneys. The large and broad-based ASPPA membership gives it unusual insight into current practical problems with the Employee Retirement Income Security Act and qualified retirement plans with a particular focus on the issues faced by small- to medium-sized employers. ASPPA membership is diverse and united by a common dedication to the private retirement plan system.

The private retirement system provisions in Title II of the SAFE Act will dramatically simplify the operation of qualified retirement plans by eliminating unnecessary paperwork and traps for the unwary, as well as providing new approaches to expanding the availability of workplace savings through qualified retirement plans, especially small business retirement plans. These common sense proposals will go a long way toward improving the retirement security of millions of working Americans.

ASPPA commends your offering of these proposals, and applauds your commitment to enhancing the private retirement system and the retirement security of our nation's workers.

Sincerely,

BRIAN H. GRAFF, ESQ., APM,
ASPPA Executive Director/CEO.

AMERICANS FOR TAX REFORMS,

JUNE 26, 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
United States Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: On behalf of Americans for Tax Reform, I write today in support of your new bill, the ''Secure Annuities for Employees (SAFE) Retirement Act of 2013.'' I would urge all senators to support this common-sense, job-creating legislation.

The SAFE Retirement Act provides net tax relief for retirement savings. Title II of the legislation spells out a host of common-sense and long-overdue reforms to our nation's retirement savings laws, especially with regard to small- and mid-sized employers. Pending a final score from the Joint Committee on Taxation, it seems self-evident that this section alone makes the SAFE Retirement Act a net tax cut for American families and employers.

The SAFE Retirement Act is good public policy for state and local taxpayers. Title I of the bill allows states to opt into an annuity-based alternative (a ''SAFE Retirement Plan'') to today's under-funded legacy defined benefit pension regime. A state wisely choosing to do so would give taxpayers the assurance that government employees won't strain state government funding obligations into perpetuity—the harsh reality facing many states today as they struggle with meeting the pension promises of an earlier era.

The SAFE Retirement Act builds upon the modernization efforts of the Pension Protection Act of 2006. This bill gives ordinary employers what they've been looking for—a cost-effective, easy to administer, and lower-hassle retirement planning structure they can work with. Common sense reforms like extending elective dates, providing safe harbors, and simplifying paperwork should be able to get broad support. In particular, the ''Starter 401(k)'' is an idea whose time has come.

The ''Secure Annuities for Employees (SAFE) Retirement Act of 2013'' is a great example of good, solid legislative blocking and tackling. I look forward to working with you on this legislation as it winds its way through the lawmaking process.

Sincerely,

GROVER NORQUIST.

Mr. HATCH. These letters come from businesses and organizations representing employers, life insurance companies, State insurance commissioners, State guarantee associations, and tax policy groups. These letters demonstrate that the SAFE Retirement Act is good policy and will make good law. America's retirement system deserves no less.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a legislative hearing to receive testimony on the following bills: S. 235, to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium and S. 920, to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224–2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 9, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 9, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 9, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 192, 193, 194; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Daniel R. Russel, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (East Asian and Pacific Affairs).

Geoffrey R. Pyatt, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counsler, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ukraine.

Tulinabo Salama Mushingi, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Burkina Faso.

ELECTIONS IN AFGHANISTAN

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 94, S. Res. 151.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 151) urging the Government of Afghanistan to ensure transparent and credible presidential and provincial elections in April 2014 by adhering to internationally accepted democratic standards, establishing a transparent electoral process, and ensuring security for voters and candidates.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic and strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.

S. RES. 151

[Whereas Afghanistan's Independent Election Commission has affirmed that Afghanistan will hold presidential and provincial elections in April 2014 and parliamentary elections in 2015;

[Whereas Afghanistan's current electoral process was established in 2004 by the Constitution of Afghanistan;

[Whereas the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework conditions some international assistance to Afghanistan on the holding of credible, inclusive, and transparent elections in 2014 and 2015, among other measures to improve governance;

[Whereas Afghanistan lacks a comprehensive and accurate voter registry, and previous voter registration drives have resulted in duplicate or fraudulent registrations, according to a report by the National Democratic Institute;

[Whereas security concerns and voter intimidation have impeded the ability of people in Afghanistan to cast votes reliably and safely in past elections;

[Whereas Afghan women in particular are prevented from meaningful participation in the electoral process due to the security environment, the scarcity of female poll workers, and lack of awareness of women's political rights and opportunities, according to the Free and Fair Election Foundation of Afghanistan;

[Whereas Afghanistan's 2009 presidential election was characterized by inadequate security for voters and candidates, low voter turnout, and widespread fraud, according to the National Democratic Institute;

[Whereas Afghan officials, including President Karzai and Attorney General Mohammad Ishaq Aloko, disputed the results of Afghanistan's 2010 parliamentary elections and established a Special Election Tribunal to investigate allegations of fraud;

[Whereas, following the 2010 parliamentary elections, Democracy International's Afghanistan Election Observation Mission concluded that comprehensive electoral reform is necessary to ensure a free, fair, and credible election process in 2014;

[Whereas the Honorable Hamid Karzai is the first democratically elected president of modern Afghanistan and has served two terms in that position;

[Whereas the Constitution of Afghanistan states, ''No one can be elected as president for more than two terms.'';

[Whereas President Karzai stated on January 11, 2013, alongside President Barack Obama, ''The greatest of my achievements [. . .] will be a proper, well-organized, interference-free election in which the Afghan people can elect their next president.'';

[Whereas, on several occasions since the late 1970s, civil war has broken out in Afghanistan over the legitimacy of the Afghan government;

[Whereas United States taxpayers have invested more than $89,500,000,000 in reconstruction and humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan since October 2001, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR);

[Whereas a democratically elected and legitimate government that reflects the will of the Afghan people is in the vital security interests of Afghanistan, the United States, its partners in the NATO International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), and Afghanistan's neighbors; and

[Whereas the most critical milestone for Afghanistan's future stability is a peaceful and credible transition of power through presidential elections in 2014: Now, therefore, be it]

Whereas Afghanistan's Independent Election Commission has affirmed that Afghanistan will hold presidential and provincial elections in April 2014 and parliamentary elections in 2015;

Whereas Afghanistan's current electoral process was established in 2004 by the Constitution of Afghanistan;

Whereas the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework conditions some international assistance to Afghanistan on the holding of credible, inclusive, and transparent elections in 2014 and 2015, among other measures to improve governance;

Whereas Afghanistan lacks a comprehensive and accurate voter registry, and previous voter registration drives have resulted in duplicate or fraudulent registrations, according to a report by the National Democratic Institute;

Whereas security concerns and voter intimidation have impeded the ability of people in Afghanistan to cast votes reliably and safely in past elections;

Whereas Afghan women in particular are prevented from meaningful participation in the electoral process due to the security environment, the scarcity of female poll workers, and lack of awareness of women's political rights and opportunities, according to the Free and Fair Election Foundation of Afghanistan;

Whereas Afghanistan's 2009 presidential election was characterized by inadequate security for voters and candidates, low voter turnout, and widespread fraud, according to the National Democratic Institute;

Whereas Afghan officials disputed the results of Afghanistan's 2010 parliamentary elections and established a Special Election Tribunal to investigate allegations of fraud;

Whereas, following the 2010 parliamentary elections, Democracy International's Afghanistan Election Observation Mission concluded that comprehensive electoral reform is necessary to ensure a free, fair, and credible election process in 2014;

Whereas the current president of Afghanistan is serving a second elective term and the Constitution of Afghanistan states, ''No one can be elected as president for more than two terms.'';

Whereas the current president of Afghanistan has committed to not seeking another term in office;

Whereas, on several occasions since the late 1970s, civil war has broken out in Afghanistan over the legitimacy of the Afghan government;

Whereas United States taxpayers have invested more than $89,500,000,000 in reconstruction and humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan since October 2001, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR);

Whereas a democratically-elected and legitimate government that reflects the will of the Afghan people is in the vital security interests of Afghanistan, the United States, its partners in the NATO International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), and Afghanistan's neighbors; and

Whereas one of the most critical milestones for Afghanistan's future stability is a peaceful and credible transition of power through presidential elections in 2014: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, [That the Senate—

[(1) affirms that the electoral process in Afghanistan should be determined and led by Afghan actors, with support from the international community, and should not be subject to internal and external interference;

[(2) expresses its strong support for credible, inclusive, and transparent presidential and provincial elections in April 2014;

[(3) urges the Government of Afghanistan to conduct the elections in full accordance with the Constitution of Afghanistan, to include maintaining the quota for women's parliamentary participation;

[(4) honors the sacrifice of United States, coalition, and Afghan servicemembers who have been killed or injured since October 2001 in defense of the democratic rights of the Afghan people;

[(5) recognizes the substantial investment made by the United States taxpayers in support of stability and democracy in Afghanistan;

[(6) recognizes the contributions made by the government of President Hamid Karzai to the democratic progress of Afghanistan, including statements by President Karzai committing to hold presidential elections in 2014 and not seek a third term;

[(7) recognizes that transparent and credible elections will safeguard the legitimacy of the next Afghan government and will help prevent future violence by groups that may be ready to contest a process perceived as rigged or dishonest;

[(8) recognizes that a democratically elected and legitimate government is as important to ensuring the long-term stability of Afghanistan as the successful training and fielding of the Afghan National Security Forces;

[(9) urges the Government of Afghanistan to recognize the independence and impartiality of the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) and an elections complaints mechanism with clear jurisdiction over the final results, and urges all parties not to interfere with their deliberations;

[(10) urges the Parliament of Afghanistan to pass legislation that will establish a consultative and inclusive process for appointing elections commissioners and allowing election disputes to be resolved transparently and fairly;

[(11) urges the IEC to adopt measures to better mitigate fraud, include marginalized groups, and improve electoral transparency of the polling and counting process and communicate these measures clearly and consistently to the people of Afghanistan;

[(12) urges the Government of Afghanistan to support a credible and effective electoral complaints mechanism whereby its members are perceived as impartial, it is given the ultimate authority on deciding whether a ballot or candidate is disqualified, and it has the time and resources to do its work;

[(13) urges close and continuing communication between the IEC and the Afghan National Security Forces to identify and provide security for vulnerable areas of the country during the election period;

[(14) urges the Afghan National Security Forces to make every necessary effort to ensure the safety of voters and candidates;

[(15) expresses its support for the full participation of Afghan civil society in the election process; and

[(16) urges the Secretary of State to condition financial, logistical, and political support for Afghanistan's 2014 elections based on the implementation of reforms in Afghanistan including—

[(A) increased efforts to encourage women's participation in the electoral process, including provisions to ensure their full access to and security at polling stations;

[(B) the implementation of measures to prevent fraudulent registration and manipulation of the voting or counting processes, including—

[(i) establishment of processes to better control ballots;

[(ii) vetting of and training for election officials; and

[(iii) full accreditation of and access for international and domestic election observers; and

[(C) prompt passage of legislation through the Parliament of Afghanistan that codifies the authorities and independence of the IEC and an independent and impartial election complaints mechanism.]

That the Senate—

(1) affirms that the electoral process in Afghanistan should be determined and led by Afghan actors, with support from the international community, and should not be subject to internal or external interference;

(2) expresses its strong support for credible, inclusive, and transparent presidential and provincial elections in April 2014;

(3) urges the Government of Afghanistan to conduct the elections in full accordance with the Constitution of Afghanistan, to include maintaining the constitutionally-mandated allocation of seats for women's parliamentary participation;

(4) honors the sacrifice of United States, coalition, and Afghan service members who have been killed or injured since October 2001 in defense of the democratic rights of the Afghan people;

(5) recognizes the substantial investment made by the United States taxpayers in support of stability, democracy, and the rule of law in Afghanistan, including efforts to end public corruption;

(6) recognizes the commitment of the Government of Afghanistan to hold presidential elections in 2014 and the current president's commitment not to seek a third term;

(7) recognizes that transparent and credible elections will help safeguard the legitimacy of the next Afghan government and will help prevent future violence by groups that may be ready to contest a process perceived as rigged or dishonest;

(8) recognizes that a democratically-elected and legitimate government is important to ensuring the long term stability of Afghanistan, as is the successful training and fielding of the Afghan National Security Forces;

(9) urges the Government of Afghanistan to respect and support the independence and impartiality of the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) and the need for an independent and impartial elections complaints mechanism with clear jurisdiction over the final results, and urges all parties not to interfere with their deliberations;

(10) urges the Parliament of Afghanistan to pass legislation that will establish a consultative and inclusive process for appointing elections commissioners and allowing election disputes to be resolved transparently and fairly;

(11) urges the IEC to adopt measures to better mitigate fraud, include marginalized groups, and improve electoral transparency of the polling and counting process and communicate these measures clearly and consistently to the people of Afghanistan;

(12) urges the Government of Afghanistan to support a credible and effective electoral complaints mechanism whereby its members are perceived as impartial, it is given the ultimate authority on deciding whether a ballot or candidate is disqualified, and it has the time and resources to do its work;

(13) urges close and continuing communication between the IEC and the Afghan National Security Forces to identify and provide security for vulnerable areas of the country during the election period;

(14) urges the Afghan National Security Forces to make every necessary effort to ensure the safety of voters and candidates;

(15) expresses its support for the full participation of Afghan civil society in the election process;

(16) urges the President of the United States to ensure that all United States Government efforts in Afghanistan are well-coordinated and are fully consistent with the American taxpayers longstanding commitment to stability, democracy, and the rule of law in Afghanistan, including efforts to end public corruption; and

(17) urges the Secretary of State to condition financial, logistical, and political support for Afghanistan's 2014 elections based on the implementation of reforms in Afghanistan including—

(A) increased efforts to encourage women's participation in the electoral process, including provisions to ensure their full access to and security at polling stations;

(B) the implementation of measures to prevent fraudulent registration and manipulation of the voting or counting processes, including—

(i) establishment of processes to better control ballots;

(ii) vetting of and training for election officials; and

(iii) full accreditation of and access for international and domestic election observers; and

(C) prompt passage of legislation through the Parliament of Afghanistan that codifies the authorities and independence of the IEC and an independent and impartial election complaints mechanism.

Ms. WARREN. I further ask that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 151), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 151

Whereas Afghanistan's Independent Election Commission has affirmed that Afghanistan will hold presidential and provincial elections in April 2014 and parliamentary elections in 2015;

Whereas Afghanistan's current electoral process was established in 2004 by the Constitution of Afghanistan;

Whereas the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework conditions some international assistance to Afghanistan on the holding of credible, inclusive, and transparent elections in 2014 and 2015, among other measures to improve governance;

Whereas Afghanistan lacks a comprehensive and accurate voter registry, and previous voter registration drives have resulted in duplicate or fraudulent registrations, according to a report by the National Democratic Institute;

Whereas security concerns and voter intimidation have impeded the ability of people in Afghanistan to cast votes reliably and safely in past elections;

Whereas Afghan women in particular are prevented from meaningful participation in the electoral process due to the security environment, the scarcity of female poll workers, and lack of awareness of women's political rights and opportunities, according to the Free and Fair Election Foundation of Afghanistan;

Whereas Afghanistan's 2009 presidential election was characterized by inadequate security for voters and candidates, low voter turnout, and widespread fraud, according to the National Democratic Institute;

Whereas Afghan officials disputed the results of Afghanistan's 2010 parliamentary elections and established a Special Election Tribunal to investigate allegations of fraud;

Whereas following the 2010 parliamentary elections, Democracy International's Afghanistan Election Observation Mission concluded that comprehensive electoral reform is necessary to ensure a free, fair, and credible election process in 2014;

Whereas the current president of Afghanistan is serving a second elective term and the Constitution of Afghanistan states, ''No one can be elected as president for more than two terms.'';

Whereas the current president of Afghanistan has committed to not seeking another term in office;

Whereas, on several occasions since the late 1970s, civil war has broken out in Afghanistan over the legitimacy of the Afghan government;

Whereas United States taxpayers have invested more than $89,500,000,000 in reconstruction and humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan since October 2001, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR);

Whereas a democratically-elected and legitimate government that reflects the will of the Afghan people is in the vital security interests of Afghanistan, the United States, its partners in the NATO International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), and Afghanistan's neighbors; and

Whereas one of the most critical milestones for Afghanistan's future stability is a peaceful and credible transition of power through presidential elections in 2014: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that the electoral process in Afghanistan should be determined and led by Afghan actors, with support from the international community, and should not be subject to internal or external interference;

(2) expresses its strong support for credible, inclusive, and transparent presidential and provincial elections in April 2014;

(3) urges the Government of Afghanistan to conduct the elections in full accordance with the Constitution of Afghanistan, to include maintaining the constitutionally-mandated allocation of seats for women's parliamentary participation;

(4) honors the sacrifice of United States, coalition, and Afghan service members who have been killed or injured since October 2001 in defense of the democratic rights of the Afghan people;

(5) recognizes the substantial investment made by the United States taxpayers in support of stability, democracy, and the rule of law in Afghanistan, including efforts to end public corruption;

(6) recognizes the commitment of the Government of Afghanistan to hold presidential elections in 2014 and the current president's commitment not to seek a third term;

(7) recognizes that transparent and credible elections will help safeguard the legitimacy of the next Afghan government and will help prevent future violence by groups that may be ready to contest a process perceived as rigged or dishonest;

(8) recognizes that a democratically-elected and legitimate government is important to ensuring the long term stability of Afghanistan, as is the successful training and fielding of the Afghan National Security Forces;

(9) urges the Government of Afghanistan to respect and support the independence and impartiality of the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) and the need for an independent and impartial elections complaints mechanism with clear jurisdiction over the

final results, and urges all parties not to interfere with their deliberations;

(10) urges the Parliament of Afghanistan to pass legislation that will establish a consultative and inclusive process for appointing elections commissioners and allowing election disputes to be resolved transparently and fairly;

(11) urges the IEC to adopt measures to better mitigate fraud, include marginalized groups, and improve electoral transparency of the polling and counting process and communicate these measures clearly and consistently to the people of Afghanistan;

(12) urges the Government of Afghanistan to support a credible and effective electoral complaints mechanism whereby its members are perceived as impartial, it is given the ultimate authority on deciding whether a ballot or candidate is disqualified, and it has the time and resources to do its work;

(13) urges close and continuing communication between the IEC and the Afghan National Security Forces to identify and provide security for vulnerable areas of the country during the election period;

(14) urges the Afghan National Security Forces to make every necessary effort to ensure the safety of voters and candidates;

(15) expresses its support for the full participation of Afghan civil society in the election process;

(16) urges the President of the United States to ensure that all United States Government efforts in Afghanistan are well-coordinated and are fully consistent with the American taxpayers longstanding commitment to stability, democracy, and the rule of law in Afghanistan, including efforts to end public corruption; and

(17) urges the Secretary of State to condition financial, logistical, and political support for Afghanistan's 2014 elections based on the implementation of reforms in Afghanistan including—

(A) increased efforts to encourage women's participation in the electoral process, including provisions to ensure their full access to and security at polling stations;

(B) the implementation of measures to prevent fraudulent registration and manipulation of the voting or counting processes, including—

(i) establishment of processes to better control ballots;

(ii) vetting of and training for election officials; and

(iii) full accreditation of and access for international and domestic election observers; and

(C) prompt passage of legislation through the Parliament of Afghanistan that codifies the authorities and independence of the IEC and an independent and impartial election complaints mechanism.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2013

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, July 10, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that the majority leader be recognized and that following the remarks of the two leaders, the time until 12 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that at 12 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 1238, the student loan bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Ms. WARREN. At noon tomorrow, there will be a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the student loan bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. WARREN. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 10, 2013, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

WANDA FELTON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE FIRST VICE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2017. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARK BRADLEY CHILDRESS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA.

TOMASZ P. MALINOWSKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND LABOR, VICE MICHAEL H. POSNER, RESIGNED.

CARLOS ROBERTO MORENO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BELIZE.

EVAN RYAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS), VICE JUDITH ANN STEWART STOCK, RESIGNING.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DENNIS V. MCGINN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, VICE JACKALYNE PFANNENSTIEL, RESIGNED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

KATHLEEN M. ADAMS, OF FLORIDA
CHARLES J. ADDISON, OF VIRGINIA
STERLING K. AINSWORTH, OF VIRGINIA
CLAUDIA A. ALVAREZ, OF VIRGINIA
NAVDEEP AULJA, OF WASHINGTON
ROBERT N. BADENHOP, OF VIRGINIA
BETHANY BARRIENTEZ, OF VIRGINIA
KATHRYN M. BOSWELL, OF MARYLAND
ANNA MARIE BOULOS, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DORCAS D. BRANNOCK, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID BYRNES, OF VIRGINIA
JUAN C. CACERES, OF VIRGINIA
KARN L. CARLSON, OF TEXAS
CARRINGTON R. CARTER, SR., OF MARYLAND
FLACELIA CELSULA, OF VIRGINIA
TAMARA SAITO CHAO, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER M. CLOSE, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN M. COATS, OF FLORIDA
CHIANA N. COLEMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KATHLEEN L. COLGAN, OF VIRGINIA
STEVEN CUPIC, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW T. DAVIS, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL DAVIS, OF VIRGINIA
BYRON H. DENNEY, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL R. DISNER, OF VIRGINIA
SEAN DOHERTY, OF VIRGINIA
COCO DOWNEY, OF VIRGINIA
LEON PAUL D'SOUZA, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN Q. DUONG, OF VIRGINIA
FRANZ W. DURDLE, OF VIRGINIA
STACEY C. DUVALL, OF MARYLAND
KATHRYN EDWARDS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
KURT M. EILHARDT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
THOMAS ELFMONT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RANDALL T. EVERS, OF MARYLAND
KAYLAN M. FILLINGHAM, OF MARYLAND
JACOB K. FISHER, OF FLORIDA
SARAH LINDSEY FLEWELLING, OF MAINE
DAVY E. FOGLER, OF VIRGINIA
RAPHAEL A. GARCIA, OF FLORIDA
JENNIFER K. GORMAN, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN GRIFFITH, OF MARYLAND
LEKISHA R. GUNN, OF ALABAMA
ERIC C. HAMMARSTEN, OF OKLAHOMA
KINGSPRIDE HAMMOND, OF VIRGINIA
BRETT ETHAN HANSEN, OF VIRGINIA
JOSHUA D. HATCH, OF TEXAS
CALVIN HAYES, OF FLORIDA
GABRIEL LAVON HURST, OF NEW YORK
BRIAN JEFFREY HUSAR, OF ILLINOIS
CHEN-TZE GEORGE HWANG, OF VIRGINIA
GREGORY A. JENTZSCH, OF OREGON
DAMION R. JOHNSON, OF NEW YORK
BRANDON W. KAPPUS, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN J. KELLENBERGER, OF VIRGINIA
KATHERINE KIGUDDE, OF CALIFORNIA
CAITLYN KIM, OF NEW YORK
AMY ELIZABETH KORNBLUTH, OF FLORIDA
JULIE A. LABORDE, OF NEVADA
MARIANNE E. LEE, OF FLORIDA
ADAM A. LUND, OF OREGON
JESSE LYNCH, OF FLORIDA
NICHOLE L. MADDEN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
TIMOTHY A. MILLER, OF VIRGINIA
CAROLYN I. MOORE, OF MISSOURI
KARA M. MOORE, OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA A. MORRIS, OF NEW YORK
KENT MULLEN, OF VIRGINIA
STEVEN MULLEN, OF MARYLAND
EMILY M. R. NELSON, OF NEW YORK
PHOEBE J. NEWMAN, OF MAINE
BRUNO E. NOJIMA, OF VIRGINIA
LAUREN FORBES O'DOHERTY, OF NORTH CAROLINA
ALEXANDER JOZEF PARCAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
WILLIAM HAIGH PAYNE, OF VIRGINIA
MARY JO ANN PHAM, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ROBYN A. PUCKETT, OF GEORGIA
GREGORY W. QUICK, OF PENNSYLVANIA
SEONG HEON RA, OF VIRGINIA
VALERIE M. REED, OF VIRGINIA
EILEEN R. REQUENA, OF VIRGINIA
NATHAN W. RHOADS, OF VIRGINIA
AMANDA J. RIVERS, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH K. G. ROGERS, OF CALIFORNIA
JOSEPH AARON ROZENSHTEIN, OF NEW YORK
PATRICK RUMLEY, OF FLORIDA
WILBER N. SAENZ, OF VIRGINIA
SARA E. SAUKAS, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT ALLEN SCOTT, OF IOWA
JOSEPH J. SENCHYSHYN, OF NEW YORK
JOSEPH F. SKRTIC, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH B. SOLLENBERGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SUSAN SKODA SOLLENBERGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREA R. STARKS, OF MARYLAND
JOEL STEWART, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DANIEL STREITFELD, OF TEXAS
ELLEN TAMARKIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KIMBERLY S. TIGHEARNAIN, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFERY ALAN TOMASEVICH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
VALERIE L. ULLRICH, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
LAURA J. VERBISKY, OF MICHIGAN
ERIC WASHABAUGH, OF VIRGINIA
RYAN MICHAEL WAYE, OF GEORGIA
MICHAEL A. WELCH, OF VIRGINIA
MARK A. WELLS, OF VIRGINIA
REBECCA R. WHITE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOHN F. WIEDOWER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DAVID LEE WILLEY, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
TIARA WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA
ODESSA M. WORKMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HAENIM YOO, OF CALIFORNIA
SEAN YOUNG, OF VIRGINIA

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF SECTION 271(D), TITLE 14, U.S. CODE:

To be rear admiral

RICHARD T. GROMLICH

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JAMES M. KOWALSKI

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. KURT W. TIDD

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

DEAN C. ANDERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER D. PERRIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

SHEENA L. ALLEN
MICHAEL M. ARMSTRONG
DAVID A. AYALA
ANDREW M. BAKER
MICHAEL D. BARNO
MICHAEL J. BEKE
BRENT H. BETHERS
BERNARDO F. BIANCO
JENNIFER D. BRITT
MICHAEL J. BROWNING
AARON G. CAMPBELL
STEVEN W. CAMPBELL
CHRISTOPHER K. CHANG
MILES R. CONE
MATTHEW J. COZBY
PETER K. CUDJOE
KIRK R. DAHLKE
MINDY M. M. DAUGHERTY
EDUARDO A. DECARDONAJULIA
CANDACE K. DEVEAUX
JEFFRY D. FLETCHER
GREGORY S. FURDEK
JOHN O. GREEN
KYLE R. GRIFFITH
JONATHAN M. HARDY
MICHAEL A. HOFFMAN
FREDWIN R. HOLOMON
BRYAN L. HORSPOOL
MIGUEL A. JUSINOPEREZ
YONG S. KIM
MITCHELL P. KREUZE
KWAME O. KWATENG
KHAI Q. LE
DONG S. LEE
MEGAN E. LICHTWARDT
NATHAN R. LUND
MATTHEW D. MORRIS
JADELIN M. S. MORTON
RUTH A. NELSON
RYAN L. OLSON
BRETT R. POTTER
JENNIFER S. PRITTS
DEMARCIO L. REED
ALEXANDRA M. RIHANI
RYAN P. ROMERO
SHETEKA K. ROSSGOODLETT
MATTHEW D. SCHAFER
RUSSELL K. SEARLE
REZA J. SHARIFI
CLINT T. SHELLEY
AARON D. SIMMONS
JONATHAN D. SPENN
MARY S. STUART
NATHAN R. THOMPSON
STEVEN J. TODD
ERNESTO M. VERA, JR.
NAM T. VO
DOUGLAS N. WATERMAN
LEAH M. WIGER
GARRETT G. WOOD
MIAO X. ZHOU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

COURTNEY L. ABRAHAM
ROBERT S. ADCOCK
ANDREW J. AIELLO III
AMANDA B. AKERS-VORNHOLT
EVERARDO ALANIS
TROY V. ALEXANDER
TODD J. ALLISON
LUIS M. ALVAREZ
JASON M. ALVIS
MATTHEW K. ANASTASI
CHRISTIAN O. ANDERSON
BRANDY M. ANDREWS
JUDY C. ANTHONY
AUGUST A. ARDUSSI
JOHN L. ARGUE
WILLIAM C. ARNOLD
CARLA J. AUGUSTINE
CARMEN M. AVILESECHEVARRIA
MICHAEL A. BAKER
ROBERT E. BAKER
BRAD A. BANE
MARCUS L. BATES
LOYD BEAL III
BRIAN D. BEINER
CHICO D. BENNETT
DEREK A. BIRD
CATHERINE M. BLACK
SETH T. BLAKEMAN
KENYA M. BOOKER
FREDA V. BOUCHELAGHEM
KEVIN D. BOUREN
TERRY D. BRANNAN
GARY W. BROCK, JR.
CHRISTOPHER M. BROWN
CAPRISSA S. BROWNSLADE
LAHAVIE J. BRUNSON
THOMAS A. BUCHHOLZ
ZACHARY J. BUETTNER
JAMES M. BUNYAK, JR.
PETER Q. BURKE
SHAWN R. BURTON
WOODWARD H. CALDWELL
LAWRENCE F. CAMACHO
CHAD M. CARLSON
ROGER D. CARROLL, JR.
MATTHEW P. CASHDOLLAR
ANTHONY J. CASSINO
GLOVER H. CASTRO
SANDRA L. CHAVEZ
EDWIN L. CHILTON II
MICHAEL J. CHRISTIANSEN
STEVEN M. CLARK
NILE L. CLIFTON, JR.
KEVIN R. CLINE
SCOTT T. CLUTTER
PATRICK L. COBB
OCTAVIA T. COLEMAN
MANUEL COLON
JASON R. CONDE
TRENTON J. CONNER
STEPHEN D. COOK
DOUGLAS W. COPELAND
MYRTA I. CRESPO
MARTIN L. CROUSE
FRANKIE J. CRUZ
HERMINIO N. CRUZ
SHANE R. CUELLAR
BRADLEY T. CULLIGAN
PAUL J. CURRY
BENJAMIN K. DENNARD
JOEL L. DILLON
KEVIN S. DIXON
GARRY DODARD
STEVEN M. DOWGIELEWICZ, JR.
SARA E. DUDLEY
FELICIA R. EADDY
JAMES S. EDWARDS
DANIELLE L. ELEY
LUKE E. EMERSON
CHRISTOPHER ENDERTON
MELISSA R. ESLINGER
MICHAEL E. FELLURE
MICHAEL P. FITZGERALD
TEVINA M. FLOOD
RUSSELL J. FOSTER
JACOB H. FREEMAN
DANIEL P. FRESH
KIMBERLY K. FUHRMAN
JOHN R. GAIVIN
TIMOTHY M. GALLAGHER
JAMES E. GANNON
SAFIYYA GAYTON
JOEL A. GEGATO, JR.
MILES T. GENGLER
ANTHONY R. GIBBS
PETER L. GILBERT
JASON D. GOOD
SETH C. GRAVES
LACHER M. GREEN
RONNARD GREEN
GYLES E. GREGORY III
JEREL R. GRIMES
MICHAEL J. HALLEY
TODD W. HANDY
JASON J. HANIFIN
DIANA B. HARE
CURTIS N. HARPER
ALFRED L. HARRIS, JR.
FREDERICKA R. HARRIS
JON C. HAVERON
TIMOTHY W. HAYLETT
PRESTON J. HAYWARD
JASON H. HEARN
ROY E. HEFFNER
RAPHAEL S. HEFLIN
MARK P. HENDERSON
CARL L. HENNEMANN
JUSTIN S. HERBERMANN
WAYNE F. HIATT
RALPH G. HILLMER III
GREGORY J. HIRSCHEY
RUSSELL V. HOFF
SCOTT E. HOLDEN
JONATHAN R. HOLLAND
JOEL R. HOLMSTROM
WANDA I. HUDDLESTON
IAN W. HUMPHREY
ROBERT W. HUMPHREYS
DAVINA L. HUNT
CURTIS L. JOHNSON
LEE M. JOHNSON
KEITH JONES, JR.
LATONYA N. JORDAN
LOUIS J. KARNES
GLEN P. KEITH
CHRISTOPHER S. KENNEDY
RYAN R. KING
TROY T. KIRBY
RUSSELL W. KLAUMAN
JOHN W. KREDO
BRIAN D. KUHN
MICHAEL F. LABRECQUE
KEIRYA R. LANGKAMP
STACEY L. LEE
ROBERT L. LEIATO
MICHAEL L. LINDLEY
BENJAMIN M. LIPARI
TODD R. LITTLE
STEVEN S. LITVIN
MICHAEL E. LUDWICK
RYAN P. LUEDERS
SCOTT A. MADDRY
SCOTT J. MADORE
JOHN J. MAHER
TRAHON T. MASHACK
CARL E. MASON
CHRISTINE A. MASSEY
AMBROSE U. MBONU
MICHAEL D. MCBRIDE
MICHAEL R. MCBRIDE
JEFFREY A. MCCARTNEY
PATRICK J. MCCLELLAND
WADE M. MCCOLLIN
ERIC A. MCCOY
CHRISTOPHER M. MCCREERY
JAMES T. MCDONALD
TIMOTHY D. MCDONALD
BEN P. MCFALL III
KYLE A. MCFARLAND
MARK T. MCGOVERN
SHAWANA J. MCKNIGHT-BRAZZLE
CHARLES W. MCPHAIL
IVAN K. MCPHERSON
ROBB A. MEERT
ADAM MELNITSKY
LUKE J. MEYERS
BURR H. MILLER
DOUGLAS M. MILLER
ERIN C. MILLER
SAMUEL S. MILLER
DANIEL MISIGOY
JARRETT S. MOFFITT
ERIC J. MOLFINO
ROBIN W. MONTGOMERY
GORDON R. MOON
LATASSHA R. MOORE
JAMES J. MORGAN
COLETTE M. MOSES
JARRETT R. MOSES
CHAD M. NANGLE
GEORGE G. NASIF
DAVID L. NELSON, JR.
PATRICK NIESTZCHE
ALTHERIA M. NILES, JR.
DONNIE NOWLIN
MICHAEL T. NUCKOWSKI
RYAN P. OQUINN
DENNIS J. ORTIZ
LESLEY G. ORTIZ
ROBERT M. OVERGAARD, JR.
ADALBERTO PAGANFIGUEROA
CHRISTOPHER L. PAONE
MICHAEL N. PARENT
JONATHAN M. PATRICK
JASON D. PEREZ
LETSY A. PEREZ-MARSDEN
RICHARD H. PFEIFFER, JR.
WAYNE N. PICKETT
JASON D. PIKE
JOHN S. PIRES
REGINA PISTONE
WILLIAM J. PONTES
MICHAEL P. POST
JOHN W. PRATT
JOHN E. PRICE
CLYDELLIA S. PRICHARD ALLEN
CLYDEA M. PRICHARD-BROWN
GARY J. PRUIETT, JR.
BRUCE R. PULVER
RYAN L. RAYMOND
MARK D. REA II
SCOTT M. REED
ERIN D. REEDER
RYAN L. REID
DARIN S. REILING
NICOLE U. REINHARDT
CHRISTINE H. RICE
TRINA RICE
DANNY L. ROBINSON
PERNELL A. ROBINSON
ROBERT B. ROCHON
HECTOR ROMAN
CHRISTINE D. RONEY
EVANGELINE G. ROSEL
JOHN P. T. ROUB
EDWARD K. ROWSEY
JAY C. SAWYER
BRYANT L. SCHUMACHER
RICARDO L. SIERRAGUZMAN
ROBERT W. SLEASMAN
JACQUELINE A. SMITH
CHRISTOPHER W. SNIPES
BRIAN E. SOUHAN
GREGORY S. SOULE
LYNNA M. SPEIER
JONATHAN W. SPURLOCK
MICHAEL D. STEALEY
KELLY K. STEELE
TONEY R. STEPHENSON
JAYSON L. STEWART
MARK W. SUSNIS
LARRY A. SWINTON
MATTHEW D. TATMAN
STEPHEN R. TAUTKUS
MARK R. TAYLOR
CHESLEY D. THIGPEN
DOUGLAS C. THOMPSON
HERB L. THOMPSON
KENNETH D. THOMPSON
FRANCIS P. TOBIN
ANNA C. TRUESDALE
JASON A. TUCKER
MICHAEL K. J. TYLER
BRIAN T. UNGERER
LAURA C. UPDEGRAFF
ERIC J. VANDEHEY
ERIC D. VANDEWEG
CHAD E. VAUGHN
STEPHEN F. VENSOR
MATTHEW H. VINING
DEREK M. VINSON
WAYNE A. VORNHOLT
TRACY L. WADLE
RONALD D. WALCK

LISA K. WALSH
JASON B. WAMSLEY
SHAWN P. WARD
MARIO A. WASHINGTON
JASON WEHRMAN
JAMES R. WILEY
ARCHIE L. WILLIAMS, JR.
HURCHEL L. WILLIAMS
JAY J. WILLIAMS
JOHN M. WILLIAMS
ONEAL A. WILLIAMS, JR.
SCOTT L. WILLIAMS
BRIAN N. WITCHER
AARON M. WOLFE
BRIAN P. WOLFORD
AUDREY S. L. WOO
JUSTIN M. ZIMMER
ANTHONY E. ZUPANCIC
D003084
D003915
D010505
D010567
D010658
D010859
D010897
D010955
D011115
D011386
D011394
D011398
D011476

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

CHRISTOPHER L. AARON
ROMAN A. ACIERTO
JOSHUA A. ADAMS
ATIF U. AHMED
TROY W. AKERS
JASON B. ALISANGCO
DAVID M. ANDERSON
MARK R. ANDERSON
ALLAN A. ANDRES
PETER S. ARMANAS
JUSTIN M. ATKINS
SARKIS BABIKIAN
MEGAN L. BARNWELL
ROBERT M. BARNWELL
KATE L. BARRONMICHEL
NATHAN S. BECKERMAN
KELLY E. BEEKEN
ADRIANE E. BELL
JAIME L. BELLAMY
CHRISTOPHER J. BERMUDEZ
JOHN C. BERRY
ADAM J. BEVEVINO
TODD A. BIALOWAS
MARK A. BLACK
JAMES A. BLAIR
BRITTONY L. BLAKEY
ANDREW F. BOGNANNO
LESLIE B. BOOTHBY
DANTAE L. BOWIE
JOSEPH M. BOYER
JACQUELINE BRADEN
SAMANTHA L. BRANDON
DEAN M. BREWER
RACHEL M. BREWSTER
ANDREW T. BRIGG
JOEL R. BROCKMEYER
STERLING L. BRODNIAK
JIM A. BROOKS
JOHN A. BROOKS
GREGORY S. BROWN
KRISTEN P. BUNCH
SCOTT R. BUNKER
KRISTINA G. BURGERS
JASON M. CAGE
DAVID M. CALLENDER
ANTHONY P. CARDILE
PAUL A. CAREY
MICKEY S. CHABAK
DAVID M. CHAMBERS
CHRISTOPHER P. CHANEY
WILLIAM T. CHANG
ANDREW W. CHAPMAN
LISA M. CHAPMAN
GRIGORY CHARNY
TONY T. CHOI
SCOTT R. CHRISTENSEN
VITO V. CIRIGLIANO
GREGORY C. CLAIBORN
JACOB R. CLAWSON
BRIAN M. COHEE
JOHN C. COLEMAN
SUSAN M. COLLA
DHRUTI CONTRACTOR
DANIEL G. CONWAY
STEVEN C. CORDERO
DANIEL J. CORREA
LUIZ F. CORREA
DEVEN D. COX
JAMES A. COX
JERIS M. COX
MICHAEL J. CRIMMINS
BETHANY S. CUNNINGHAM
BENJAMIN D. DAGGETT
CASY A. DANIELSEN
MIA D. DEBARROS
ERIK A. DEDEKAM
MICHAEL A. DEMARCANTONIO
KATHERINE L. DENGLER
LAURA L. DESADIER
JOHNNY A. DIAS
JEFFREY M. DIFFENDERFER
MICHAEL S. DIGBY
MICHAEL A. DIMEOLA
PETER Q. DINH
MARY S. DOELLMAN
JOSEPH W. DOMBROWSKY
MICHAEL S. DONOVAN
DANIEL R. DOUCE
MARIT C. DUFFY
SEAN P. DUFFY
CHRISTOPHER R. ENGLAND
GRANT H. EVANS
J R. L. EVANSON
JAMES A. FALCON
CHRISTOPHER A. FARABAUGH
ALLYSON E. FEWELL
KELLY V. FITZPATRICK
CHRISTOPHER M. FORBUSH
JILLIAN M. FRANKLIN
TRACY L. FRANZOS
DEREK M. FRAZIER
ESTEPHAN J. GARCIA
BRANDON I. GARDNER
JENNIFER M. GARRISON
ROBERT B. GAYLE
SARAH K. GIBBONS
JOSEPH E. GILLHAM
JOHN L. GLOMSET III
RONALD P. GOODLETT
CHASE A. GRAMES
RACHEL A. GRAVEL
KATHLEEN A. GREEN
RICHARD N. GREENE, JR.
JESSE D. GREER
LAUREN T. GREER
LESTER L. GREER
SAMUEL L. GRINDSTAFF
BRIAN GROGAN
KELLY L. GROOM
ROBERT J. GRUMBO
LOUIS K. HAASE
JOSH E. HANSEN
MEGAN M. HANSON
CHRISTOPHER B. HARTNESS
FREDERICK A. HAUSER
KATHERINE M. HETZ
CATON L. HILL
CHAD A. HILLS
ELIZABETH C. HINES
ZACHARY S. HOFFER
JASON L. HOKE
LINCOLN A. HOLDAWAY
CARL F. HOOGESTEGER
MARK E. HOOSTE
MICHELLE B. HORNBAKERPARK
SONYA B. HORWELL
DAVID C. HOSTLER
JOHN E. HOUK
CHARLES T. HOUNSHELL
AICHA M. HULL
DAVID W. HUMPHREY
APRIL J. HURLSTON
MARIAN N. HYATT
DMITRI IGONKIN
BENJAMIN J. JABARA
KEITH L. JACKSON
POOJA B. JASANI
JOSEPH D. JENKINS
LESLIE A. JETTE
GABRIEL H. JOHNSON
LYNNETTE M. JOHNSON
SYLVIA B. JOHNSON
WARREN P. JOHNSON
CHRISTOPHER P. JORDAN
CONOR M. KAIN
JOSEPH H. KAMERATH
DANIEL G. KANG
MADEERA KATHPAL
MICHAEL J. KELLY
DIANA L. KENYON
JESSICA J. KEPCHAR
OWEN R. KIERAN
JONATHAN K. KIM
JAMES W. KOCH
MONIKA A. KRZYZEK
GINA D. KUBICZ
EDWARD Y. KWON
CHRISTIAN A. LABRA
MARIO D. LAGIGLIA
SHERRELL T. LAM
MILES C. LAYTON
DARA S. LEE
EARL LEE
JOSEPH S. LEE
THERESA M. LONG
AMBER A. LOVELACE
LUIS E. LOZADAMARRERO
MYRO A. LU
JASON A. MACDONNELL
CRISTIAN S. MADAR
HOWARD K. MAHONEY
ANNA MAKELA
JULIAN G. MAPP
KEVIN D. MARTIN
DEANNA L. MASCHOCAWLEY
RYAN M. MASCIO
AARON G. MATLOCK
JENNIFER L. MCCAIN
JOHN P. MCCALLIN III
KAREN M. MCGRANE
ADAM B. MEHRING
JASPER K. MESARCH
MATTHEW E. MILLER
CHRISTOPHER A. MITCHELL
JUSTIN S. MITCHELL
JACQUELINE D. MOORE
MATTHEW B. MOTE
MARVIN S. MOUL
RITA P. MUNSON
KRISTEN E. NATALE
JESS T. NELSON
MARSHALL S. NICKEL
MICHAEL D. NICKERSON
CHRISTOPHER M. NOVAK
BENNETT J. OBERG
ARTHUR C. OKWESILI
RYAN T. OLESZEWSKI
JONATHAN R. OLIVA
MICHAEL I. ORESTES
NICHOLAS H. ORR
PATRICK D. OWSIAK
NATHALIE D. PAOLINO
JAMES R. PASCUAL
JEANNE C. PATZKOWSKI
MICHAEL S. PATZKOWSKI
ZAAL H. PAYMASTER
SAMUEL M. PEIK
JENNIFER M. PENA
DANIEL L. PERRAULT
SHANNA B. PETTIE
TYLER A. PEZALSKI
NATALIE W. PHILBRICK
BRANDON N. PHILLIPS
BRUCE D. PIER
RICHARD A. PIERRE
JUSTIN D. PILGRIM
WALDA S. PINN
ZACHARY J. PLOTZ
DANIEL R. POSSLEY
AARON M. PROFFITT
JASON S. RADOWSKY
UMA E. RAMADORAI
ENRIQUEZ E. RAMIREZ
RICHARD H. RAWSON
JASON M. REESE
ELIZABETH A. RHYNE
MARK L. RIDDLE
JULIE A. RIZZO
RYAN L. ROBERTS
SCOTT H. ROBINSON
ERIK Q. ROEDEL
LUIS O. ROHENA
IVAN R. ROHENAQUINQUILLA
NATHAN J. ROHLING
PHILIP A. ROSEN
CLARK M. ROSENBERRY
MARK J. ROSENGREN
KEVIN D. ROWLEY
LAURA RUBINATE
DAWN M. RUMINSKI
CHRISTOPHER A. RUMSEY
RYAN C. RUSNOK
SCOTT R. SANDERSON
KENT A. SAUNDERS
ANDREW T. SCHLUSSEL
DONALD A. SCHULTZ
WILLIAM F. SCULLY III
ALAN K. SEARS
AARON A. SEE
REBECCA M. SEIFRIED
JERRY P. SEILER
DANIEL J. SESSIONS
OMAR SHAMI
JAMES R. SHAUBERGER
RICHARD SHERIDAN
MICHAEL J. SHIGEMASA
EMILY H. SHIN
TERRY SHIN
RYAN N. SIEG
EMILY A. SIMMONS
TYSON J. SJULIN
JASON M. SMALLEY
JENNIFER M. SMITH
JONATHAN K. SMITH
MORI S. SPEAKMAN
JAY M. STANLEY
JUSTIN P. STERNE
CHRISTOPHER B. SUGALSKI
RACHEL M. R. SULLIVAN
JONATHAN P. SWISHER
ROBERTO TAAREA
MELINDA A. THIAM
DIMITRI M. THOMAS
DUSTIN M. THOMAS
KENDRA L. THOREN
JEFFREY THORMEYER
JOHN S. THURLOW
EVAN T. TRIVETTE
SANDRA A. VANHORN
KRISTEN E. VINES
DRUMMOND G. VOGAN
MARC R. WALKER
JONATHAN M. WALSH
ROBERT J. WALTER
MATTHEW A. WESTHOFF
AARON B. WICKLEY
DOUGLAS B. WIDENER
INDY M. M. WILKINSON
MOLLY E. WILLIAMS
NICOLE A. WILLIAMSON
CHRISTOPHER E. WILSON
KRISTOPHER C. WILSON
BRIAN P. WINSTON
WAYNE O. WOLVERTON
MATTHEW S. WRIGHT
AHMAD H. YASSIN
CHONG K. YI
JOSHUA C. ZINNER
NATHAN P. ZWINTSCHER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RICHARD R. ABELKIS
JEFFREY W. ADAMS
CHRISTOPHER G. ALESHIRE
ERIC A. ANDERSON
TERRI L. ANDREONI
GREG W. ANK
VALERO R. AQUINO, JR.
DAVID C. ASHCRAFT II
CHARLES L. ASSADOURIAN
ROBERT L. ATIENZA
CHRISTOPHER A. BACHL
STEPHANIE A. BAGLEY
TAMIKA B. BAILEY
JAMES W. BAKER
ERIK S. BARKEI
TIMOTHY S. BEAN
TIA L. BENNING
JAMES K. BJERKAAS
ERIC R. BJORKLUND
BRIAN S. BLACKSTONE
JAMES N. BLAIN, JR.
REX L. BLAIR, JR.
CRAIG M. BLANDO
MICHAEL A. BONURA
MARIA C. BORBON
RANDY BOUCHER
ALEXANDER BRASZKO, JR.
SEAN M. BRATTON
CHRISTOPHER T. BRIDGES
CARL R. BROOKS
JAMES D. BROWN, JR.
STEPHEN C. BROWNE
TIMOTHY T. BRUCE
MICHAEL C. BURGOYNE
MICHAEL L. BURGOYNE
JONATHAN D. BURNETT
ERIC D. BUTLER
CHRISTOPHER J. BYRD
KEVIN G. CAHILL
ADISA O. CARTER
CARL T. CARTER, JR.
BRIAN D. CASTELLANI
CHRISTOPHER B. CHAMBLISS
PETER H. CHAPMAN
JAMES M. CHASTAIN
JOSEPH B. CHESTNUT II
JOHN A. CHISOLM
ARI A. CLAIBORNE
JASON P. CLARK
RONALD H. COHEN
KACI H. COLE
PAUL B. COLE IV
ALEXANDER D. CORBIN
JACULYN R. COSEY
JEFFREY A. COULON
DAVID F. COY
MICHAEL P. CULLINANE
BRIAN H. CUNNINGHAM
NICOLE H. CURTIS
ANDREW J. CYCKOWSKI
LAN T. DALAT
WILLIAM R. DANIEL II
MARC D. DANIELS
BRANDON J. DARBY
BENJAMIN A. DAWSON
KEITH W. DEGREGORY
MATTHEW A. DELOIA
MICHAEL F. DEROSIER
THOMAS M. DEVEANS
GARRETT S. DEWITT
JERRY W. DIAMOND, JR.
ROBERT T. DIXON
DANIEL K. DORADO
ROBERT F. DUFFY, JR.
BRIAN E. DUGAN
JONATHAN S. DUNN
REGINAL K. DYKES
PAMELA L. DZIEDZIC
MATTHEW D. EBERHART
ERIC J. EBERLINE
BRIT K. ERSLEV
BENTON J. FABER
ADAM T. FAIN
JEFFREY J. FAIR
TYLER K. FAULK
CARLOS K. FERNANDEZ
EFRAIN FERNANDEZANAYA
MARCUS M. FERRARA
JAY D. FINE
MICHAEL J. FLENTIE
DOUGLAS M. FLETCHER
MARC J. FRANCISZKOWICZ
JAMIE GARCIA
BENJAMIN A. GARDNER
RICHARD E. GARNER, JR.
JIMMY T. GAW
DOUGLAS F. GIBSON
BRIAN C. GOINGS
JEREMY J. GRAY
THOMAS D. GREENE
JASON P. GRESH
MARCUS W. GRIMES
JACQUELINE A. GUILLORY
CHRISTIAN A. HAFFEY
MICHAEL L. HALL
ROBERT E. HAMILTON
STEPHEN S. HAMILTON
KURT A. HAMMOND
JOSEPH A. HARRIS, JR.
CHRISTOPHER W. HARTLINE
HEATH D. HARTSOCK
ERIC HARTUNIAN
CHRISTOPHER J. HEATHERLY
ROBERT M. HEFFINGTON
RYAN C. HELLERSTEDT
COURTNEY L. HENDERSON
CORA D. HENRY
RANDAL E. HICKMAN
TIMOTHY M. HILL
WILLIAM R. HOGAN
BRYAN E. HOOPER
JONATHAN W. HUGHES
CAROLYN E. HUNT
EARL J. HUNTER
PAMELA S. HUNTER
TERENCE M. HUNTER
GUY C. HUNTSINGER
AMANDA L. IDEN
JAMES D. JACKSON
KEE Y. JEONG
ALTON J. JOHNSON
MARK H. JOHNSON
DIKILA L. JONES
ROBERT L. JONES III
ROBERT M. KAM
GALEN R. KANE
DEXTER J. KELLY
EDWARD W. KENDALL
MARVIN L. KING III
JOSEPH A. KLING
NED A. KRAFCHICK
JACOB M. KRAMER
JOHN P. KUNSTBECK
DAVID C. LAMBERT, JR.
GARRETT L. LANDERS
MICHAEL E. LEE
SHANE E. LEE
KURTIS A. LEFFLER
ANDREW M. LEONARD
DENE R. LEONARD III
MICHAEL LEWCZAK
JORIN C. LINTZENICH
LISA J. LIVINGOOD
JONATHAN E. LONG
CHRISTOPHER J. LONGO
JEFFREY T. LOPEZ
DIANA C. LOUCKS
GARY A. LOUCKS
CRAIG R. LOVE
GARY A. LOVE
SETH T. LUCENTE
FERNANDO M. LUJAN
CHARLES C. LUKE
RODOLFO U. LUNASIN
KIRK E. MACDONALD
BRIGHAM J. MANN
CHRISTOPHER D. MARCHETTI
CRAIG A. MARTIN
MICHAEL W. MARTIN
RODOLFO MARTINEZ, JR.
LATASHA M. MATTHEWS
RANDALL D. MCCAULEY
HEATH L. MCCORMICK
KEVIN M. MCKIERNAN
MATTHEW L. MCMILLEN
WILLIAM S. MCNICOL
PATRICIA E. MCPHILLIPS
ALEXANDER S. MENTIS
SHAWN E. MERGES
DANIEL R. MILLER
JOHN T. MILLER
BRADLEY W. MILLS II
ROGER MIRANDA
JAMES F. MONTGOMERY
SHON R. MOORE
JARROD P. MORELAND
GREGORY MORRIS
ANDREW A. MORRISON
STEVEN D. MOSELEY
SHANE A. MOYER
JEFFREY A. MUIR
DAVID J. MULACK
JOHN J. MYERS
THOMAS J. NAGLE, JR.
JOSHUA R. NAGTZAAM
TODD A. NAPIER
ERIC P. NEBEKER
ANTHONY W. NELSON
KEVIN M. NEUMANN
ANTHONY J. NEWTSON
CHI K. NGUYEN
THO D. NGUYEN
SEAN C. NOWLAN
CHRISTY L. H. NYLAND
PAUL S. H. OH
GREGORY G. ORRELL
GARY S. OSCAR
TIMOTHY R. OSULLIVAN
JONATHAN A. OTTO
DAVID P. OWEN
IVAN A. PALACIOS
RONNIE PARK
MICHAEL D. PARKER
STEPHEN M. PARRISH, SR.
STACEY D. PATTERSON
LIVIA A. PAYNE
JASON B. PERIATT
STEPHEN J. PETERS
DWIGHT E. PHILLIPS, JR.
SHAW S. PICK
WILLIAM L. PLATTE
JAMES J. POCHOPIEN
GEORGE POLOVCHIK III
DALLAS A. POWELL, JR.
THOMAS S. PUGSLEY
DOUGLAS M. PULLEY
JORN A. PUNG
CHAD B. QUAYLE
KAREN F. RADKA
FRANCISCO J. RANEROGUZMAN
PETER J. RASMUSSEN
STANLEY M. REED, SR.
GREG C. REESON
SHANE R. REEVES
RANDALL L. ROCKROHR
ALFREDO RODRIGUEZ III
MICHAEL J. RODRIGUEZ
MATTHEW A. ROSS
ROBERT K. ROSS
DAVIDMICHAEL P. ROUX
CHADDRICK L. RUSSELL
DARCY R. SAINTAMANT
NATHAN T. SAMMON
SCOTT M. SANFORD, SR.
BRIAN J. SCHMANSKI
MATTHEW J. SCHREIBER
CHRISTOPHER L. SCHREINER
THOMAS A. SCOTT
SCOTT B. SEIDEL
JESSE T. SESSOMS
MICHAEL T. SHAW
COREY N. SHEA
JEFFREY A. SHEEHAN
NICHOLAS R. SIMONTIS
WILLIAM L. SKIMMYHORN
BRENT O. SKINNER
JONATHAN P. SLOAN
ACETRION L. SMALLWOOD
CHARLES D. SMITH
CHRISTOPHER M. SMITH
DENNIS A. SMITH
JAY B. SMITH
MICHAEL L. SMITH
TRACEY E. SMITH
TRAVIS A. SMITH
WALLACE N. SMITH
THOMAS W. SPAHR
CHRISTOPHER J. SPRINGER
WILLIAM J. STARR, JR.
HUBERT L. STEPHENS
SHARON STEPHENS
KEVIN C. STEYER
KIM A. STONE
DANIEL A. STRODE
WILLIAM E. SUMNER
AARON C. SWAIN
JAMES M. SWARTZ
CHRISTOPHER R. SYBERT
MOMOEVI S. TAWAKE
MATTHEW A. TEMPLEMAN
CHRISTIAN G. TEUTSCH
GINA A. THOMAS
MICHAEL S. TOKAR
ERNEST TORNABELL IV
STEVEN J. TOTH
JOHN S. TRANSUE, JR.
JOHN J. TRYLCH
RONALD E. TURNAGE
MELANIE C. VINTON
BRIAN D. VOGT
JOSEPH C. WALCHKO
ERIC M. WALTHALL
CHRISTOPHER D. WASHINGTON
AARON S. WELCH
BRIAN K. WELCH
RICHARD D. WELLMAN, JR.
EDWIN B. WERKHEISER II
CHRISTIAN L. WERNER
JOHN F. WHITFIELD, JR.
ROBERT S. J. WHITTINHAM
ANNE M. R. WIERSGALLA
KENNETH J. WILKINSON
DEMITRA L. WILLIAMSON
JAMES E. WINLAND
JASON P. WRIGHT
CHRISTOPHER M. YOUNG
WALTER D. ZACHERL
MARK M. ZAIS
SEAN L. ZINN
LORI L. P. ZUBIETA
D001295
D001743
D010096
D010156
D010175
D010330
D010347
D010728
D010910
D011007
D011232
D011293
D011311
D011392
D011397
D011530
D011694
D011712
G001129
G001133
G001316
G001345
G001407

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH H. ALBRECHT
JOSEPH M. ALBRIGHT
JAMES G. ALDEN
JORDAN A. ALEXANDER
MATTHEW S. ALLISON
CHRISTOPHER T. ALTAVILLA
EDGAR J. ALVAREZ
RICHARD F. AMADON
MICHAEL T. ANDERS
MARK C. ANDRES

AARON ANGELL
MATTHEW T. ARCHAMBAULT
LUIS R. ARZUAGAMALAVE
JAMES M. ASHBURN
ARIEYEH J. AUSTIN
MICHAEL S. AVEY
MICHAEL T. BAILEY
MICHAEL D. BAJEMA
RODNEY S. BAKER
MATTHEW S. BALINT
JULIE A. BALTEN
ELLIS H. BARNES IV
DALE E. BARNETT, JR.
SAMUEL L. BATTAGLIA
JEFFREY R. BAVIS
MARC P. BECKAGE
CALMER R. BEESON
MARK D. BELINSKY
SUNSET R. BELINSKY
JEREMY D. BELL
LAWSON F. BELL
ANDREW T. BELLOCCHIO
DEREK J. BELLOWS
BENJAMIN A. BENNETT
MICHAEL A. BERDY
LARRY J. BERGERON, JR.
AUGUSTO J. BERNARDO
STEVEN A. BESEDA
STEPHEN M. BESINAIZ
JOSEPH B. BETHEL
ANDREW M. BEYER
DANIEL D. BLACKMON
MATTHEW R. BOCKHOLT
LEE E. BOKMA
ROY L. BOLAR
JOSHUA R. BOOKOUT
JARED D. BORDWELL
KENRIC F. BOURNE
DAVID D. BOWLING
SILAS R. BOWMAN
RYAN P. BOYLE
JEFFREY A. BRACCO
JAMES A. BRADY
KENNETH J. BRAEGER
JEFFERY J. BRAGG
KARST K. BRANDSMA
BRUCE A. BREDLOW
MATTHEW P. BREWSTER
CHRISTOPHER D. BRINGER
KIRK E. BRINKER
WENDY E. BRINSON
BRIAN D. BROBECK
MICHELLE B. BRONELL
COLIN N. BROOKS
MERVIN G. BROTT
ALAN S. BROWN
WADE D. BROWN
ELDRIDGE D. BROWNE
COREY A. BRUNKOW
ROBERT K. BRYANT
FRANK M. BUCHHEIT
TERRENCE H. BUCKEYE
MICHAEL E. BUGAJ
ALEXANDER L. BULLOCK
MATHEW F. BUNCH
DAVID R. BUNKER
JASON T. BURGESS
JEFFREY T. BURGOYNE
JOHN M. BUSHMAN
DARREN W. BUSS
JEFFREY S. BUTLER
TODD S. BZDAFKA
TYLER G. CANTER
STEPHEN E. CAPEHART
BRIAN F. CARLIN
JASON A. CARR
BRUCE J. CARTER
DANIEL A. CASTRO
WILLIAM C. CAVIN
ADAM M. CHALMERS
CHRISTOPHER N. CHAPMAN
JEREMY J. CHAPMAN
CARL A. CHASTEEN
FRITZ B. CHERILUS
DANIEL V. CHERRY
VARMAN S. CHHOEUNG
CURRAN D. CHIDESTER
CRAIG S. CHILDS
KYUNGHO CHO
DOMINIC J. CIARAMITARO
WILLIAM C. CLARK, JR.
BRENT A. CLEMMER
MICHAEL K. COLE
BRENNAN F. COOK
KATRINA S. COOLMAN
AARON K. COOMBS
EDWARD C. COONEY
GEORGE I. CORBARI
ELVIS CORONADO
SEAN D. COULTER
WILLIAM N. CRAIG III
JAMES R. CRANE
MICHAEL P. CRANE
JESSICA L. CRANFORD
KENNETH T. CRAWFORD
ERIC D. CRISPINO
LARRY J. CROUCHER
PAUL B. CULBERSON
JOHN K. CURRY
MATTHEW W. DALTON
JASON S. DAVIS
JASON W. DAVIS
MICHAEL E. DAVIS
ANDREW J. DEATON
BRIAN E. DECKER
TONY L. DEDMOND, JR.
SCOTT M. DELLINGER
MARK J. DEROCCHI
RYAN C. DICKERSON
NICHOLAS J. DICKSON
HANNON A. DIDIER
TIMOTHY J. DILEY
NATHAN T. DIVELBESS
HANSJORG W. DOCHTERMANN
JAYSON B. DODGE
ROBERT J. DUCHAINE
ANTWAN L. DUNMYER
WILLIAM M. DUNN
JAMES R. DUNWOODY
RAFAEL A. DURANMARIOT
SONJA G. DYER
JASON A. EDDY
THOMAS P. EHRHART
RYAN R. EHRLER
ROBERT C. ELDRIDGE
KIMBERLY A. ELNIFF
JAMES R. EMBRY
JASON S. ENYART
GEORGE S. EYSTER V
CHRISTOPHER T. FAHRENBACH
STEPHEN A. FAIRLESS
BRIAN K. FEDDELER
MARK D. FEDEROVICH
LEE S. FENNEMA
RICHARD M. FINFERA
DEREK S. FINISON
BRADLEY C. FOOSE
SHEFFIELD F. FORD III
CHAD R. FOSTER
LAWRENCE E. FOULKS II
PAUL A. FOWLER
ADAM B. FREDERICK
WILL B. FREDS
ALEXANDER S. FUERST
JOHN A. GAGAN
BRADY A. GALLAGHER
ROBERT M. GAMBRELL, JR.
MANUEL R. GARCIA
THOMAS M. GENTER
JOSEPH C. GERACI III
JOHN E. GIANELLONI
JEREMY A. GILKES
JUDSON B. GILLETT
RYAN R. GILLOGLY
KELVIN L. GLASS
PETER C. GLASS
PETER F. GODFRIN, JR.
TIMOTHY A. GODWIN
ANDREW R. GRAHAM
CHARLES B. GRAY
JOSEPH E. GRAY
ROBERT E. GRAY
DEMETRIUS A. GREEN
STUART C. GREER
MICHAEL E. GRISWOLD
JEANMICHEL T. GUERIN
EDDIE J. GUERRERO
ROBERT K. GUNTHER
TRAVIS M. HABHAB
SAMUEL HALL
ERIC R. HANES
MICHAEL A. HARDING
MATTHEW J. HARDMAN
MATTHEW F. HARMON
REGINALD R. HARPER
DAMON K. HARRIS
MATTHEW B. HASH
DAVID J. HASKELL
IRVIN R. HAWKINS
DAVID L. HAYNES
SHAWN M. HEBERT
DANIEL K. HEDMAN
RALPH R. HEIDEL, JR.
TODD W. HEINTZELMAN
ROBERT J. HELLNER III
BRIAN J. HENDERSON
MARK E. HEROLD
BRIAN L. HERZIK
WILLIAM O. HICKOK
AARON T. HILL, JR.
JOHN E. HILL
MARK R. HIMES
JOSEPH E. HISSIM
RUSSELL G. J. HOGAN, JR.
CARSON S. HOKE
TODD W. HOOK
BARRY L. HORSEY
BRIAN C. HOWARD
MATTHEW R. HOWELL
JAMES D. HOYMAN
ANTHONY W. HUDSON
JOSEPH A. HUGH III
JEFFREY M. HUSTON
MATTHEW L. INGRAHAM
DANIEL L. ISABELL
MARK IVEZAJ
JOEL S. JACKSON
JOSEPH A. JACKSON
RATASHA L. JACKSON
ROBERT G. JENKINS, JR.
ROBERT L. JENKINS
MICHAEL C. JENSIK
JENEEN G. JOHNSON
MATTHEW K. JOHNSON
MICHAEL S. JOHNSON
JASON A. JOHNSTON
MICHAEL A. JOHNSTON
LARRY R. JORDAN, JR.
MELVIN D. JUAN
JACKIE K. KAINA
THEODORE J. KAISER
JENNIFER J. KASKER
SUNG K. KATO
CHARLES W. KEAN
WILLIAM R. KEATING
JAMES D. KEMTER
WALTER E. KENT III
GARY A. KERR
DON M. KING
PHILLIP J. KINIERY III
BRYAN G. KIRK
SPRING A. KIVETT
JAMES S. KLEAGER
THEODORE W. KLEISNER
MICHAEL F. KLOEPPER
VANCE J. KLOSINSKI
JASON M. KNIFFEN
TIMOTHY G. KNOTH
ERIK K. KOBER
AARON T. KOHLER
STEPHEN J. KOLOUCH
KEITH A. KRAMER
PETER N. KREMZAR
MICHAEL R. KUHN
TIMOTHY D. LABAHN
ROBERT B. LACKEY
JASON A. LACROIX
MARK A. LASTORIA
DAVID LAW
GERALD S. LAW
AYODELE O. LAWSON
CLINTON L. LEE, JR.
EDDY J. LEE
RANCE A. LEE
BRENT L. LEGREID
JOHN C. LEMAY
RICHARD D. LENCZ
AARON M. LEONARD
HEATHER A. LEVY
MATTHEW P. LILLIBRIDGE
BRENT W. LINDEMAN
RAFAEL E. LINERARIVERA
GARY L. LLOYD
JOSEPH E. LONG
THOMAS C. LONG
MICHAEL S. LONGACRE
ERIC D. LOPEZ
JOHN LOPEZ
BRIAN F. LOVE
CHRISTOPHER T. LOWMAN
KAREN LUGODEAN
KURT W. LUMBERT
MATTHEW W. LUZZATTO
JOHN D. LYBARGER
LARRY J. LYLE, JR.
DOUGLAS LYNCH
CHRISTOPHER S. MAHAFFEY
RICHARD W. MALTBIE, JR.
WINSTON M. MARBELLA
AARON M. MARTIN
ANGEL M. MARTINEZRODRIGUEZ
ALICIA M. MASSON
DAVID N. MAYO, JR.
PETER P. MAZZELLA III
RYAN D. MCAFEE
JAMES S. MCCULLAR
KERNAA D. MCFARLIN III
MATTHEW A. MCGREW
KEVIN E. MCHUGH
TRAVIS L. MCINTOSH
WILLIAM B. MCKANNAY
JOSEPH P. MCLAINE
JOHN A. MCLAUGHLIN
DONALD R. MEEKS, JR.
TROY A. MEISSEL
JUSTIN T. MEISSNER
BILLY MEREDITH, JR.
JOHN D. MILLAY
BRYAN M. MILLER
DANIEL G. MILLER
FRED W. MILLER
HAROLD E. MILLER
JABARI M. MILLER
JEFFREY S. MILLER
YVONNE C. MILLER
KENNETH D. MITCHELL
JACOB A. MONG
JASON G. MONTGOMERY
FERNANDO MONTOYA
ALLEN T. MOORE, JR.
CLAY A. MORGAN
CORNELIUS L. MORGAN
MATTHEW T. MORGAN
RYAN J. MORGAN
JAMERSON W. MOSES
KELVIN E. MOTE
JAMES A. MOYES
MATTHEW W. MULARONI
CHRISTOPHER J. MULLIGAN
JOSEPH D. MUNGER
ALEXANDER C. MURRAY
CHAD T. MURRAY
JEREMY S. MUSHTARE
DARREN E. MUSICO
WILLIAM B. NELSON
JEFFREY J. NERONE
ROBERT P. NESBIT
MICHAEL C. NICHOLSON
DAVID W. NOBLE
DENNIS E. NUTT
JEREMY J. ODONNELL
RICHARD N. OJEDA II
JONATHAN L. OLSON
NATHANIEL J. ORLOWSKI
CHRISTOPHER T. OWEN
STEPHEN W. OWEN
MICHAEL D. OWENS
IAN C. PALMER
JOSEPH H. PARKER
NEIL T. PARKS
GITTIPONG PARUCHABUTR

DAVID J. PASQUALE
SEBASTIAN A. PASTOR
RYAN W. PATNODE
CHRISTOPHER D. PAYANT
CHRISTOPHER A. PAYEUR
BRANDON Y. PAYNE
MIKE L. PEARCE
JEREMY L. PEIFER
ROBERT S. PERRY
STEPHEN T. PETERSON
MATHIEU N. PETRAITIS
STEPHEN C. PHILLIPS
GARY L. PINA
MICHAEL G. POIRIER
JOHN M. POOLE
WILLIAM H. POOLE IV
SANTEL H. POWELL II
WILLIAM R. PRAYNER, JR.
CHARLES E. PRICE
MATTHEW K. PROHM
JAYSON H. PUTNAM
CASEY M. RANDALL
LYNN W. RAY
JAMES V. RECTOR
KENNETH J. REED
JAMES C. REESE
JUSTIN Y. J. REESE
MONICA M. REID
JACQUELINE M. REINI
DANIEL T. REMPFER
JENNIFER A. REYNOLDS
PHILIP W. REYNOLDS
JASON R. RIDGEWAY
BRIAN G. RIDLEY
KURT D. RITTERPUSCH
BENJAMIN RIVERAOTERO
ROBERT A. ROBINSON II
PATRICK M. RODDY, JR.
CHAD M. ROEHRMAN
JAMES J. ROGERS, JR.
MATTHEW B. ROGERS
CURTIS L. ROWLAND, JR.
MICHAEL S. RUPPERT
JAMES D. RYE
ROY C. SABALBORO, JR.
JASON M. SABAT
IVAN SALGADO
CHRISTOPHER A. SAMPLES
JANE W. SANDER
ERIC F. SAUER
DEAN S. SCALETTA
JAMES N. SCHAFER
JEFFREY S. SCHMIDT
MICHAEL D. SCHOENFELDT
BRYAN D. SCHOTT
JOE M. SCHOTZKO
BRADD A. SCHULTZ
CONRAD A. SCHUPAY
MICHAEL S. SCIOLETTI
SEAN A. SCOTT
JAMES D. SCROGIN
RYAN D. SEAGREAVES
JOHN R. SEGO
JOHNNY D. SELLERS, JR.
DARON L. SETTLES
MATTHEW J. SHEIFFER
WILLIAM C. SHEPHERD, JR.
CHADWICK W. SHIELDS
RICHARD K. SHOWALTER
BENJAMIN F. SIEBOLD
THOMAS J. SIEBOLD
PETER M. SITTENAUER
BRIAN S. SMITH
KENNETH E. SMITH
KENRIC M. SMITH
NIEL A. SMITH
RANDALL M. SMITH
THOMAS B. SMITH
NEIL N. SNYDER IV
BRIAN L. SPEARS
GARY J. SPIVEY
NATHAN R. SPRINGER
PAUL W. STAEHELI
KURT N. STEPHAN
JEREMY A. STERMER
DAVID C. STEVENSON
DONALD E. STEWART
RUSSELL C. STEWART
CHAD A. STOVER
JOSHUA U. STRINGER
MICHAEL C. STULL
STEPHEN A. SUHR
JOSEPH A. SULLIVAN
DARREN A. SUNDYS
ERIC R. SWENSON
PATRICK D. SYLVESTRE
ANDREW S. TACKABERRY
FRED W. TANNER
SHANE L. TARRANT
RHETT A. TAYLOR
TIMOTHY A. TERESE
ROBERT M. THELEN
PHILLIP W. THOMAS
RHETT D. THOMPSON
SONNY A. THOMPSON, JR.
JUSTIN L. TICKNOR
KEVIN R. TONER
MICHELLE G. TOPE
KEVIN L. TURPIN
EDWARD S. TWADDELL III
SHAWN M. UMBRELL
SHAWN P. UNDERWOOD
ERIC A. VANEK
JOSE M. VASQUEZ
BENEFSHEH D. VERELL
TONY K. VERENNA
GREGORY S. VINCIGUERRA
SCOTT M. VIRGIL
MICHAEL P. WAGNER
FOY S. WALDEN
EUGENE M. WALDENFELS
LELAND W. WALDRUP II
GREGORY H. WALL
BRIAN L. WALLACE
CHRISTOPHER L. WALLS
EDWARD S. WALTON
WILLIAM J. WARD
CHRISTOPHER A. WASHINGTON
MATTHEW W. WEBER
RYAN K. WELCH
STEVEN B. WELIVER
GABRIEL D. WELLS
MICHAEL R. WEST
JOHN T. WETTACK
ANDREW D. WHISKEYMAN
JOSHUA D. WHITE
JASON M. WHITTEN
SCOTT R. WHITTENBURG
DAVID C. WILLETTE
EDWIN A. WILLIAMS IV
JOHN D. WILLIAMS
SEAN P. WILLIAMS
STEVEN M. WILLIAMS
TROY A. WILLIAMS
JAMES WILLS
JOHN M. WILSON
KEITH W. WILSON
JEFFERY E. WINEGAR
MATTHEW H. WINTERS
JEFFREY L. WITHERS II
CHRISTOPHER L. WONG
ADLAI B. WOOD
STEVEN A. WOOD
EARL D. WRIGHT, JR.
RYAN B. WYLIE
JASON A. YANDA
JAMES R. YASTRZEMSKY
PHILIP A. YOUNG
TIMOTHY M. ZAMORA
JUAN C. ZAPATA
MARK C. ZIMMERMAN
MICHAEL A. ZOPFI
D001284
D001378
D002253
D005492
D005731
D006286
D010055
D010251
D010369
D010537
D010675
D010975
D011309

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

PHILIP B. BAGROW
CARL M. BARNES
CARLA M. BARRY
JOSEPH S. BLAIR
LYNN W. CHRISTENSEN
BRYAN K. CRITTENDON
MICHAEL E. FOSKETT
TIMOTHY D. GAULT
BRANDON S. HARDING
PATRICK S. JOYNER
JOSEPH KOCH
STEVEN D. MILLS
RICHARD H. RYAN, JR.
BENNETT C. SANDFORD
CLIFFORD A. STUART
DAVID B. THAMES
DAVID M. TODD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

TANYA CRUZ
KATHLEEN A. ELKINS
NELL O. EVANS
BRIAN J. HALLIDEN
JAMES R. HOFFMAN
JASON L. JONES
THERON R. KORSAK
JASON M. LEVY
JEROD L. MARKLEY
ANNE Y. MARKS
WAYNE A. MIANI, JR.
MEGAN K. SMITH
SARAH A. STANCATI
SCOTT W. THOMAS
JEFFREY G. TRANSTROM
WILLIAM H. WEILAND
DANIEL WERNER
EDWARD K. WESTBROOK II
CHRISTOPHER M. WILLIAMS
JEANINE B. WOMBLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

RENE J. ALOVA
PETER R. BARNDT
THOMAS E. BERCHTOLD
TROY W. BROOKS
JEFFREY D. DOMARK
MARTIN E. EVERS
JENNIFER E. FERREIRA
MICHAEL D. FERREIRA
BRIAN M. GILLEN
JAMES L. HARRIS III
JEFFREY L. HOCKETT
JOHN B. HOYOS
BRADLEY E. JONES
NIMA A. KHORASSANI
ROBERT M. LAUGHLIN
THU N. LUU
JAMES H. MACDOWELL
MICHAEL T. MOONEY
ZHENGSHI SONG
JAMES M. THOMPSON, JR.
JOYCE Y. TURNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JAMES ALGER
WILLIAM R. BUTLER
JASON CHUNG
JASON A. CROSBY
BOBBY D. DASHER, JR.
STEPHEN J. FICHTER
JOSHUA J. GAMEZ
LUKE B. GREENE
LUIS A. HOLKON, JR.
JEFFREY D. JASINSKI
DAVID M. JAYNE
CARL V. KIRAR
JASON G. KRANZ
WARREN R. LEBEAU
BENJAMIN D. LEPPARD
BRIAN J. LONGBOTTOM
MICHAEL W. MENO, JR.
NATHAN R. PAUKOVITS
BRENT C. PAUL
ANGEL L. SANTIAGO
JESUS M. SANTIAGO
GRIFFIN K. STAUFFER
JOEL R. STRAUS
OMARR E. TOBIAS
SUSANNE M. WIENRICH
MARCUS E. WILLIAMSON
WILLIAM E. WINDUS
JASON N. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

CHRISTOPHER W. ABBOTT
ZIAD T. ABOONA
MARIA L. BAREFIELD
KEITH M. BASS
DANIEL E. BIBLE
KELLY M. BOARDWAY
JORI S. BRAJER
DAVID M. BURKE
THOMAS F. BURKE III
JOHN H. CALLAHAN
SCOTT D. COON
KATHLEEN K. COOPERMAN
MICHAEL J. GREGONIS
JAMES R. HAGEN
BRIAN C. HATCH
HEATHER D. HELLWIG
MARC D. HERWITZ
S. J. KENTON
MICHAEL J. KLEMANN
ANGELICA A. KLINSKI
DAVID G. LANG
COREY J. LITTEL
JOHN L. MELTON
JAIME L. MONTILLA
RAYMOND C. NAIRN
MARCELLA R. ODEN
NICHOLE A. OLSON
HENRY L. PHILLIPS IV
MARY A. PILIWALE
MARGARET M. READ
LESLIE E. RIGGS, JR.
THOMAS E. SATHER
LORENZO TARPLEY, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MARY R. ANKER
JESSICA S. BAIN
ERIC J. BOPP
GARRY P. CLOSAS
CATHERINE B. CORBETT
LAURI T. DEWITT
TIMOTHY S. DRILL
MELINDA R. EWING
TRACY L. FAHEY
KEITH L. FERGUSON
JOHN A. FLEMING
CHRISTINA E. FRIX
MARIA P. FUENTEBELLA
URSULA V. GALVEZ
RALPH J. GARGIULO
KAREN M. GRAY
STEPHEN L. GUIDRY
ANNE S. H. HOLLIS
JEREMY M. KILDAY
BRIAN A. KING
ROBERT W. KREJCI

RICHARD B. LAWRENCE
JOHN E. LENAHAN
JEANNE M. LEWANDOWSKI
LORRIE L. MEYER
TARA K. MOORE
JAMES R. MORRIS
ERLINA P. NAVAL
REBECCA L. NAVARRETE
KATHERINE E. NOEL
THOMAS OLIVERO
JASON T. PENFOLD
MARY E. PHILLIPS
PROTEGENIE REED
DORA O. REID
BRENDA K. RESETER
MATTHEW D. SEYMOUR
DETRIK F. SIMMON
VORACHAI SRIBANDITMONGKOL
ANDREW D. TARRANT
MARK A. THOMAS
CRAIG T. VASS
ALLECIA V. WEBSTER
WALTER D. WILLIAMSON
JENNIFER M. ZICKO
GEORGINA L. ZUNIGA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LILLIAN A. ABUAN
DON N. ALLEN, JR.
CIELO I. ALMANZA
SEAN M. ANDREWS
AARON K. AYERS
SPENCER L. BAKER
WILLIAM J. BARICH
WILLIAM T. BENHAM
PAUL R. BENISHEK
MATTHEW L. BOLLS
DANIEL D. BROWN
MICHAEL S. CARL
VICTOR J. CINTRONNATAL
DOYNE D. CLEM
ANTHONY R. COCA
ROBERT M. CORLEY
JAYSON L. CRAMER
RUSSELL A. CZACK
MARTIN L. EDMONDS
JASON W. ENDRESS
MATTHEW J. FAHNER
MATTHEW GEISER
LA H. A. GRAHAM
MATTHEW J. JACOBS
CHRISTOPHER T. KOVACK
MICHELE M. LAPORTE
ROBERT S. MCMASTER
JEFFREY S. MILLS
ERNUEL MIRANDAROSARIO
THOMAS P. MOORE
RYAN M. PERRY
SAMUEL T. RISER
CAMERON W. ROGERS
DAVID M. ROZZELL
AARON B. SIKES
SCOTT D. STAHL
JOSEPH B. SYMMES, JR.
PHOEBE U. TAMAYO
RONALD K. TERRY
ELIZABETH A. TRAVIS
NOLASCO L. VILLANUEVA
MICHELLE M. WILLIAMS
MICHAEL R. WILSON
JAMES Y. WONG
GLENN A. WRIGHT
JEFFERY S. YOUNG
CHRISTOPHER R. ZEGLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ERIN G. ADAMS
AFSHIN K. AFARIN
MICHAEL J. ARNOLD
ANGELA M. BACHMANN
TIMOTHY W. BARKDOLL
RHETT A. BARRETT
MARGARET A. BAYARD
ERIKA S. BEARDIRVINE
BRENT R. BECKER
MONTE K. BELL
RANDY S. BELL
RYAN A. BELL
WILLIAM E. BENNETT
CATHERINE A. BORJA
STEPHANIE A. BRAGG
MATTHEW L. BRECKENRIDGE
KIMBERLY L. BROOM
COLEMAN J. BRYAN, JR.
CYNTHIA M. BRYANT
CHRISTOPHER J. BURNS
CRAIG G. CARROLL
JONATHAN L. CHADWICK
RICHARD C. CHILDERS
CHONG H. CHOE
JEAN CHRETIEN
DOUGLAS J. CRAGIN
KANTI R. CRAIG
COLIN V. CRICKARD
SAMYA V. CRUZ
JENNIFER A. CURRY
ANJA DABELIC
JASON G. DAILY
RUPA J. DAINER
MARK N. DAMIANO
ERIC C. DEUSSING
HAMMA A. DIALLO
GLENN A. DOWLING
JOSH L. DUCKWORTH
ERIN E. DUFFY
JASON M. DURBIN
KENDALL M. EGAN
KELLY O. ELMORE
CHRISTOPHER S. ENNEN
GORDON L. FIFER
DAVID B. FOX
GREGORY H. FREITAG, JR.
CORY P. GACONNET
ROGER M. GALINDO
SAM W. GAO
WENDY C. GAZA
HAROLD J. GELFAND
THERESA M. GILLE
JONATHAN S. GLASS
CHRISTINA J. GONDUSKY
JUSTIN S. GREEN
MIGUEL A. GUTIERREZ
ROBERT J. HACKWORTH
KENT S. HANDFIELD
JOHN D. HARRAH, JR.
NATHAN C. HAWKES
DANIEL B. HAWLEY
AMY E. HENNING
CAMILLE A. HENNINGER
MARION C. HENRY
DAVID D. HESSERT
JOHN A. HODGSON
MERLENE V. HORAN
NICOLE D. HURST
ADNAN A. JAIGIRDAR
ELLIOT M. JESSIE
MICHAEL G. JOHNSTON
JEFFREY M. KANG
MICHEL J. KEARNS
MICHAEL L. KENT
BUDDY G. KOZEN
DAVID A. LALLI
MATTHEW W. LAWRENCE
JEFFREY L. LESTER
NELLE A. LINZ
PETER N. LOMBARD
JOSEPH R. LYNCH
MARCEL A. MACGILVRAY
VINH Q. MAI
MAUREEN F. MCCLENAHAN
SEAN A. MCKAY
EUGENE A. MILDER
JEFFREY H. MILLEGAN
ANDREW G. MORTIMER
JOSHUA P. MOSS
JUSTIN R. MOY
DAVID P. MULLIN
ANDREW D. MULLINS
JAMES C. NEDEROSTEK
MATTHEW NEEDLEMAN
CORMAC J. OCONNOR
JOSEPH A. ODANIEL, JR.
ROWENA E. PAPSON
BRETT J. PARTRIDGE
JOHN A. PAYTON
LISA A. PETERSON
JULIO PETILON
THOMAS A. PLUIM
SUNEIL R. RAMCHANDANI
JEFFREY C. RICKS
BENJAMIN RODRIGUEZ
SHERRI L. RUDINSKY
NEIL N. S. SALDUA
KRISTIAN E. SANCHACK
MICHAEL G. SANTOMAURO
PAUL D. SARGENT
CRAIG I. SCHRANZ
RICHARD H. SCHRECKENGAUST
ROBERT M. SELVESTER
TARA M. SHERIDAN
PETER D. SNYDER
ROBERT A. STATEN
JOHN H. STEELY
GEORGIA A. G. STOKER
THEOPHIL A. STOKES
DARYL J. SULIT
MATTHEW D. TADLOCK
MICHAEL S. TERMINI
KATHY D. TIEU
MICHAEL M. TILLER
BRENDAN T. TRIBBLE
MICHAEL S. TRIPP
DAVID L. TROWBRIDGE
DANIEL J. TRUEBA, JR.
TOMMY H. TSE
PAULETTE R. TUCCIARONE
IAN L. VALERIO
HEATHER J. VENTURA
BINH V. VO
SCOTT C. WALLACE
BENJAMIN D. WALRATH
BRUCE A. WATERMAN
REBECCA M. WEBSTER
DANIEL R. WEIS
DYLAN E. WESSMAN
SHARESE M. WHITE
MICHAEL E. WILLIAMS
EUGENE K. WILSON III
TARA B. WILSON
LUKE A. ZABROCKI

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 9, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

JENNIFER A. DORSEY, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DANIEL R. RUSSEL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS).

GEOFFREY R. PYATT, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO UKRAINE.

TULINABO SALAMA MUSHINGI, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BURKINA FASO.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL PULINSKI AND STEPHANIE URBANCZYK ON THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Daniel B. Pulinski and Mrs. Stephanie M. Urbanczyk, lifelong residents of Lackawanna, on the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary.

The couple was wed on August 10, 1963 in a ceremony at St. Michael's Church, now Queen of Angels, in Lackawanna, New York.

Daniel attended St. Barbara's elementary school and St. Francis High School, after which he nobly enlisted in the United States Army. After his service, he worked in the Bethlehem Steel plant, rising through the ranks to become a foreman. A dedicated family man, Daniel worked several more jobs to support his wife and children after the plant closed. He retired after working as a custodian in the auto tech division of Erie Community College.

Stephanie attended St. Michael's elementary school and Lackawanna High School. After completing her education, she became a secretary for a Buffalo insurance company. While starting a family, she became a stay-at-home mother for a few years, returning to work at Hills Department Store. The store became Ames, where she rose to the position of Manager. Stephanie continues to work to this day, currently at Dollar General.

Daniel and Stephanie raised four children together, Anita, Ronald, Denise, and Daniel. They are grandparents to eight beautiful grandchildren: Stephanie, Alanna, James, Rebecca, Danielle, Brandon, Nicholas, and Matthew.

The couple enjoys spending family time with their grandchildren and traveling across the globe with their many friends. They continue to reside in Lackawanna, and are still active in Queen of Angels Church and the Buffalo Polish community.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to offer my sincerest congratulations to Daniel, Stephanie, and their family on this most joyous occasion. I ask my colleagues to join me to acknowledge their commitment to each other as they celebrate their Golden Anniversary, and offer our best wishes for continued happiness.

TRIBUTE ON THE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF MR. AND MRS. ANDREW SEWELL

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute on the occasion of the 50th wedding anniversary of Andrew and Nancy Sewell, my beloved parents who celebrated this special event on July 2, 2013. This phenomenal couple celebrates love, marriage and family on this momentous occasion that began on June 15, 1963. They instilled family values to so many others as well to me. This golden wedding anniversary is a special day and it marks a half of a century of commitment and love for one another. We honor this milestone of marriage and a life well lived together.

Their love story begins with the attraction of an outstanding football player in college who was Captain of the team to his beautiful classmate Nancy. My father says lovingly that my mother met him on the steps of the library and that she barely gave him the time of day. He remembers being drawn to her outer beauty as well as inner beauty noting her friendly spirit. He also said that she was studious. My mother recalls that my father was ''the jock of the campus'' and especially remembers that he was athletic and gregarious.

After graduating college, their romance blossomed in the summer of 1961 when Andrew was recruited as the Head Coach for Councill Training School in Huntsville, Alabama. His future bride was already employed at the school as the Head Librarian. When Andrew saw Nancy in the Library on the school tour before he signed the contract he immediately knew that he wanted to work there telling the principal yes, he would take the job!

The romance led to a Valentine's Day marriage proposal in 1962 as Andrew asked for Nancy's hand in marriage at the Old American Legion Club in Huntsville, Alabama. Prior to the proposal as was custom, my father asked permission for my mother's hand in marriage from my grandfather, Reverend Tom Gardner, Jr. of Lowndes County, Alabama. This tradition of respect for elders in our family continues today. The Gardner family is a family of Christian religious leaders and this value of spirituality permeates our family life as my father is Catholic and my mother is Methodist.

For 50 years, this exceptional couple has built a life of love together. They were married on June 15, 1956 and have served as a pillar to the communities where they have lived. Their first home was in Huntsville, Alabama and my mother was the Head Librarian and my father was the Head Coach for Councill Training School. Their leadership, values, commitment to community, work, and family are demonstrable through their actions and accomplishments.

As first born child of my parents, I am pleased to say that while Coach Sewell wanted a future football player, he was thrilled with the addition of his ''cheerleader'' on New Year's Day in 1965. During this time my father was recruited to return to his beloved R. B. Hudson High School as Head Basketball Coach and Assistance Football, Track and Baseball Coach. Nancy became the Assistant Librarian and history teacher at R. B. Hudson High School.

Life continued to blossom as my parents became the parents of twins on July 21, 1967. My parents encouraged and supported their children to maximize their potential, to achieve excellence, to have a strong work ethic and to be a blessing to others. My parents have often said that to those who are blessed it is their obligation to be a blessing to others. Through their inspiration, motivation, prayers, and strength my brothers are college level athletic coaches and I am serving my 2nd term in Congress as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. They cherish three beautiful grandchildren: Neshambia, Taylor and Carter. Neshambia is a sophomore at the University of Alabama, Taylor will be in 6th grade and Carter will be in 3rd grade this year.

Andrew and Nancy Sewell continue to be excellent role models that lead by example. They reach out to family, friends and community teaching their children and now grandchildren the importance of doing the same. This becomes part of the fabric of our lives, interwoven into who the children are and what they will become. Families work together to solve problems, and they believe in the importance of passing their values and skills on to the next generation.

Andrew's successful and productive career as a Coach continued for 33 years in Huntsville and Selma, Alabama. Nancy, in addition to being Head Librarian in the school system, she was the first African-American woman elected to the Selma City Council, serving 12 years; the Alpha Kappa Alpha (AKA) South Eastern Regional Director for 4 years; and AKA International Secretary for 4 years.

Marriage is a bond that lasts a lifetime. For my parents it is based on a foundation of love, spiritual belief, common goals and family values. Their love story nourishes one in understanding that this sacred union brought together their hearts, minds and souls. The laughter, love and joy continue today as we acknowledge with a grateful heart the 50th Wedding Anniversary of my parents, Andrew and Nancy Sewell.

On behalf of the State of Alabama, and this nation, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the Golden Anniversary of my parents who are extraordinary Americans and Alabama treasures!

HONORING CHIEF TODD HOUDE'S RETIREMENT

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Cherry Valley Police Chief Todd M. Houde, and to recognize his service to the Cherry Valley community.

Chief Houde began his career in law enforcement as a deputy sheriff with the Winnebago County Sherriff's Office in 1981 after graduating from Memphis State University with a degree in criminal justice. He became a full-

time police officer with the Cherry Valley Police Department in August 1986.

Throughout his years with the department, he has protected the Cherry Valley Community through his work on multiple task forces. From 1987 to 1990, Chief Houde was assigned to the State Line Area Narcotics Task Force and in 1995 he was assigned to the Northern Illinois Auto Theft Task Force.

On June 28, Police Chief Todd M. Houde retired from the Cherry Valley Police Department after thirty-two years of service.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 16th District of Illinois, I wish to express our deepest thanks to Chief Houde for devoting his life's work to protecting and serving his community.

HONORING LT. COL. ADAM J. KIMMICH, U.S. ARMY

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the promotion of Major Adam J. Kimmich, to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

This Thursday, July 11, 2013, it will be my great honor to preside over his promotion ceremony and celebrate his exceptional accomplishment of service and dedication to this great nation.

Though he currently works as an Operations Officer at US Special Operations Command, Kimmich has served in many capacities throughout the world. In 1997, he began his career in the Army as an Infantry Officer at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii, and has since been promoted to positions including Rifle Platoon Leader, Assistant Battalion Operations Officer, Commander, Operations Officer in Special Operations Command, and Battalion Operations Officer in the Philippines, South Asia, and Southeast Asia. Kimmich also served in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

His awards and decorations include the Combat Infantryman's Badge, Bronze Star, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, multiple Army Commendation Medals and Army Achievement Medals, as well as the Iraq Campaign Medal, GWOT Campaign and GWOT Expeditionary Medals, and 5 Overseas Service Ribbons. He has earned the Special Forces Tab, Ranger Tab, Parachutists Badge, Air Assault Badge, and Expert Infantryman's Badge.

Adam's parents, John and Barbara Kimmich of Kennesaw, Georgia, should be proud to know that their guidance has led their son to stand for the principles this country cherishes most, and the freedom of its people. His path has not been easy, but Adam's valor and sense of duty have led him to overcome obstacles that most of us could never imagine.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 11th District of Georgia, I extend my deepest gratitude to Lieutenant Colonel Kimmich for devoting his life to upholding the Constitution of the United States and making the world a safer place. Again, I congratulate him on this well-deserved promotion.

HONORING RICHARD MICHALSKI

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary career of my friend Richard Michalski. Rich is retiring after over 40 years of service with the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAM).

I had the pleasure of first meeting Rich when I was elected to Congress nearly 20 years ago. I have always appreciated his honesty, straightforward approach, and wise counsel.

Rich was first initiated into IAM Local Lodge 1916 and worked as a welder at General Electric in Milwaukee, Wisconsin in 1968. He held several positions in his local lodge, including steward, chairman of the bargaining committee, and president.

Rich has always been involved at the grass roots level, volunteering many hours promoting the rights and representation of all workers.

Rich became the Director of the Legislative and Political Action Department at IAM in 1992. In this capacity, he was involved on a daily basis with legislation that affects working men and women.

Rich joined the ranks of the IAM's Executive Board as the General Vice President in charge of IAM Headquarters in 2006.

I want to thank Rich for his lifelong commitment to supporting labor rights, promoting fair trade and boosting U.S. exports. I congratulate Rich and wish him the best in his much deserved retirement.

IN HONOR OF ALAN BALDRIDGE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 80th birthday of Alan Baldridge, a leading environmental conservationist, naturalist, educator and dedicated community activist in my Central California Coast district.

Alan Baldridge and his wife Sheila immigrated to the United States from England in 1962 so that Alan could work as a history and literature reference librarian in Portland Oregon's public library. Four years later, the couple moved to Pacific Grove, CA to allow Alan to take over the library at Stanford University's Hopkins Marine Station. Through his tireless work as a librarian, Alan has been able to use his expansive scientific expertise to inspire and assist countless marine biologists and researchers. An expert on ecology, biology and conservation Alan wrote The Bird Year published in 1980; co-authored the definitive book on Monterey Bay birds, and co-authored Gray Whales in 1991 and 2006.

Alan's careful observation of seabirds and marine mammals made him not only an educator and librarian, but also a naturalist and local authority on the incredible array of animals that fly, swim and wash up on the shores of Monterey Bay. He has served as a naturalist on a number of Stanford alumni trips to the Sea of Cortex, Alaska and ice sheets off eastern Canada. Alan has readily shared his vast knowledge with countless members of the community, including scientists, students, government officials and reporters. Throughout his time in Monterey, Alan served as a liaison to the fishing community, and many records of rare seabirds first came to the attention of researches and birders alike through Alan's efforts to acquire and pass on information. Alan's other work as a Regional Editor for Audubon Field Notes/American Birds for Northern California, seabird editor for the Middle Pacific Coast Region for 12 seasons and member of the editorial board for the first three volumes of California Birds, made Alan an integral contributor to the birding community.

A long-time leading environmental activist, Alan has utilized his expertise in order to support conservation movements in the area. A leading advocate for establishing the Elkhorn Slough National Marin Estuarine Reserve, the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District, the Monarch Grove Sanctuary and an instrumental assest in raising funds for the construction of the Harold A. Miller Library of Marine Biology, Alan's dedication to protecting the marine environment of his community has been unrivaled.

After 23 years as librarian at Hopkins Marine Station, Alan retired in 1994. He and his wife Sheila continue to promote educational efforts to create an understanding of the marine environment of their community.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in wishing Alan Baldridge well and to thank him for his invaluable and tireless work on behalf of his community.

CELEBRATING BILL GRAY

SPEECH OF

HON. DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 2013

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked and saddened to hear of the sudden and untimely passing of former Congressman William "Bill" Gray, a former member of the Congressional Black Caucus who represented Philadelphia in the House of Representatives for many years in stellar fashion.

William Gray was a trailblazer for African Americans and other minorities in Congress, an inspirational pastor, a persuasive advocate for education of minorities and the poor and for causes where often others feared to tread. He was a steadfast friend to countless of us and the epitome of a servant-leader.

My first recollection of meeting him personally was poolside at the then St. John Virgin Grande Hotel with his and my long time friends Orville and Julie Kean. He had a home in St. John at the time.

We talked late into the night and he often referred to me as a St. Croix Nationalist many times after that. I was also always proud of his calling me his Congresswoman, even after he sold the St. John home. And it was just days before he was suddenly taken from us that in the Members Dining room he remarked that he would be visiting our Islands in the near future. Sadly that will not happen.

Although we did not serve together, I consider that it was a privilege to be able to work with him on many of the issues he championed as only he could—from the United Negro College Fund, to his work on telecommunications advances or on relations with the foreign governments he represented. Whenever he called we responded because he was always there to support us when needed. We never even had to ask.

We will miss exuberant presence and his booming raspy voice, but not just the sound. What the CBC, I, our Nation and the world will truly miss is the strong unrelenting voice that he was for a better country and world and for opportunity, equality and justice for all. We have lost a great public servant.

To his son Justin who was always with him, his wife Andrea and the other children, his church family and the people of Philadelphia who loved him dearly on behalf of my family, staff and the people of the Virgin Islands I extend my condolences. We are a better place that he lived. May he rest in peace.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIE E. ROBINSON, JR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable, well-rounded, and highly driven young man, Mr. Willie E. Robinson, Jr. (affectionately known as J.R.)

Born to Mr. and Mrs. Willie E. Robinson, Sr. and Vickie Robinson on February 3, 1988, J.R. was raised in the small, close-knit town of Bolton, Mississippi. As a child, he was an outstanding young man who was deeply involved in his community and church home. He regularly attended Hill of Zion Missionary Baptist Church and was active in Sunday school and various other auxiliaries.

J.R. was not only a well-mannered young man, but also exceptionally bright. His academic ambitions were accomplished and exceeded during his matriculation at Clinton High School, where he graduated in May 2006. He furthered his education at the University of Southern Mississippi (USM) in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, ultimately receiving his B.A. in Administration of Justice and a M.S. in Economic Development. During his time at USM, he was well known among his peers, faculty and administrators. He became Student Government Association President and also served as president of the Mississippi Student Government Board of President's Council. While serving on the council, he was instrumental in implementing a number of policies geared towards assisting the student body with their matriculation at USM, including reducing the cost of textbooks through a consorted effort with textbook manufacturers and USM campus officials.

While obtaining his Master's degree, J.R. served as a graduate assistant for the Trent Lott National Center for Excellence in Economic Development and Entrepreneurship. His commitment to the USM campus earned him induction into the Centennial Student Hall of Fame.

In addition to his valuable contributions to USM, J.R.'s passion for helping others reaches far into the surrounding Hattiesburg community. He serves as Guide Right Director, which allows him to mentor over 20 young men. Many in the area attribute the economic growth of the area to J.R. because of his skillfulness in helping to coordinate the placement of a General Dynamics facility, which brought 250 jobs to the community. He also was instrumental in negotiations for fiscal expansion of an existing company in Hattiesburg, leading to the retention of 120 jobs and the addition to 10 within that company. As a result of his hard work and dedication, he was named "2012 Up and Coming Black Professional" in the Greater Hattiesburg area.

Currently, J.R. serves on the Board of Directors of the Mississippi Young Professionals, to which he was appointed by Governor Phil Bryant. He is also employed as the Business Development Director with Area Development Partnership in Hattiesburg, Mississippi. He is an active member of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. and continues to dedicate time to help those in need in his growing community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Willie E. Robinson, Jr. for his remarkable contributions as a young adult to the Greater Hattiesburg area.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 305 on suspending the Rules and passing H.R. 1341, the Financial Competitive Act of 2013, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANCIS RESTIVO

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as our nation celebrated its liberty and independence last week, a champion of liberty has passed away in our home community of Toledo, Ohio. Judge Francis "Buddy" Restivo passed from this life at the age of 91 on July 2, 2013. We extend deepest sympathy, heartfelt prayers, and gratitude from our community to his family for sharing him with us these many years. Truly, he was a generous, kind, and wise "buddy" to all who knew him. His gleeful presence never failed to inspire anyone who met him. His smile was infectious, his humor ever-flowing.

Judge Restivo came from humble beginnings yet graduated from Toledo's Central Catholic High School and the University of Toledo, earning his law degree. The economic circumstances from which he arose in his early years were not easy and then he served during World War II, where he was a member of the Air Force 136th Radio Intelligence Squadron. He married his wife, Jane, with whom he celebrated 70 years of marriage. Together they built a strong family and raised four children.

Buddy Restivo dedicated his life to public service and to our community. He was an assistant Ohio attorney general and assistant Lucas County prosecutor. He served on Toledo City Council in 1957 to 1960, and then served as solicitor for Sylvania, Walbridge, and Northwood. In 1971 Ohio Governor John Gilligan appointed him to the Toledo municipal court. He was elected later that year, and re-elected to six-year terms in 1973 and 1979. In 1980, he was elected to a vacancy on Lucas County Common Pleas Court and re-elected in 1982. He retired in 1986 and worked until 2000 as a visiting judge and as a hearing officer for mental health commitment cases for Lucas County Probate Court.

Judge Restivo was a fair and compassionate judge with a keen understanding of both people and the law. Lucas County Probate Court Jack Puffenberger said of Judge Restivo, he "was considerate of everyone in his courtroom. He was an excellent judge. He had good legal knowledge and he knew people and he just knew how to be fair. He was a great mentor . . ." Toledo lawyer Jerome Phillips perhaps expressed it best when he said, "I would classify him as a people's judge. He had a wonderful understanding of people and how to try to deal with the problems they had."

After retirement, though he kept in touch with the lives of colleagues and the law, his focused turned to fishing, family, and University of Toledo basketball. His son explained, "He went on numerous fishing trips with family members. He was a big UT Rockets fan, especially basketball. He had season tickets probably 40 years."

If the measure of a man can be counted by the lives he touched, then Judge Restivo was a great man indeed. He has shared his love of life, good heart, and generous spirit as husband, father, grandfather, and great grandfather for his wonderful family, as well as our community and country. He shall be missed by all who knew the pleasure of his company. How fortunate each of us is to have known him, been blessed by his happy spirit, love of life, respect for the "common man," and his even-handed dispensing of the law. His good measure lifted us all. May his family and friends draw strength and comfort from his example of living life to its fullest as he helped countless others along life's way. His life made us all better as people and as a community.

HONORING MS. KAVONYA WALKER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a student making a difference in her school West Tallahatchie High School, Ms. KaVonya Walker.

The difference KaVonya is making in her school comes in the form of art. Her home town is Webb, MS. It's a small community of about five hundred citizens. Like many other small rural towns, it too has its challenges to meet the needs of its citizens in more ways than one. The one I am speaking of is recreational which is why she turned to art when it comes to KaVonya making a difference. Art

is an expression, it's a way to release, relax, communicate, and to beautify. And that is what KaVonya does, she's an artist. She turns eyesores into beautiful eye pieces to look at. Right now she has been given the charge to lead the effort at her school to paint murals to represent the school spirit. This meant presenting herself as a leader in a way that other students would follow and listen to. She had the task of all the preliminary planning, choosing fellow artists that could help her complete this awesome responsibility. This project is scheduled to be completed May 1, 2013. KaVonya has plans to attend college to study art. She says, "Life is too short to not pursue your dreams. I dream of art, academic achievement, and completing my college degree . . ." I wish her much success.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. KaVonya Walker for her current active role as a student making a difference as an artist.

CONGRATULATIONS TO U.S. BANK

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and offer congratulations to U.S. Bank, who was awarded the prestigious Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award from the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESGR) organization.

The Freedom Award was instituted in 1996 to recognize exceptional support of the U.S. Armed Forces from the employer community, and is the highest honor given by the U.S. government to employers for outstanding support of employees who serve in the National Guard and Reserve.

U.S. Bank is one of only 15 honorees out of nearly 2,900 nominated companies. Through U.S. Bank's companywide initiative called Proud to Serve, thousands of veterans have been hired and supported over the past five years.

The numbers are impressive. U.S. Bank committed to hiring 1,000 service members and veterans between 2012 and 2013 and surpassed its 2012 goal by hiring 597 new veterans.

Minnesota is home to many great corporate citizens like U.S. Bank who are dedicated to supporting those who have made great sacrifices to defend freedom, liberty and our country. Congratulations to U.S. Bank for receiving the Employer Support Freedom Award and thank you for your support of our nation's veterans.

A TRIBUTE TO FLOYD SEARS, A LEADER OF THE MILITARY RETIREE GRASSROOTS MOVEMENT

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Floyd Sears of Ocean Springs, Mississippi. Floyd passed away on June 5, 2013 at the age of 82.

Floyd Sears was a national leader of grassroots military retirees who achieved remarkable legislative success in righting what they knew was a wrong. He represented the best of the military retirees whom we all represent.

I am grateful to Floyd Sears, a great American citizen in the truest sense, who joined the military in his youth when duty called and devoted his career to defending our freedoms, and then, in his retirement, exercised those freedoms to help make our country a better place.

Health care for our military community is a priority for me as it was for Floyd, and it is a privilege to represent the district that is home to the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center. Walter Reed is the crown jewel of military medicine, serving our country's active and retired military and especially the wounded who have suffered greatly in the most difficult circumstances. Congress has provided the resources that were necessary to ensure that the new Walter Reed can provide world-class health care to our uniformed service personnel.

However, Floyd's generation did not always receive that level of attention. Floyd became a leader in the effort to restore retiree health care benefits that his generation of enlistees was losing. These individuals had been promised health care upon their retirement when they enlisted in the military services in their youth. But those benefits were pulled out from under them when they retired after a career of at least 20 years due to unintended consequences of legislative and administrative changes in military health care.

Floyd recognized how these legal changes were stripping him and his colleagues of the retiree health care benefits that they earned and richly deserved. Nearly 20 years ago, he began his personal crusade to amend the law and restore those promised benefits. What began as one man sending letters to his local newspaper and representative in Congress became a nationwide grassroots effort connected by the Internet. Ultimately, Floyd, his good friend Jim Whittington and others, on behalf of their grassroots army, inspired the introduction of the "Keep Our Promise to America's Military Retirees Act," which led to the enactment of Tricare for Life, a great leap towards fulfilling Floyd's dream of full restoration of the benefits he had been promised.

Floyd never intended to draw attention to himself. But with his passing we can admire what one person can accomplish when he puts his mind, his heart, and his energy into it.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our gratitude for the extraordinary contributions that Floyd Sears, a truly great American, made to our nation.

HONORING MODESTO REGIONAL FIRE AUTHORITY CHIEF GARY HINSHAW

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Modesto Regional Fire Authority Chief Gary Hinshaw, who announced his retirement after serving 35 years in the fire service.

Currently serving as the Fire Chief of the Modesto Regional Fire Authority, Gary Hinshaw also serves as the Fire Warden and Assistant Director of Emergency Services for Stanislaus County. Prior to joining the County team in June 2002, Gary enjoyed a long-term career in the fire service starting as a wildland firefighter with the United States Forest Service in 1973 on the Stanislaus National Forest. His first full-time position as a firefighter was with the Modesto Fire Department, beginning on November 21, 1978. He remained in that position for two years and was promoted through the ranks; four years as a Fire Engineer, seven years as a Captain, four years as a Battalion Chief and nine years as a Division Chief. He was appointed Interim Fire Chief of Modesto Regional Fire Authority on April 20, 2012.

During his career, Chief Hinshaw has championed the concept of a close and effective working relationship between the fire service and the pre-hospital medical community; he served as the Chair of the Stanislaus County Emergency Medical Care Committee.

Chief Hinshaw's assignments within the Office of Emergency Services have included: Chair of Stanislaus County Domestic Terrorism Task Force, President of Stanislaus County Fire Chief's Association, Operational Area Coordinator for the Stanislaus Operational Area Council, Stanislaus County Mutual Aid Coordinator, Operational Coordinator for Stanislaus County Arson Task Force, Region IV Representative to Cal EMA Standardized Emergency Management, Administrator of the Homeland Security Grant Programs, and Manager Stanislaus County Emergency Operations Center.

Chief Hinshaw has been involved in numerous instructional opportunities within the community, including instructor at Modesto Junior College Fire Science Program, County Public Information Officer Training, Weapons of Mass Destruction for First Responder Agencies, Incident Command System/Standardized Emergency Management System, High Rise Strategy and Tactics, and Strike Team Leader.

Chief Hinshaw has been recognized by his colleagues with many awards and accolades. He is well respected on a state and local level in the fire service and CalEMA arenas.

Chief Hinshaw is married and has a daughter, a son-in-law and a grandson. He is active in his church and enjoys photography, boating and the outdoors.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending the outstanding contributions made to fire service and Stanislaus County by Modesto Regional Fire Authority Chief Gary Hinshaw and hereby wish him continued success in his retirement.

HONORING VICTOR MOORE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable student, Victor Moore.

Victor is the son of Ms. Linda Moore and Mr. Vicky Ivy of Clarksdale, Mississippi.

Victor was raised by his loving grandmother, Ms. Reola Moore who he cherishes. She encouraged him to reach for the stars and become a success story in his own right. He excelled in elementary school and upon graduating he entered Coahoma County High School. During his freshmen year, he was sent to the Alternative School twice, failed and was retained. After making it to his sophomore year, he returned to the Alternative School and made it through his junior and senior year of high school without any disciplinary problems, and was a team member of the basketball and football teams.

Victor has successfully overcome his struggles, and in May 2013 will be the first to graduate high school in his family.

Victor has learned the importance of an education, and plans to further his education at Coahoma Community College in Clarksdale, Mississippi to become a licensed barber. Upon completing his degree he desires to open his own barber shop where he will be able to give back to his community and assist his family.

Victor credits his teachers, Mr. John Howard, Ms. Tonja Taylor, Ms. Wilma Bays, Ms. Sonya Rockett and his school guidance counselor, Ms. LaTasha Stringer, for seeing what he can become and not giving up on him.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Victor Moore for his dedication in being an outstanding student.

HONORING DOMAINE CHANDON'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Domaine Chandon Winery on the occasion of their 40th year in production in the Napa Valley. Founded in 1973, it was the first winery in America established by a French wine and spirits producer.

The Moet & Chandon partnership sought prime growing locations in the Napa Valley, and selected vineyards in Mt. Veeder, Carnero, and Yountville to carry on their tradition of excellence. Today, Domaine Chandon continues as a leader in the winemaking field, using sustainable farming practices to maintain their 1,000 acres in the Napa Valley.

The Domaine Chandon Winery has served as a training ground for many industry leaders in the areas of winery management, winemaking, grapegrowing, the culinary arts, restaurant management and farming. The company released their first sparkling wine in 1976, and today their innovative practices in sparkling wine production are followed by sparkling wine producers throughout the world.

Domaine Chandon's history of excellence does not stop at sparkling wine. More than a quarter of its employees have been with the winery for more than 20 years, and the company hired the first sparkling wine maker in the United States. The winery's culture maintains high standards of excellence and innovation.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we acknowledge Domaine Chandon for their immense contribution to the Napa Valley.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 305, 306, and 307, on July 8, 2013, I was unable to be on the floor for votes. Due to weather delays and aircraft problems at the Detroit Airport. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

IN MEMORY OF CINDY ANN KOSSER DUBOIS

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor the memory of a bright light for the arts that my community lost on Tuesday, July 2nd. But more importantly, Andy DuBois and their children, Madeline, 15, and Hunter, 11, lost a wonderful wife and a special mother.

From her birth in Austin she grew up in New Braunfels where she was class president and homecoming queen at Canyon High School. She graduated from the University of Texas where she met the love of her life, Andy. At every step in her life Cindy DuBois put her heart and soul into everything she did.

She started her career deep in the Rio Grande Valley at a PBS station in Harlingen and went on to manage public relations for South Padre Island before her family moved to The Woodlands and she found her calling in the arts. From helping grow major events like The Woodlands Children's Festival and the Waterway Arts Festival, Cindy DuBois will always be remembered for her smile and her determination to bring the arts to everyone.

It's fitting that her CEO called her a "driving force" for the arts, because under Cindy DuBois' leadership, attendance nearly tripled for art events at The Woodlands' famed Cynthia Woods Mitchell Pavilion. From the Houston Symphony to performances by the Houston Ballet and the Houston Grand Opera and many more artists, the growing enthusiasm for the arts in The Woodlands is a testament to Cindy DuBois. The outreach, savvy marketing/public relations efforts, and many smiles from this 2007 graduate of Leadership Montgomery County moved mountains.

That same spirit, determination and grace sustained her during a lengthy battle with cholangiocarcinoma, a rare cancer. At her touching and emotional funeral service held July 5th at The Woodlands Pavilion, where her remarkable children, sisters, friends and family paid tribute to her, it's clear The Woodlands and all who know her have been touched forever by Cindy's positive attitude and infectious glasshalf-full philosophy.

As Andy, Madeline, and Hunter begin a much different phase as a family, they have wonderful memories of bowls of homemade salsa, scary movies and board games and her cheers at Rush soccer and ORWALL baseball. While the community is heartbroken, we are so grateful for all Cindy has given us to remember her by. In every concert, in every fine arts performance, I'm confident she will always be there.

TRIBUTE TO MISS STEPHANIE MICHELLE COLLUM

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a bright young lady, Miss Stephanie Michelle Collum.

Stephanie Michelle Collum, a lifelong resident of Bentonia, Mississippi, was born on September 22, 1994. She is a part of the 2013 Yazoo County High School graduating class.

Stephanie believes in the old adage, "a mind is a terrible thing to waste," and for this reason she strives for excellence. She is active in both school and community activities. She is a member of the American Legion, National Honor Society, and both the volleyball and softball teams at school. Recently, Stephanie was selected to attend the Lock Heed Martin 5th Information Technology Day because of her academic achievements. Also she is a member of the JROTC where she was promoted to the leadership of 1st Sergeant and received the National Fitness Award.

Stephanie is a faithful member of Pleasant Grove Baptist Church in Bentonia, MS where she sings in the choir. Recognizing that each day is a gift from God, she strives to live each day with purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Miss Stephanie Michelle Collum for her hard work, dedication and a strong desire to achieve.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding my absence from the House for the first vote on the evening of July 8, 2013. I would like to submit how I would have voted had I been in attendance for the following vote:

Rollcall No. 305, on Agreeing to On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 1341. I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall vote on July 8, 2013 and would like the record to reflect that I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 306: "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANN KIRKPATRICK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at the memorial service in Arizona for the Prescott Fire Department's Granite Mountain Hotshots, I will miss votes today, July 9, 2013.

HONORING MS. QUIN'NITA COBBINS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Quin'Nita Cobbins who is a dedicated worker making changes to the Holmes County community.

Quin'Nita Cobbins is a native of Mississippi and has completed her primary and secondary education in the Holmes County School District. In 2010, she graduated Summa Cum Laude with a Bachelor's Degree in history from Fisk University and completed a master's degree in history at the University of Georgia in 2012.

Ms. Cobbins has served Holmes County by working with the Community Students Learning Center in equipping students with tools needed to expand their worldview, enriching their knowledge on academic subjects, and encouraging college prep. Working with school age children and adults, she used her study abroad experience to construct a class that exposed students to the history, culture, and language found in Spain. Students learned the history of Spain's expansion and colonization in the supposedly "New World" and why we have a growing Spanish-speaking population. In addition, students, both young and old, learned how to form simple conversations in Spanish that will be beneficial to them as the U.S. demographics change. Students not only became new "bilingual" speakers but were able to think more globally.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Quin'Nita Cobbins for her sincere dedication and determination in bringing back knowledge to our community.

HONORING MR. JULIUS CIACCIA ON BECOMING PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CLEAN WATER AGENCIES

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Mr. Julius Ciaccia, Executive Director of the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District, on his election as President of the National Association of Clean Water Agencies, NACWA.

Mr. Ciaccia is an accomplished leader and committed environmental steward who has played a prominent role in the water industry, exemplifying what it means to be a public servant. He is ideally suited to serve as President of one of the Nation's leading proponents of responsible policies that advance clean water. Mr. Ciaccia has served the people of the Cleveland area for decades, and in this new role, will continue to ensure that the Nation's clean water agencies continue to protect public health and improve the environment.

Mr. Ciaccia began his career in public utilities in 1977 when he was appointed as Assistant Director of the Public Utilities Department for the City of Cleveland. In 1979 he joined the leadership of the City's Division of Water where he served as both Deputy Commissioner and Commissioner until 2004.

During his over 30 years with the City of Cleveland's Division of Water, Mr. Ciaccia oversaw the management of over $1 billion worth of capital improvement projects and maintained the agency's very favorable financial position. He was appointed Director of the City's Department of Public Utilities in 2004 exercising oversight of the water, sewer collection and public power systems, with a focus on developing comprehensive financial plans and supporting revenue enhancement initiatives.

Mr. Ciaccia began his current role at the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District (NEORSD) in 2007. At the Regional Sewer District In his current role at the District, he oversees all aspects of managing one of the nation's largest wastewater management utilities. Under his leadership, the District has received two awards from the Commission on Economic Inclusion including a 2009 award for Supplier Diversity which highlights the success of his initiative to craft and implement a supplier inclusion program. In 2012 the NEORSD was awarded by the Commission for Senior Management Inclusion, recognizing the diversity of senior staff.

As the District's Executive Director, Mr. Ciaccia was responsible for confirming their consent decree for a long-term control plan to significantly reduce overflows from combined sewers, as well as the successful development and implementation of a new Regional Stormwater Management Program. Among Mr. Ciaccia's many accomplishments as Executive Director of NEORSD is the transformation of the District's culture to one of transparency and exceptional financial management.

As a member of NACWA's Board of Directors, Mr. Ciaccia has served as the Secretary, Treasurer, and Vice President. Mr. Ciaccia has selflessly shared his time, passion, energy and ideas to carry out the objectives of the Clean Water Act.

It is my sincere pleasure to congratulate Julius Ciaccia on becoming President of NACWA. I am certain his actions will ensure continued water quality progress for the Cleveland area, the State of Ohio and the Nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of June 17, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following.

Monday, June 17, 2013:

Rollcall No. 245: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 876, "yea."

Rollcall No. 246: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 253, "yea."

Rollcall No. 247: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 862, "yea."

Tuesday, June 18, 2013:

Rollcall No. 248: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 1947 and 1797, "nay."

Rollcall No. 249: Motion on Agreeing to the Resolution on the Rule for H.R. 1947 and 1797, "nay."

Rollcall No. 250: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1151, "yea."

Rollcall No. 251: Final Passage of H.R. 1797—Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, "nay."

Rollcall No. 252: H.R. 1896—To amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that the United States can comply fully with the obligations of the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance, "nay."

Wednesday June 19, 2013:

Rollcall No. 253: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 1947, "nay."

Rollcall No. 254: Motion on Agreeing to the Resolution on the Rule for H.R. 1947, "nay."

Rollcall No. 255: Motion on Approving the Journal, "yea."

Rollcall No. 256: McGovern of Massachusetts Part B Amendment No. 1, "aye."

Rollcall No. 257: Foxx of North Carolina Part B Amendment No. 3, "no."

Rollcall No. 258: Broun of Georgia Part B Amendment No. 5, "no."

Rollcall No. 259: Blumenauer of Oregon Part B Amendment No. 8, "aye."

Rollcall No. 260: Blumenauer of Oregon Part B Amendment No. 9, "aye."

Rollcall No. 261: Kaptur of Ohio Part B Amendment No. 14, "aye."

Rollcall No. 262: Royce of California Part B Amendment No. 15, "no."

Rollcall No. 263: Chabot of Ohio Part B Amendment No. 16, "no."

Thursday June 20, 2013:

Rollcall No. 264: Brooks of Alabama Part B Amendment No. 18, "no."

Rollcall No. 265: Butterfield of North Carolina Part B Amendment No. 25, "aye."

Rollcall No. 266: Marino of Pennsylvania Part B Amendment No. 26, "no."

Rollcall No. 267: Schweikert of Arizona Part B Amendment No. 30, "no."

Rollcall No. 268: Tierney of Massachusetts Part B Amendment No. 32, "aye."

Rollcall No. 269: Polis of Colorado Part B Amendment No. 37, "aye."

Rollcall No. 270: Garamendi of California Part B Amendment No. 38, "aye."

Rollcall No. 271: Marino of Pennsylvania Part B Amendment No. 41, "no."

Rollcall No. 272: McClintock of California Part B Amendment No. 43, "no."

Rollcall No. 273: Gibson of New York Part B Amendment No. 44, "aye."

Rollcall No. 274: Walorski of Indiana Part B Amendment No. 45, "no."

Rollcall No. 275: Courtney of Connecticut Part B Amendment No. 46, "aye."

Rollcall No. 276: Kind of Wisconsin Part B Amendment No. 47, "no."

Rollcall No. 277: Carney of Delaware Part B Amendment No. 48, "aye."

Rollcall No. 278: Goodlatte of Virginia Part B Amendment No. 99, ''no.''

Rollcall No. 279: Radel of Florida Part B Amendment No. 49, ''no.''

Rollcall No. 280: Walberg of Michigan Part B Amendment No. 50, ''no.''

Rollcall No. 281: Pitts of Pennsylvania Part B Amendment No. 98, ''aye.''

Rollcall No. 282: Fortenberry of Nebraska Part B Amendment No. 100, ''aye.''

Rollcall No. 283: Huelskamp of Kansas Part B Amendment No. 101, ''no.''

Rollcall No. 284: Southerland of Florida Part B Amendment No. 102, ''no.''

Rollcall No. 285: Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.R. 1947, ''aye.''

Rollcall No. 286: Final Passage of H.R. 1947—Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, ''no.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained yesterday and missed Roll Nos. 305, 306 and 307. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on Roll Nos. 305 and 306, and I would have voted ''yea'' on Roll No. 307.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF STEVEN PEZENIK

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life and service of Steven Pezenik, who passed away at age 57 on May 26, 2013 after a long battle with cancer.

Steven Pezenik began his distinguished career as a Consumer Service Specialist with the New York State Public Service Commission, where he served with distinction for 14 years. He then joined United Way New York City/AFL–CIO as a Constituent Liaison, before moving on to the United Food and Commercial Workers/Retail Wholesale Department Store Union. There, he proudly served the working men and women of Local 338 as Director of Special Projects, coordinating the local's public relations, and writing in and editing a quarterly newspaper. In his most recent position as Deputy Director of Constituent Services for New York State Senator Jose Peralta, Steve acted as a liaison between government agencies to help secure services for constituents.

Mr. Speaker, Steven Pezenik was a tireless public servant and advocate for the underserved and most in need. He helped raise over $11 million for The United Way and organized AFL–CIO toy, blood, and food drives, including a large-scale effort after September 11, 2001. With work that spanned almost three decades, he exemplified the meaning of public service. As a board member of the Queens Jewish Community Council, Steve always put first those most in need. Steve's commitment to working families functioned as the foundation for his activism and commitment to social justice.

The legacy he leaves behind reflects the love he had for his community. Yet, nothing was more important to Steve than his love for his family, his wife Lisa and daughter Sasha.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me now in honoring Steven Pezenik for his service to the people of Queens County, New York City and New York State.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,738,249,094,798.80. We've added $6,111,372,045,885.72 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

TRIBUTE TO NATHANIEL WILLIAMS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a jovial and ambitious man, Mr. Nathaniel Williams. Nathaniel has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to serve others.

Nathaniel, a native of Vicksburg, Mississippi was born March 1, 1960 to Charles Williams and Martha M. Nash Williams. He graduated from the Vicksburg Warren School District and later attended Hinds Community College and Jackson State University.

Currently, Nathaniel is a Tax Field Representative for the Mississippi Department of Employment Security where he has worked for several years.

Nathaniel is the President and Founder of the Mighty Train of Gospel Community Choir. Currently, he serves on the board for Make a Promise Coalition of Vicksburg, President of the Vicksburg Junior High PTO, Youth Choir Director for both Mt. Carmel Baptist Church and Mercy Seat Baptist Church, member of the Riverfest Board of Directors, mentor and sponsor for the United Way of West Central MS (TEEN HELP) and volunteer at the YMCA. He has served on several other boards as president and member.

Nathaniel is also the recipient of several awards such as the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc. 2010 Community Service Award, The Governor's Initiative for Volunteer Excellence 2008 Award and the Vicksburg Family Development 2007 Male Image Award to name a few.

Nathaniel is married to Esther Bell Williams and to that union they have five children: Nathaniel, Derrick, Roderick, Sederick and Jessica Reese.

Nathaniel lives by the motto: ''Whatever you do for the Master, do all you can while you can, but let it be real.'' He is a faithful member of Ebenezer Baptist Church where he is the Vice President of the choir.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Nathaniel Williams for his unwavering dedication to serving others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on July 8, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall vote 305, ''yea'' on rollcall vote 306, and ''yea'' on rollcall vote 307.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OMAHA STAR

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Omaha Star on the occasion of their 75th Anniversary.

The Omaha Star was founded by the late Mildred D. Brown on July 9th, 1938. Brown was believed to be the first female, certainly the first African-American woman, to have founded a newspaper. Later the paper was placed in the hands of Brown's niece, Dr. Marguerita Washington, who now heads the newspaper.

Since 1938, the policy The Omaha Star has been to print only positive news and to be a vigilant champion for African-American progress. The circulation of The Omaha Star is 30,000 and its archives are a miniature history of Omaha's black community. Its work for equal rights for all Americans are legendary.

Two significant accomplishments of The Omaha Star are leading the charge to open public accommodations to African-Americans and working with the public school system of Omaha to ensure that black teachers have equal participation. Over the years, The Omaha Star has received many awards and was inducted into the Chamber of Commerce Business Hall of Fame on July gth, 1996.

Currently, The Omaha Star concentrates of news coverage that is relevant to the particular market that they have continued to serve proudly for decades. It has been Nebraska's largest African-American newspaper and the Omaha's most effective publican highlighting ways to improve the lives of African-Americans. The Omaha Star has stood the test of time and continues to provide relevant information, education and positive motivation to Omaha's citizens.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating The Omaha Star on their 75th Anniversary. I know that Omahans join me in hoping The Omaha Star continues providing positive information to the African-American community for many years to come.

HIGH ON A HILL: IN HONOR OF AMERICA'S BIRTHDAY AND THE 33RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPITOL CONCERTS ON THIS 4TH OF JULY, BY THE COLBERT FAMILY AND PBS

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of America's birthday, on this Fourth of July. Also, in honor of the Colbert family who created the Capitol Concerts annual Fourth of July celebration broadcast to millions across our Nation each year on PBS. This year marks its 33rd anniversary. I ask every American to take the time to remember all of our families in harm's way and their loved ones. And to reflect upon all of those who have fallen on battlefields of honor, and all of our wounded warriors across the Nation, so that we may be here this day. I submit this poem, penned by Albert Carey Caswell.

HIGH ON A HILL

High!
High on a Hill!
As once each year,
Our Nation is given so such a thrill. . .
As so appears. . .
America's great Birthday Party so here. . .
As all out across this County Tis of Thee,
This celebration so PBS!
Broadcasting to young and old,
Yea Jerry and Michael, they the Men, presenting broadcast gold!
And out to all of our Armed Forces, All in Harm's Way,
As from where America's Greatest Honor so comes this day!
As for all of them and their families we now so pray!
And as the music starts,
It so urges us all to so get up and so dance!
To so celebrate this great romance,
Of America's Birthday as another year does so advance!
While all in the front rows,
Are all of those, America's Greatest Heroes!
Her Wounded Warriors,
Who for all of us all have such selfless magnificence so chose!
As it's all so here in our Nation's Capitol!
A place where history now so rules!
As PBS and The Capitol Concerts,
Brings to us the entertainment world's real who's who!
All in Democracy's home,
Asking us all to towards Freedom and Independence to so let all our hearts so roam!
As it all so began,
When a great Boston family, the Colberts', so lent their helping hand!
To so create The Capitol Concerts celebration,
33 years ago they created this great sensation!
As high up on this Hill,
As where they so broadcast to so give all a thrill!
And the reception's better here still!
So that all out across the heartland,
America's homes are no so filled!
So filled,
With Rock and Roll, Country Western,
To Classical music to inspire our very souls!
For you will never so see,
Such a more inspiring sight than all of these. . .
All in the shadow of The United States Capitol,
And The Washington Monument with fireworks exploding all in DC!
As your heart so begins to rule!
As we all celebrate our Nation's Birthday,
With all of our families so very cool!
And maybe next year on your bucket list,
Come to this city surrounded by consequence and so join all of us!
Come and sing and dance,
And let Freedom ring as you fall for its romance!
But, in the meantime. . .
Turn on your flat screen, as a Nation we all so unite!
As all of our Yankee Doodle Dandy Hearts,
Climb up to such new heights!
High on a Hill!
For you will not so find a greater thrill!
Than, America's Birthday all on The Fourth of July,
All up on Capitol Hill!
Happy Birthday, America,
As Our Best is Yet to Come Still!

40 YEARS OF OUR LADY OF THE ASSUMPTION OF THE PORTUGUESE CHURCH

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the rich heritage of Our Lady of the Assumption of the Portuguese Church as they celebrate 40 years of worship and friendship in Turlock, California.

Our Lady of the Assumption of the Portuguese Church in Turlock is the most recent of Portuguese national churches in the United States. Its origins go back to a small church blessed and dedicated on Monday, June 11, 1973. With the influx of thousands of Portuguese immigrants to California in the 1800s, after the eruptions of the Capelinhos volcano in 1957–1958, the stage was set for the development of a new parish with a clear mission to Portuguese immigrants in the Central Valley of California. Although relatively young, Our Lady of the Assumption has a rich history, shaped by several important events in the second half of the 20th century.

In the 1960s Father Manuel Vieira Alvernaz, pastor of Sacred Heart Catholic Church in Turlock, invited two young Portuguese missionaries to stay in his parish and minister to the Portuguese community. The two, Fathers Ivo Dinis Rocha and José Carlos Vieira Simplício, officially began their ministry on March 1, 1969. One of the first things the missionaries noticed was that the Portuguese youth yearned for places of belonging and meaning; they reached out to the young by forming a youth group in 1969.

On June 1, 1972, 12 individuals acquired the original five acre property at 2602 S. Walnut Road. This became the site of the Portuguese Cultural Center and eventually, the home of Our Lady of the Assumption of the Portuguese Church. On June 11, 1973, the chapel of the Portuguese Cultural Center was dedicated and blessed; this is considered the beginning of the parish of Our Lady of the Assumption. On June 22, 1973 the Feast of St. John the Baptist was celebrated for the first time. The first parish festival in honor of the Patroness Our Lady of the Assumption took place on Sunday August 19, 1973, i.e., the third Sunday of the month.

In 1975, the Portuguese Cultural Center purchased an additional five acre parcel to accommodate growth and expansion. The parcel was purchased for $38,000. Escrow was closed on March 25th and corresponded with the Feast of the Annunciation of Blessed Virgin Mary by the angel St. Gabriel. A large parish hall was built in 1984 and has become the gathering place for many beautiful celebrations including weddings and receptions.

In September of 1982, Father Rocha invited Father Richard Forti, who was also campus minister at Stanislaus State College, to celebrate a Sunday Mass in English and serve as a part-time youth minister and confirmation coordinator. By welcoming Father Ford, Our Lady of the Assumption was opening itself to the larger Church and society. The Sunday Mass in English at 9 a.m. would become a magnet attracting members from neighboring parishes and from non churchgoers in the area setting the stage for future conflict and growth. By 1986, approximately one thousand people participated at Sunday Mass at Our Lady of the Assumption in both languages.

Over the years, the church continued to grow from the original five acre parcel consisting of a small house, garage and chicken coop. In 1992, plans were started for a new church. With the help of over 2,000 donors the new church was consecrated on August 16, 1998. The property now includes 18.2 acres with two community halls, two houses, three soccer fields, the original chapel, and the new church.

Our Lady of the Assumption maintains a strong presence among the sick in the Central Valley with a team of 20 ministers who visit local hospitals. In July of 2006, with the leadership of Margaret Santiago, Michaleen Klee and Father Manuel Sousa, the parish embraced Stephen Ministry. A team of 11 trained listeners, with over 50 hours of classroom instruction and on-going supervision, are available to accompany people suffering from depression, loneliness, isolation and difficult life transitions. Parishioners and non-parishioners alike have benefitted from this competent, faith-based, extended hand of friendship and prayer.

Currently, the parish roster contains 1,300 families, approximately 85% with Portuguese surnames. Sunday Mass attendance is over 1,000 in the winter months, with 60 percent of Sunday participation being in English services and 40 in Portuguese.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating with the Our Lady of the Assumption of the Portuguese Church in Turlock and the tremendous opportunities that lay ahead in their efforts to fulfill a vision for the future. Congratulations on the past 40 years, and I wish them the best success in the years to come.

HONORING MS. DANEISHA DOMINIQUE McGOWAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Daneisha Dominique McGowan, a dedicated student, who is making the difference in her community.

Daneisha Dominique McGowan, a Georgetown, MS native. She is the granddaughter of Mr. W.C. and Lula Bickham. As an only child, Daneisha was raised in a household that placed education as a top priority. Daneisha has maintained the honor list since entering 9th grade and now she is 12th grade at Crystal Springs High School and still going strong on that list. She has scored exceptionally on all of her state test.

Daneisha strives hard in the classroom and also the community. She is a member of the Drama Club, S.A.D.D. (Students Against Drunk Driving), Mu Alpha Theta, and serves as president of the 2012–2013 Crystal Springs Mayor's Youth Council. As president of the Mayor's Youth Council, Daneisha has lead her peers in a City-wide voters registration campaign, Anti-Bullying Workshops for children, School Supply Drives, Breast Cancer Awareness Walk and Runs, Youth Summits, and much more.

To be only 18 years old, Daneisha has accomplished quite a bit. She is driven by a deep passion for helping others. After high school, Daneisha plans on obtaining a Master's Degree in Business and desires to create a business in the fashion industry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a talented and dedicated student, Ms. Daneisha Dominique McGowan, for her determination in making a difference in her community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 25; Wednesday, June 26; Thursday, June 27; and Friday, June 28, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 287 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2383);

''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 288 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1092);

''no'' on rollcall vote No. 289 (on ordering the previous question on H.Res. 274);

''no'' on rollcall vote No. 290 (on agreeing to H.Res. 274);

''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 291 (on agreeing to the Grayson Amendment to H.R. 1613);

''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 292 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 1613 with instructions);

''no'' on rollcall vote No. 293 (on passage of H.R. 1613);

''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 294 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1864);

''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 295 (on agreeing to the Hastings of Florida Amendment to H.R. 2231);

''no'' on rollcall vote No. 296 (on agreeing to the Flores Amendment to H.R. 2231);

''no'' on rollcall vote No. 297 (on agreeing to the Cassidy Amendment to H.R. 2231);

''no'' on rollcall vote No. 298 (on agreeing to the Rigell Amendment to H.R. 2231);

''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 299 (on agreeing to the DeFazio Amendment to H.R. 2231);

''no'' on rollcall vote No. 300 (on agreeing to the Broun Amendment to H.R. 2231);

''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 301 (on agreeing to the Grayson Amendment to H.R. 2231);

''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 302 (on agreeing to the Capps Amendment to H.R. 2231);

''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 303 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 2231 with instructions); and

''no'' on rollcall vote No. 304 (on passage of H.R. 2231).

CONGRATULATING POLICE CHIEF JIM GRADDON ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate Jim Graddon, Police Chief of SeaTac, Washington, on his retirement. Jim has served 39 years in law enforcement, including the past 34 years with the King County Sheriffs Office.

A native of South King County, Chief Graddon is a graduate of Burien's Kennedy High School. His father, Lawrence James Graddon, spent 20 years with the King County Sheriffs Office and retired as a Lieutenant.

After first serving in the Seattle Police Department, Jim joined the King County Sheriffs office. As a Sergeant, he became adjutant to the Chief of the new SeaTac Police Department. He then went on to become co-supervisor of the Sheriffs Office's Major Crimes Unit.

Jim Graddon served as a leader in the task force established to investigate one of the most notorious criminal cases in our nation's history—that involving the Green River Killer. Through his efforts and those of others, the suspect in the case eventually pled guilty to multiple murders, bringing closure to the families and friends of the victims.

Since 2007, Jim has served as a Major in the Sheriffs Office and as the City of SeaTac's Chief of Police. He is also a Commander of the Sheriff's Office Southwest Precinct, which polices unincorporated areas throughout Southwest King County as well as in the cities of Burien and SeaTac. Further, Chief Graddon has supported victims of human trafficking with compassion and led various youth violence prevention efforts.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I congratulate Police Chief Jim Graddon on his retirement. The city of SeaTac, King County, and our region are extremely grateful for his many years of service keeping our community safe.

THE INTRODUCTION OF ''THE APOLLO LUNAR LANDING LEGACY ACT''

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, in 1969, led by the late Apollo Astronaut Neil Armstrong, American ingenuity changed history as humanity took a giant leap forward on the surface of the moon. That history, as preserved on the lunar surface, is now in danger, as spacefaring commercial entities and foreign nations begin to achieve the technical capabilities necessary to land spacecraft on the surface of the moon.

The United States must be proactive in protecting our unique cultural heritage left by the seven *Apollo* lunar landings. I am excited to have introduced H.R. 2617, ''the Apollo Lunar Landing Legacy Act,'' which would expand and enhance the protection and preservation of the *Apollo* lunar artifacts while providing for greater recognition and public understanding of this achievement for generations to come. I would like to thank EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Ranking Member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for her commitment to the space program and for being an original cosponsor of this bill. It is also significant that we have introduced H.R. 2616, ''the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Authorization Act of 2013,'' legislation that reauthorizes NASA and ensures the Agency remains a multi-mission agency with a balanced and robust set of core missions in science, aeronautics, space technology, and human space flight and exploration.

The Apollo Lunar Landing Legacy Act will ensure that the scientific data and cultural significance of the *Apollo* artifacts remains unharmed by future lunar landings. This Act will endow the artifacts as a National Historic Park, thereby asserting unquestioned ownership rights over the *Apollo* lunar landing artifacts. The legislation will additionally require the Secretary of the Interior to pursue nominating the historic *Apollo* 11 lunar landing site, where humanity left its first steps on the moon, as a World Heritage Site. The bill builds on the recommendations of the 2011 report, ''NASA's Recommendations to Space-Faring Entities: How to Protect and Preserve the Historic and Scientific Value of U.S. Government Lunar Artifacts.''

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, this Act addresses an increasingly important aspect of our cultural heritage that I want to be available for future generations. I hope that all Members will join me in supporting ''the Apollo Lunar Landing Legacy Act'' by cosponsoring H.R. 2617.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to a flight delay and was unable to vote on rollcall No. 305, rollcall No. 306 and rollcall No. 307.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 305, ''yea'' on rollcall No. 306 and ''yea'' on rollcall No. 307.

THE INTRODUCTION OF ''THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013''

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 2616, ''the National Aeronautics

and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2013.''

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, is the nation's crown jewel for spurring innovation, highly-skilled and good paying jobs, and inspiring the next generation of scientists. Since the Apollo era, NASA has been a cornerstone of domestic innovation, economic growth, and international competitiveness. Unfortunately, in the past few years, Congress has not funded NASA adequately in a way that reflects its unique role and its many contributions. Simply put, recent flat and reduced funding had required NASA to do too much with too little.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Space Subcommittee, on which I proudly serve as the Ranking Member, has historically been known for its bipartisanship and commitment to a strong and vibrant space and aeronautics program at NASA. Last Wednesday, Committee leadership released a committee print of its authorization bill. Notwithstanding the fact that this current version of the Committee leadership's legislation incorporates some positive clarifications from the version initially circulated for discussion two weeks ago, it still cuts NASA's funding in Fiscal Year 2014 (FY14) by over $1 billion from the requested level.

The Committee leadership's bill does not contain funding commensurate with the tasks NASA is already being asked to undertake while also adding NASA unfunded mandates. In particular, the majority's legislation amends existing law to create the milestone of enabling humans to land on the Moon, while maintaining deep sequestration cuts over the life of the bill. I regret to say that if enacted, it would not help NASA meet the challenges facing the Agency.

That is why I, along with 11 original cosponsors of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, wish to provide an alternative which I hope will be the foundation for bipartisan support. This legislation is a pragmatic path forward that will give NASA a clear sense of purpose and direction in a way that also recognizes the nation's need for fiscal restraint. NASA is and should remain a multi-mission agency with a balanced and robust set of core missions in science, aeronautics, space technology, and human space flight and exploration.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2616 does a number of important and necessary things by:

Preserving NASA's purchasing power relative to FY12 enacted levels by authorizing $18.1 billion for FY14 with inflationary increases over the three year authorization period of FY14 through FY16;

Providing a clear goal of a crewed mission to the surface of Mars and requiring a roadmap which identifies intermediate destinations and activities that contribute to enabling the effective achievement of that goal;

Recognizing the Space Launch System (SLS) and Orion crew vehicle as the highest priorities for carrying out the Mars goal and authorizing increases that bring SLS funding to $1.8 billion by FY16;

Emphasizing congressional commitment to safety in NASA's human spaceflight activities by requiring an independent review of NASA's commercial crew safety processes and procedures and providing for other measures to enable full government insight and oversight in ensuring safety;

Providing robust funding for commercial crew system development of $700 million per year;

Maintaining our commitment to International Space Station, ISS, operations through 2020 and initiating a process for determining if and how long ISS should operate beyond 2020;

Authorizing increases for ISS research to augment discovery-based science and maximize the full and productive utilization of this unique laboratory;

Restoring Planetary Science to $1.5 billion annual funding, following recent cuts to the program;

Maintaining a sound Earth Sciences program that ensures observing systems development, and advances research, knowledge, and applied data uses that benefit society;

Sustaining a stable aeronautics research program, consistent with FY12 enacted levels, that supports research priorities, strategic initiatives, and flight demonstrations;

Recognizing the importance of investing in space technology to enable future missions, spur innovation, and contribute to economic growth and job-creation;

Sustaining NASA's Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, STEM, Education Activities and continues current agency education and outreach activities supported by scientists and engineers; and

Including a number of ''good government'' provisions such as establishing measures to strengthen NASA's cost estimating and fiscal management practices to minimize cost overruns in projects and assessing the capabilities and resources needed to expand NASA's Near-Earth Objects program to include smaller objects.

In closing Mr. Speaker, this fiscally responsible bill puts NASA back on track to greatness and provides flexibility in how the agency is to implement engineering and scientific details. This Authorization bill is a vitally important opportunity to set the policy direction and authorize funding needed to both sustain NASA's global excellence and preeminence in space and aeronautics and provide a clear and inspiring path forward for the nation's human exploration of outer space.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5531–S5581

Measures Introduced: One bill was introduced as follows: S. 1270. **Page S5567**

Measures Passed:

Presidential and Provincial Elections in Afghanistan April 2014: Senate agreed to S. Res. 151, urging the Government of Afghanistan to ensure transparent and credible presidential and provincial elections in April 2014 by adhering to internationally accepted democratic standards, establishing a transparent electoral process, and ensuring security for voters and candidates, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the committee amendment to the preamble.

Pages S5572–75

Measures Considered:

Keep Student Loans Affordable Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1238, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans.

Pages S5531–37, S5543–64

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10 a.m., on Wednesday, July 10, 2013, the Majority Leader be recognized and that following the remarks of the two Leaders, the time until 12 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders or their designees with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to ten minutes each; and that at 12 p.m. on Wednesday, July 10, 2013, Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S5575**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 54 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. EX. 170), Jennifer A. Dorsey, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

Pages S5537–43, S5581

Geoffrey R. Pyatt, of California, to be Ambassador to Ukraine.

Tulinabo Salama Mushingi, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Burkina Faso.

Daniel R. Russel, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (East Asian and Pacific Affairs).

Page S5581

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Wanda Felton, of New York, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2017.

Mark Bradley Childress, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania.

Tomasz P. Malinowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

Carlos Roberto Moreno, of California, to be Ambassador to Belize.

Evan Ryan, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs).

Dennis V. McGinn, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

1 Coast Guard nomination in the rank of admiral.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army, Foreign Service, and Navy. **Pages S5575–81**

Messages from the House: **Page S5567**

Measures Referred: **Page S5567**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5567–69**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S5569–72**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5564–67**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S5572**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S5572**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—170) **Page S5543**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, July 10, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of

the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5575.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies approved for full committee consideration an original bill making appropriations for Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2014.

NOMINATION

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of John H. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Census, Department of Commerce, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Durbin, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of James B. Comey, Jr., of Connecticut, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 9 public bills, H.R. 2628–2636, and 4 resolutions, H. Res. 290–291, 293–294 were introduced. **Page H4308**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4309–10**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 657, to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to improve the management of grazing leases and permits, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–145, Pt. 1);

H.R. 819, to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–146, Pt. 1); and

H. Res. 292, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness (H. Rept. 113–147). **Page H4308**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Collins (NY) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4217**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:35 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4221**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 262 yeas to 138 nays with 1 answering "present", Roll No. 310. **Pages H4221, H4230–31**

Authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony honoring the life and legacy of Nelson Mandela: The House agreed by unanimous consent to discharge from committee and agree to H. Con. Res. 43, to authorize the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony honoring the life and legacy of Nelson Mandela on the occasion of the 95th anniversary of his birth. **Page H4231**

Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014: The House began consideration of H.R. 2609, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, July 10th. **Pages H4224–30, H4231–4308**

Agreed to:

Noem amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Bureau of Reclamation rural water projects by $25,000,000; **Pages H4255–56**

Hastings (WA) amendment that reduces funds in both the Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and

Efficiency account and the Departmental Administration account and redirects funds to the Defense Environmental Cleanup account; **Pages H4256–57**

Reed amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup by $18,956,000; **Pages H4279–80**

Schiff amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy by $20,000,000; and **Pages H4284–86**

Frelinghuysen amendment that amends section 311 relating to a required report that provides an analysis of alternatives for each major warhead refurbishment program that reaches Phase 6.3. **Page H4305**

Rejected:

Eddie Bernice Johnson (TX) amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency activities, Science activities, and the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy by a total of $1,655,900,180; **Pages H4257–60**

Moran amendment (No. 1 printed in the Congressional Record of July 8, 2013) that sought to strike section 107, which prohibits funds from being used to implement regulations pertaining to the definition of waters under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 311); **Pages H4246–50, H4265–66**

Moran amendment (No. 2 printed in the Congressional Record of July 8, 2013) that sought to strike section 112, which prohibits funds from being used to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations in effect on October 1, 2012, pertaining to the definitions of the terms ''fill material'' or ''discharge of fill material'' for the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 226 noes, Roll No. 312); **Pages H4250–55, H4266**

Takano amendment (No. 7 printed in the Congressional Record of July 8, 2013) that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $245,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 152 ayes to 264 noes, Roll No. 313); **Pages H4260–61, H4266–67**

Perry amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $31,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 140 ayes to 275 noes, Roll No. 314); **Pages H4261–62, H4267–68**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $9,826,370 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 153 ayes to 257 noes, Roll No. 315); **Pages H4262–63, H4268–69**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for Science activities of the Department of Energy by $158,309,900 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; **Page H4280**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for Departmental Administration by $9,500,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; **Page H4288**

Cohen amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $50,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 168 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 316); **Pages H4263–65, H4290–91**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $4,751,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 158 ayes to 256 noes, Roll No. 317); **Pages H4265, H4291**

Swalwell amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $1,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 201 ayes to 213 noes, Roll No. 318); **Pages H4269–70, H4292**

McClintock amendment that sought to reduce funding for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency; Nuclear Energy; and Fossil Energy Research and Development and apply the $1,543,929,000 in total savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 115 ayes to 300 noes, Roll No. 319); **Pages H4270–72, H4292–93**

Peters (CA) amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $10,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 191 ayes to 223 noes, Roll No. 320); **Pages H4272, H4293**

Perlmutter amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $15,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 321); **Pages H4272–73, H4293–94**

Connolly amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $15,500,000 (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 242 noes, Roll No. 322); **Pages H4273–74, H4294–95**

Takano amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $20,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 164 ayes to 252 noes, Roll No. 323); **Pages H4275, H4295**

Takano amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $40,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 166 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 324); **Pages H4275–76, H4295–96**

Heck (NV) amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Science activities of the Department of Energy by $25,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 81 ayes to 335 noes, Roll No. 325); **Pages H4276–77, H4296–97**

Butterfield amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy by $127,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 150 ayes to 266 noes, Roll No. 326); **Pages H4278–79, H4297**

Foster amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Science activities of the Department of Energy by $500,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 143 ayes to 273 noes, Roll No. 327); and **Pages H4281–83, H4297–98**

Garamendi amendment that sought to redirect $1,000,000 in funding within the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account. **Pages H4283–84, H4302–05**

Withdrawn:

Kelly (PA) amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have required the Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and the U.S. Geological Survey to lead a multiagency effort to slow the spread of Asian Carp in the Ohio River basin and tributaries. **Page H4246**

Point of Order sustained against:

Castor (FL) amendment that sought to increase funding for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency activities by $1,127,954,000 and require that the amount made available under such heading be allocated between programs, projects, and activities previously funded under the heading ''Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' and programs, projects, and activities previously funded under the heading ''Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability'' in the same proportion as such funds were allocated between such accounts in fiscal year 2013 (Representative Castor (FL) appealed the ruling of the Chair and it was agreed by voice vote to sustain the ruling of the Chair); **Pages H4262, H4275**

Tonko amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency by $145,000,000; and **Pages H4274–75**

Brownley (CA) amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Non-Defense Environment Cleanup by $5,000,000 (Representative Brownley (CA) appealed the ruling of the Chair and it was agreed by voice vote to sustain the ruling of the Chair). **Pages H4277–78**

Proceedings Postponed:

Hastings (FL) amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, for Science activities of the Department of Energy by $223,000,000; **Pages H4280–81**

Garamendi amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, for the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy by $329,000,000; **Pages H4283–84**

Broun (GA) amendment that seeks to eliminate funding for the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program and apply the $6,000,000 in savings to the spending reduction account; **Page H4286**

Jackson Lee amendment that seeks to increase funding for Departmental Administration by $1,000,000 and reduce funding for Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration by $1,200,000; **Pages H4286–87**

Quigley amendment that seeks to reduce funding for Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration by $23,700,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; **Pages H4288–90**

Heck (NV) amendment that seeks to increase funding for Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration by $14,000,000 and reduce funding for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation by $16,546,000; **Pages H4298–99**

Polis amendment that seeks to reduce funding for Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration by $13,072,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; **Pages H4299–H4300**

Burgess amendment that seeks to reduce funding for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation by $48,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; **Pages H4300–02**

Burgess amendment that seeks to strike language allowing the Secretary of Energy to make not more than $48,000,000 available for the purpose of carrying out domestic uranium enrichment research, development, and demonstration activities; and **Page H4302**

Titus amendment that seeks to strike section 509, which prohibits funds from being 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. **Pages H4307–08**

H. Res. 288, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 178 nays, Roll No. 309, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 182 nays, Roll No. 308. **Pages H4228–30**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H4224.

Senate Referral: S. 793 was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Page H4308

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and 17 recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4229, H4230, H4230–31, H4265–66, H4266, H4267, H4267–68, H4268–69, H4290–91, H4291, H4292, H4292–93, H4293, H4294, H4294–95, H4295, H4296, H4296–97, H4297, H4297–98. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 12:03 a.m. on Wednesday, July 10, 2013.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a markup on appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. The bill was forwarded without amendment.

KEEPING COLLEGE WITHIN REACH

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Keeping College Within Reach: Improving Higher Education through Innovation''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing on H.R. 1900, the ''Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act''. Testimony was heard from Philip D. Moeller, Commissioner, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power began a markup on the following: H.R. 1582, the ''Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2013''; H.R. 1900, the ''Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act''; and H.R. 83, to require the Secretary of the Interior to develop an action plan to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States.

CYBER ESPIONAGE AND THE THEFT OF U.S. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Cyber Espionage and the Theft of U.S. Intellectual Property and Technology''. Testimony was heard from Slade Gorton, former U.S. Senator, Washington, Commission Member, Commission on the Theft of American Intellectual Property; Larry M. Wortzel, Commissioner, U.S.- China Economic and Security Review Commission; Susan Offutt, Chief Economist, Applied Research and Methods, Government Accountability Office; and public witness.

HOW THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU COLLECTS AND USES CONSUMER DATA

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled ''Examining How the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Collects and Uses Consumer Data''. Testimony was heard from Steven L. Antonakes, Acting Deputy Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

CONSTITUTIONAL DEFICIENCIES AND LEGAL UNCERTAINTIES IN THE DODD–FRANK ACT

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Examining Constitutional Deficiencies and Legal Uncertainties in the Dodd-Frank Act''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEARNING FROM IRAQ

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled ''Learning from Iraq: A Final Report from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction''. Testimony was heard from Stuart W. Bowen, Jr., Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction; and John Herbst, Director, Center for Complex Operations, National Defense University, former American Ambassador to Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

CAMBODIA'S LOOMING POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CRISIS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled ''Cambodia's Looming Political and Social Crisis''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EMERGENCY MGMT 2.0

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communication held a hearing entitled ''Emergency MGMT 2.0: How #SocialMedia and New Tech are Transforming Preparedness, Response, and Recovery #Disasters #Part2 #Govt/NGOs''. Testimony was heard from Shayne Adamski, Senior Manager of Digital Engagement, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Albert

Ashwood, Director, Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management; Sergeant W. Greg Kierce, Director, Jersey City Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security; and public witness.

IRAN'S EXTENDING INFLUENCE IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency held a hearing entitled ''Threat to the Homeland: Iran's Extending Influence in the Western Hemisphere''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a hearing on H.R. 2122, the ''Regulatory Accountability Act of 2013''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CLOSING AMENITIES AT YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation held a hearing entitled ''Public Impact of Closing Amenities at Yosemite National Park''. Testimony was heard from Representative Garamendi; Jonathan B. Jarvis, Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

POWDER RIVER BASIN COAL MINING

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Mining in America: Powder River Basin Coal Mining the Benefits and Challenges''. Testimony was heard from Dan Coolidge, Chairman, Campbell County Commissioners; Mary Kendall, Office of the Inspector General, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 761, the ''National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013''. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a structured rule for H.R. 761. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–17 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representative Amodei; and Representative DeFazio.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Environment held a markup on H.R. 2413, the ''Weather Forecasting Improvement Act of 2013''. The bill was forwarded, as amended.

AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS WORLDWIDE

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access held a hearing entitled ''American Competitiveness Worldwide: Impacts on Small Businesses and Entrepreneurs''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

INNOVATIVE FINANCE IN INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a hearing entitled ''The Role of Innovative Finance in Intercity Passenger Rail''. Testimony was heard from John Porcari, Deputy Secretary, Department of Transportation; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on H.R. 1443, the ''Tinnitus Research and Treatment Act of 2013''; H.R. 1612, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to convey a parcel of land in Tuskegee, Alabama, to Tuskegee University, and for other purposes; H.R. 1702, the ''Veterans Transportation Service Act''; H.R. 2065, the ''Safe Housing for Homeless Veterans Act''; and draft legislation on the Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act. Testimony was heard from Representative Rogers of Alabama; Representative McKinley; Robert L. Jesse, M.D., Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Health Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities''. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings to examine Smithfield, focusing on foreign purchases of American food companies, 2:30 p.m., SD–562.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance, to hold hearings to examine stopping fraudulent robocall scams, focusing on if more can be done, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine repealing the Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) and the path forward, focusing on a view from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider S. 815, to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and any pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine lessons learned from the Boston Marathon bombings, focusing on preparing for and responding to the attack, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Gregory Howard Woods, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Elizabeth A. Wolford, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, and Debra M. Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine diabetes research, focusing on reducing the burden of diabetes at all ages and stages, 2 p.m., SDG–50.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, markup on appropriations for Financial Services and General Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, 9:30 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science and Related Agencies, markup on appropriations for Commerce, Justice, and Science and related agencies, 11 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing entitled ''Examining the Labor Department's Proposed Reforms to the FECA Program'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, continue markup on the following: H.R. 1582, the ''Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2013''; H.R. 1900, the ''Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act''; and H.R. 83, to require the Secretary of the Interior to develop an action plan to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled ''Reducing Barriers to Capital Formation, Part II'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade; and Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, joint hearing entitled ''The Terrorist Threat in North Africa: Before and After Benghazi'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, hearing entitled ''The Abu Dhabi Pre-Clearance Facility: Implications for U.S. Businesses and National Security'', 1:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Assessing Attacks on the Homeland: From Fort Hood to Boston'', 9 a.m., 311 Cannon. A portion of this hearing may be closed.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, markup on H.R. 1493, the ''Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2013''; and H.R. 2542, the ''Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2013'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Unaccountable Government GAO Reports Show Feds Struggling to Track Money and Performance'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service, and the Census, hearing entitled ''The Combined Federal Campaign: Making Every Dollar Count'', 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Space, markup on committee print of the ''NASA Authorization Act of 2013'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled ''Strategic Planning for National Manufacturing Competitiveness'', 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Beyond the Beltway: Successful State Strategies for Small Business Growth'', 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup of the following: H.R. 1848, the ''Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013''; H.R. 2576, to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes; and legislation regarding the following: Public Buildings Savings and Reform Act of 2013; a bill to designate the United States Coast Guard Headquarters the ''Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building''; a concurrent resolution

authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run; and a General Services Administration Resolution, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, and Full Committee on Armed Services, joint hearing entitled ''DOD and VA Collaboration to assist Service Members Returning to Civilian Life'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on the Obama Administration's decision to delay the employer mandate and the employer information reporting requirements under the Affordable Care Act, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee: to hold hearings to examine building job opportunities for veterans, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: The Majority Leader will be recognized. At 12 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1238, Keep Student Loans Affordable Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 10

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Continue consideration of H.R. 2609—Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Brady, Kevin, Tex., E1029
Capps, Lois, Calif., E1029
Christensen, Donna M., The Virgin Islands, E1026
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1031
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E1028, E1032
Edwards, Donna F., Md., E1033, E1033
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1026
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E1026, E1027
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E1031
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1025
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1027, E1030
Kinzinger, Adam, Ill., E1025
Kirkpatrick, Ann, Ariz., E1030
Lamborn, Doug, Colo., E1033
Larson, John B., Conn., E1032
Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E1029
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E1030
Meng, Grace, N.Y., E1031
Miller, George, Calif., E1031
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1029
Paulsen, Erik, Minn., E1028
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E1025
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E1026
Smith, Adam, Wash., E1033, E1033
Terry, Lee, Nebr., E1031
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1027, E1027, E1028, E1029, E1030, E1031, E1032
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1029
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1028

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.