

I don't know how anyone argues that the Federal Government has got to intervene in setting the marketplace for wages on construction projects \$2,000 or more, but not intervene in the price of gas or the price of electricity or the price of some of the commodities that we are dealing with on a regular basis.

If we are going to have a robust economy, we have got to get a value received for the work that is done, and that value received is determined by supply and demand in the marketplace, not by a de facto mandated union scale. I know how these scales are reached. I know how these conferences go.

Mr. Chairman, we want to save the taxpayers money. We want to build 5 miles of road, not 4. We want to build five bases, not four. We want to put five different components out there, instead of four, and get a return on the taxpayers' dollar so that we maximize the utilization of the hard-earned tax dollars that come from some of the people that are working on these projects.

□ 2015

They want a return on their investment, too. You can't argue that there is fiscal responsibility in this country if we are going to impose an additional 20 percent on every dollar that is spent to produce construction projects on MILCON in America.

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

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

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

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

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman I yield to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for a colloquy.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman DENT and Ranking Member BISHOP for your work on this bill. And congratulations to Congressman DENT on the work he has done on H.R. 2029, his first bill as chairman of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Subcommittee.

I admire Chairman DENT's and Ranking Member BISHOP's commitment to our veterans of America. They have demonstrated day-to-day that they are here for our people in the armed services.

I would like to especially acknowledge this bill's provisions relating to

the importance of early detection and treatment of colorectal cancer. As the bill notes, the VA has made screening patients for colorectal cancer a priority, and I am encouraged by the steps that this bill would take to ensure that the VA continues to dedicate the resources and attention to this important issue which it deserves.

Almost every family in America, including our veterans, including Members of Congress, including people all over this Nation, have been touched by cancer. My father, former Congressman Donald Payne, who served New Jersey's 10th Congressional District for 23 years, prior to me coming here and taking his place, succumbed to this preventable and treatable disease.

Chairman DENT, thank you for your partnership on this issue. I am looking forward to continuing to work together to advance the fight against colorectal cancer and lessen the needless loss of life.

The committee report encourages the VA to support additional research and development in the field, including investigating a less costly blood test for colorectal cancer. I applaud this language, and I also understand that both the FDA and CMS have approved a new DNA, noninvasive, stool-based colorectal cancer screening test that is pending review with the Federal supply services for availability in the VA health system.

For clarity, does this committee also encourage the VA to consider and review such stool-based test screening?

Mr. DENT. Thank you, Congressman PAYNE, for your shared interest in this very important topic.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague for his steadfast support of colorectal cancer awareness research, prevention, and treatment efforts. As the second leading cause of death in men and women in the United States, we have both seen the personal toll that colorectal cancer can have on family members and loved ones. Congressman PAYNE obviously lost his father; I lost my brother-in-law. It was very painful for all of us. We lost them all too soon.

It has been a privilege to work together with you on an issue that has raised awareness and increased preventive screenings. This is an issue that affects far too many of our veterans and, as you mentioned, this bill takes steps to support the VA's prevention and treatment efforts.

The report's language should not be misconstrued as only focusing on blood tests, and I certainly encourage the VA to expedite its review of alternative colorectal cancer screening tests, including DNA stool-based noninvasive tests. We certainly want to encourage the VA in that regard.

I look forward to continuing to work with you on these important matters. Again, I want to really commend Congressman PAYNE for his determination and steadfast interest in advancing therapies and treatments for colorectal cancer.

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

Mr. DENT. 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. NEWHOUSE) 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. 2029) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1732, REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 43, DISAPPROVAL OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-98) on the resolution (H. Res. 231) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2028, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 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. 2028.

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

□ 2022

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. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for the first time. The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

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

It is my distinct honor to bring the fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water bill before you today.

Before I go into the details, I would like to recognize the hard work of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY on this bill and the appro-

priation process. I would also like to thank my ranking member, Ms. KAPTUR. I appreciate her help, and with it, this bill is better because of it.

The bill provides \$35.4 billion for the activities of the Department of Energy, Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies under our jurisdiction. This is a \$1.2 billion increase from last year's funding level, and \$633 million below the request.

This is a responsible bill that recognizes the importance of investing in our Nation's infrastructure and national defense. As we do each year, we worked hard to incorporate priorities and perspectives from both sides of the aisle.

The administration's proposal to cut programs of the Army Corps of Engineers by \$750 million would have led to economic disruptions in our ports and waterways as they filled in, and would have left our communities and businesses vulnerable to flooding.

Instead, this bill recognizes the critical work of the Corps and provides \$5.6 billion for those activities, \$865 million above the request and \$142 million more than last year. The bill makes use of all estimated annual revenues from the inland waterways trust fund, for a total of \$340 million.

The bill takes a strong stand against the administration's regulatory overreach with regards to the Clean Water Act and includes three provisions that prohibit changes to the definition of "fill material," the definition of

"waters of the United States," and the permit requirement for certain agricultural activities.

The nuclear weapons program run by the Department of Energy is funded at \$8.7 billion, which is \$526 million more than last year. This increase will support full funding for the stockpile life extension programs, and includes an additional \$100 million above the request to address the growing backlog of deferred maintenance and physical security projects.

The recommendation for Naval Reactors is \$1.3 billion, an increase of \$86 million, and includes full funding for the *Ohio* class replacement submarine.

This bill makes strong, balanced investments in our energy sector to ensure that our constituents continue to have reliable, affordable energy.

Fossil energy, which provided more than 67 percent of our electricity production in 2014, received \$605 million, a \$34 million increase above fiscal year 2015.

Nuclear energy is increased by \$23 million above last year. The bill also includes \$40 million more than last year to ensure an electric grid that is both reliable and resilient now and into the future.

This is a strong bill that will advance our national security interests and our economy. I urge everyone to support it.

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

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2016 (H.R. 2028)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
Investigations.....	122,000	97,000	110,000	-12,000	+13,000
Construction.....	1,639,489	1,172,000	1,631,000	-8,489	+459,000
Mississippi River and Tributaries.....	302,000	225,000	275,000	-27,000	+50,000
Operations and Maintenance.....	2,908,511	2,710,000	3,058,000	+149,489	+348,000
Regulatory Program.....	200,000	205,000	200,000	---	-5,000
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP).....	101,500	104,000	104,000	+2,500	---
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies.....	28,000	34,000	34,000	+6,000	---
Expenses.....	178,000	180,000	180,000	+2,000	---
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works).....	3,000	5,000	4,750	+1,750	-250
General Provisions					
Title I Rescission.....	-28,000	---	---	+28,000	---
=====					
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil...	5,454,500	4,732,000	5,596,750	+142,250	+864,750
Appropriations.....	(5,482,500)	(4,732,000)	(5,596,750)	(+114,250)	(+864,750)
Rescissions.....	(-28,000)	---	---	(+28,000)	---
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah Project Completion Account.....	9,874	7,300	9,874	---	+2,574
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and Related Resources.....	978,131	805,157	948,640	-29,491	+143,483
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund.....	56,995	49,528	49,528	-7,467	---
California Bay-Delta Restoration.....	37,000	37,000	37,000	---	---
Policy and Administration.....	58,500	59,500	59,500	+1,000	---
Indian Water Rights Settlements.....	---	112,483	---	---	-112,483
San Joaquin River Restoration Fund.....	---	35,000	---	---	-35,000
Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account (Rescission).....	-500	---	---	+500	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	1,130,126	1,098,668	1,094,668	-35,458	-4,000
=====					
Total, title II, Department of the Interior.....	1,140,000	1,105,968	1,104,542	-35,458	-1,426
Appropriations.....	(1,140,500)	(1,105,968)	(1,104,542)	(-35,958)	(-1,426)
Rescissions.....	(-500)	---	---	(+500)	---
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Programs					
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.....	1,937,000	2,722,987	1,657,774	-279,226	-1,065,213
Rescissions.....	-13,065	---	---	+13,065	---
Subtotal, Energy efficiency.....	1,923,935	2,722,987	1,657,774	-266,161	-1,065,213
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.....	147,306	270,100	187,500	+40,194	-82,600
Nuclear Energy.....	805,000	772,413	810,000	+5,000	+37,587
Defense function.....	108,500	135,161	126,161	+17,661	-9,000
Rescission.....	-80,000	---	---	+80,000	---
Subtotal.....	833,500	907,574	936,161	+102,661	+28,587
Fossil Energy Research and Development.....	571,000	560,000	605,000	+34,000	+45,000
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves.....	19,950	17,500	17,500	-2,450	---
Elk Hills School Lands Fund.....	15,580	---	---	-15,580	---
Strategic Petroleum Reserve.....	200,000	257,000	212,030	+12,030	-44,970

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2016 (H.R. 2028)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve.....	7,600	7,600	7,600	---	---
Rescission.....	-6,000	---	---	+6,000	---
Subtotal.....	1,600	7,600	7,600	+6,000	---
Energy Information Administration.....	117,000	131,000	117,000	---	-14,000
Non-defense Environmental Cleanup.....	246,000	220,185	229,193	-16,807	+9,008
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.....	625,000	542,289	625,000	---	+82,711
Science.....	5,071,000	5,339,794	5,100,000	+29,000	-239,794
Nuclear Waste Disposal.....	---	---	150,000	+150,000	+150,000
Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy.....	280,000	325,000	280,000	---	-45,000
Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs.....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Title 17 Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program.....	42,000	42,000	42,000	---	---
Offsetting collection.....	-25,000	-25,000	-25,000	---	---
Subtotal.....	17,000	17,000	17,000	---	---
Tribal Indian Energy Loan Guarantee Program.....	---	11,000	---	---	-11,000
Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loans program.....	4,000	6,000	6,000	+2,000	---
Clean Coal Technology (Rescission).....	-6,600	---	---	+6,600	---
Departmental Administration.....	245,142	270,682	247,420	+2,278	-23,262
Miscellaneous revenues.....	-119,171	-117,171	-117,171	+2,000	---
Net appropriation.....	125,971	153,511	130,249	+4,278	-23,262
Office of the Inspector General.....	40,500	46,424	46,000	+5,500	-424
Total, Energy programs.....	10,232,742	11,554,964	10,324,007	+91,265	-1,230,957
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration					
Weapons Activities.....	8,231,770	8,846,948	8,713,000	+481,230	-133,948
Rescission.....	-45,113	---	---	+45,113	---
Subtotal.....	8,186,657	8,846,948	8,713,000	+526,343	-133,948
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.....	1,641,369	1,940,302	1,918,000	+276,631	-22,302
Rescission.....	-24,731	---	-10,394	+14,337	-10,394
Subtotal.....	1,616,638	1,940,302	1,907,606	+290,968	-32,696
Naval Reactors.....	1,238,500	1,375,496	1,320,394	+81,894	-55,102
Rescission.....	-4,500	---	---	+4,500	---
Subtotal.....	1,234,000	1,375,496	1,320,394	+86,394	-55,102
Federal Salaries and Expenses.....	370,000	402,654	388,000	+18,000	-14,654
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration.....	11,407,295	12,565,400	12,329,000	+921,705	-236,400
Environmental and Other Defense Activities					
Defense Environmental Cleanup.....	5,010,830	5,055,550	5,055,550	+44,720	---
Rescission.....	-10,830	---	---	+10,830	---
Subtotal.....	5,000,000	5,055,550	5,055,550	+55,550	---
Defense Environmental cleanup (Legislative proposal).....	---	471,797	---	---	-471,797
Defense Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning.....	463,000	---	471,797	+8,797	+471,797

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2016 (H.R. 2028)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Other Defense Activities.....	754,000	774,425	767,570	+13,570	-6,855
Total, Environmental and Other Defense Activities.....	6,217,000	6,301,772	6,294,917	+77,917	-6,855
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities.....	17,624,295	18,867,172	18,623,917	+999,622	-243,255
Power Marketing Administrations /1					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration.....	7,220	6,900	6,900	-320	---
Offsetting collections.....	-7,220	-6,900	-6,900	+320	---
Subtotal.....	---	---	---	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration.....	46,240	47,361	47,361	+1,121	---
Offsetting collections.....	-34,840	-35,961	-35,961	-1,121	---
Subtotal.....	11,400	11,400	11,400	---	---
Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration.....	304,402	307,714	307,714	+3,312	---
Offsetting collections.....	-211,030	-214,342	-214,342	-3,312	---
Subtotal.....	93,372	93,372	93,372	---	---
Falcon and Amidast Operating and Maintenance Fund.....	4,727	4,490	4,490	-237	---
Offsetting collections.....	-4,499	-4,262	-4,262	+237	---
Subtotal.....	228	228	228	---	---
Total, Power Marketing Administrations.....	105,000	105,000	105,000	---	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	304,389	319,800	319,800	+15,411	---
Revenues applied.....	-304,389	-319,800	-319,800	-15,411	---
General Provisions					
Title III Rescissions:					
Department of Energy:					
Energy Efficiency and Energy Reliability.....	-9,740	---	-16,677	-6,937	-16,677
Science.....	-3,262	---	-4,717	-1,455	-4,717
Nuclear Energy.....	-121	---	-1,665	-1,544	-1,665
Fossil Energy Research and Development.....	-10,413	---	-12,064	-1,651	-12,064
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.....	-331	---	-900	-569	-900
Advanced Research Projects Agency - Energy.....	-18	---	---	+18	---
Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration..	-1,632	---	-4,832	-3,200	-4,832
Weapons activities (050).....	-6,298	---	---	+6,298	---
Office of the Administrator (050).....	-413	---	---	+413	---
Departmental Administration.....	-928	---	---	+928	---
Defense Environmental Cleanup (050).....	-9,983	---	---	+9,983	---
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (050).....	-1,390	---	---	+1,390	---
Naval Reactors (050).....	-160	---	---	+160	---
Other Defense Activities (050).....	-551	---	---	+551	---
Subtotal.....	-45,240	---	-40,855	+4,385	-40,855
=====					
Total, title III, Department of Energy.....	27,916,797	30,527,136	29,012,069	+1,095,272	-1,515,067
Appropriations.....	(28,152,876)	(30,527,136)	(29,063,318)	(+910,442)	(-1,463,818)
Rescissions.....	(-236,079)	---	(-51,249)	(+184,830)	(-51,249)
=====					

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2016 (H.R. 2028)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	90,000	95,000	95,000	+5,000	---
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.....	28,500	29,150	29,900	+1,400	+750
Delta Regional Authority.....	12,000	14,936	12,000	---	-2,936
Denali Commission.....	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Northern Border Regional Commission.....	5,000	5,000	3,000	-2,000	-2,000
Southeast Crescent Regional Commission.....	250	---	250	---	+250
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,003,233	1,020,119	1,003,233	---	-16,886
Revenues.....	-885,375	-899,971	-862,274	+23,101	+37,697
Subtotal.....	117,858	120,148	140,959	+23,101	+20,811
Office of Inspector General.....	12,071	12,136	12,136	+65	---
Revenues.....	-10,099	-10,060	-10,060	+39	---
Subtotal.....	1,972	2,076	2,076	+104	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.....	119,830	122,224	143,035	+23,205	+20,811
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.....	3,400	3,600	3,600	+200	---
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects.....	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000	---
=====					
Total, title IV, Independent agencies.....	268,980	280,910	297,785	+28,805	+16,875
Appropriations.....	(268,980)	(280,910)	(297,785)	(+28,805)	(+16,875)
=====					
Grand total.....	34,780,277	36,646,014	36,011,146	+1,230,869	-634,868
Appropriations.....	(35,044,856)	(36,646,014)	(36,062,395)	(+1,017,539)	(-583,619)
Rescissions.....	(-264,579)	---	(-51,249)	(+213,330)	(-51,249)
=====					

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 want to begin by thanking Chairman SIMPSON for his bipartisan approach in preparing this bill. We have a good committee, and we work together.

I want to thank also our entire staff, Donna Shahbaz and Taunja Berquam, the Republican and Democratic Clerks, as well as the rest of the Committee staff: Matt Anderson, Angie Giancarlo, Loraine Heckenberg, and Perry Yates; and in the personal offices, Sarah Cannon and Ryan Steyer. Their countless long hours, late nights, and thoughtful insight are so critical to help us prepare this legislation.

Thirty-seven years ago, President Jimmy Carter, after the first Arab oil embargo, as gasoline prices exploded and the U.S. fell into deep, deep recession, championed the creation of a U.S. Department of Energy. He equated the struggle for America's energy independence as the moral equivalent of war, and he was right. He set a goal to steer the United States toward energy independence by 1985.

Today, America still struggles to meet that challenge set out nearly four decades ago: reducing our imported energy dependence, curbing our voracious appetite for foreign oil, and growing a diverse domestic energy portfolio that invests in a self-reliant America and the job creation here at home that goes with it.

Containing our ballooning consumption topped President Carter's agenda. But while he successfully reduced consumption during his Presidency, his successors lost focus. Demand for gasoline increased by 40 percent in the 25 years after he left office, a troubling reality, as every economic recession since World War II has come on the heels of a sharp spike in gasoline prices. I have a chart here that so dramatically shows every time gasoline went over \$4 a gallon, America, in the late seventies, in the early nineties, and then of course in 2008, fell into deep, deep recession.

Our work is important. Under the current administration, partnerships between the Department of Energy labs and automotive companies have finally helped level out demand for gasoline with increasing fuel efficiency.

President Carter also envisioned a new energy horizon for our Nation, including renewable energy and conservation. Solar electric capacity currently operating in our country is enough to power more than 3.5 million homes, on average.

Today, 90 percent of homes in our country are insulated. These are important achievements, milestones for our country, and America must push onward.

On the critical issue of reducing foreign oil dependence, President Carter's initiative strikingly reduced imports below the target of 6 million barrels a day, a cut of nearly a third, but imports, again, after his Presidency, went on the rise in subsequent decades. Vast

energy imports continue to represent the single largest component of our overall trade deficit.

□ 2030

I brought a chart down here tonight that shows America has been in the depths of deficit in trade, but the portion of it that deals with petroleum is its most significant percentage, and it has been for a very long time.

That translates into millions and millions of forfeited jobs here at home. Still at \$47 billion last year, crude oil imports were roughly equal to the next four largest trade deficit categories.

Around the world, the war over energy rages on. Look only to Europe's compromised position toward Ukraine and, of course, oil-rich but unstable Iraq. We must position our own Nation to a secure energy future.

Our bill's priority is to strengthen our Nation's energy foundation. This bill does responsibly invest in that effort, as well as in our nuclear security as well as our water infrastructure. But I must ask: At what cost does our bill do this? Our bill is among the first two to be considered. There are 10 bills that will follow, and, frankly, they were raided to pay for ours.

This Republican budget will mean that additional funding for this bill—1 of 12 appropriation bills on which Congress must act—comes at the expense of other vital national needs that will be shortchanged as subsequent appropriation bills are brought forward; in total, 12 of them.

For example, our bill funds incredible advanced scientific research. But it does so at the expense of the Health and Human Services bill that shorts support for our students who will be the next generation of scientists.

Our bill provides for the Department of Energy labs, whose new technologies will power our future. But why is the National Institutes of Health shortchanged in the Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations bill? Its discoveries will save and improve millions of lives.

In our bill, nuclear weapons funding will increase by \$500 million. Meanwhile, in the Transportation, Housing bill, crumbling cities will lose even more resources, elderly housing will remain unfunded, and our poorest families will continue struggling to put food on the table.

Nuclear nonproliferation and environmental cleanup efforts in our bill will make our world safer. But on America's streets, police and fire departments will remain understaffed, insufficiently trained, and underequipped because the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill is shorted.

In our bill, there are no new starts for the Army Corps of Engineers infrastructure, whose \$60 billion backlog of unfinished projects is astounding. But to fund the Corps in our bill, America's roads will be shortchanged and remain pothole-ridden, the rail lines clogged, with more bridges on the brink of col-

lapse because the Transportation, Housing bill has been shortchanged too.

In our bill, the Bureau of Reclamation will continue to help our 17 Western States cope with record drought, yet severe underfunding of the clean water and drinking water funds in the Department of Interior-EPA bill will further threaten the fresh water supply of thousands more communities across our country. No amount of duct tape can fix all the leaking pipes.

This bill sacrifices the long-term strength of our Nation by raiding other bills that are essential appropriation responsibilities, but that is the game plan of the overall Republican budget that has been handed us. It is not a prescription for an American success story.

The Appropriations Committee's discretionary programs, at only 6.8 percent of our Nation's total economy, or GDP, are too thin a reed on which to balance our Nation's accounts.

The Ways and Means Committee must put its cards on the table too and open its vast jurisdiction to scrutiny. Mandatory programs must be put on the table. And then the preparation of America's budget will have an engine in which all pistons are firing and engaged.

We want to produce an appropriation bill here tonight, but I find myself guilty in a way because I know what is being taken from those other subcommittees so vital to our Nation's future.

Though this Energy and Water bill is respectable, it is only one oar in the water pushing our ship of state forward. We can't reach our destination without the other 11 oars in the water too. For that reason, I urge my colleagues, as we move forward, to consider a "no" vote on this measure in hopes that a message will be sent strongly. The American people deserve all hands on deck and all oars in the water.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 2028 and would like to take this opportunity to talk about the importance of investing in American infrastructure.

This legislation provides support for critical national and regional waterways. The Soo Locks, located in my district, are a critical point in our Nation's infrastructure. Over 80 million tons of commercial commodities travel through the Soo Locks each year, including the vast majority of the iron ore mined in the United States. The value of the cargo traveling through the Soo Locks represents approximately 3.2 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product each year.

Recently, the Army Corps completed a sensitivity analysis on the Soo Locks

and has indicated that they may begin a new benefit-cost ratio in the future.

This lip service isn't good enough. The impact on our economy, should there be a failure of the lock, is too great.

The study must be completed, and I am confident that it will show a need for a replacement lock and construction can get underway.

I urge the Corps to continue to work with Congress in an efficient and transparent fashion so that we can continue to move this process forward and get this project going.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to inquire of the Chair, how much time do we have remaining on this side, please?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 22 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Idaho has 26 minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I thank subcommittee Chairman SIMPSON, Ranking Member KAPTUR, and full committee Chairman ROGERS for their work on this bill.

The House Republican "work harder for less" budget resolution was opposed by every Member on my side of the aisle in part because it makes it impossible to provide the funding necessary in the 12 appropriations bills to grow our economy and give hard-working Americans the opportunity to succeed.

Democrats much preferred the approach taken by the President, calling for an end to the sequester and more reasonable and realistic budgeting that could help families afford college, a home, and a secure retirement.

The proposed funding level for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy is dismal and would curtail innovation in clean and renewable energy and make us less competitive. This type of investment grows our economy and provides opportunity to hard-working Americans. But under the Republican proposal, funding would be slashed by \$266 million compared to the 2015 level.

A number of other areas fall far short of the President's proposal, including \$82.6 million less to modernize and secure the electric grid and \$240 million less for scientific research critical to addressing long-term energy needs.

These levels are above the current enacted levels; but by failing to address sequestration, the majority is missing an opportunity to further invest in critical initiatives that create jobs and make American families more secure.

Given the difficulty in resolving funding disputes, I am deeply disappointed that the majority also, once again, needlessly included controversial policy riders.

An annual appropriations bill is not the place to make sweeping changes to environmental protection or gun laws.

Despite the fact that it streamlines existing activities to protect 2.8 mil-

lion ocean industry jobs and \$282 billion in GDP generated by ocean industries in coastal States, the National Ocean Policy would be blocked. I do not understand how any public good is served by thwarting efficiency measures that bring together the best ecological, economic, and stakeholder-driven data.

There are egregious attacks on the Clean Water Act, including locking in place a state of confusion about the scope of pollution control programs and sacrificing water quality for small streams and wetlands that contribute to the drinking water of one in three Americans.

I should not have to remind my majority colleagues that similar provisions have imperiled this bill in the past. The administration is, once again, on record with veto threats of nearly identical language, and leading environmental groups have stated that these and other riders are bad policies that will put Americans' health and safety at risk.

I am truly amazed that the majority would willfully go down this path again. Despite the many shortcomings, there are positive aspects, particularly the Army Corps of Engineers. In its most recent report card, the American Society of Civil Engineers gave the U.S. a D-plus and estimated that \$2.6 trillion in investments are needed by 2020.

I am very grateful that Chairman SIMPSON included \$142 million more than the current level and \$865 million more than the President requested for the Army Corps.

While a number of priorities in the bill receive sufficient funding, due to major shortcomings, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chair, I was elected to fight for the people of the Third Congressional District. That is what I am doing, and that is what this bill does.

As members of the Appropriations Committee, we are using the power of the purse. This bill provides full funding for key Army Corps of Engineers projects in my district, nearly \$26 million for projects in southern West Virginia—East Lynn, Summersville, Bluestone, and Beech Fork lakes—all critically important.

This bill supports the excellent work of the Appalachian Regional Commission, making a real difference in real people's lives. This bill actually adds an additional \$5 million over last year's funding.

And this bill also says no to funding for the administration's war on coal, no to expanding the definitions of the "waters of the U.S.," and no to new regulations on fill material.

This is a good bill, and I urge its passage.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the very, very able gentleman from the State of California (Mr. HONDA), a distinguished member of our subcommittee.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chair, this was my first year serving on the subcommittee. And I thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their leadership throughout this process, for the collaborative way they had worked with the members of the subcommittee on this bill.

I support the increases in the bill for the important investigations and construction accounts of the Army Corps of Engineers, which are increasingly important for dealing with the effects of climate change and have been underfunded for too long. I hope we can fully address the Corps' budgetary needs as this bill moves forward.

I am pleased that the bill includes language I sought to help us increase access to solar and other renewable energy sources for low-income families. This inclusiveness is critically important if we are going to transform to a 21st century energy economy that benefits all Americans.

I also appreciate the inclusion language supporting development of new photonics technologies to enable exascale computing breakthroughs.

Funding DOE's Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists program at the President's request level is essential for programs to develop K-12 STEM educators, including the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship, now in its 25th year.

□ 2045

The funding level in this bill should allow for continued growth of the Einstein Fellows program, which brings exceptional STEM educators to Washington for a year to work in Federal agencies and in Congress helping to shape STEM education programs. There are, however, damaging cuts to some programs and others funded below the President's budget request.

These decisions will take us in the wrong direction. We need to boost the funding levels for renewable energy programs that are our path to a clean energy future. We also must address the shortfalls in the Science Laboratories infrastructure funding that will hamper operations at user facilities such as light sources and science and nanoscience centers and engineering centers.

I want to voice my disagreement with several of the policy riders in the bill. We shouldn't be blocking work to clarify the scope of the Clean Water Act, and we should be fostering collaboration between the Federal, State, and local agencies and ocean stakeholders about how to share this vital resource and not hindering it.

I know my chairman was faced with a difficult task, and his approach to developing this bill has shown these issues, which are important for our Nation and for our planet, the respect they deserve.

I look forward to working with Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR, as this bill moves forward, to resolve some of these issues in a bipartisan fashion so we can send a bill to the President that all of us can support.

Mr. SIMPSON. It is my pleasure to yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a good friend of mine, for the purpose of colloquy.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as we continue to cut, squeeze, and trim the Federal budget, we have a responsibility to ensure that our Federal agencies operate as efficiently as possible.

I know that we both have examples in our district where multiple Federal, State, and local agencies overlap in their management authority, often causing unnecessary bureaucratic red tape, which ends up costing taxpayers more money while accomplishing less.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to work with you as we move this bill forward to improve the transparency and efficiency of Federal agencies. They need to talk to each other and work together so that our constituents are not forced to sort through conflicting requirements. I hope you can help me.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from California for inviting me to speak on this important matter. I agree that the Energy and Water Appropriations bill should strive to make our Federal agencies work more efficiently with each other and work together.

I look forward to working with the gentleman on this issue.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a very, very hard-working and passionate member of our Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank our ranking member, first of all, for yielding, but secondly, for her unwavering leadership on this subcommittee, but also on each and every issue that we are addressing in this bill and for her leadership just in general, in terms of making sure that people who have been marginalized and who really have been victimized by this terrible recession really have opportunities into the middle class. Thank you very much, Congresswoman KAPTUR.

Let me thank the Chair for including language to recognize the importance of workplace diversity in the Department of Energy's National Laboratories and encouraging the Department to develop and broaden partnerships with minority-serving institutions, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Chairman, however, I am concerned that not only does this bill maintain harmful sequester levels for funding, it also continues the pattern of inserting unnecessary policy riders into spending bills, including allowing guns to be carried on all Corps of Engineers lands. These riders are harmful and further complicate the already difficult appropriations process.

Mr. Chairman, instead of trying to roll back vital environmental protections, we need to be proactive about preserving our environment for the next generation. We need to make more investments in clean energy like solar, wind, and geothermal.

We need to do this to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels that release harmful, toxic methane and carbon. Pollution and smog must not be a normal way of life for our children and our children's children.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to yield 30 seconds to myself to just thank the gentlewoman very much for her comments and to say how very much I enjoyed visiting the Berkeley lab with her out in California and knowing the work that they are doing not just for California, but for the whole country.

It has been really a pleasure to work with you and to support that lab and its activities.

Ms. LEE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Ms. LEE. I just thank the gentlewoman, first of all, for her visit, but also for really understanding very deeply what our labs are about and what they are really conducting not only for my district and for California, but for the country and for the world in terms of their research.

I just really want to thank you because the feedback, of course, from my lab is how smart and how committed you are.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a good friend of mine and a member of the Appropriations Committee. He is the chairman of the Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Before yielding to Mr. DIAZ-BALART from Florida, I would like to thank the gentleman for all his tireless work on behalf of the Everglades, truly a remarkable spot. He is a true leader on these issues, and he continues to restore the Everglades to their natural state.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I actually came here to thank Chairman SIMPSON for putting together this great bill, a responsible bill and, again, for putting up with me and working with me on issues dealing with Everglades restoration. I don't have to tell anybody here that is a national treasure. It is important not only for southern Florida's drinking water, but also for our economy.

I also want to specifically thank the chairman for his help in the Herbert Hoover Dike, which is crucial, again, for the folks in that area.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is a great bill. Chairman SIMPSON has a very difficult task. He has done a spectacular job. Again, thank you, sir, for working with me on these important issues.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Once again, congratulations on bringing this important bill to the floor.

I wanted to thank you for the chance to really engage and for your willingness to address an issue of critical importance to the Nation's innovation and competitiveness, that is the full utilization of the Department of Energy's radiation light source national user facilities.

Unfortunately, the funding level in this bill for DOE's light source scientific user facilities would not utilize our Federal investment to the fullest effect. This would lead to facilities temporarily shutting down and laying off and furloughing scientific staff.

The fiscal year '15 enacted level for this program was \$447 million. Now, the President has requested \$477 million, but the House mark is \$443 million.

My colleagues and I look forward to working with you to address this issue in conference and with the Senate and to work toward a higher mark for this account, at least higher than fiscal year '15 and hopefully closer to the President's budget.

Again, I want to thank you for your leadership and for your willingness to work with us on this important issue.

Mr. HONDA. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member KAPTUR, I echo my colleague's comments and thank you for your collegial leadership of the subcommittee.

Funding the synchrotron light sources adequately is a competitiveness issue for the Nation's economic well-being. Companies from my district, throughout Silicon Valley and around the Nation, utilize these unique, large-scale scientific facilities to advance next generation technologies and to grow our Nation's economy.

Other nations are catching up. We must make sure to make the investments that retain our leadership. Thank you for your willingness to address this issue.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank you for bringing this important issue to the subcommittee's attention. I look forward to working with Ranking Member KAPTUR and all of you to support the Nation's light source user facilities as we move forward into conference.

Ms. KAPTUR. I also appreciate the Members bringing this to our attention, having visited more than one of these facilities and look forward to working with the chairman to support this very worthy activity.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

NEWHOUSE), a new Member of Congress who has been very active and who has been newly appointed to the Rules Committee for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, Hanford is the Nation's largest and most complex Department of Energy defense nuclear cleanup site. I have greatly appreciated your willingness to work with me to ensure funding for this important effort.

The restoration of funds for cleanup along the Columbia River Corridor, which is legally required and a priority for the mid-Columbia region, puts those projects on a very strong path forward.

I also appreciate the funding provided for the Office of River Protection. As the final bill is developed for fiscal year '16, I would like to continue working with you to ensure that all of the work that the Federal Government is legally obligated to do is realized.

I am particularly concerned with ensuring that work is able to progress on retrieving Hanford's tank waste and preparing to feed an operational waste treatment plant while providing sufficient resources to meet near-term regulatory requirements in the tank farms.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington for his strong advocacy for these important cleanup activities. I agree they are probably the most important in this country.

I look forward to working with him to ensure that activities at Hanford's tank farms and at the waste treatment plant receive the funding required to move forward safely, efficiently, and in a timely manner.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I thank the gentleman and look forward to working with him, as well as the ranking member from Ohio, in the future.

Ms. KAPTUR. I have no further requests for time, so I yield back the balance of my time in the interests of moving forward with the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2028, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2016.

Not only does the underlying bill support funding for critical infrastructure in our country, but also includes several important provisions a majority of the Members in this body are concerned with.

Section 105 provides an excellent backstop for ensuring the EPA's controversial waters of United States rule does not go forward in its current state. This rule is nothing more than a Federal power grab for the EPA and it

flies in the face of two Supreme Court decisions. The agencies themselves have admitted to Congress, in multiple hearings, that the proposed rule has created confusion and uncertainty.

I want to thank the chairman for including this necessary backstop provision that will help stop this rule from wreaking havoc on farmers, businesses, families, and the entire regulated community. This rule could potentially roll back the progress we have made in our Nation's water quality by instituting burdensome permitting costs and unnecessary red tape.

Another important provision prohibits the Corps from using funds for open lake placement of dredge material in Lake Erie, unless the material is approved under the State water quality certification program. We all know the benefits of dredging and how vital it is to the Great Lakes system's ecosystem, businesses, recreation, and tourism.

We must ensure dredged material is safely repurposed for beneficial use or placed in a confined disposal facility. If dredged sediment is placed in Lake Erie now, research shows increased PCB levels in the fish could cause significant setbacks to the recreational community.

In a time where our Great Lakes' water quality is threatened by algae and other contaminants, we must ensure we do not add to the problem.

I am also pleased to see my common-sense legislation included in the underlying bill to grant law-abiding gun owners the ability to exercise their Second Amendment rights when they are legally camping, hunting, and fishing on Army Corps property.

I thank Representative SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for recognizing the importance of these provisions and for putting together a bill that sets appropriate levels.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SIMPSON for providing me time to engage in this colloquy.

Through working with the chairman and others, the House was able to pass the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act last year, and the legislation was signed into law.

□ 2100

This legislation is designed to bring manufacturing in our country to the next level by increasing global competitiveness and training the workforce of tomorrow through the establishment of centers throughout the country.

As some of these centers lie within the purview of the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, I want to take this opportunity to thank the chairman for working with me on this issue and to clarify that this bill we are considering today funds the establishment of at least one new center that can be coordinated with the Department of Commerce.

With that, I thank the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I appreciate my friend's leadership on the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act and can confirm that this bill funds the establishment of at least one new center. I look forward to working with you on these issues in the future and as this bill moves forward.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON. With that, Mr. Chairman, I believe we have no more requests for time on general debate and look forward to moving forward on the bill.

Like my colleague from Ohio, I yield back the balance of my time.

The 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 each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment. No pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. 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. Amendments so printed shall be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2028

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, 2016, 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, \$110,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which will help reduce the large backlog of important Army Corps of Engineers projects.

This amendment transfers \$1 million from the Department of Energy’s Departmental administration budget to the Corps of Engineers’ investigations budget to bring it closer to the fiscal year 2015 enacted appropriation level.

The investigation account funds the planning and environmental studies required under law for important Corps projects prior to construction. There is a large backlog of worthwhile Corps projects throughout the country that are essential to improving infrastructures for communities, improving ecosystem restoration, providing clean water, and expanding much-needed water storage. These projects are especially critical to the drought-stricken communities in the West and many other parts of the Nation.

The committee showed great insight in recognizing that the administration’s request for the Corps’ investigation budget was much too low. Having said that, the amount appropriated in this bill is still \$12 million below the fiscal year 2015 levels. At a time of historic drought and major water challenges, we shouldn’t be reducing investigation dollars that will allow worthwhile community projects to move forward.

The committee has provided significant safeguards in the report to ensure the funds transferred by this amendment will go to the studies in planning for the most viable projects. Thus, support for this amendment is a definitive action we can take to directly support timely development of critical infrastructure projects.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I thank the distinguished chair and ranking member for their work on this bill.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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); \$1,631,000,000, 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, except as otherwise specifically provided for in law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer another commonsense amendment that will help reduce the large backlog of important Army Corps of Engineers’ projects by providing additional resources to the Corps’ construction budget.

I applaud the committee for recommending resources for the Corps of Engineers’ construction budget above the President’s budget request, but the recommended level in this bill for construction is still \$8.5 million beneath the fiscal year 2015 level.

A devastating drought is currently plaguing the West. CRS estimates that more than 93 percent of the State of California is experiencing severe drought. Other scientists have claimed this is the worst drought for some Western States in more than 100 years and that approximately 60 percent of the West is “experiencing moderate drought or worse, affecting 52 million people.”

At a time of historic drought and major water challenges, we shouldn’t be reducing construction dollars for Corps projects that improve infrastructure for local communities, improve ecosystem restoration, provide clean water, and expand much-needed water storage.

The committee report on this bill raised some important concerns about the draconian cuts proposed by this administration to the Corps of Engineers’ construction budget.

From the committee report: “The construction account would see the largest dollar reduction (\$467,489,000) and largest percentage reduction (29 percent) . . . As mentioned above, the budget request is woefully inadequate for meeting the critical water resource infrastructure needs of this Nation. Numerous continuing studies and construction projects will be suspended or slowed, leaving many communities vulnerable to floods and coastal storms longer than necessary and hindering economic growth and international competitiveness . . . Once again, the administration’s claims to understand the importance of infrastructure ring hollow when it comes to water resource infrastructure investments . . . Once again, however, the committee rejects the low priority placed on infrastructure in the budget request.”

The committee has provided significant safeguards in the report that will ensure that the funds transferred by this amendment go to the best projects, including those that will prevent future flooding and storm damage, create jobs, and enhance national, regional, or local economic development.

Support for this amendment is definitive action that we can take to directly support timely development of critical water projects that benefit communities throughout the Nation.

I thank the distinguished chair and ranking member.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to the gentleman’s amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. But I will tell you it is easy to draft amendments and take money out of the department of the administration—who is not going to be in support of that—and put it to other things.

I can tell you this committee has worked hard to address the issues. We know about the drought in California and other places, and we have done a good job in trying to fund this. If the gentleman wants to do this in here and take money out of the department of administration and the committee wants to do it, it is kind of meaningless, but I understand what the gentleman is trying to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 7, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$1,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chair and ranking member for their extremely hard work on the underlying bill and their ongoing commitment to Everglades restoration.

I rise because, at this very moment in my district in Florida, toxic blue-green algae is threatening the environment in our area. The amendment I am offering, along with the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CLAWSON, will enhance the Army Corps' environmental restoration efforts in south Florida and help put a stop to this vicious cycle once and for all.

The Everglades watershed stretches as far north as Orlando, where runoff eventually flows into Lake Okeechobee. Due to rapid development, the natural flow of water from north to south in the system has been severely disrupted, and we are inundated with freshwater discharges that harm our communities to the east and to the west of the lake.

Meanwhile, Florida Bay desperately needs freshwater to restore its natural ecology. However, moving clean water south to restore the entire ecosystem is no small feat.

I had the chance to explain to President Obama last week on his first trip to the Everglades how freshwater discharges are hurting our community while freshwater is desperately needed in the Florida Bay, and how critical the Everglades restoration efforts are throughout the whole system.

Supporting the Corps' ongoing work in the Everglades is key for water quality in the Caloosahatchee River watershed, which includes Ft. Myers and Cape Coral, the St. Lucie River watershed in the Treasure Coast and Palm Beaches that I represent, and throughout Florida.

Right now, a toxic blue-green algae bloom pictured here is threatening waterways in the most biodiverse estuary in all of North America. When toxic blooms hit our water, health advisories like this are posted—right here—warning people do not touch the very water that is the center of their livelihoods.

Supporting the Corps' Everglades work can help move restoration projects closer to completion, like the C-44 reservoir in Martin County, which will help hold water back from further harming the local population and ecologically fragile areas.

This is not the first time I have come to the House floor to address this issue. Every year, our communities face this same threat. And to the people that I represent, it is unsustainable, and it is time to stop this before lasting damage is done.

I, along with many people committed to protecting our water and our community, will not rest until the health advisories posted along our rivers and estuaries disappear once and for all. These aren't just our precious Everglades in Florida. This ecosystem is America's River of Grass with no place like it in the world. It must be protected at all costs.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON), who has been a tireless champion on Everglades restoration.

□ 2115

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Thank you to Representative MURPHY for his great leadership on this issue, and particularly thank you to the chairman, Mr. SIMPSON, for his leadership and success in this endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, my first steps towards Congress began one summer day 2 years ago while I was wading in the Gulf of Mexico with my father, who is in the autumn of his lifetime. Walking beside my dad in knee-deep depth, the old vet and I couldn't see our own toes because of the dirty water. Dad looked at me, and he said, “Son, do something about this.”

The Gulf had been contaminated by the discharge from Lake Okeechobee. The algae was in full bloom—toxic algae in our Gulf. Two years later, I humbly stand here and ask you: Please join me. Let's do something about this.

Clean water is both an environmental issue and a business issue. The dirty discharges damage our tourism, our economy, our drinking water, our beaches, our businesses, and our national treasure, the Everglades. The Federal Government and the State of Florida are already working to restore the Everglades with a larger freshwater supply, but we can do more.

I am asking you to help here by voting “yes” on this Murphy-Clawson amendment in order to help expedite projects like the critical South Florida Ecosystem Restoration and the Herbert Hoover Dike.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to offer this

amendment and to speak in support of a program that is important to my constituents and to all of those around the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration, also known as “GLFER,” is responsible for the planning, design, and construction of projects to protect and restore the fisheries and aquatic habitat of the Great Lakes. These projects include the restoration of riverside and wetland habitats, the construction of fish passages, and improving spawning and nursery habitats. A critical part of this program is that it requires a 35 percent cost share from a local sponsor. So it is not just Federal money. It is local money as well to fund this project.

GLFER is widely supported by those with a stake in the Great Lakes, including the Great Lakes Commission, the Alliance for the Great Lakes, the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, and the Great Lakes fishing community.

At House of Washburn, Wisconsin, one of my constituents and a board member of the Apostle Islands Sport Fisherman's Association, recently shared with me the importance of this program. He recounted: “In recent discussions with groups in Lake Superior's basin, sport fishermen are in unanimous agreement that the GLFER program offers invaluable support to fishery habitat and ecosystem restoration projects that maintain and restore the health of our Great Lakes.”

This program has broad bipartisan support and the backing of environmental, industry, and recreational groups. Not often in this House do we see this kind of support across the spectrum.

It is authorized under WRRDA, similar to other regional restoration programs in south Florida and the Louisiana coastline, which are funded by the Army Corps of Engineers in this bill. Unfortunately, for the past several years, the Corps has chosen to include no funding for this program in the budget request. This is despite the calls from Congress to do so. In fact, language in the final funding bill for fiscal year 2015 urged the Corps to “budget for this aquatic habitat restoration program in future budget submissions as it is important to the overall Great Lakes Restoration effort.” Again, they didn't include it in their budget.

This amendment is intended to ensure that the Army Corps actually provides the \$10 million necessary for the GLFER program in this fiscal year. This program should not have to rely on funding from other Great Lakes programs or wait for the leftovers of the Corps' to fund this very important project. I would hope that the Corps would follow the advice of Congress and actually account for this program in next year's budget request—actually listen to us.

I want to thank Chair Simpson and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their work on this legislation and for their support on this issue. I would urge my

colleagues to support our Great Lakes, to support our fish, and to support this bipartisan effort.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to my fellow Great Lakes member that I appreciate his coming down here tonight at this late hour and representing the interests of the Great Lakes. We need stronger voices, and you, obviously, are one of those.

I am so glad that you are calling the Corps to task to pay attention to our region and to all of the improvements that are necessary to deal with the most vital body of freshwater on the face of the Earth and, certainly, in our country. I want to thank you very much, Congressman DUFFY, for your proposal. I think that the Corps will hear you. Many of us want to work with you and to do what we can to help not just this generation but those that follow in having access to this globally critical, precious freshwater resource that we call the Great Lakes. Thank you so very much for coming down this evening.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ms. KAPTUR for her support of this amendment and for all of her work on the Great Lakes.

It is remarkable that we have such a wonderful bipartisan group that has a wide variety of opinions in this Chamber but that comes together to support the health and well-being of our Great Lakes and of our fisheries. Thank you for your support.

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

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, \$275,000,000, 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

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

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

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$27,000,000)".

Page 21, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$96,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arkansas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. First, let me thank the committee chairman and the staffs for their hard work in putting this bill together. I know it has taken a lot of time and the work of a lot of people to get it here today.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment restores funding for the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project, which is the largest flood control project in the world, to its FY15 enacted levels. The MR&T is critical in preventing widely devastating floods and to ensure this waterway remains open and able to carry the massive stream of trade that is so vital to American commerce. The Mississippi River is a thriving economic thoroughfare in the United States, with billions of tons of cargo being transported up and down the river each year.

The MR&T has played an integral role in protecting the lower Mississippi valley from floods and enabling continuous navigation along the Mississippi River and its tributaries. Since its inception in 1928, our Nation has received \$45 for every dollar invested while preventing \$612 billion in flood damages and protecting 4 million residents of the lower Mississippi River valley. The success of the project was on display in 2011, when the system withheld historic flooding that exceeded the benchmark set by the very 1927 flood which spurred the creation of the MR&T.

Not only does the MR&T protect lives and property in the lower Mississippi valley, but it also promotes navigation along the river and its tributaries, and it helps support a vibrant agriculture economy. Over 500 million tons of cargo move on the Mississippi River system each year, saving billions of dollars in domestic transportation costs and giving U.S. businesses a natural advantage.

At a time when the fiscal environment forces us to carefully evaluate where every dollar goes, I believe it is prudent to sufficiently fund projects like those covered under MR&T, which give taxpayers a return on their investment. I urge the support of this critical project.

I thank the chairman for his consideration, and I look forward to continuing to work with the committee and the chairman through the appropriations process on this critical investment in the Midsouth region.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, \$3,058,000,000, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$36,306,000)".

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$36,720,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to offer an amendment, along with my friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN), to ensure that the Federal Government meets its obligations to our ports, to our harbors, and, frankly, to the American people.

Just last year, this body overwhelmingly passed the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, WRRDA,

by a vote of 412-4. It was later then signed into law by President Obama. WRRDA includes a glide path to increase harbor maintenance funding to a level collected through the harbor maintenance tax, directing Congress this fiscal year to spend 69 percent of all of the funds collected from the user fee of that harbor maintenance. Now, that is just 69 percent this year with a 10-year glide path, and we are pleased that we are going to be able to use all of that funding for its intended purpose.

While I was hoping to achieve full expenditure for the trust fund right away, I was willing to compromise on this glide path as a step in the right direction. Unfortunately, the current version of the Energy and Water bill falls short of the mark by just over \$36 million.

I would like thank the chairman for working with us on a bipartisan and, I should say, a bicoastal way with my coming from the west side of Michigan, the west coast of Michigan—and we have got the West Coast of the country with California—and for finding a bipartisan solution to hit the target and offset the cost by reducing spending elsewhere.

We can hit this WRRDA target, and we believe that this will ensure that the 140 federally maintained commercial and recreational ports and harbors in the Great Lakes will be adequately maintained. These Federal harbor channels, like Pentwater, White Lake, Ludington, Muskegon, Holland, and Grand Haven, in my district, are the lifeblood of these very communities. Let's keep our promise to these communities and to the taxpayers who support this and allow their ports and harbors to be engines of economic growth and create jobs for American workers, farmers, and manufacturers.

Again, thank you for working with us, Mr. Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. HAHN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague and good friend from Michigan in offering the Huizenga-Hahn amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill in order to utilize the harbor maintenance trust fund at the target set forth in the recently passed Water Resources Reform and Development Act. As my colleague said, this is a very important part of what we compromised on in the WRRDA bill.

As a Representative of the Nation's busiest port complex in Los Angeles, along with Long Beach, and as the co-founder of the Ports Caucus, along with TED POE, I have fought so hard since the first day I came to Congress to increase the funding for our Nation's

ports and to fully utilize this harbor maintenance trust fund to ensure that the money that is collected at our ports goes back to our ports.

□ 2130

After working for months with my colleagues, we reached a plan to finally put the harbor maintenance trust fund to work and fully utilize it by 2025, but this bill on the floor today fails to follow the law we passed just last year with an overwhelming vote of 404-4. This bill is \$36 million behind our targets. For our Nation to remain globally competitive, we need to fund our port infrastructure.

According to the Army Corps of Engineers, we need to fully fund our harbor maintenance tax for 5 years to fully dredge our ports. Ports are crucial across this country. Americans expect to go to Target and have tennis shoes or toys on its shelves; our farmers need efficient ports to export our agriculture products, and we cannot let America's infrastructure crumble. That is unacceptable.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment because it is critically important that we provide the necessary funding to ensure that our ports are fully dredged and properly maintained. The port in Wilmington, North Carolina, plays a vital role in helping our State's farmers and other businesses export their goods to foreign markets.

In fact, a recent study showed that Wilmington's port contributes \$14 billion toward North Carolina's economy and supports, both directly and indirectly, nearly 77,000 jobs in our State. Without the proper funding, our ports will continue to deteriorate, and we risk putting our farmers and local industry—indeed, America—at a competitive disadvantage.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the Huizenga and Hahn amendment. First, I would like to commend our Committee on Appropriations' efforts on the increased Army Corps of Engineers budget on the navigation safety and efficiency.

The committee's work this year, despite very low numbers from the budget, has been difficult. I would like to thank the chair, ranking member, and staff for your hard work in working with us.

In Texas, we have serious energy and water infrastructure needs. Representing a large part of the Port of Houston, our need for operation and maintenance, as well as construction money, is significant. I greatly appreciate the committee's efforts to fund our needs by appropriating more than

\$32 million for harbor maintenance, but this amount does not reflect the amount the Port of Houston needs or the amount of revenue it generates. The Port of Houston is the second largest port in the country by tonnage. The Port of Houston ranks number one in foreign tonnage.

For dredging operations alone, the Port of Houston requires more than \$50 million annually. Currently, the Port of Houston has a backlog of projects with the Corps of Engineers totaling almost \$100 million.

The Port of Houston generates significant tax revenue, both for the State and Federal Government. To meet the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century, the Port of Houston needs the funding allocated from the harbor maintenance trust fund.

The Water Resources Reform and Development Act, WRRDA, requires that 69 percent of harbor maintenance trust fund fees be spent on related activities. While the energy and water appropriators have done great things with limited resources, this bill shortchanges the Port of Houston and many other ports across the country.

I support the Huizenga-Hahn amendment. The approximately \$37 million shortfall significantly impacts the ability of the Port of Houston to receive larger ships, and it is our job to meet these demands.

I ask my colleagues to support the Huizenga and Hahn amendment.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chair, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON for putting the money for the whole E and W bill.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment to ensure that Congress remains faithful to its obligation to fund important infrastructure projects. The harbor maintenance trust fund takes in enough revenue each year to provide the necessary maintenance of our harbor ports and channels.

However, for years, expenditure of these funds has failed to keep up with the annual revenues. This amendment would simply keep us on schedule to hit the harbor maintenance target authorized by law in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act.

This fund helps the Army Corps of Engineers provide dredging and maintenance for critical ports and channels throughout the country. In my district alone, these funds have been used to provide needed dredging at the Lake Providence Harbor, the Madison Parish Port, and ensure that the Ouachita and Black Rivers and the J. Bennett Johnston Waterway remain open to transportation and commerce.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that will keep our Nation's critical arteries open for business.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I just really want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for allowing us to offer this amendment tonight. I really want to thank my colleague, Mr. HUIZENGA, for his incredible

passion and his ability to move this forward in a way that was acceptable tonight.

I think our ports and waterways across this country will thank the gentleman, but more importantly, I really believe that, when our ports and waterways are strong, this country will be strong, and I thank the gentleman very much for that.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Huizenga-Hahn amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I, too, want to thank my colleague, Ms. HAHN, for her work on the Huizenga-Hahn amendment. It has been a pleasure to work with her over a few years as we have gone to battle over this issue and for this issue; and ultimately, as she pointed out, having a port system that is functional, that is usable, is critical to the economy of our Nation.

I, too, want to thank Chairman SIMPSON for his work and willingness to sit down and work through some issues with us. I pledge to the chairman—and I know Representative HAHN does as well—that, as we are going through this process, we will continue to refine how the harbor maintenance trust fund works, and I look forward to having this amendment be passed.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan and the gentlelady from California for working with us on this.

What a lot of people may not understand is the challenge that presents us with the harbor maintenance trust fund and the way it is scored and the way it is counted for. I am one who believes that, if you have got a problem and you are going to tax people in order to address that problem, you ought to spend the money that you are receiving to address the problem.

Instead, what happens is we spend—as I think the gentleman said, 69 percent is the target—we will only spend 69 percent of what came in this year in the harbor maintenance trust fund on actually dredging the harbors and so forth. That seems rather silly. I think we ought to be able to spend it all if we have got a problem. If we are not going to spend it all, we shouldn't tax it.

The problem is the way we score things and the budget around here is that we are given an overall cap in the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations. We have to have our total bill come in under that cap.

If we spend more money in the harbor maintenance area, even though we have that money in a trust fund, then we have to decrease spending in everything else, such as the other energy portions of the bill or something like

that, so increasing it even more decreases what we can spend in other needed areas. That is the challenge we face.

What I would like to do is work with all of the supporters of the harbor maintenance trust fund to find a way that we can address this issue—it is really an issue created by us—but address this issue so that the funds that we collect in the harbor maintenance trust fund can actually go out and do what we expect them to do.

I do appreciate the gentlelady from California and the gentleman from Michigan and the others that are interested. I should mention the other gentleman from Louisiana that is not here that has been an advocate for this for many years and many Congresses, Mr. BOUSTANY. I do thank you for working on this and working with the committee to try to address this to see if we can get up to the target.

The other thing is it was said that we didn't reach the target in this. While it depends on kind of how you look at it, there are, as you know, other purposes for which the harbor maintenance trust fund is spent, Saint Lawrence Seaway and also for one of the other accounts in transportation for border security and stuff.

If you count those in the total spending of WRRDA, it probably does come close to reaching the target, as long as those committees appropriate what was requested. I don't know whether they will or not, but if they do.

I think working in a bipartisan way, we have come up with the best we can do to address this. I know it is of high importance to all Members of Congress. I thank the gentlelady and the gentleman for working with the committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,500,000)".

Page 6, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,500,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from South Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, so many things we do here in Washington are nonsensical. Our tax system is not competitive; our immigration system is not competitive; our regulatory system is not competitive, and our infrastructure is deteriorating. Our ports are certainly a very, very critical part of our infrastructure.

When we have a situation where it takes 15-plus years to get environmental permitting done for the Port Everglades, when we are on the fourth year of studying the Charleston port—one of the most efficient ports on the East Coast—and when it has been 10 years since we have had dredging funds for the small Port of Georgetown in my district, our infrastructure continues to deteriorate; the country becomes less competitive, and thousands more American jobs are lost.

With limited funds, it is increasingly difficult for small harbors to compete with larger projects. Given this competition for scarce funds, very few small projects make the President's budget and receive funding.

What my amendment proposes to do, Mr. Chairman, is to remove \$4.5 million from the Army Corps' regulatory budget, which the regulatory division of the Army Corps of Engineers continues to grow and promulgate more regulations that make our country even less competitive, such as the expansion of the Clean Water Act that are currently proposed.

This would take money from that regulatory division and put it into the operating and maintenance division so that these moneys can be used to actually make our ports work again.

The bottom line is our harbors are showing, and we need to increase money to maintenance accounts so that our harbors can compete. In my district, the Port of Georgetown has not received maintenance dredging in over a decade. This is a port that handled 1.7 million tons of cargo in the year 2000. The economy in the area is largely dependent on the port, and the port is getting more and more shallow each year.

The State of South Carolina has pledged \$18 million for port dredging. The ports authority in South Carolina has pledged \$5 million, and even the Georgetown County voters have passed a referendum that will apply \$6 million to dredge the harbor. Currently, Georgetown is waiting for the President or the Army Corps of Engineers to realize its importance and fund the Federal portion of this project.

It is vitally important for the Corps' maintenance account to be sufficient, which is why my amendment transfers \$4.5 million from regulatory activities to maintaining our harbors.

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

□ 2145

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. It is my understanding the gentleman is going to withdraw the amendment after speaking on it.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. If the chairman is going to oppose my amendment, I will withdraw it out of respect for the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand the desire and the need for sufficient funding for harbor maintenance. That was a debate we just had here on the floor, but this House adopted an amendment from my colleague from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) to meet the annual target set for the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014. We hit the target we all agreed to.

Additionally, while I certainly take issue with some of the regulatory changes this administration is pursuing, the Corps does need funding for processing permits in a timely manner.

The underlying bill already eliminates funding for the changes to the waters of the United States. We do not want to slow down other necessary activities.

For these reasons, I must oppose the gentleman's amendment, but I certainly understand his concern and his desire with this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their work on this good piece of legislation.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. Are there further amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REGULATORY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary for administration of laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands, \$200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$424,000)”.

Page 28, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$424,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which seeks to ensure the adequate resources for the Department of Energy's inspector general's office.

As a member of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I am a firm believer in oversight of the Federal Government. The more sunlight on Federal activity, the more honest and efficient it will be. I am also a strong proponent of our inspector general community.

Since the Inspector General Act was passed into law, the IG community has saved taxpayers billions of dollars and has uncovered countless examples of

wrongdoing in the Federal Government.

I just read a GAO investigation report yesterday that found that loans currently in the Department of Energy portfolio are expected to cost the taxpayers more than \$2.2 billion. The report went on to state that \$807 million of the \$2.2 billion is a result of bad loans that have already defaulted. In fact, five major DOE loans have already defaulted from the agency's 2014 portfolio.

The report also noted that the cost to the taxpayers from these flawed DOE loans could even exceed the \$2.2 billion estimated figure. “The final credit subsidy cost of a given loan or loan guarantee will not be known until the life of the loan is complete . . . Both DOE loan programs can expose the government and taxpayers to substantial financial risk if borrowers default.”

Further, this committee noted in the committee report accompanying this bill: “The committee is also concerned that the Department is failing in its responsibility to ensure that DOE contracts with incurred costs valued at billions of dollars per year are audited in a timely manner.”

Clearly, there is a lack of oversight and accountability within DOE that needs to change. It is the responsibility of the DOE inspector general to report to Congress on these issues so that we can rectify these problems and ensure taxpayers aren't exposed to another Solyndra.

I applaud the committee for recommending resources above and beyond last year's enacted levels, but the recommended level is still beneath the President's budget request.

Let's give the inspector general's office the resources it needs. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the passage of this common-sense amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,500,000)”.

Page 21, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$400,000)”.

Page 22, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$22,661,000)”.

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$34,000,000)”.

Page 24, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$227,000)”.

Page 25, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$32,262,000)”.

Page 25, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$18,000)”.

Page 27, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,119,000)”.

Page 35, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,632,000)”.

Page 49, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 51, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$23,101,000)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$128,920,000)”.

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

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment continues the effort to stop or, at least in this case, to freeze appropriations that are made for agencies whose legal authorizations lapsed many years and even decades ago.

Ever since 1835, the rules of the House have forbidden spending any money for purposes unauthorized by current law; yet today, about one-third of our discretionary spending is for unauthorized programs.

Why is that? Well, it is because the rule against unauthorized spending cannot be enforced because it is always waived by the resolutions that bring these bills to the floor.

The bill before us today contains \$25 billion in unauthorized spending for programs that have not been reviewed by the authorizing committees since as far back as 1980, Jimmy Carter's last year in office.

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

Rather than review our spending decisions and making tough choices about spending priorities, Congress simply rubberstamps these programs out of habit, year after year. It is no wonder we are so deeply in debt with so little to show for it.

My amendment does not defund these unauthorized programs, as the House rules require. It simply freezes spending on them at last year's level.

The cuts contained in this amendment total \$129 million, or about thirty-six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total spending in this bill.

This House has a responsibility to examine these programs, reauthorize the ones that work, and modify or end the

ones that don't. It has a responsibility, but it has no incentive, as long as we keep funding them and, worse, increasing the funding that these programs receive.

In a sense, this is a token. It is a symbol. Reducing this bill by thirty-six one-hundredths of 1 percent will have no appreciable effect on the \$35.5 million in this appropriation or the \$3.8 trillion the Federal Government plans to spend this year, but I hope that it will send a subtle but clear message that the Members of this House insist that the Congress reassert its constitutional responsibility to authorize Federal spending and to enforce its own rules that prohibit spending blindly on unauthorized programs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I have to tell you, in all honesty, I understand what he is trying to do, and I agree with him in many ways; but, when he says we have to observe the rules of the House, the rules of the House also allow for the Rules Committee to write a rule that overrides the rules of the House. If it is approved by a majority, guess what, that is what happens. We are following the rules of the House, but he raises a point that is of concern—and should be.

When I was chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, we tried to defund the Endangered Species Act and designations of critical habitat because the Endangered Species Act had not been reauthorized for something like 23 or 26 years.

We lost an amendment on the floor to put the money back into it, but we were trying to make a point—and I was supported by the chairman of the Resources Committee—but we were trying to make the point that the authorizing committees need to get busy and do their job. I fully believe that.

That was 8 years ago. We still haven't done anything to reauthorize the Endangered Species Act, and the chairman at that time supported what we were trying to do. I haven't seen any reauthorization bills come up.

Now, if you look at what is not authorized in the Federal Government right now—or where authorizations have expired—I think there is a reason for an expiration date. It is so that you go in and review the program and see if the need is still there, can we do it better, do we need to make changes, is there still a justification for the program.

The problem is the authorizing committees have failed in many respects in that responsibility. If we were to simply defund everything where authorizations have expired—I think the Department of State authorization has expired; I am not sure we want to defund the Department of State; some people might want to—but there is an awful lot. I think, in most senior programs,

the authorizations have expired, and you can go through the list.

While the gentleman raises a very valid point and one that I would like to help work with him on trying to address, the Appropriations Committee is trying to do our job of oversight. That is why we have hearings.

Is it the best place to do oversight of the need for the programs? We do oversight on how the money is spent and so forth, but the authorizing committees are the best place to look at the programs and see in their totality if they are still needed or not.

While I sympathize—and I know that is not what the gentleman from California wants—while I sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do—and even agree with what he is trying to do—I have to rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, but I thank him for bringing a very important subject to this floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I, as well as the chairman, appreciate the gentleman coming to the floor and pointing out some of the inadequacies of process here, but I wanted to just state for the record that a couple of the items that the gentleman targets, I think, would do damage to the country.

For example, the accounts that deal with cleaning up the cold war legacy, that means that communities across our country that sacrificed in the name of the country would have to wait even longer for a resolution to the contamination that exists.

It is astounding how much there is from coast-to-coast. When you start looking, you almost want to close the book because there is so much, and I think that the communities that have been dealing with these remediation problems over the years would not appreciate the gentleman's amendment this evening.

□ 2200

In addition to that, I wanted to say something about ARPA-E, where we have our advanced energy research going on. You know, the United States is not energy secure. We are still too vulnerable here at home on many levels, and ARPA-E provides us with a real global advantage.

I don't think we need to shave anything from ARPA-E because if I look at some of the competition that is coming at us from China, for example, it is even coming in very unfair ways, such as hacking into our intellectual property that any of our private companies hold.

We view ARPA-E as essential to our future, really, with what we are doing within the global marketplace. So I think the gentleman is very well-intentioned in trying to have regular order. I wish that it all worked so perfectly, but I don't think that we should hurt

communities across this country nor the long-term energy interests of the Nation, because I think that is what would be done if the gentleman's amendment were to pass.

I just wanted to put that on the RECORD and rise in opposition, but I respect the gentleman for coming down here and for trying to perfect the way that we conduct the affairs of the Nation.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I appreciate the gentlelady's kind words.

I would point out that this defunds nothing. All that it does is to freeze spending of those unauthorized programs at last year's level until the authorizing committees actually sit down and review them and revise them and reauthorize them. Nor is anything in the NDAA affected by this freeze.

I appreciate my friend from Idaho's sympathy, but I would trade it in a moment for his support. And I would point out that this amendment, the whole point of this amendment is that authorizing committees have got to review, reauthorize, revise, or repeal these measures. They have got to do one of those things.

But why should they, why would they want to go to all of the fuss and bother of reviewing these programs, taking on entrenched interests, asking hard questions, making people cranky in the process, when all they have to do, under our current practice, is sit there, do absolutely nothing, and the funding, just like the mighty Mississippi, just keeps rolling along.

We cannot continue down this course responsibly. We have a responsibility to the American people to do that heavy lifting, to go through these programs with a fine-tooth comb, to make the revisions that are necessary according to our own experience and, in the most important mandate this Congress has been given, to stop wasting people's money.

This measure is a very small step. To suggest that it is going to have dire consequences, cutting thirty-six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total funds in this bill, is a measure of how out of control our thinking on spending has gotten.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask for this single token, that we take a stand and at least freeze the unauthorized spending.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for his comments and for proposing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIR. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's

amendment. I would hate to get the idea, when he says stop wasting taxpayer money that, just because we are funding these programs that haven't been reauthorized, we are wasting taxpayer money. We actually look at these programs very deeply when we do the appropriations process.

And, in fact, I wouldn't want to suggest to the American people that we never eliminate any program that authorizations have expired on or whose need we have deemed has run out. When I was chairman of the Committee on the Interior, I think we eliminated something like 59 different programs that we no longer needed. So it is not that we sit here and just continue to fund things, but we do look at the programs, the need for the programs.

I fully agree with the gentleman about the need to somehow change this so that the authorizing committees can do their—or will do their—authorizations work. But the Appropriations Committee holds probably more hearings than any other committee in this body and looks at these programs very deeply.

There may be differences about what is necessary and what is appropriate for funding between Members of this body, but what we come out with is a bill that we think a majority of the Members of this body can support.

So I look forward to working with the gentleman from California to try to address what is a real problem that he brings up, but I would hope my colleagues would oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, \$34,000,000, 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, \$180,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, 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 pro-

vided 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), \$4,750,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That not more than 25 percent of such amount may be obligated or expended until the Assistant Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a work plan that allocates at least 95 percent of the additional funding provided under each heading in this title (as designated under such heading in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act) to specific programs, projects, or activities.

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 have been 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 both Houses of Congress 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. 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.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may transfer to the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service may accept and expend, up to \$4,700,000 of funds provided in this title under the heading "Operation and Maintenance" to mitigate for fisheries lost due to Corps of Engineers projects.

SEC. 104. 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 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, beginning on line 10, strike section 104.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is very simple. It strikes section 104 of this bill.

Section 104 would prevent the Army Corps of Engineers from updating regulations pertaining to the definitions of "fill material" or "discharge of fill material" for the purposes of the Clean Water Act.

When Congress first enacted the Clean Water Act, and for nearly 35 years after its passage, the law kept America's lakes, rivers, and streams safe from mining pollution, protecting our wildlife and our drinking water. That is no longer the case today.

My amendment would remove this anti-Clean Water Act rider. Current and future administrations should have the flexibility to change the definitions of "fill material" or "discharge of fill material" should they wish to.

When Congress first enacted the Clean Water Act, 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 unavoidable.

Under a 2002 rule change, the definition of "fill material" was broadened to include: "rock, sand, soil, clay, plastics, construction debris, wood chips, and overburden from mining or other excavation activities." The revised rule also removed regulatory language which previously excluded "waste" discharges from section 404 jurisdiction, a change that some argue allows the use of 404 permits to authorize certain discharges that harm the aquatic environment.

The Clean Water Act, section 404(b)(1) guidelines are not well-suited for evaluating the environmental effects of discharging hazardous wastes such as mining refuse and similar materials into a water body or wetland.

In sum, the net effect of the 2002 rule change was to alter the Corps permit process in ways that Congress never intended. It was not congressional intent to allow mining refuse and similar material, some of it hazardous, to qualify

as “fill material” and thereby bypass a more thorough environmental review and meet Federal pollution standards. Downstream water users have every right to be concerned that the section 404 process fails to protect them from the discharge of hazardous substances.

Lower Slate Lake in Alaska is the perfect example. A permit allows 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’s standards for the mining industry.

Mining waste can contain toxic chemicals known to pose health risks to humans and aquatic animals, and continuing the practice of dumping this waste into our Nation’s streams and rivers is dangerous and irresponsible. EPA estimates that 120 miles per year of headwater streams are buried with the chemical-laden discharge as a result of surface mining operations under the existing definitions of “fill.”

Equally important, a 2008 EPA study found evidence that mining activities can have severe impacts on downstream aquatic life and the biological conditions of a stream. That same study found that 9 out of every 10 streams downstream from surface mining operations were impaired based on assessments of aquatic life.

Mr. Chairman, this provision is a preemptive strike against protecting our drinking water, and since there is no time limit on the provision, it would not only block the current Obama administration, but any future administration from considering changes.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and to strike section 104 from this bill.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. It seems like old times. You just changed your appearance.

Mr. Moran and I, your colleague before you, he and I had this discussion many, many times on the Clean Water Act and waters of the United States and fill material and so forth, and it seems like you just look different than he used to.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The language in the bill is intended simply to maintain the status quo regarding what is “fill material” for the purposes of the Clean Water Act.

The existing definition was put in place through a rulemaking initiated by the Clinton administration and finalized by the Bush administration. The rule aligned the definitions on the books of the Corps and the EPA, so that both agencies were working with the same definition.

Changing the definition again, as some have proposed, could effectively

kill mining operations across much of this country. For that reason, I support the underlying language in the bill. That is why we put it in the bill, and I oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 105. 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 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 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, beginning on line 19, strike section 105.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply strike section 105. As it stands, section 105 would prevent the Army Corps of Engineers from finalizing its proposed regulation clarifying the limits of Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act.

This language is not new. I understand we have seen it a number of times. The difference is that the conversation has since progressed, and almost everyone agrees that clarity is needed. Calls for the EPA to issue a rule even came from such notable organizations as the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Western Business Roundtable, and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Prohibiting EPA from finalizing the rule, as section 105 would direct, would perpetuate this confusion, and there are countless cases that reiterate this point.

For example, the EPA acknowledged enforcement difficulties in a case in which storm water from construction sites carried oil, grass, grease, and other pollutants into tributaries to the San Pedro River, which is an internationally recognized river ecosystem supporting diverse wildlife but where the waters in question only flow for

part of the year. The Agency stated that it “had to discontinue all enforcement cases in this area because it was so time-consuming and costly to prove that the Clean Water Act protects these rivers.”

We need to end the confusion and, through a public comment process and appropriate congressional oversight, allow the administration to move forward and complete a formal rulemaking.

It also needs to be said that the opponents of the Clean Water rule have it wrong. The proposed rule respects agriculture and the law by maintaining all of the existing exemptions for agricultural discharges and water. It 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 is fully consistent with the law and the decisions of the Supreme Court.

The administration has a strong, commonsense plan to make clean water a priority by protecting the sources that feed the drinking water for more than 117 million Americans.

If Congress blocks this proposal to protect clean water, 20 million acres of wetlands nationwide will continue to be at risk. Stopping this proposal will also impact the small businesses and communities that rely on clean water.

American businesses need to know when the Federal Government has authority and when it doesn’t, and without updated guidance, businesses will often not know when they need Army Corps of Engineers permits. This uncertainty could subject them to civil and criminal liability and will certainly cost them extra money.

□ 2215

The clean water rule will largely restore but not expand historic coverage of the Clean Water Act at no direct cost to the public. EPA estimates that the clean water rule would provide up to \$514 million annually in benefits to the public.

Updating the rules and guidance is essential. We need to allow EPA and the Corps to do their job and clarify their rules and guidance. If they fail to do it in accordance with existing law, more lawsuits will ensue.

Overall, these anti-Clean Water Act riders are part of an effort to return us to a time when we had no uniform national minimum clean water standard and States had conflicting policies or no policies at all. That was a time when rivers were so polluted, they caught fire, and responsible downstream States suffered the consequences of lax or weak upstream States’ policies.

Today we have cleaner, more drinkable waters precisely because of the Clean Water Act.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this clean water rider and support our amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Last spring, the administration proposed a rule that would greatly expand the Federal jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act to include waters that were traditionally understood to be under State jurisdiction.

Let me repeat that. Many people believed that if the waters were not regulated under the Clean Water Act, they were unregulated. Not true. They were regulated by the States. And that is where it should remain.

Now, there became a question of, under the Clean Water Act, under “navigable waters,” what the heck does that mean? It was very confusing. Does it mean navigable by a steamship, navigable by a boat, a canoe, an inner tube? And the Court said, You need to clarify this.

Well, the EPA essentially said, Well, we can clarify that. We will just control all the waters and take them out of State control.

I think that is a problem, and I can tell you that it is a real problem for States in the West, particularly.

The administration’s proposed rule is inconsistent with two separate Supreme Court decisions that clearly said the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency had gone too far in that Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act was not as broad as they had claimed.

Deciding how water is used should be the responsibility of State and local officials who are familiar with the people and local issues.

Under the rule provided by the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers, they are saying intermittent streams. Any streams that don’t have water running in them, but maybe a month or two a year, now fall under their jurisdiction.

And under the connectivity rule, which is what this is—you know, the hip bone is connected to the leg bone is connected to the knee bone sort of thing—under the connectivity rule, while they say that this is not their intent, there is no way that you cannot eventually say that we are going to control groundwater also—not just surface water but groundwater also—because it is connected to the surface water also.

So while there may be a desire for clarity on the issue of Federal jurisdiction, providing clarity does not trump the need to stay within the limits of the law. The proposed rule would expand Federal jurisdiction far beyond what was ever intended by the Clean Water Act. The provision in the Energy and Water bill does not weaken the Clean Water Act. It stops the administration from expanding Federal jurisdiction.

For those reasons, I strongly oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require a permit for the discharge of dredged or fill material under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251, et seq.) for the activities identified in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 404(f)(1) of the Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A), (C)).

SEC. 107. As of the date of enactment of this Act and each fiscal year 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.

SEC. 108. No funds in this Act shall be used for an open lake placement alternative of dredged material, after evaluating the least costly, environmentally acceptable manner for the disposal or management of dredged material originating from Lake Erie or tributaries thereto, unless it is approved under a State water quality certification pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1341.

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, \$9,874,000, 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: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$1,300,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for expenses necessary in carrying out related responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2016, of the amount made available to the Commission under this Act or any other Act, 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, \$948,640,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$22,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and \$5,899,000 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 MR. RUIZ

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

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

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their hard work and collaboration on this important bill.

I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2028, the Energy and Water Appropriations Act, that provides additional, critical resources for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake projects that address the historic and severe drought conditions across the West.

Mr. Chairman, one of the worst droughts in modern history is ravaging our Nation’s crops, choking our fragile economic recovery, and placing our water supply in unprecedented jeopardy.

Last year, more than 60 percent of the contiguous United States suffered drought conditions, and the West continues to bear the brunt of this burden. In the Olympic Mountains of northwest Washington State, the snowpack contained just 7 percent of the average. In California, the drought is the worst to hit the State since record-keeping started in 1895. 2013 was the driest year on record, and 2014 was the hottest.

The impacts of this severe drought are harsh and far-reaching, threatening public health, degrading the environment, increasing the risk of wildfires, and hampering a wide range of industries.

In 2012, California’s agriculture industry contributed over \$45 billion to the United States economy. Last year, because of the drought, hundreds of thousands of acres were left fallow because sufficient water was unavailable. According to a University of California

study, this cost the State \$2.2 billion in direct economic output and the devastating loss of 17,100 seasonal and part-time jobs.

These effects will be felt by Americans across the country. This year, the price of fruits and vegetables is expected to rise 3 percent, in part due to the severe drought conditions in California.

Furthermore, continuing to draw down groundwater supplies in California will have dangerous public health impacts. In rural communities, where residents rely on wells for drinking water, reduced groundwater levels result in higher concentrations of contaminants, including dangerous nitrates and arsenic.

Stagnant pools have also created breeding grounds for mosquitoes. The California Department of Public Health announced in April that the State had a record-breaking number of deaths related to the mosquito-borne West Nile virus in 2014.

In addition to West Nile, the arid conditions could also increase the number of cases of valley fever, a potentially fatal disease caused by a fungus called *Coccidioides* that can grow in the soil and becomes airborne if the soil dries out. While the majority of people exposed to the spores do not exhibit symptoms, people who start to develop the disease can have cough, fever, headache, and, in rare cases, it can lead to death.

It is time for action at all levels of government to address the dangerous economic and public health impacts of ignoring this drought.

Back home in the southern California desert, local water agencies are working to help residents, businesses, and municipalities convert their lawns and landscaping into water-efficient desert landscapes.

At the Federal level, the Bureau of Reclamation is investing in public-private partnerships to help improve the delivery of water for agricultural users, which in turn allows them to invest in more water-efficient irrigation techniques, such as drip irrigation.

The Bureau can also help communities whose wells have run dry due to excessive groundwater pumping install relief wells that provide, in some cases, the only source of freshwater for an entire town. And through one of the most successful water conservation grant programs, the WaterSMART program, the Bureau has helped local water agencies, tribal governments, irrigation districts, and State agencies implement water conservation techniques that have conserved over 860,000 acre-feet of water since 2009.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply shift funding away from taxpayer-subsidized fossil fuel research that benefits the wealthiest oil companies that can pay for the research themselves and redirect it toward critical Bureau of Reclamation activities to address the impacts of this devastating drought and help mitigate future droughts.

We must put the American economy, our constituents, and the public's health above politics and Big Oil. I urge my colleagues to come together to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I understand the gentleman seeks to show support for additional funding for projects that are drought-related in California and other places, but we must be mindful of the balancing and competing priorities across this bill.

The gentleman would take \$20 million out of the fossil energy account. As I have said before, fossil fuels—such as coal, oil, natural gas—provide nearly 85 percent of the energy used by the Nation's homes and businesses and will continue to provide for the majority of our energy needs for the foreseeable future.

The bill rejects the administration's proposed reductions to fossil energy and, instead, funds these programs at \$605 million, \$34 million above last year. With this additional funding, the Office of Fossil Energy will research how heat can more efficiently be converted into electricity in a cross-cutting effort with nuclear and solar energy programs, how water can be more efficiently used in power plants, and how coal can be used to produce electric power through fuel cells.

This amendment would reduce funding for a program that ensures that we use our Nation's abundant fossil fuel resources as well and as cleanly as possible. Therefore, I must oppose the amendment and urge other Members to do so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their leadership and hard work on this bill.

I urge my colleagues to come together in a bipartisan fashion and support my amendment to ensure the Bureau dedicates essential resources towards projects that will help keep American-made food on the table and prevent a dangerous rise in food prices across the country, again, just taking money from taxpayer-subsidized research that they can afford on their own and putting it to combating our drought.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the

amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their collaborative effort in bringing together this bill.

I appreciate very much Chairman SIMPSON's support of my floor amendment last year, reprogramming funds within the Bureau of Reclamation's water conservancy and delivery fund to advance and complete ongoing work that would provide efficient delivery of clean drinking water from an existing multipurpose reclamation project, as authorized by Congress in 1962.

Mr. Chairman, water is the lifeblood of the Western United States and is absolutely critical to the vitality of our communities and local economies.

Today I am offering a simple amendment that will bolster the Bureau of Reclamation's water and related resources account by \$2 million, allowing the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with ongoing water supply delivery projects at a more efficient pace to reach our shared goals in meeting increased water demands by developing and maximizing clean water supplies.

In Colorado, as is the case throughout the West, we have similar needs to move forward with engineering design work on the authorized features of existing reclamation projects. These projects improve water supply quality, address water shortage issues, improve conservation measures, and stabilize water supplies.

□ 2230

In the Western United States, water is an economic driver. In order to attract more economic growth, either in business or agriculture, every industry in the West is dependent upon an ample and safe water supply.

This amendment will provide Bureau of Reclamation increased funding to continue with these types of projects while simultaneously improving public health and protecting the environment. These projects are critically important during drought years so that water is appropriately allocated for both municipal and agricultural uses.

The Bureau's budget has been previously used for the California Central Valley Project, the Washington State Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project, the Arkansas Valley Conduit in Colorado, and the Lewiston

Orchards Project in the chairman's home State of Idaho.

It is our hope that this bill gives the Bureau of Reclamation the resources it needs to advance vital projects that resolve water shortage issues in the West while enhancing regional development and promoting job growth.

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

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK), the coauthor of this amendment and my colleague.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment from my colleague from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. Chairman, we have a history of borrowing for the future in this country. We have borrowed for fighting wars, for building roads, and for building space programs. Now, we are borrowing from the future, as opposed to for the future. We have \$18 trillion of debt, and we will add to that debt this year.

This project was authorized in 1962, and it is required more recently by the EPA's interpretation of the Clean Water Act. We have 40 communities in southeast Colorado who are in violation of the Clean Water Act because of naturally occurring elements. This amendment offers those communities a future.

If we have to incur debt, let it be an investment for our children's future.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Chairman SIMPSON.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentlemen from Colorado, both of them, for offering this amendment and bringing this issue before the committee. We have no objection with the amendment and would be happy to accept it.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The 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, \$49,528,000, 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, \$37,000,000, 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 expenses necessary for 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, 2017, \$59,500,000, to be derived from the Reclamation Fund and be nonreimbursable as provided in 43 U.S.C. 377: *Provided*, That not more than 25 percent of such amount may be obligated or expended until Reclamation complies with congressional and statutory direction related to Technical Memorandum 8140-CC-2004-1 ("Corrosion Considerations for Buried Metallic Water Pipe") and the associated pipeline reliability study: *Provided further*, 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 both Houses of Congress;
- (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 Com-

mittees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress 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 "SJVD—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. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall—

(1) complete the feasibility studies described in clauses (i)(I) and (ii)(II) of section 103(d)(1)(A) of Public Law 108-361 (118 Stat. 1684) and submit such studies to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than December 31, 2015;

(2) complete the feasibility studies described in clauses (i)(II) and (ii)(I) of section 103(d)(1)(A) of Public Law 108-361 and submit such studies to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than November 30, 2016;

(3) complete the feasibility study described in section 103(f)(1)(A) of Public Law 108-361 (118 Stat. 1694) and submit such study to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than December 31, 2017; and

(4) provide a progress report on the status of the feasibility studies referred to in paragraphs (1) through (3) to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and each 180 days thereafter until December 31, 2017, as applicable. The report shall include timelines for study completion, draft environmental impact statements, final environmental impact statements, and Records of Decision.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ENERGY PROGRAMS

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

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 in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$1,657,774,000, to remain

available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$150,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 5, after the dollar amount insert “reduced by \$50,000,000”).

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$50,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, over the past 6 years, the policy of the current administration has been to wage a war on coal that has crippled the coal industry and left areas like Virginia's Ninth District economically devastated, and I believe it has put our access to reliable, affordable electricity in jeopardy.

The onslaught of harmful, burdensome, and unreasonable regulations on coal-fired power plants is continuing in the President's Clean Power Plan. States must come up with a plan for CO₂ in 13 months after the final rule is released, which is supposed to be that summer. That State plan is then to begin by 2020 and completed by 2030.

There are a number of clean coal technologies currently in development, but according to the testimony from the Department of Energy, these new technologies are not likely to be ready for prime time until 2025. That is 9 years after the States have to come up with a plan and 5 years after the States have to begin implementing that plan and halfway through the time to come into compliance.

This is not right. If we are to avoid rolling brownouts, coal will have to continued to be used; but, if we don't take action, it will be illegal to use coal.

While I fight and will continue to fight more for more reasonable regulations, we must take action to ensure that we can still use coal, should the next administration also be unreasonable and antioal.

Mr. Chairman, to bend the curve of development and bring the new coal technologies to market, we must spend some money. My amendment will simply add \$50 million for fossil energy research and development from energy efficiency and renewable energy for the purpose of aiding the development of these new clean coal technologies so we can continue to have reliable, affordable energy.

The very least we can do is to make sure that coal-fired power plants have access to these new technologies in a timely fashion so that they can meet these extremely burdensome regulations.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the underlying bill provides a 6 percent in-

crease in fossil fuel energy research. However, when districts like mine are seeing mine after mine shut down and power plants shut down because of numerous regulations on coal, it is clear that more needs to be done.

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

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman from Virginia's amendment. I wanted to point out—perhaps he doesn't have the full numbers—but the figure that we have, we had a request from the administration of \$560 million, and we actually increased the administration's request by \$45 million to a level of \$605 million for fossil energy research, which is more than we spent in this fiscal year of 2015. We are spending \$571 million this year, so I would say that the fossil energy accounts have been rather well provided for.

I also want to say to the gentleman that you are taking the funds from the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy account, and that account is not above last year. It is \$266 million below last year. What is in the account, what remains there, is focused on American manufacturing—which is important in Virginia—and vehicle technology, which are really not partisan interests.

My own view is that, if you were to take the amount of funds that you are proposing out of the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy account, you would decimate these programs and further erode manufacturing which has taken such big hits.

Let me also mention that since 2003, our country has spent \$2.3 trillion importing foreign petroleum. This shifts vast amounts of wealth abroad and squelches thousands upon thousands of jobs in our country in the energy sector.

I agree with the gentleman that a diverse energy portfolio is necessary to eliminate our reliance on imported energy, and we need an “all of the above” strategy. Our bill provides that in terms of not just fossil energy, but renewable energies. We should be leading investment in these technologies across the board and expanding jobs in our country.

Though I appreciate the gentleman's interest—and I know Virginia has coal deposits, so does Ohio—but I really feel that the bill that we have worked out on a bipartisan basis provides very, very well for fossil energy, certainly better than the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy accounts fared.

I would oppose the amendment, and I would ask our colleagues to join us in doing the same.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

My colleague's amendment would increase funding for the Fossil Energy research and development program and decrease the EERE account by the same amount as an offset.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's concern to protect the fossil fuel industry against overreach by this administration's Clean Power Plan proposal.

This amendment would advance research and development in allowing robust utilization of our abundant natural resources in a safe and efficient way. Therefore, I support the amendment and urge Members to do the same.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Using the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments, and I appreciate the chairman's support.

The bottom line is that we are losing thousands of jobs in the central Appalachian region, and according to the Bristol Herald Courier in a recent article, 1,000 jobs have been lost in the last year alone in the coal fields. That is one concern.

We are shutting down this month several coal-powered power plants in my district, and we are going to have serious problems if we don't do something. If we are going to continue down this path, we have to help the industry. We have to help make sure that we are burning the coal in a clean manner, and this is the way to do it.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 5, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$266,161,000)”.

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$355,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy account by \$266 million, to simply restore it to last year's levels, with an offset from the fossil energy account.

My amendment will boost energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives across America that have a proven return on investment for taxpayers.

This amendment is paid for by reducing—but not by eliminating—accounts that do not have the same return on investment for taxpayers.

Unless we adopt this amendment, America's commitment to energy efficiency and renewable energy will be slashed by \$266 million below the 2015 enacted level and over \$1 billion below the budget request.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish that we could meet the budget request this year, but that doesn't appear possible, but we should at least restore the money back to last year's levels, which is still a very modest investment in energy efficiency and renewable energy for America.

Investments in energy efficiency create jobs and help make our businesses more competitive compared to businesses all across the globe. In addition, energy efficiency reduces costs for consumers. Wouldn't that be revolutionary, that we put money back into the pockets of our neighbors back home?

The amount proposed for energy efficiency and renewable energy in the Republican bill is so low that America will have to reduce the number of research, development, and demonstration projects with industry, with our universities, and in our national labs. America should be a leader in innovation and technological advancement, but instead, the Republican bill says America should take a back seat.

Well, Mr. Chairman, America should take a back seat to no one. We are in the midst of a technological revolution when it comes to energy. Look at what is happening across our great country. We have an incredibly diverse energy portfolio and a growing clean energy and efficiency sector. This is especially important as we tackle the challenges of the changing climate.

Yet the Republican bill reduces investment in solar energy technology R&D within the Solar Energy Technologies Office by \$81 million, or 35 percent, from last year. That means the Department of Energy's exciting SunShot Initiative goal of enabling cost-competitive solar electricity without subsidies by 2020 will be delayed for years.

That is extremely detrimental to the U.S. solar industry and the jobs it creates that currently employ over 174,000 Americans. It will send an unfortunate signal to the Chinese and foreign competitors that we are ceding this clean energy industry to them.

The Republican bill also would result in a significant reduction in core solar R&D and the national labs, including the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratories, necessitating reductions in force.

The Republican bill will also eliminate support for solar industry job training for students and military veterans at more than 400 community colleges across 49 States. This network has been a critical source of trained

employees in an industry that is growing and is expected to grow even more with over 200,000 jobs by the end of 2015.

Finally, the recently piloted Solar Ready Vets program would be at risk, and the planned expansion from 3 to 10 military bases would be affected and canceled. Veterans currently make up 10 percent of the solar industry.

□ 2245

If we do not unleash American ingenuity now, our neighbors back home will face increased costs of the changing climate, such as increases in property insurance, increases in flood insurance, all of this from extreme weather events, increased property taxes from having to protect drinking water supplies, and storm water infrastructure. I would say instead, let's invest in America.

My amendment shifts a little bit, not all, from older technologies into cutting-edge energy efficiency and clean energy that are so vital to America's future.

I appreciate Ranking Member KAPTUR's vision. She understands that this is our future. We are talking about American jobs in American manufacturing. I appreciate her work. And I appreciate Chairman SIMPSON's work on the appropriations bill.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Florida says we should invest. We are investing. This amendment would increase funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy by \$266 million, restoring it to last year's level, by using the fossil energy account as an offset.

This year, funding for EERE is \$1.66 billion, \$266 million below last year, and \$1.1 billion below the budget request. The recommendation strategically focuses funding on three main priorities: helping American manufacturers compete in the global marketplace, supporting weatherization assistance programs, and supporting basic research into renewable energy sources. These are all areas with broad bipartisan support.

The House recommendation for this year was the result of a focused effort to ensure taxpayer funds are spent on the most advanced research projects within these priorities. Increasing funding for EERE by diverting funds from research into fossil energy strikes the wrong balance when considering the Nation's electricity needs.

Fossil fuel, such as coal, oil, and natural gas, provide the vast majority of the energy used by the Nation's homes and businesses and will continue to provide our energy needs for the foreseeable future. For example, fossil fuels produce nearly 11 times more electricity than renewable energy fuel sources.

I am not against renewable energy. I think they are an important part of the mix. They are cute, but they don't provide the majority of energy that is needed in this country.

This amendment would decimate funding for a program that ensures we use our Nation's fossil fuel resources as well and as cleanly as possible. Therefore, I must oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the burgeoning jobs being created in American manufacturing and energy efficiency and renewable energy are more than just cute. They are the jobs of the future in America, a clean energy future.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the Castor amendment: vote for America, vote for American jobs, and vote for the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000) (increased by \$4,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

The purpose of this amendment is to increase the funding for the U.S.-Israel Energy Cooperation program from the current \$2 million to \$4 million. This critical program allows companies across the U.S. to develop cutting-edge technologies with new partners in Israel in order to advance America's energy goals.

Furthermore, the U.S.-Israel Energy Cooperative Agreement facilitates greater cooperation and sharing of knowledge between American and Israeli universities on alternative energy. Collaboration between the American and Israeli private sector and academia will significantly enhance U.S. efforts to develop alternative technologies and increase energy efficiency to the benefit of our national security, our economy, and the environment.

Let me be clear, this is not an aid program, but instead a cooperative agreement designed to connect the U.S. and Israeli private sectors in the development of innovative technologies to strengthen our energy security and independence. Reauthorized in 2014 through 2024, the cooperative energy program mandate was expanded to

cover collaborative research and development into renewable technologies, natural gas, and water—key areas of interest for the United States.

The program is also designed to leverage matching contributions from both the Israeli and American private sectors; thus, for every dollar Congress appropriates, \$3 are invested, contributing to our economy in addition to our energy security. The program has already leveraged over \$27 million in private sector investment. This is an excellent way to leverage a modest investment into critical energy innovation to the benefit of both countries.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this amendment to make a greater investment in America's and Israel's energy future and to support an important bilateral energy cooperation agreement with one of our Nation's closest allies.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$25,500,000)”.

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$34,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which I offer along with Representatives PERLMUTTER, WELCH, LIEU, TONKO, MATSUI, and CONNOLLY, which would cut the increase provided to the fossil Energy Research and Development account back to its fiscal year 2015 level and put that money toward the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, also known as EERE, account.

My amendment presents a question for the Congress this evening: Are we going to invest in the future of energy or are we going to continue to look backwards?

We are certainly an all-of-the-above country when it comes to where we get our energy; however, that does not mean we have to be an all-of-the-above country when it comes to how we spend our Federal research dollars.

For decades, we have relied on fossil fuels, fuels that dirty our environment, that are fundamentally changing our environment, that keep us dependent on foreign sources of energy and are a finite resource. Reliance like this is

simply not sustainable over the long-term.

Energy that is clean and renewable is where our future lies. To put this in perspective, this budget proposes to cut the investment in renewable energy by \$266 million from last year, and increase investments in fossil fuel by \$34 million.

My colleagues on the other side often ask: Why can't we run government like a business? This would be similar to a business cutting its cell phone, iPhone, laptop, iPad budget and increasing its pager and landline budget. It is time that we start running government like a business and making investments in renewable energy because they will pay off for our future and also for health and jobs that will be created around them.

Young people understand this choice well. I have the opportunity to lead a group in the Congress called Future Forum, and we have gone across the country from New York to Boston to San Francisco talking to young people about what issues matter to them. And across the country the issue is always the same: Why can't this Congress be more forward looking as to where we get our energy?

Millennials know that they are a generation who will be living with the consequences of the energy choices we make here today. It is their environment that will be damaged. It is their climate that will be altered, and their energy choices that will be limited if we fail to invest in renewable clean sources of energy now.

I know the budget is tight and we have to make difficult choices about how to allocate scarce resources, and I understand and appreciate that some of the money supported by the Fossil Energy research and development account are seeking to improve how we use fossil fuels.

But how can we take limited resources to increase spending in any way to support fossil fuels and encourage their use over fiscal year 2016 by \$34 million while cutting renewable energy by \$266 million? This makes no sense.

Look at what other countries are doing. Germany right now receives 30 percent, 30 percent of its energy from renewable sources. Can we not do better than Germany? The only way we can is if we invest in the future. We shouldn't be increasing funding to continue to use energy sources of the past. I urge all Members to support my amendment, to undo this increase and redirect that money towards supporting the energy of the future—renewable energy.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, it is the same debate we used on the other amendment, so I could just say repeat

the same debate. The fact is we are investing in what we use: 85 percent of electricity produced in this country is produced by fossil energies. We invest in that to try to make it more clean. We are the Saudi Arabia of coal. Why would we walk away from that? We can do it cleaner. We can do it more efficiently, and that is what we are investing in.

We are still investing in renewable energies. It is not that we are just ignoring those other things. In fact, we are investing \$1.66 billion in those things. Fossil energy that we use much more than we do renewable energies, only investing \$605 million in it.

So our priorities, I believe, in this bill are in the right place. And while I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do, I think it would unbalance the bill, and I would urge the rejection of his amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$22,300,000)”.

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$22,300,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking Chairman SIMPSON for working on the bill and being willing to listen to this issue.

This amendment seeks to highlight the fact that the Water Power Program is vitally important to reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

This bill, the underlying bill, cuts hydropower by over \$22 million. What the amendment I am offering does is restores that funding and offsets it with Department of Energy administrative costs.

Hydropower is the Nation's most available, reliable, affordable, and sustainable energy source. Requiring only the power of moving water—rivers, streams, and ocean waves and tides—hydropower is domestic and renewable.

Hydropower is available in every region of the country. A range of technologies exist or are under development to tap the power of waves, tides, and river flows. Thousands of megawatts of potential are available from ocean energy projects from New England to the west coast and Alaska, and from in-river hydrokinetic projects proposed along the Mississippi River and others. 2,200 hydropower plants provide America's most abundant source of clean, renewable electricity.

The United States produces more electricity from hydropower than from any other renewable electricity source. It accounted for 56 percent of renewable generation in 2012 and 7 percent of the Nation's overall electricity generation.

New technology employed at existing hydro sites represents an opportunity for new sources of power. By installing more efficient turbines and enhancing performance, existing hydropower infrastructure can generate even more power, sustainably. Harnessing more of this energy will create a truly renewable and green energy source.

There are advantages over wind and solar. Hydro has a predictable year-round output, while solar and wind output can be variable in some areas and necessitates the use of large battery banks and/or alternate power sources.

□ 2300

Even routine, minor maintenance on a windmill can be difficult on the top of a wind tower, while hydropower provides relatively low maintenance. Hydropower facilities are quiet and often can be made unobtrusive, while many people report that considerable noise is generated by wind power.

Hydropower also faces a comprehensive regulatory approval process. It involves too many participants, including FERC, the Federal and State resource agencies, local governments, tribes, NGOs, and the public. Currently, there are 60,000 megawatts of preliminary permits and projects awaiting final approval or that are pending before the Commission in 45 States.

Pennsylvania, where I come from, is in the top 10 for hydropower potential, and, according to the Department of Energy, of the 80,000 total dams in the United States, 600 have the immediate capability to produce energy.

This amendment seeks to highlight the lost and underutilized capacity of abundant, economical, and clean energy right here within our communities while we irresponsibly spend hard-earned tax dollars on less viable options.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment from consideration while simultaneously asking for favorable consideration on the bipartisan hydro amendment to be offered very shortly.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$9,000,000)".

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$9,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Oregon and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today because of the power and potential of water and in support of a bipartisan amendment that I am pleased to offer with my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman PERRY, and with my colleague from Maine, Congresswoman PINGREE.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment would increase funding to the Department of Energy's Water Power Program by just \$9 million, which is a small price tag that will yield a huge return on investment. This increase is offset by an equal amount by the departmental administration account. The modest increase that we are proposing will support hydropower and also the development of innovative hydropower technologies, along with marine and hydrokinetic energy technologies.

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

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

When fully developed, wave and tidal energy systems could generate a significant amount of total energy used in the United States. As Congress promotes technologies that can help lower our constituents' energy bills, we must embrace new and innovative solutions, like marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy. With this modest increase, the Water Power Program can do that while continuing to support a Federal investment in conventional hydropower technology.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I see the amendment as a reasonable, bipartisan approach and agreement which has seen favorable consideration in this House in the past.

As I said just previously, hydropower is the Nation's most available, reliable, affordable, and sustainable energy source. It seems to me, while we spend a lot of money, time, and energy on unproven resources, this is one that has stood the test of time. As a matter of fact, it is one of the beginning sources of energy not only in the United States but around the globe, and if we should be spending any of our resources, this is one that we know. This is one that is in every community. This is one that is clean. This is one that doesn't create too much noise for people, and it doesn't hurt fish. All it does is produce power without doing anything else, so it is hard to argue why we wouldn't be in support of this amendment and this program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his sponsorship of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again, this is a modest increase in the Water Power Program, which supports hydropower technology as well as new and innovative solutions, like hydrokinetic renewable energy.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase funding for the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy account by \$2 million for the SuperTruck II program.

The SuperTruck program was initiated by the Department of Energy to improve freight and heavy-duty vehicle efficiency. The Appropriations Committee acknowledged the success of the

SuperTruck I in their committee report, but, unfortunately, it recommended only \$8 million of the requested \$40 million for the SuperTruck II program to further improve the efficiency of these vehicles. SuperTruck II will continue dramatic improvements in the freight efficiency of heavy-duty Class 8 long-haul and regional-haul vehicles through system level improvements. These improvements include hybridization, more efficient idling, and high efficiency HVAC technologies.

By increasing the funding for the SuperTruck program by just \$2 million, it will allow the Department of Energy to better achieve their freight efficiency goals. It will be good for the environment. It will be good for the trucking community. It will be good for America. This amendment is offset via a decrease in the departmental administration account.

I would like to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their hard work on the bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, Line 5

In the "Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy" account, after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,657,774,000)".

Page 21, Line 6

In the "Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy" account, after the dollar amount relating to program direction, insert "(reduced by \$150,000,000)".

Page 57, Line 11

In the spending reduction account, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,657,774,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to strike all funding of the Department of Energy's Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy program.

This program, under the Department of Energy, allows the government to invest millions—indeed, over \$1 billion—of taxpayer money in high-risk research and development schemes for green energy projects. The government should not be in the business of subsidizing the research and development initiatives of individual companies. Let's be clear. Competition and innovation have been key aspects of the private sector's success in our country from day one, and the government should not take the role of a private investor.

Every business has a bottom line, which is itself a direct incentive for de-

veloping methods for becoming more energy efficient and innovative. By subsidizing this small sector of the energy economy, we are essentially allowing the Department of Energy to spend millions of taxpayer dollars on unconventional energy initiatives and projects that place taxpayer dollars at risk and that are not likely to produce a return on investment.

We as a Congress have continuously stated the need for an all-of-the-above energy strategy, but continued investment into the EERE program focuses on the small portion of a largely unproductive portion of the energy sector at the expense of more traditional energy sources, such as fossil fuels and nuclear, which have a proven, reliable track record.

I do want to applaud Chairman SIMPSON and the entire committee for their work on this bill. I know they face many tough choices when it comes to preparing these bills, and I do appreciate their hard work.

Ultimately, the American people are sick and tired of a Federal Government that continues to recklessly spend taxpayer dollars. They want to see Congress make the tough choices and rein in wasteful spending. I believe that eliminating funding for the EERE program would be a step in the right direction. It would be a small step toward restoring fiscal sanity in Washington. At a time when many Americans and small businesses continue to struggle, we must focus on reasonable energy strategies that allow for the most affordable and reliable energy resources for consumers and businesses alike.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, we have now seen amendments to put more money into the EERE and amendments to take money out of the EERE and now an amendment to eliminate the EERE.

I have to rise in opposition to this amendment. This bill supports an all-of-the-above approach to utilize our abundant natural resources and advance energy in new technologies to increase our energy security. A part of that approach includes strategic investments in the EERE accounts.

I agree that there are many activities in this program that could use a closer and more critical look. That is why this bill focuses funding on basic technological research and manufacturing advancements in this account. The bill reduces the EERE by \$266 million over last year's level, but this amendment, I believe, would go too far. I must support the strategic balance of this bill. Therefore, I must oppose my colleague's amendment, and I urge others to do the same.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I appreciate the chairman's yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I first want to invite the gentleman from Alabama to Ohio to see part of the new energy sector in our country. It is absolutely incredible, and it does involve high-level research to produce new energy technologies. I support nuclear, and I support fossil-based research, but I also support coal and tidal energy and wind and biofuels and geothermal—all of them—because we need them.

New investment in clean energy in our country in 2013 totaled \$36.7 billion. The leading company in solar in our country and, frankly, globally is a U.S.-born company—born in Ohio—called First Solar. You mentioned non-productivity. Their stock is sold on Wall Street. They benefited early on in that company's life by photovoltaic research beginning back in the 1970s and 1980s at the U.S. Department of Energy. It is really incredible to see the future being born, and I am hoping Alabama can take advantage of that kind of technology.

What concerns me, and one of the reasons I am on my feet at this point, is that they have competition from China. The first and second companies in the world that are being subsidized by the Chinese Government are in tough competition with the U.S.-born company, and we can't ignore the fact that global venture capital and private equity in new investment in clean energy increased from \$1.4 billion in 2004 to \$4.4 billion in 2013. The question is: Where is that going to be invested—in our country or someplace else?

□ 2315

So I would just say that we have made tremendous progress in an all-of-the-above strategy. Renewable sources now account for 23 percent of all electricity generation globally. That is amazing progress. We are learning how to work in conjunction with the Earth.

Who would ever have guessed that ethanol would now consume 10 percent of what you put in your tank? People said you can't even get to 1 percent. Now they are looking to 15 percent. It is unbelievable what is happening in these fields.

I appreciate the gentleman wanting to be responsible. I think we are being responsible in providing an all-of-the-above bill, including new energy technologies that will help our country in future generations so we no longer have to be dependent on imported energy, which I view as our chief strategic vulnerability.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. BYRNE. I rejoice with the gentlewoman from Ohio that there is a company there that is making money. We should always be about American companies making money. But if they are making money, they don't need a

subsidy from the government. I would like you to come to Alabama, where coal miners are losing their jobs because we have a war on coal in this country.

We give lip service to all-of-the-above, and then the administration has a deliberate policy of attacking coal as a means of energy for our country and putting people out of work. So I would invite you to come down and see the suffering of our people because of that one-sided strategy: we are going to attack coal, but we are going to give money to alternative energy. There is something wrong with that.

So I understand the gentlewoman wants to stand up for a great company in Ohio—I would love to come see it—because I think an all-of-the-above strategy is good for America, but we are picking winners and losers with this money, and the administration is picking losers by attacking coal as a source of energy and a source of jobs for our American people. So I would hope that we would care as much about those coal miners in West Virginia and Kentucky and Alabama.

Ms. KAPTUR. And Ohio.

Mr. BYRNE. And Ohio as we do about these alternative energy programs that we are subsidizing. No one is subsidizing those coal miners; no one is subsidizing their families that have lost their means of living, but we are going to subsidize all these other companies—maybe they are doing good things, maybe they are not—because we have a lopsided understanding about how to produce energy in this country.

Let the energy sector go. Let oil and natural gas and coal go. Look what we have done to the price of oil and the price of gas just over the last year because they have innovated on their own. They don't need the government to innovate for them. They need the government to get out of their way.

If the gentlewoman wants to respond, I would be happy to yield to her.

Ms. KAPTUR. I just wanted to say Ohio is a major coal-producing State.

Mr. BYRNE. Then you understand what I am saying.

Ms. KAPTUR. We will have more coal-fired utilities shut down in Ohio than almost any other State, so I identify with what the gentleman is saying. Frankly, I think that we, as a country, have to be much more responsive to our miners and to coal country USA. I represent the largest coal shipping port on the Great Lakes. I fully appreciate what you are saying.

I supported that industry from the day I got here. I have supported research into the clean coal program and continue to do so. I just want you to know that. We don't disagree on harming any sector. We need them all.

Mr. BYRNE. Reclaiming my time, I would just say I wish we could put money into that program like we do into this.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, lines 5 and 6, after each dollar amount, insert “(reduced to \$0)”.

Page 22, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$691,886,000)”.

Page 22, lines 20 and 21, after each dollar amount, insert “(reduced to \$0)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,954,660,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to the previous one, except this one requires energy companies of all kinds to fund their own research and development programs rather than continuing to require taxpayers to subsidize their activity to the tune of almost \$3 billion. It does not affect the funds set aside for nuclear waste disposal or national defense projects.

For too long we have suffered from the conceit that politicians can make better energy investments with taxpayer money than investors can do with their own money. It is this conceit that has produced a long line of scandals best illustrated by the Solyndra fiasco. This research doesn't even benefit the common good by placing these discoveries in the public domain. Any discoveries, although financed by the public, are owned lock, stock, and barrel by the private companies that receive these public funds. Public costs, private benefit; this is nothing but corporate welfare, and that is what these energy subsidies amount to.

My amendment protects taxpayers from being forced to pay 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.

Last year when we debated similar amendments, we heard of all the technological breakthroughs financed by the Federal Government, from railroads to the Internet. We heard promises of future breakthroughs from this massive expenditure of public funds. I freely recognize that if you hand over millions of dollars of public subsidies

to a private corporation, perhaps in Ohio, that corporation will do very well. Some of these dollars might even produce a breakthrough that will then be owned by that private corporation, and then it will do extremely well.

But what the advocates of these subsidies fail to consider is Bastiat's dilemma between the seen and the unseen. We see the politically well-connected company that makes out like a bandit. What we don't see are the sacrifices that struggling families and small businesses must make as these taxes are taken away from them. You don't see small companies struggle by having to compete against their own tax dollars given to their corporate competitors by a dotting friend in government. Nor do we see the breakthroughs and discoveries that these dollars might have purchased if they had been made by investors using their own money, making investments based on the highest economic return of these dollars.

Politicians using other people's money make investments based on the highest political return of these dollars. That is the principal difference between Apple Computer and Solyndra or between FedEx and the post office. These public subsidies, in effect, take dollars that would have naturally flowed into the most effective and promising technologies and divert them into those that are politically favored. Dollar for dollar, this minimizes our energy potential instead of maximizing it.

For example, hydraulic fracturing has revolutionized the fossil fuels industry, and it offers us the very real potential of becoming energy independent. After the 1973 oil embargo, the Federal Government spent \$1.5 billion on oil and gas production research, much of it on shale production, and accomplished nothing. The government lost interest.

But private investors renewed research with their own money in the 1990s and began producing the technologies that are used in today's boom. Public investment failed miserably; private investment succeeded beyond our wildest dreams. In short, if the technology is promising, it does not need our help; and if it isn't promising, it doesn't deserve our help. In either case, we have no business taking from the earnings of struggling families and small businesses that pay the research and development budgets of big corporations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment. Hydraulic fracking has been going on for 40 or 50 years in this country, by the way.

This year the committee continues its responsibility to reduce government spending, and we have done that. We have worked tirelessly to that end. The

bill already cuts energy efficiency and renewable energy programs by \$266 million below last year's request and \$1.1 billion below the budget request.

The fossil and nuclear energy programs receive targeted increases of \$34 million and \$23 million, respectively. The increase to fossil energy targets advanced research that will increase the efficiency of power plant turbines and conserve water usage during electricity generation.

The increase to nuclear energy will support security upgrades for the Idaho National Laboratory to protect the Nation's nuclear energy materials and a range of nuclear security programs at the NNSA, Homeland Security, and other Federal agencies.

Although my colleague asserts the amendment would keep the government from intervening in the private markets, these applied energy programs are strategic investments for our energy independence. I appreciate my colleague's desire to reduce the size of the government. I agree with him. This amendment goes too far by eliminating the strategic investments we need to make for our future. I therefore oppose this amendment and ask my colleagues to oppose it also.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would simply respond to my friend from Idaho that he is right to point with pride to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has reduced EERE spending by 16 percent. He is certainly on the right track. He is just building a little slowly in that regard.

We want to help him by doing what is right and restoring to the private investors the responsibility of using their own money to research and develop these energy breakthroughs and leave the Federal Government to doing what it does best, and that is staying out and letting the private sector succeed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for electricity delivery and energy reliability activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construc-

tion, or expansion, \$187,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$27,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for nuclear energy activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$936,161,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$80,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction including official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$10,000.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

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. 304. An act to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information; to the committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 30, 2015, 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:

1298. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Cecil County, MD, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8377] received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1299. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Administrative Detention of Drugs Intended for

Human or Animal Use; Correction [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0365] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1300. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rules — Revisions to Rules of Practice received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1301. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rules — Revisions to Rules of Practice received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1302. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1303. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1304. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1305. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1306. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the Corp's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1307. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Sabine River, Orange, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0236] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1308. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Xterra Swim, Myrtle Beach, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0019] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1309. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Mantua Creek, Paulsboro, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0807] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1310. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Taylor Bayou Outfall Canal (Joint Outfall Canal), TX [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0386] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1311. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Consolidation of Officer in