

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 313, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

AYES—96

Adams Hartzler Pitts
Akin Hensarling Pompeo
Amash Herger Posey
Berg Huelskamp Price (GA)
Bishop (UT) Huizenga (MI) Quayle
Blackburn Hunter Ribble
Brady (TX) Jenkins Rigell
Broun (GA) Johnson, Sam Rohrabacher
Bucshon Jones Rokita
Burgess Jordan Rooney
Burton (IN) Kingston Ross (FL)
Campbell Kline Royce
Cansoco Labrador Ryan (WI)
Carter Landry Scalise
Chabot Lankford Schmidt
Chaffetz Latta Schweikert
Conaway LoBiondo Scott (SC)
Duncan (SC) Long Scott, Austin
Duncan (TN) Mack Sensenbrenner
Ellmers Manzullo Sessions
Farenthold Marchant Southerland
Flake McCaul Stearns
Fleming McClintock Terry
Flores McHenry Thornberry
Fox Miller (FL) Walberg
Franks (AZ) Miller, Gary Walsh (IL)
Garrett Mulvaney West
Gingrey (GA) Nugent Westmoreland
Gohmert Nunes Wilson (SC)
Gowdy Paul Woodall
Graves (GA) Paulsen Yoder
Harris Petri Young (IN)

NOES—313

Ackerman Cole Graves (MO)
Aderholt Connolly (VA) Green, Al
Alexander Conyers Green, Gene
Altmire Cooper Griffin (AR)
Andrews Costa Griffith (VA)
Austria Costello Grijalva
Baca Courtney Grimm
Bachus Cravaack Guinta
Baldwin Crawford Guthrie
Barletta Crenshaw Hall
Barrow Critz Hanabusa
Barton (TX) Crowley Hanna
Bass (CA) Cuellar Harper
Bass (NH) Culberson Hastings (FL)
Becerra Cummings Hastings (WA)
Benishek Davis (CA) Hayworth
Berkley Davis (KY) Heck
Berman DeFazio Heinrich
Biggert DeGette Herrera Beutler
Billray DeLauro Higgins
Bilirakis Denham Himes
Bishop (GA) Dent Hinojosa
Bishop (NY) DesJarlais Hirono
Black Diaz-Balart Hochul
Blumenauer Dicks Holt
Bonner Dingell Honda
Bono Mack Doggett Hoyer
Boren Dold Hultgren
Boswell Donnelly (IN) Hurt
Boustany Doyle Inslie
Brady (PA) Dreier Israel
Brooks Duffy Issa
Buchanan Edwards Jackson (IL)
Buerkle Ellison Jackson Lee
Butterfield Emerson (TX)
Calvert Engel Johnson (GA)
Camp Eshoo Johnson (OH)
Cantor Farr Johnson, E. B.
Capito Fattah Kaptur
Capps Filner Keating
Capuano Fincher Kelly
Cardoza Fitzpatrick Kildee
Carnahan Fleischmann Kind
Carney Forbes King (IA)
Carson (IN) Fortenberry King (NY)
Cassidy Frank (MA) Kinzinger (IL)
Castor (FL) Frelinghuysen Kissell
Chandler Fudge Kucinich
Chu Gallegly Lance
Cicilline Garamendi Langevin
Clarke (MI) Gardner Larsen (WA)
Clarke (NY) Gerlach Larson (CT)
Clay Gibbs Latham
Clever Gibson LaTourette
Clyburn Gonzalez Lee (CA)
Coble Goodlatte Levin
Coffman (CO) Gosar Lewis (CA)
Cohen Granger Lewis (GA)

Lipinski Pascrell Scott, David
Loebbeck Pastor (AZ) Serrano
Lofgren, Zoe Payne Sewell
Lowey Pearce Sherman
Lucas Pelosi Shimkus
Luetkemeyer Pence Shuler
Lujan Perlmutter Shuster
Lummis Peters Simpson
Lungren, Daniel Peterson Sires
E. Pingree (ME) Slaughter
Lynch Platts Smith (NE)
Maloney Poe (TX) Smith (NJ)
Marino Polis Smith (TX)
Markey Price (NC) Smith (WA)
Matheson Quigley Speier
Matsui Rahall Stark
McCarthy (CA) Rangel Stivers
McCollum Reed Sullivan
McCotter Rehberg Sutton
McDermott Reichert Thompson (CA)
McGovern Renacci Thompson (MS)
McIntyre Reyes Thompson (PA)
McKeon Richardson Tiberi
McKinley Richmond Tierney
McMorris Rivera Tipton
Rodgers Roby Tonko
McNerney Roe (TN) Tsongas
Meehan Rogers (AL) Turner
Meeks Rogers (KY) Upton
Mica Rogers (MI) Van Hollen
Michaud Ros-Lehtinen Velázquez
Miller (MI) Roskam Visclosky
Miller (NC) Ross (AR) Walz (MN)
Moore Rothman (NJ) Wasserman
Moran Roybal-Allard Schultz
Murphy (CT) Runyan Watt
Murphy (PA) Ruppertsberger Waxman
Myrick Ryan (OH) Webster
Nadler Sánchez, Linda Welch
Napolitano T. Whitfield
Neal Sarbanes Wilson (FL)
Nuñez Schakowsky Wittman
Olson Schiff Wolf
Oliver Schilling Womack
Owens Schock Woolsey
Palazzo Schrader Wu
Pallone Schwartz Yarmuth
Scott (VA) Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—22

Bachmann Hinchey Sanchez, Loretta
Bartlett Holden Stutzman
Braley (IA) Johnson (IL) Towns
Brown (FL) Lamborn Walden
Davis (IL) McCarthy (NY) Waters
Deutch Miller, George Young (FL)
Giffords Neugebauer
Gutierrez Rush

□ 1912

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably absent for votes in the House Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 534 and “no” on rollcall votes 535, 536, 537, and 538.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 23, line 4, strike “expended.” and all that follows through “6864(a).”, and insert “expended.”

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, my constituents in Colorado, like all Americans, are demanding that Congress cut spending. We must look for every opportunity, large and small, to

cut wasteful government programs. This amendment does just that.

The Weatherization Assistance Program, otherwise known as “Cash for Caulkers,” and part of the failed stimulus package, has been plagued by bureaucratic mismanagement. This \$5 billion program was supposed to create jobs, but we all know that didn’t work out so well. In fact, with unemployment ticking up for 2 months in a row, we must reverse course and cut all unspent stimulus dollars.

In the stimulus, \$5 billion was injected into “Cash for Caulkers” through the Department of Energy in an attempt to help lower the cost of energy and increase efficiency for people who qualified. The goal was to make 593,000 homes more energy efficient by March 2012.

This program, however, has been marked by mismanagement, fraud, waste, and abuse. Most notably is the case of Delaware, where Federal auditors found mismanagement issues and potential fraudulent activities. Reportedly, subsequent repairs and other inspections will cost the State a sizable amount of their remaining funds. Issues have arisen in other States as well.

When large sums of money are spent too quickly, the opportunities for waste and abuse are rampant. The Obama administration, in its haste to create government jobs, failed to thoughtfully and prudently assess how money was spent. In these tough fiscal times, we must have accountability for every dollar spent by the Federal Government.

□ 1920

States have until March of 2012 to use Cash for Clunkers funds or risk having them returned to the Treasury. I am concerned that this could leave a large slush fund of \$1.5 billion in the hands of federal bureaucrats. They could spend that money with very little Congressional oversight.

My amendment is simple. It will prevent the Secretary of Energy from re-allocating funds remaining from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act from one State to another. This will leave up to \$1.5 billion that can be returned to the Treasury next March, thus reducing our massive deficit.

I urge support for this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes language in the bill that allows the Secretary of Energy to redirect unspent stimulus funds from one State to another. What they’re really saying is this: \$1.5 billion is going to be taken from the States that decided not to use the money and give it to States that not only have spent their allocations but want to

spend even more. If Aesop were writing this tale, I think it would include an ant and a grasshopper.

The principle stinks, and so does the program. These funds are ostensibly to finance weatherization and building design programs to increase energy efficiency. But the potential savings—if anywhere near as great as the administration claims—should be more than enough motivation for individuals to pursue this activity on their own without a government giveaway. After all, why should taxpayers pay to develop and subsidize building materials and technologies to be sold in the private sector to private consumers?

In all matters of energy and energy conservation, we've got to get back to the simple doctrine that the beneficiary should pay. If a product saves consumers money—in this case through energy savings—that's a benefit, and it is incorporated into the price structure of that product. This elegant and simple process allows consumers to decide for themselves if the added energy savings are worth the added financial cost. If the answer is yes, the world will beat a path to the door of those who manufacture and sell those products. And if the answer is no, taxpayers shouldn't be subsidizing it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the amendment.

The weatherization program was provided \$5 billion by the stimulus bill in 2009. But the program has been slow to act, and approximately \$1.4 billion will be unspent and available for use in fiscal year 2012.

Some States have spent all of their stimulus money, while others will have plenty left for fiscal year 2012. But the Department of Energy, by law, must spread any new funding evenly across all States.

The bill cuts this program by \$141 million below the President's request. The language in the underlying bill gives the Secretary of Energy the flexibility to use limited appropriations provided in fiscal year 2012 to supplement States that have no stimulus funding. The bill does not allow—I would like to add that emphasis—the bill does not allow the Secretary to reallocate stimulus funds. All it does is allow the Secretary some flexibility in where he allocates it. There is \$33 million left in the bill.

Let me say, we can't afford, in the Department of Energy, with this program, or any other program, to have business as usual in terms of weatherizations. And I would agree with the gentleman from Colorado that in many cases, the money hasn't been spent, and in some cases there have been questions as to how well it's been spent.

This waiver in our bill provides a solution allowing all States to continue

this program under a tight federal budget and with direct oversight of our committee. The amendment that is suggested by the gentleman from Colorado would undo the solution by striking language providing this flexibility, causing job losses and program stoppages in many States where, in fact, in those States, these funds are obligated.

So, therefore, I oppose the amendment and urge other Members to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment as well.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would point out to my colleagues that while the pending legislation is \$141 million below fiscal year 2011 levels, the fact is we do have approximately \$1.5 billion that essentially has been forwarded to the States. And the chairman just mentioned the issue of jobs. Those moneys are available as they are allocated and distributed for weatherization programs to put people to work. We have had complaints in this Chamber over the last week about the last unemployment report.

These moneys have already been budgeted. These moneys have been obligated to the States, and these moneys can put people to work doing useful things such as helping those who need to weatherize their house and reduce their utility bills so they can have enough money to buy gasoline and put it in their cars, as well as to begin to reduce the use of energy in this country. These are very necessary moneys to create jobs, to help those in need, and to reduce our energy dependence. I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$46,000,000)".

Page 24, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$99,000,000)".

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 2012 Energy

and Water Appropriations Act is an assault on any rational, scientific basis for public policy. It would decimate American manufacturing, impoverish American consumers, and allow polluters to sully our water with impunity. At a time when the American economy is stuck in neutral, while China and Germany are accelerating their production of clean energy and advanced vehicles, this bill would take America back to the 19th century standards of unbridled industrial predation without public oversight or regulation.

Mr. PETERS of Michigan and I drafted a simple amendment to fix one, among many, problems in this bill. Mr. PETERS has been a leader of efforts to restore our auto industry, and I appreciate his cosponsorship of this amendment. It would simply restore some of the funding cut from the Vehicle Technologies program with a funding offset providing by eliminating an increase in corporate welfare for the fossil fuel industry. This amendment would maintain the same level of funding as was provided in this fiscal year's Energy and Water appropriations bill.

The Vehicle Technologies program is a critical part of our efforts to revive American manufacturing and the automobile industry. It is a job generator. Five years ago, our auto industry was on its deathbed, with two major manufacturers facing bankruptcy. Fortunately, President Obama intervened and provided temporary assistance both to General Motors and Chrysler, most of which has already been repaid. Today, these domestic manufacturers are growing again, with positive domestic economic benefits for auto dealers and parts suppliers all across America. Unfortunately, this Energy and Water appropriations bill would reverse this progress by gutting important vehicle research funding.

The Vehicle Technologies program is a success story in boosting domestic manufacturing of cleaner cars that save consumers money at the pump. It is reducing the cost of advanced lithium ion batteries, which are in all hybrid vehicles on the road in America. This program has helped deploy 48 battery manufacturing projects all across the United States with the goal of reducing hybrid vehicle engine costs by 35 percent. Hybrid vehicles are an important part of our domestic manufacturing base and provide direct quality of life benefits in suburban regions with high levels of smog pollution, such as here in the Nation's capital. The Advanced Vehicle Technologies program also is helping to deploy electric vehicles, including the new Chevy Volt.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this program has accelerated deployment of hybrid-electric diesel buses, improving transit service and air quality in communities throughout the country like my own in Fairfax County, Virginia.

□ 1930

We cannot allow a hemorrhaging of technology and manufacturing jobs to foreign competition while unemployment grows in America. The Republicans seem to believe that corporate welfare for oil companies will help the economy, but we tried that during the previous administration and it did not work. We need to focus on rebuilding the technologies of the future right here in America, and the Vehicle Technologies Program is a part of that effort.

I ask for favorable consideration of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman from Virginia's amendment would increase funding for the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and reduce funding for Fossil Energy Research and Development. This would result in an increase in a program that already receives sufficient funds and hamper efforts to further technologies that produce most of our electricity.

Let's be frank. Fossil fuels, such as coal and natural gas, generate 70 percent of our Nation's electricity, and we will use these valuable energy sources for many generations.

We must ensure that we use those resources, of course, as efficiently and cleanly as possible. Further, the amendment increases funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, a program that has seen record increases since 2007, and still has nearly, if you can believe it, \$9 billion of unspent stimulus funds from 2009.

There is a proper role for the core Energy Efficiency and Renewable programs, and the bill preserves funding for those activities while cutting out activities that are redundant with the private sector or that intervene improperly in market innovation.

The amendment would also add back unnecessary funding for administration proposals that are poorly planned and lack justification. That in and of itself is bad enough, and I oppose the amendment and urge others to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PETERS. I rise to support the Connolly-Peters amendment because times of fiscal restraint force us to prioritize. However, I am disappointed that the Republican bill prioritizes the needs of extremely profitable private companies over the manufacturing and innovative jobs of the future.

ExxonMobil Corp. earned nearly \$11 billion in the first 3 months of the year, Shell earned \$6.3 billion in the first quarter, and BP made \$7.1 billion. Yet the Republican bill includes \$476

million for fossil energy R&D. Clearly, the private sector has the initiative and the resources to conduct this research on their own, and they are doing so. Private sector R&D currently dwarfs activities at the Department of Energy, yet this program is actually seeing an increase in funds.

This amendment strikes a better balance by decreasing funding in the fossil energy account and restoring the Vehicle Technologies Program to fiscal year 2011 levels. The Vehicle Technologies Program supports private sector growth and the development of innovative technologies to meet mileage and emission standards for both cars and trucks.

Consider how much fuel is used in the transport of consumer goods across our Nation on medium and heavy-duty trucks. Small gains in efficiency can have huge gains in fuel and cost savings. The Vehicle Technologies Program is investing heavily in new truck technologies, which have some of the greatest potential to reduce our Nation's petroleum use and dependence on foreign oil.

There is a global competition right now to determine which countries will produce the cars and trucks of the future. There is no doubt in the years ahead more Americans will be driving hybrids, plug-in hybrids, battery electric vehicles, and cars and trucks powered by hydrogen fuel cells or natural gas. The only question is whether these new technologies will be researched, developed, and manufactured here in the United States or overseas.

The Vehicle Technologies Program is critical to ensure that the American automobile industry and manufacturing base will continue to be globally competitive, and that we as a Nation will not trade our dependence on foreign oil for dependence on foreign batteries and other emerging technology.

I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. CONNOLLY, for offering this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support American innovation and manufacturing and support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY). The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$6,000,000)".

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$6,000,000)".

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will reduce funding for the international programs of the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy by cutting \$6 million out of their \$8 million budget and transferring it to the spending reduction account to reduce our deficit.

Now, first, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for doing excellent work in cutting the EERE budget by an overall total of 27 percent, but this program was cut less than that. It was cut by 20 percent. Mr. Chairman, as I go through the district, the number one area that I hear people say let's cut that to attack our deficit is foreign aid; and basically, this program is foreign aid. It takes scarce American jobs and sends them overseas.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as you know, our unemployment rate here jumped to 9.2 percent last week. We created 18,000 jobs, and here in front of us we have a program, this international program, that creates jobs. It sure does. The problem is they're all in foreign countries. So it takes those scarce American jobs and sends them overseas.

And I agree with the ranking member: Our actions today should have jobs as our focus, American jobs. That is why this amendment is essential.

The United States Government now has a \$1.5 trillion debt. We borrow 9 cents out of every dollar spent. We borrow money from China to finance our Federal spending and our national debt. And through this program, we spend that money in China to make Chinese manufacturers more energy efficient. Yes, that is hard to believe, but we do that. We take a million dollars and spend it in China to make their factories more efficient so they can compete with us so we can lose jobs, lose our revenues, and then borrow more money from China to do it all over again. We have got to end this vicious cycle, and we have to end it with this amendment.

As chairman of the Energy and Environment Subcommittee in the Science, Space and Technology Committee, we held hearings on this specific subject. Let me tell you about some of the programs this international program funds. It assists manufacturing facilities in China and India to reduce their energy use. Well, that's great, but why are we helping our economic competitors with hard-earned dollars that we borrow from them and then use to make their industries more efficient.

It gets even better. Then we improve energy efficiency in the Chinese building sector. Great. Let's strengthen our economic opponents with money we actually borrowed from them. In fact, the DOE just announced a \$25 million project over the next 5 years to support the U.S.-India Joint Clean Energy Research and Development Center. Now, why isn't it a U.S. energy research and

development center? Why are we spending hard-earned, hard-borrowed dollars overseas?

Even more programs:

One to promote energy efficiency in Indian software companies; unbelievable. Why aren't we promoting energy efficiencies in American software companies.

Partnering with the Kazakhstan Government to provide training on industrial efficiency. Now, I like those auto jobs in the United States. Maybe we should, in fact, train our own industry to be more efficient and not go to Kazakhstan and spend our money to do it.

A renewable energy center and solar power project in Chile; energy efficiency centers in Peru and Costa Rica; windmills in Mexico. Yeah, we are taking this money and we are actually building windmills in Mexico. Renewable energy strategy development in the Caribbean, and windmills in the Dominican Republic.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have gone throughout my district. They are begging for us to cut the deficit. The President said, he promised he would go line by line through that budget and find some items to cut. Ladies and gentlemen, this program is ripe for that cutting. We shouldn't be sending this money overseas. This doesn't eliminate the program; it cuts 75 percent of the funding. It goes a little further than the committee.

□ 1940

We clearly have to allocate America's hard-earned resources to higher priorities. Again, I commend the committee for making a start in cutting here, but we've got to go further. When we're spending money on making Chinese factories more efficient to compete with us and when we're building windmills in Mexico with our money, we've gone too far. That's why the Citizens Against Government Waste has endorsed this amendment. It hardly gets more wasteful than taking hard-earned dollars, borrowing from overseas, sending it back over there, and creating jobs overseas when we have a 9.2 percent unemployment rate here.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I will be brief.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) and I are pretty close, but I will respectfully oppose his amendment for a couple of reasons.

One is that the program that is subject to his amendment is coordinating programs with other countries. We're not, by definition, sending jobs overseas to other countries. The theory of the program is to provide technical assistance for activities to help prime markets for clean technologies in

major emerging economies, and the theory of the program is also that it can bring home lessons learned from other experiences and share them at the national, State and local levels.

I say I reluctantly oppose his amendment and that we are very close because I have great concerns over any number of these types of programs at the Department of Energy. I have expressed my displeasure to the Secretary, among others, that if we are going to invest our taxpayers' money—our money—in these endeavors, we ought to be very discreet as to how those moneys are spent to develop markets in the United States of America and, God bless, the rest of the world.

So I will in this instance take the Department of Energy at its word, and that's why I would respectfully oppose the amendment. I would be happy to stay in close communication with the gentleman, and I would be happy to stay in very close touch with the Department of Energy relative to the management of this program and, assuming the moneys are in the fiscal year 2012 budget, to pursue this program to make sure that your point is heard and that their expenditures are not violative of what you want to do today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have mixed views as well.

Obviously, Israel is a strong ally, and were it not for Kazakhstan, we perhaps wouldn't be able to do some things militarily to support our troops that are both in Afghanistan and Iraq. I think that it bears close watching, but there is a perception that somehow we're giving China, India, Brazil, and other countries sort of an advantage. I view this program as a two-way street. It does provide a degree of access to American companies.

So I reluctantly oppose your amendment, but I can assure you that both of us feel very strongly that it bears watching. It has borne some fruit, so it's not money wasted, and it's not money given away to our competitors. At least that's my view of it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. But I think, again, it draws attention to the fact that we should be very closely monitoring the department as far as the expenditures of these funds.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just briefly address this so that we can move on.

We only cut \$6 million out of the \$8 million. There is actually budget language further on that protects a cooperative agreement between the U.S.

and Israeli Governments, so it does not eliminate all the funding; it protects that program, and there will be another amendment offered later that will make that quite specific.

I understand that there is some possibility of actually getting a benefit for partnering—and I thank the ranking member for offering assistance—but honestly, I'm not sure what we're going to learn from Kazakhstan by sending money over there to provide training on industrial efficiency. I thought that we were the powerhouse of the world in industry. I thought we were the leader of the world. It's fine when we have a lot of money, but the fact of the matter is we borrow 40 cents out of every dollar, and the largest program expenditure outside of the joint program with Israel is that expenditure in China.

Now, I want everyone to understand there is still money available. It's in the Department of State budget. This doesn't eliminate these programs. This just removes the Department of Energy's contribution. I will remind the body why the Department of Energy was formed years and years ago. It was to reduce our dependency on foreign oil, and it has failed to do so. It has existed for decades, failing to do the mission for which it was established. In my district, people in private industry tell me, if they had a division or a department that failed to do its job for decades, they wouldn't be cutting it back—they'd be eliminating it.

So, again, I thank the chairman and I thank the ranking member, and I urge the body to support the amendment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. In reclaiming my time, I am going to support Dr. HARRIS' amendment.

As we face this huge budget deficit as a Nation, we've got to look at every source of cuts that we can possibly accomplish. It's time not only to cut spending, but we've got to start paying back our debts, and we're not doing that here in this country. I think it is absolutely critical. The American people, the people who are looking for jobs today, want us to do the right thing. Programs like this and many others are killing our economy, and they're killing jobs in America.

So I'm going to support Dr. HARRIS' amendment. I hope at least enough of our colleagues here in the House will understand the financial crisis that we're in as a Nation and will support it also.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$24,018,000)".

Page 24, line 18, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$50,000,000)”.

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

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to others that we have heard today.

This amendment would reduce the Fossil Energy Research and Development account by \$24.018 million, and will put as much of that money as our rules will allow into the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Research, Development, Demonstration, and Deployment.

The bill now is \$5.9 billion less than the administration’s request and is more than \$1 billion less than last year’s funding. Fossil energy is a glaring exception to the austerity visited upon every other kind of energy research, but the Fossil Energy program gets an increase of \$24 million above what the administration requested and \$32 million more than last year’s levels.

This amendment would reduce that account, Fossil Energy, to the level of the administration’s request, and will put as much money as possible back into energy efficiency and renewable energy research, which now gets a \$331 million cut, or more than 25 percent, more than a quarter.

Mr. Chairman, I agree that we need to be doing fossil energy research. It is more than 70 percent of our energy now, and it will be the bulk of our energy supply for the foreseeable future. We do need an abundant and clean supply of fossil energy, but it’s hard to look at the spending levels in this bill and not see some hypocrisy at work.

I am the ranking Democrat on the Energy and Environment Subcommittee, and I have heard again and again in committee hearing after committee hearing and in subcommittee hearing after subcommittee hearing the same stale talking point that it is not the place of the Federal Government to pick energy winners and losers and that taxpayers shouldn’t have to subsidize the development of alternative fuels.

□ 1950

Just last week, in a hearing in the committee, one of my Republican colleagues on the committee said we should promote an all-of-the-above approach—oil, nuclear, coal, natural gas. Heck, I’m okay with wind, solar, water, biofuels and everything else you can think of as long as it isn’t subsidized by the American taxpayer. And we’ve heard that same talking point again and again today.

The subsidy, the help with funding for research that the alternative energy now gets, is tiny in comparison to what traditional energy sources—fossil fuel and nuclear—have gotten for a long time. And if Republicans are now pushing alternative energy and energy efficiency technologies away from the public trough, it is so they can make more room for fossil fuels and nuclear.

Of course those traditional industries have been subsidized right along, and they continue to be subsidized in this bill today. Taxpayers subsidize it, in addition to this little bit of research funding, with very significant tax incentives—the subject of discussions over at Blair House the last few weeks, and we’ve heard there is no budging on that. And we know that those industries fully expect, if disaster strikes, if there is a massive oil spill or, God forbid, a nuclear accident, they won’t really have to pay the cost. They will get help with that; they will get bailed out.

We are not talking about basic early-stage research here; that’s somewhere else in the bill. This is all late-stage applied research. But in the case of alternative energies, we have fledgling industries, economically vulnerable industries that have some ways to go to get to the marketplace before they can turn a profit. And on the other hand, we’ve got an industry that is 70 percent of our current energy supply. They’re up and running, they’re in good shape, they’re fabulously profitable.

The top five oil and gas companies made \$32 billion in profits in the first quarter—the first quarter, \$32 billion, 3 months. To that industry Republicans say, belly on up to the public trough, boys; we’ll make room for you.

The energy research that we’re talking about in the EER&E is wind, solar, biomass, water—on and on. You know what they are. We need to make some of those technologies work, or we are not going to have enough energy in the future. And in the shorter term, they promised healthy competition for the fossil fuel industry to bring down the cost of energy for Americans.

It’s hard, in fact, to look at the hostility of Republicans to those industries, to those emerging energy technologies and think a big part of their hostility is not at the bidding of the fossil fuel industry to smother that competition in the crib.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman from North Carolina’s amendment increases funding for the Energy Efficiency and Renewable account, a program that I said earlier has seen record increases since 2007 and still has \$9 billion in unspent stimulus funds in its account from 2009 to spend. On that alone, I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

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

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

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

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$26,510,000)”.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$26,510,000)”.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment cuts \$26.51 million from the Vehicle Technologies Deployment Subprogram in the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy’s Clean Cities program and transfers those funds to the spending reduction account.

The House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has identified many concerns with this program which it has shared with the Department of Energy. This program filters over \$25 million to about 90 coalitions to buy electric charging stations, E85 pumps, alternative fuel vehicles, and other infrastructure.

Beyond concerns with how this program is run and how the dollars are being spent, this program should not be funded or run by the Federal Government. This type of program is best served by the private sector or local and State governments.

Despite the management concerns, the Department of Energy has recently announced its intention to broaden the scope of the Vehicle Technologies Deployment Subprogram to also include the National Clean Fleets program. One mission of this program is to assist Fortune 100 companies to upgrade their commercial fleet. Is this really an appropriate use of Federal dollars when we are facing a \$1.6 trillion deficit? Is it really appropriate to be helping companies such as Enterprise, GE, and Ryder upgrade their fleets to electric or alternative fuel vehicles? The answer to these questions, in my opinion, is no. In fact, I think most of the American people believe the answer to those questions is no.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. The doctor from Georgia is absolutely right. We held a hearing in my subcommittee on this very topic, and it was very instructive because for the last several weeks we have heard a lot about, oh, my gosh, these giveaways to corporations and

how we have to look at them critically. Well, here is a program where we can put \$25.5 million back into our deficit reduction by reducing corporate subsidies.

The doctor is right, GE doesn't need a subsidy, but they get it through this program. UPS doesn't need a subsidy; they get it through this program. They all make money, millions and billions of dollars, but this program gives them another subsidy. Verizon doesn't need a subsidy, but they get it through this program. They make a lot of money. They make a lot of money. This program subsidizes it.

And the gentleman is right, E85 is probably a bad choice. Why are we spending money—money that we have to borrow from the Chinese every day—in order to put E85 pumps around or to convert vehicles to E85 as part of this program? Mr. Chairman, it makes no sense.

This is another little contribution we can make. Our constituents have sent us here to deal with the Federal deficit. The doctor makes a contribution, \$25.5 million. We held a hearing on this. You know, their press release on one of these was "green beer for St. Patrick's Day" because they actually spent money for a beer distributing company to upgrade their trucks.

□ 2000

Last I looked, that business made money. We shouldn't be subsidizing it.

This is a good amendment. The body should adopt the amendment, help cut our deficit, and stop sending money to corporations that simply don't need our help.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and it would appear there will be others differing in amounts but very similar in intent. And I think that they do not represent a wise energy policy for this country.

The first point I would make is that the bill includes a reduction of \$491 million for the overall renewable program from fiscal year 2011, an even more significant reduction compared to fiscal year 2010. So the committee, I believe, fully recognizes their responsibilities to be careful fiscally.

But I also must indicate that someone who I have a great deal of respect for, my senior Senator in the State of Indiana, Senator LUGAR, has always characterized our energy problem as a national security problem. I think we all recognize it is an economic problem. We can debate the environmental aspects. I happen to think it is an environmental problem myself. But I don't think anyone can dispute the fact that it is a national security issue, relative to where we are buying so many of our petroleum products. And to gain en-

ergy independence, we are going to need a different and more diverse matrix of energy sources.

Seventy percent of our energy today is created through coal and natural gas, and that cannot continue. That is not healthy for our Nation. It is not healthy for our economy. It is not healthy for our national security. We need to diversify. In this instance, the committee has recognized our fiscal responsibility but continues to make an investment in our economic, our job, and our energy futures. And I do oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to associate my remarks with those of the ranking member.

This amendment would slash even more than we did in our committee, the Vehicle Technologies Program and this Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy account. There is almost nothing left in the account now. Maybe the desire is to put this whole account out of business; but personally, I think that is unwise. We have made the tough choices. We have held our hearings. We have had the input. And I would ask Members to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$491,000,000)".

Page 33, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$491,000,000)".

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I have been sitting here listening to what, in fact, I think is a very interesting debate: what's the role that the taxpayer, through this body, should play in trying to steer an energy policy towards efficiency. There were a lot of contentious debates that we've had about energy policy, about climate change.

One of the areas where I have found that we have frequently had some common ground is the notion that less is more. Whatever the source of energy that you use or favor, if a consumer is

able to use less oil—that's what we rely on in Vermont to heat our homes—or less electricity that's generated by nuclear, you can save money. And the efficiency title is one that gives us an opportunity to try to promote efficiency, where doing so has significant benefits.

Last year, Mr. Chair, we passed in this House—it failed in the Senate—an energy efficiency bill that would have given homeowners an incentive to put some of their money into home retrofits, and the government would have matched that. So you would have had an all-in situation.

And when you're retrofitting your home, you are using local contractors who have been hammered by the collapse in housing. They need work. It's work that is done locally in your district and mine. Ninety-five percent of the materials that are used in any kind of efficiency work in a commercial building or in home building are manufactured in America. So even without a debate about Make It in America, we would be getting the benefit of manufacturing in America. And obviously, it would then have an impact of saving the homeowner money. That particular bill would have saved about \$10 million in energy bills over 10 years. So that's real savings for homeowners.

The bill that is brought before the floor makes a decision to dramatically cut the efficiency title by about 27 percent, or \$491 million. What my amendment would do is propose to restore that money and take that from the Nuclear Security Weapons Activities account which has \$7.1 billion. So diverting the amount of money this amendment proposes would not wipe out that account in any way.

I think all of us would like to find some places we can work together despite the very significant differences between us; and efficiency, I found in the last Congress, was one of those areas where we had some potential to do it. Then-Ranking Member BARTON was supportive of some of these efforts.

And the money in this title actually does end up promoting projects back in your district and mine. I will just give some examples. And these are small things. They are small things but important. In Burlington, Vermont, we had a program through this title that helped a community market install 136 solar panels on the roof of the city market that generated 31 kilowatts of power. I mean, that's not going to save the world, but it created jobs. It reduced their costs. And it was local, local people doing it.

In Waterbury, a home for seniors was retrofitted and improved with insulation, better boiler controls and efficient lighting. Again, it's not rocket science, but it's real. It was real Vermonters doing the installation work. It was insulation that was manufactured in America. And it made those seniors warmer. It made their bill lower. That kind of thing can happen all around.

In Lunenburg, Vermont, way up by the Canadian border, the 430-cow Auburn Star Farm got some loans and grants through a State energy program that was funded from this title. It allowed them to build a biodigester, and that digester will dispose of the waste from the dairy cows, produce biogas to generate electricity, and help the bottom line of that farm that is struggling with low milk prices and high costs.

So the real question that is before us is: Do we want to promote energy efficiency at the local level in all the various ways people can come up with to save money when we know that in your district or mine, Republican, Democrat, or independent, we've got out-of-work contractors, we've got homeowners who want to save money, and we've got manufacturers who want to sell their goods? So I urge the body to consider favorably the amendment that is before you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly let me salute the gentleman from Vermont. Certainly Vermonters are often characterized as being independent and self-sufficient and self-reliant. Of course I would have to note for the record that you are 72 percent relying on nuclear power in Vermont. There may be other forms of power, so you might just want to check on that, just for the record.

□ 2010

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because this amendment decreases funding for weapons activities by \$491 million in order to increase, as we heard, the Energy Efficiency and Renewable account. Modernization of the nuclear complex is a critical national priority and must be funded, and that doesn't matter whether it's the Obama administration or the Bush administration. All of our administrations are working to make sure that we have a nuclear stockpile that is safe, reliable, and verifiable.

With years of stagnant funding, we have put off long enough the investments that are needed to sustain our nuclear capabilities into the future. The funding in our bill for weapons activities is both now, as a result, timely and urgent. When every tax dollar must be spent well, we cannot enact cuts that will risk our national security while throwing money at poorly planned programs that have large balances, which I mentioned earlier—\$9 billion in the EERE account that's unspent of stimulus money.

So not so reluctantly, I rise in opposition to the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote accordingly.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CONAWAY). The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I also have to rise, with great respect to my colleague, in opposition to the amendment.

I certainly appreciate, having just talked about needing to invest in a mix of energy sources in the future, what the intent of the amendment is. He obviously wants to return us to where we are in fiscal year 2011. I would certainly point out for the record that at that level, \$1.795 billion, we would still be significantly below where we were last year, fiscal year 2010, when our level of spending in this account was \$2.24 billion.

The problem I have here is particularly where the money has come from, and that is the weapons account. Too often, and we saw it again last week, we do tend, I think unnecessarily, to hold the defense accounts harmless. In this case the committee has recommended, and it was very carefully considered, an increase in the weapons account. If the amendment was adopted, the fact is we would be \$269 million below current year level, for a cut of 4.3 percent.

I have on numerous occasions in my district, in conversations with colleagues on the floor and elsewhere, suggested it is time, if we are going to solve our budget crisis in the United States of America, for everybody to belly up on both sides of the equation. And I don't care where you're getting your paycheck or how you're earning your contract money; I cannot believe if you are a defense function of the Government of the United States you can't find one penny, one cent of savings out of every dollar we spend. Having said that, that comes out to 1 percent. I think at this point the 4.3 percent in the weapons programs, that is very important as far as their safety, their security and surety, is a step beyond that 1 percent I have so often talked about the last months. So with great respect to my colleague, I would also oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection?

Without objection, the gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Just in clarification, Member from New Jersey, Vermont has about one-third nuclear power. That was misreported I am not sure by whom, but it's one-third nuclear, one-third hydro, and one-third other.

Thank you.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. This is from the EIA.

Mr. WELCH. And it is incorrect.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I assume it is verifiable. Twenty-two percent is hydro and 72 percent is nuclear. Nothing to be ashamed of.

Mr. WELCH. All right. I will just say it's news to most of us in Vermont. And, in fact, there is a big dispute about the relicensing of the current nuclear reactor we have.

But I appreciate the gentleman. Thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

Mr. POMPEO. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$45,641,000)".

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$45,641,000)".

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I presented would decrease the Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy program by \$45.6 million and the funding for DOE's Vehicle Technologies Program.

While I am certainly 100 percent behind innovation and the development of domestic sources of energy and new vehicle technologies, this program is simply not the way to do it. We shouldn't take money from one set of citizens to subsidize companies that, frankly, have had subsidies for too long in the development of new energy vehicle technologies.

Look, it's a subsidy program, plain and simple. The program is part of this present administration's liberal agenda to replace the free market with government bureaucrats in determining which energy sources we ought to use to propel our vehicles and for transportation.

You know, we are already seeing tremendous advances in hybrid technology and electric vehicle technology. In the State of Kansas, we have got folks coming up with wonderful, great, innovative ideas. They are seeking private capital markets to make that innovation happen. We have enormous venture capital firms that have made significant investment in these technologies. Why would the government use taxpayer money to compete with those ventures? They don't need the subsidies. They'll make these things work.

This is a quarter billion dollars in an R&D subsidy in a sector that has received subsidies for decades, and they no longer need that. They are far

along. They can make the progress. They can make these vehicles work. And the market will also choose them when they provide a technology that provides a cost-effective solution for folks who want to drive their vehicles and for companies that want to move their products and goods all across our Nation.

You know, these subsidies come in lots of forms, and I have opposed them in every form. They come in our Tax Code. They come in the form of grants. They come in the form of other programs. Both the House and the Senate have recently rejected tax subsidies for specific fuel purposes already this year. This Vehicle Technologies Program should be no different.

The President today said that we need to eat our peas. I suggest that he was suggesting that we need to do some difficult things. I happen to like peas. But he said we should do some difficult things. This is an easy thing. I would just as soon see this entire technology subsidy go away, but my suggestion here in this amendment is only this: that we return to spending levels from 2008, just 2 short years ago. I, for one, certainly don't believe, and I don't think the folks in Kansas and across this country believe, that we spent too little money on vehicle technology subsidies in 2008.

So I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I would point out that we have a vote pending in the House for a reduction of about \$26.5 million from this account. This would be an additional reduction of another \$45 million from this account.

The gentleman noted that what his intent is is to get the Vehicle Technologies Program, if I understand him correctly, back to where we were in 2008. If I did understand him correctly, I would suggest that that is why we are where we are today, because the levels for vehicle technology research were inadequate, totally inadequate in 2008.

You drive by a gas station today and gas is \$4 a gallon. All of us repeatedly are asked what are we going to do about gas prices. If we are not going to act as far as price fixing, collusion, cartels, monopolies, speculation, and we can't do anything about the laws of supply and demand, I have indicated to my constituents the thing that Congress can do most effectively for the price of gasoline is help our constituents buy less of it.

□ 2020

If we can, through vehicle technology research, help everyone in this country get an extra mile per gallon, we have helped them with the price of gasoline.

If we begin to cut back to prior year levels as far as the investment in making sure people can move in this country as efficiently as possible and reduce our dependency on imported oil, we are not going to make economic progress in this country and are going to continue to be held hostage to those overseas who send that oil to us for our dollars that they then use for other nefarious purposes.

Again, I think this is an ill-advised amendment. I think it takes us in the wrong direction. We should be looking for ways to ensure that we do good research to get more miles per gallon and to make sure that the Department of Energy also, as they do this research, ensures that it is applied not for more power in cars but for more miles per gallon, because, again, these are our taxpayers dollars.

So for those reasons, again, I would be opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me just say to the gentleman from Kansas, he said he would like us at least to go back to, in this particular account, to the 2008 level. Maybe there is some consolation: In our bill, we actually go back to 2007 in this account, and the bill is just, just beneath the overall allocation, in terms of the final product, is just beneath the 2006 level. You won't find too many bills on the appropriations docket that go back to that level, recognizing this is 2011. Our committee goes back to just below 2006 levels. So give us a little bit of credit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. 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 Kansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$226,800,000)".

Page 33, line 20, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$226,800,000)".

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, first I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) for of-

fering this bipartisan amendment with me. He is a leader on energy issues, and I thank him for his support.

Mr. Chair, the Tonko-Bass amendment is simple. It will restore three specific, results-driven energy efficiency programs within the fiscal year 2012 Energy and Water Development appropriations bill to last year's levels. It is neither a stretch nor an overreach. It is a balanced approach, and it is fully offset.

First, this amendment will restore funding to the Weatherization Assistance Program, or WAP. WAP is the largest residential efficiency program in our Nation. It reduces the energy burden on low-income families and the elderly and disabled, and creates jobs, invests in local businesses, and advances technology, state-of-the-art technology. The 35 percent savings as a result of weatherizing homes under this program saves \$437 in annual utility bills for the average homeowner.

Second, the amendment restores funding to the State Energy Program or SEP. SEP is the only cost-shared program administered by the United States Department of Energy that provides resources directly to the States for allocation by the Governor for use in energy efficiency. This includes 56 State and territory energy offices. And according to a study by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, for every \$1 in federal SEP funds, annual savings of 1.03 million source Btu's are saved, along with the cost savings of \$7.22 and a leveraging of \$10.71 on that same \$1.

Finally, the Tonko-Bass amendment restores funding to the Building Technologies Programs. Buildings in the United States use about 40 percent of our total energy and two-thirds of our electricity. As such, this program seeks to promote American innovation and technologies to reduce operating costs to building owners, which is vital in today's market.

Finally, Mr. Chair, this amendment has a net impact of zero dollars on budget authority and reduces 2012 outlays by \$58 million, according to the Congressional Budget Office. It does so by offsetting the increase of spending with cuts to the Weapons Activities Account, specifically to the Readiness in Technical Base Facilities account. The Appropriations Committee report suggests they are seriously concerned with the recent cost growth reported for construction of two major projects in the account. The committee report claims modernization will take several years and the considerable number of variables still at play argues against an excessively aggressive funding curve.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wish to close by saying I do not believe we can afford to slip any further behind our global competitors in energy investments. A vote for this amendment is a vote in favor of decreasing our dependence on foreign oil, creating local, private sector contracting jobs, and providing State control on energy projects.

Again, I would like to commend the gentleman from New Hampshire for his leadership on this issue and thank him for his support.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

To: Southern States Members of the U.S. House of Representatives

From: Kenneth J. Nemeth, Secretary and Executive Director

Date: July 7, 2011

Re FY12 SEP, WAP and BTP Appropriations under H.R. 2354—Tonko Amendment

As an interstate compact organization representing 16 southern states and two U.S. territories, we are disappointed with the budget cuts to the U.S. State Energy Program (SEP), Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP), and the Department of Energy's (DOE) Building Technologies Program (BTP) under the House Energy and Water Development FY 12 appropriations measure that was approved on June 15, 2011. The Southern States Energy Board (SSEB) has a long and direct relationship with the state energy offices and fully supports their role as a key component of implementing our country's energy policies.

I am writing to you to ask for your support of Representative Tonko's amendment to H.R. 2354 to restore funds to the State Energy Program, Weatherization Assistance Program and the Building Technologies Program. Representative Tonko will be circulating a "Dear Colleague" letter seeking your support for the amendment and we are urging you to sign in support of the amendment. Mr. Tonko's amendment would add funding for these three key programs to bring them up to FY11 levels as follows:

State Energy Program—add \$25 million for a total of \$50 million

Weatherization Assistance Program—add \$141 million for a total of \$174 million

DOE Building Technologies Program—add \$62 million for a total of \$212 million

This Nation's future is reliant on reducing our energy dependence. As a policy maker, it is important to understand the role of State Energy Offices and the importance of the State Energy Program, Weatherization Program and the Building Technologies Program to achieve these national goals. The SEP allows states to support a variety of energy efficiency and renewable energy projects including improvements to schools and hospitals, establishing partnerships with utilities, businesses and industry and facilitating the economic development opportunities for states while maximizing the development of states' renewable energy resources.

In keeping with protecting our economy while increasing the efficient use of energy, the U.S. DOE Buildings Technologies Program is essential and requires full FY11 funding levels to continue deploying technologies that will reduce pressure on tight energy supplies and help to restrain prices while protecting the environment. This program encourages innovation for emerging technologies and contributes to our global leadership while creating jobs and strengthening our economy.

Also, the Weatherization Program is essential to helping low-income families, the elderly and disabled by improving the energy efficiency of their homes and lowering their energy bills. During the economic strain that we are experiencing all across the country, cutting funding to this program would create even a larger burden on our citizens forcing them into more difficult choices on basic needs.

I strongly urge you to vote in favor of the Tonko Amendment so that these critical programs can continue contributing toward our Nation's energy goals.

U.S. GREEN BUILDING COUNCIL,

Washington, DC, July 7, 2011.

Hon. PAUL TONKO,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES F. BASS,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN TONKO AND BASS: On behalf of the U.S. Green Building Council and our nearly 16,000 organizational members and 80 local chapters, I would like to thank you for introducing an amendment to the FY'12 Energy and Water Appropriations Bill that will restore funding for the U.S. Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program, U.S. State Energy Program, and Building Technologies Program to FY'11 levels. Each of these programs has an established record of successfully returning significant value to the American people. Continued funding for these programs is a crucial investment that reaches beyond short-term energy efficiency: they create jobs and savings opportunities for low-income families; support and spur building industry activity; and contribute to long-term national energy security goals.

Over the past thirty years, the Weatherization Assistance Program has served as the nation's largest residential energy conservation program. According to the Energy Information Administration (EIA)'s Short Term Energy Report, homes weatherized through WAP saved low-income residents \$2.1 billion dollars in 2010. Weatherization returns \$2.51 for every \$1 invested and annually decreases national energy consumption by the equivalent of 24.1 million barrels of oil. WAP is an essential part of both present and future national energy saving strategies.

The U.S. State Energy Program is a thirty-year-old cost-shared program that provides direct support and funding to State Energy Offices to develop and implement state allocated energy efficiency and innovation projects. The Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) found that, in a single year, the program enabled states to collectively perform 15,264 energy audits, 12,896 building upgrades, provide \$12,345,608 in grants, and loan \$30,403,388 towards energy efficiency projects. ORNL also found that \$1 of federal funding leveraged \$10.71 in state and private funding.

The Building Technologies Program works with organizations across sectors to help develop technologies that make commercial and residential buildings more efficient and affordable. Over the life of the program, \$14 billion of direct savings to the consumer has been reinvested in local economies. Additionally, since its founding 20 years ago, the Building Technologies Programs has saved the equivalent of over 12 billion gallons of gasoline.

This suite of programs provides both measurable and immeasurable value to tax-payers across the country. The U.S. Green Building Council commends your leadership by supporting these programs as they have proven to be a sound investment for this country's ability to thrive. We urge all other members to support this amendment to restore funding for each of these programs to FY'11 levels to maintain this country's commitment to energy security and economic stability.

Sincerely,

JASON HARTKE,
Vice President, National Policy,
U.S. Green Building Council.

SUPPORT THE TONKO/BASS AMENDMENT TO THE
FY'12 ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT
APPROPRIATIONS BILL

JULY 11, 2011.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned companies, organizations and associations

all strongly urge you to support the bi-partisan Tonko/Bass amendment to restore funding for energy efficiency programs within the FY'12 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill. If the country is serious about addressing our energy security concerns, reducing energy costs, promoting economic growth and domestic jobs and cutting oil imports, then we should not give up on energy efficiency programs. Energy efficiency is a cornerstone of a balanced energy policy.

The Tonko/Bass amendment would restore funding to the FY'11 levels for the Weatherization Assistance Program, the State Energy Program (SEP) and the Buildings Technology Program.

The Weatherization Assistance Program is the largest residential energy efficiency program in the nation. It reduces the energy burden on low-income families, the elderly and disabled, and creates jobs, invests in local businesses and advances technology. The 35% energy savings as a result of weatherizing homes under this program saves \$437 in annual utility bills for the average homeowner.

SEP delivers extraordinary economic benefits to all sectors of the economy by working with the private sector in delivering key energy services. A study by Oak Ridge National Laboratory found that for every federal dollar invested in this program, \$7 in energy savings are achieved and almost \$11 in non-federal funds are leveraged.

Buildings consume approximately 40% of our energy in this country. The Buildings Technology Program conducts critical R&D that permits the private sector to incorporate new technologies into their construction. This allows businesses to maintain their competitive edge by reducing their costs of doing business and expanding against fierce global competition. These new products and technologies also help consumers every day.

These three programs that would be restored to FY'11 funding levels as a result of this amendment are critical to our future. The proposed amendment will increase Weatherization funding by \$141.3 million, SEP funding by \$25 million and the Buildings Technology Program by \$60.5 million, for a total of \$226.8 million. The amendment is fully offset.

Sincerely,
Adirondack Community Action Programs, Inc. (NY)
Alexandria Economic Opportunity Commission (VA)
Alliance to Save Energy
American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy
Association of State Energy Research and Technology Transfer Institutions
Baltimore County Community Action Agency
Boston Community Development, Inc.
Business Council for Sustainable Energy
California/Nevada Community Action Partnership
Central Florida Community Action Agency (CFAA), Inc.
Chesapeake Climate Action Network
Citizens Utility Board of Wisconsin
Community Action Partnership
Community Action Partnership of Idaho
Community Action Partnership of Lake County (IL)
Community Action Partnership of Northwest Montana
Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo Co., Inc. (CA)
Conservation Law Foundation
Conservation Services Group
Corporation for Ohio Appalachian Development
Direct Energy

Earth Advantage Institute
 Eastern Idaho Community Action Partnership
 Efficiency First
 ENE (Environment Northeast)
 Energy Future Coalition
 Energy Platforms, LLC
 Environmental and Energy Study Institute
 Environment America
 Illuminating Engineering Society
 Izaak Walton League of America
 Jefferson County Committee for Economic Opportunity (AL)
 Johnson Controls, Inc.
 Knauf Insulation
 LACAP (LA)
 League of Conservation Voters
 Mid-Willamette Valley Community Action Agency (OR)
 National Association for State Community Services Programs
 National Association of Energy Service Companies
 National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO)
 National Community Action Foundation
 National Insulation Association
 National Wildlife Federation
 Natural Resources Defense Council
 Newburgh Community Action Committee, Inc. (NY)
 Nicholas Community Action (WV)
 North American Insulation Manufacturing Association
 North Carolina Community Action Association
 Northeast Missouri Community Action Agency
 NYS Community Action Association (NY)
 Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies
 Ohio Heartland Community Action Commission
 Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
 People Incorporated of Virginia
 Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association
 Pro Action of Steuben and Yates, Inc. (NY)
 Safe Climate Campaign
 Schenectady Community Action Program (NY)
 S.E. Idaho Community Action Agency, Inc.
 Sierra Club
 Southeastern Association of Community Action Agencies (NC)
 Supportive Housing Network of New York
 The Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, Inc. (SMACNA)
 Tompkins Community Action, Inc. (NY)
 The Dow Chemical Company
 The Mechanical Contractors Association of America (MCAA)
 The Weidt Group
 Union of Concerned Scientists
 U.S. Green Buildings Council
 West CAP (WI)
 West Virginia Community Action Partnership, Inc.
 Wider Opportunities for Women
 WSOS Community Action Commission, Inc. (OH)

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In order to increase funding for this energy efficiency and renewable account, the gentleman's amendment again suggests we decrease funding for weapons activities.

As I said earlier the modernization of the nuclear complex is a critical na-

tional security priority and must be re-funded. Reductions of this magnitude would be unacceptable and impact our ability and our nuclear security strategy.

These reductions in the nuclear account would be to increase funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy programs primarily in the area of weatherization in the State Energy Program. For your information, these two programs have \$3.4 billion in unspent funds from the 2009 stimulus and a full \$2.7 billion is expected to be available for use in fiscal year 2012.

They don't need any more money. The Department of Energy needs to get the money out of the door, and if they aren't capable, they need to make sure States that have received money get money out of the door. So I therefore oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
 Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. As much as it pains me to oppose the position of my good friend from the State of New Jersey, I rise in support of this very worthy amendment and want to thank my friend from New York for his sponsorship of it.

As he said, it raises the Weatherization Assistance Program by about \$141.3 million, the State Energy Program by \$25 million, and the Buildings Technologies Program by \$60.5 million, basically to the level funded at the 2011 level. It is offset, as was mentioned, by a reduction of an increase in the Nuclear Security Administration's Weapons Activities, which would make that line item level funded as well.

And I believe, as has been said by my friend from Indiana, as well as my friend from New Jersey, that the Weapons Activities Programs are laudable, especially as they relate to the safety and security of our weapons stockpile. But I think level funding the 2011 levels is adequate.

□ 2030

When you look at the weatherization programs and what they do, you can't dispute it. Low-income individuals cannot afford to spend money on efficiency. It's just not possible. Yet when they do, it has a positive impact on all sorts of other programs, one of which is LIHEAP.

As was mentioned by my friend from New York, these programs pay back on the order of \$7, \$8, \$9, \$10, \$11 to \$1 spent, not only in savings to low-income individuals but also to the Federal Government. This is good for the economy. It puts people to work. It's good for energy efficiency and lessening our dependence on foreign sources of oil, and it does contribute to the long-term national energy goals for this country as I see them.

So all that Mr. TONKO and I are looking for is level funding for fiscal year

2011 for both the nuclear weapons program as well as the weatherization program, the State Energy Program, and the Building Technologies Program, which benefit so many people in so many different parts of America.

So I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
 Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. For a point of clarification, I would just point out the statutory deadline for the weatherization program and the State Energy Program is on March 31 of any given year, in this case 2012. So, of course, it's not all spent yet. There is expected to be an accelerated spending on these investments that are made. The draw-down on those moneys will come in an accelerated way. But also the intent was a 3-year spend-out. And I think if we pull the rug out from these job creators at this stage, we stand to reduce employment among our private sector contractors, our builders and renovators. What I had seen in New York, especially with the State Energy Programs, they had a 3-year waiting list.

There is a great deal of good that comes from this program, and I think everyone in this Chamber is well served by investment in this program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TONKO. 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 New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$300,000,000)".

Page 24, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$32,000,000)".

Page 28, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$167,500,000)".

Page 32, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000,000)".

Mr. GARRETT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to consider the amendment read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to rise with me in support for my amendment, which will save Americans over \$500 million.

My amendment before us today makes reasonable and targeted spending reductions in order to do what? Achieve significant savings that will contribute to our Nation's fiscal health.

Mr. Chairman, we must really now step forward and take bold steps to reduce spending. And I do commend my colleague from the State of New Jersey for the hard work that he has put in, and I appreciate so many of the comments that he has already made on the floor, pointing out to the other side that in so many cases there is money in these accounts, the money hasn't been spent, and they have taken a serious look to try to rein in spending throughout the committee process. For they realize that our Nation is on a path to bankruptcy and we have maxed out our Nation's credit card.

So while the committee did an admirable job and made significant cuts in the underlying bill, I stand here myself, and I and the Republican Study Committee believe that we can go further than this. So this amendment is a very reasonable attempt at showing that this body is serious about cutting spending.

Mr. Chairman, for too long the Federal Government's energy programs have been sold to the American public as basically wise investments that will yield vast new technologies whose costs would basically pale in comparison to the benefits later on. But when you think about it, when you think about the billions and billions of dollars that we have spent year after year, our energy infrastructure remains largely the same in many respects, and we are still here today dependent upon foreign sources of oil. And energy prices? Well, they just continue to spiral upward.

The other side talked wise energy policy. Well, time and time again, Federal energy programs have failed to live up to their potential. These Federal programs have allowed the government to basically play venture capitalists, if you will, and they do so not with their own money. Not at all. They do it with taxpayer moneys. And despite the little return on their investment, they have little choice in making these investments. American taxpayers basically are commanded to increase this investment every year.

For example—I will just give out one since we have been here for a long time this evening—the American people are being asked by their government to invest literally millions to promote something called “advanced solid-state lighting.” What is that? It's a technology that even its supporters can see is far too expensive to compete in today's marketplace. So does this sound like something that an intelligent investor would do? I think not. But only Members of Congress who are spending other people's money would do so.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is home to the most vibrant marketplace of ideas and investors. So the very best way for government to encourage energy innovation and revolutionary technology is to do what? It is to use that marketplace and get out of the way and allow private capital to make those investments. It is in the marketplace where private individuals will assess the risks and rewards, and they will invest responsibly with their own money on projects that will merit further development.

So to conclude, considering the precarious state of our economy and the fiscal condition of this country, the government can no longer invest in some of these extremely risky and unproven projects without regard to loss and expense. Government can no longer play the role of that reckless investor. We must eliminate the waste where it exists and encourage the Federal Government to spend the American public's money in a wise and prudent manner.

For that reason I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this amendment and fiscal responsibility.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. First of all, let me compliment my colleague and good friend from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT). And, of course, I'm reluctant because he's done his homework and he's worked hard, and I believe, with him, that we need to reduce Federal spending. We've been going over a financial precipice.

But we on the Energy and Water Committee made a commitment. Of course, we were given a very low allocation, so we had to meet that. But we have cut Energy and Water back to approximately the 2006 level after multiple hearings. We have put into the bill more oversight. I believe we have made the tough choices. We've reviewed all accounts. We've put at the pinnacle, of course, our responsibility for national security, national defense, and the weapons program and the nuclear navy, the next class of Ohio ballistic submarines, and also made substantial investments in the Army Corps of Engineers.

I am reluctant to oppose this amendment, but I think we've made the tough choices. I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I rise also to join my chairman in opposition to the gentleman's amendment relative to, again, cutting back on what I think are very

necessary investments in our economy as far as research, both as far as renewables, as far as fossil energy, as far as the science account.

The gentleman mentioned advanced solid-state lighting. It is my understanding that Philips has indicated that a small investment in manufacturing technology to improve the mechanisms as far as the construction and manufacturing of these lightbulbs would allow them to bring back jobs that are currently outsourced overseas. If we make that investment, and I hope we do, I certainly would want to join with other colleagues to see if, in fact, Philips Electronics is good to their word. But at this point I would state my objection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARRETT. 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 New Jersey will be postponed.

□ 2040

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WU

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$60,500,000)”.

Page 32, line 4, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$60,500,000)”.

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment to save consumers significant costs in heating and cooling their homes and businesses. I am joined by my colleagues Don YOUNG of Alaska, CHARLES BASS of New Hampshire, and PAUL TONKO of New York in this bipartisan, commonsense amendment.

Now, it's important because buildings use more energy than either transportation or industry. Fully 40 percent of our energy is consumed by building systems and in homes. My friend PAUL TONKO cited the figure that 70 percent of electricity in America is used in buildings.

At a time of both record energy costs and record unemployment, we need to protect Americans from crushing energy costs by improving the efficiency of existing and new buildings and homes. It's not just an issue for cold weather regions like the State of one of my cosponsors, Representative YOUNG of Alaska. It's also an issue for hot climates like what we have here in Washington, DC. Even at this late hour, at

8:30 p.m., you can just about hear the air conditioning straining to keep it cool in this Chamber. The cost for air conditioning the U.S. Capitol is a fortune. It is also very costly at my 13-foot-wide townhouse near the Capitol, and, of course, heating cost is a big issue in my home in Oregon.

The Building Technologies Program reduces the cost of operating homes and buildings by fostering public-private partnerships and developing technologies, techniques, and tools for making homes and businesses more affordable, productive, and efficient.

According to the Department of Energy, the Building Technologies Program has resulted in fully \$14 billion of direct savings to the consumer, savings that have been reinvested in local economies. Additionally, since its founding 20 years ago, the Building Technologies Program has saved the equivalent of over 12 billion gallons of gasoline.

This amendment would return the Building Technologies Program to just its current fiscal year 2011 funding level. This amendment will cost nothing extra because it is fully offset by taking funds from the Office of the Secretary.

According to the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee report, "a significant fraction of the funding directed in prior appropriations reports to specified energy efficiency and renewable energy activities has been diverted by department management to other purposes in recent years. In some cases, as much as 12 percent of the funding directed by the Congress for this activity has been diverted."

The offset for this amendment will simply return the funds to the Building Technologies Program as intended by this Congress. This, my colleagues, is low-hanging fruit, and we should pick it.

I want to thank my colleagues DON YOUNG, CHARLES BASS, and PAUL TONKO for their joint sponsorship.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment, but I give him credit for pursuing it. I have already noted that the bill reduces funds for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy activities from that account because the government needs to live within its means and really because they don't need any additional funding.

This amendment increases that account despite, as I said earlier, \$9 billion in unspent stimulus money. But perhaps the amendment illustrates how there is simply no room to increase funding for this provision, as the amendment makes an unrealistic cut to departmental administration to do so.

It's not responsible to cut administration and oversight, the very thing that both the ranking and I would suggest the Department of Energy needs more than anything. They need people to review their programs, provide accountability, meet the benchmarks we've set and the timetables we've set and report back to our committee.

So I oppose the amendment and urge others to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WU. 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 Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000)".

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000)".

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I realize \$200,000 doesn't seem like a lot of money as we talk about millions and billions and then on to trillions. But, Mr. Chairman, when I got this press release from the Department of Energy dated May 24, 2011, it read this:

The U.S. Department of Energy, together with the U.S. Department of Education, today announces the launch of a new energy education initiative, America's Home Energy Education Challenge, to educate America's youth about the benefits of energy efficiency.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you know as I do, this committee has been asked to make tough, tough decisions about how to allocate money in this appropriations bill and has done an amazing job in doing that. And yet what we continue to see out of agencies from downtown is the creation of new programs.

Now you know as I know that we could go through and eliminate, we could zero out this entire appropriations bill and we wouldn't be anywhere close to balance. We could zero out all the discretionary spending and wouldn't be close to balance. And I wonder if folks downtown are getting that same message. Now more than ever is not the right time to start a new program for which there is no demand and bring that to the American people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I grew up before there was a Department of Energy. And believe it or not—and this program is targeted at folks in grades 3 to 8—when I was in elementary school, we had an

energy efficiency program. There was a sign on the wall that said, Please turn out the lights when you leave. There was another room in my younger days that had a bird, and the light switch came right out through the beak that said, Tweet the beak when you leave.

Lots of those things were going on in America's classrooms, Mr. Chairman. They don't need to originate from Washington, D.C. They don't need the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Energy to get involved training children to turn out the lights.

We've heard from speaker after speaker after speaker who is trying to move dollars around to make sure that we are targeting our few dollars that we have at those critical, cutting-edge technology programs, those critical research programs, those critical infrastructure programs, and yet here we have a brand new program, Mr. Chairman, going to teach children to turn out the lights when they leave.

I think that is a wonderful goal, and I hope parents across America who are watching this tonight, Mr. Chairman, will take this as their push to go and begin that program at home if they haven't already. Knowing how tight dollars are in my community, I'm sure families are already doing that.

But this is a serious issue that requires folks across this board to come together to make the kinds of spending decisions that we have to make to dig ourselves out of this hole. Creating new programs to do something that are State responsibilities, local responsibilities, family responsibilities, this is not the time nor the bill for it, Mr. Chairman. And I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, to cut this \$200,000 and eliminate this new program and put these dollars in the spending reduction account before the new school year begins.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2050

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to speak in support of the gentleman from Georgia's amendment. He is so articulate and so convincing, we are willing to accept his amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia for providing us with a copy of the amendment ahead of time and join with the chairman in accepting the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. One of the convincing arguments you made, you made reference to the Department of Energy newsletter, a new program where maybe personal responsibility should be perhaps ahead of what they may suggest.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$166,143,000)".

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$166,143,000)".

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment saves \$166 million by relieving taxpayers of having to subsidize yet another year of handouts to the solar industry.

Solar power is not some fragile, new technology. Photovoltaic electricity generation was invented by Edmund Becquerel in 1839, more than 170 years ago. And in more than 170 years of continuing research and development and technological advancement, not to mention untold billions of taxpayer subsidies, we have not yet invented a more expensive way to generate electricity.

Yet we're perfectly comfortable telling our constituents that we are taking another \$166 million from their families this year to throw at this 19th-century technology for no particular reason other than it makes us feel good.

Not only is this the most expensive way we have ever invented to generate electricity; it also adds nothing to our baseline power. Our electricity systems operate on an integrated grid, meaning we constantly have to match the power going onto the grid with the power coming off the grid. And since there's no way to predict when a cloud passing over a solar array will immediately drop the output to zero, we have to construct an equal amount of reliable conventional power to back it up at a moment's notice.

In other words, for every kilowatt of solar power we add to the grid, we also have to add an additional kilowatt of backup power. If this technology was truly on the verge of a breakthrough, it would be the hottest thing in the stock market right now, and investors would be tripping over themselves to get a piece of the action. They are not.

We have no right to take our constituents' money and put it into yet another losing proposition. We're told the solar industry is making great strides in the marketplace. Lots of new jobs. That's true, but it is making those strides not on its own merit, but solely because we are hiding its true cost from consumers through massive tax subsidies that in turn we are borrowing from the Chinese.

It is true that if you hand over \$166 million of taxpayer money to certain solar corporations, those corporations are going to do very well financially.

But their government-funded windfall comes at the expense of not only the hardworking Americans who are the source of this largess; it comes at the expense of our ability to generate the most energy for the lowest price.

Perhaps it is just human nature that the more we invest in our mistakes, the less willing we are to admit them. But with the mistakes of the last 30 years now contributing to the bankruptcy of our country and the impoverishment of our people, perhaps it is time to tell not only the solar industry but every part of the energy sector, get off the public dole, compete on your own merit, and restore to consumers the accurate and unadulterated price signals that they need to make rational decisions in the marketplace.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment for reasons I have stated on other very similar amendments relative to energy research into renewable accounts.

I would point out there has been reference about the care that the subcommittee has taken as far as drafting this legislation. Stated in the committee report is language relative to solar, that the committee encourages the Department to include in its efforts disruptive solar energy utilization technologies, fabrication methods that yield ultra-low-cost solar cells, technology for ultrahigh efficiency solar cells, and technologies designed to simulate the operation of solar cells and other methods to yield advance sciences.

The committee also recommended no funding for solar demonstration zone projects, as the Department has adequate facilities at its existing laboratories. So they certainly recognized that they did not want money expended in that area.

The committee also indicated in its report that it is aware of the significant cost and efficiency advantages that solar films can provide to thin film and crystalline silicon modules, and we encouraged the Department to expand the funding of solar film research and development.

So, again, the moneys that are provided, which are very tight, are also very thoughtfully put forth with very directive language by the committee.

For that reason, I do oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. We clearly have to move away from fossil fuels. In order to do so, we need to understand the other opportunities that are available to us. Indeed, solar has been around for

a long time. But also in the last decade, 15 years, there have been extraordinary increases in the efficiencies in the solar systems, and they continue to increase.

This is not the time for us to back away from the future. It is time for us to move aggressively forward, providing the research, providing the incentives to move to a new source of energy.

If you want to continue to pollute the atmosphere, then stay with coal. If you want to continue to be indebted to the petro dictators of the world, then stay with oil. But we need to move away from that. And this money in this particular part of the bill provides us with the opportunity to seize the next generation of power, and that is the sun. Yes, the sun has been around a long time, warming us and providing us with what we need to survive. We need to use it more effectively and efficiently, and that is what this money allows us to do. Removing the \$154 million is exactly the wrong thing to do. I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I oppose this amendment, but agree with the gentleman's concern about the use of the taxpayers' dollars. In this account, which we have been debating for perhaps an hour and a half, I don't think any program has probably had a larger cut than the solar program, perhaps for the very reasons that the gentleman raises. Solar technologies have been around for a long time. We have a fairly viable public sector, but I still think we do need within the Department of Energy people in the Department of Energy who can put together and provide some degree of expertise and advice to a variety of different entrepreneurs.

So I reluctantly oppose the amendment, but certainly know his heart is in the right place.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for electricity delivery and energy reliability activities in

carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$139,496,000, to remain available until expended.

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, and the purchase of not more than 10 buses, all for replacement only, \$733,633,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

□ 2100

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. Of the \$733 million appropriated in this bill for nuclear energy research at the Department of Energy, it separates out \$10 million to spend on a cooperative effort with NASA to restart the production of plutonium-238.

Advancing the state of nuclear energy technology was the initial mission of the DOE, and it was hugely successful, developing technologies now used in power plants, submarines and deep space missions. This last focus is now one of the smallest: DOE spends about \$40 million a year building plutonium-238 radioisotope thermal generators, RTGs, for NASA and for national security purposes. This program began in the fifties. RTGs flew on all of the Apollo missions and many times since. In deep space, RTGs are often the only possible source of power.

Unfortunately, in the early nineties, the U.S. shut down plutonium-238 production, and since then, the Department of Energy has been using stockpiled material and material purchased from Russia to build these devices. Recently, though, Russia refused to continue that relationship, and our supply of plutonium-238 is almost exhausted. There are no other viable ways to provide this power, so the U.S. must restart production to allow any deep space or national security uses to continue.

This project has been requested in the last three budget requests, under the Bush and Obama administrations. Over the course of 5 years, the total cost of the project is estimated at \$75-\$90 million. By agreement between the agencies, the project would be equally funded by NASA and the DOE as NASA

has the largest need for the power and the DOE has the expertise and would build and maintain the facility. The \$10 million requested this year in the NASA budget was included in the CJS billing making its way through the Appropriations Committee. This 50/50 cost share is consistent with the decades-long history of the RTG program in which NASA has paid for each RTG produced for its purposes and the DOE has paid for the infrastructure required.

In the context of the nuclear energy research budget, which, in fact, receives a modest increase in this bill, this is a very small project, but it would have an outsized influence on our ability to do the kind of space exploration that no one else in the world can. It may also provide an opportunity for national security agencies to pursue important projects that would otherwise not be available.

I hope that every Member can support this amendment so that we can continue the long history of space exploration for which this Nation is known around the world.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, but let me thank him for his historical perspective of the department and of its initial responsibility and for his own deep knowledge, which he shared with many of us in the House, of its necessity in terms of space exploration.

The gentleman's amendment increases funding for the plutonium-238 production restart project, as it's called. To do so, funding for other valuable nuclear energy activities would have to be cut, including the advanced reactor concept research, fuel cycle development, and promising avenues like small modular reactors licensing and research.

The administration has proposed this new project for several years in order to increase domestic supplies of plutonium-238. The vast majority of this material, as Mr. SCHIFF has said, would be used by NASA for in-space power supplies, and only a small fraction would be used by the Department of Energy. Unfortunately, after the committee repeatedly expressed concerns since fiscal year 2010, the administration once again proposed in the 2012 budget request for the Department of Energy to share a full half of the project's financial cost. The administration has neither altered its stance nor addressed or even acknowledged the committee's concerns about this disproportionate sharing.

The funding plans in the budget request and the amendment simply don't make sense, particularly given the other critical priorities in this bill. As

we have expressed for 2 years, the administration must develop a more sensible plan. Therefore, I oppose the amendment, and urge Members to do likewise.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. I would like to make a brief comment in support of the gentleman's amendment.

As he said and as I would like to reiterate, there is a class of space exploration that cannot be carried out without these RTGs. Our domestic supply is unreliable at best, essentially nonexistent, and it takes a while to regenerate that.

I strongly support the gentleman's move to restart that program so that we could have a reliable domestic program for deep space exploration that cannot be conducted in any way with other energy sources. I think it is a reasonable amendment and is not overstated, and I would urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I certainly appreciate, again, the gentleman's seriousness in offering it. I appreciate what he wants to accomplish, but the history of this issue has been discussed by a number of speakers.

The fact is there have been Presidents of both parties who have made this recommendation over the last 3 years, and there has been directive language by this committee under the direction of both political parties over the last 3 years. The point is there is a benefit to another agency in the government outside the Department of Energy picking up a reasonable cost, and there ought to be an agreement. Until that is done, I would, with all due respect, rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 24, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. This particular section provides \$700 million-plus for nuclear power research, various kinds. The chairman spoke to this issue a few moments ago.

The purpose of my amendment is to carve out of that \$700 million-plus a sum of \$20 million to restart America's program on recycling spent nuclear fuel. We currently call this spent nuclear fuel a “waste” when, in fact, it still possesses about 97 percent of the energy that was originally in the uranium and then processed once through the light water reactors. The purpose of the amendment is to restart.

In the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, America undertook a program to close the nuclear fuel cycle. That was abandoned in 1994 after a successful effort to recycle and to use that energy that is found in the nuclear fuel. Unfortunately, now this spent nuclear fuel, which we call a “waste product,” is sitting at every reactor in the United States and mostly around the world, creating a significant hazard. We only need to think about Fukushima's little swimming pool that went dry and of the meltdown that occurred at that point.

We need to recycle and completely use, or as much as possible completely use, the energy in these spent nuclear fuel pools. If we do so, we can do it in a way that significantly reduces the hazards and that significantly reduces the longevity of the problem from some 200,000 to some 300 years and create an enormous energy opportunity.

This is a beginning. There is a long path ahead of us, and we have to start on this immediately. That is the purpose of this. Unfortunately, it is going to be ruled out of order. However, in the future, as we move forward, I would hope that the committee and this House and the Senate deem fit to put this kind of program back into action.

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

□ 2110

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will insist on my point of order but would first make a few comments.

The gentleman's amendment prescribes a path forward for the back end of the nuclear energy fuel cycle by directing the Department of Energy to

develop a specific type of reprocessing plant and facility, the integral fast reactor.

Let me say I appreciate our colleague from California's passion for moving forward our Nation's strategy for handling spent nuclear fuel, and I want to thank him for the many times he approached me on this issue. I and many of my colleagues share the gentleman's concerns, and I have repeatedly pushed the administration to move forward at least one piece of the solution, which is the Yucca Mountain repository. There is, however, ongoing debate about the future of the back end of our Nation's fuel cycle.

There are many approaches, including open, closed and modified fuel cycles. Each of these approaches—some of which utilize reprocessing facilities—are far from straightforward and can be accomplished using a variety of competing technologies. While I appreciate my colleague's desire to move the Nation forward, we must carefully evaluate these highly technical issues to address the economic safety and non-proliferation impacts that accompany any fuel cycle option. The gentleman's amendment chooses one winning technology, and I believe it deserves more careful evaluation before moving forward.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair. The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to speak on the point of order?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I do wish to speak on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think the point of order is out of order. In fact, the issue before us is of utmost importance to this Nation—and indeed to the world—as more and more light water reactors are built.

The problem of spent fuel continues to mount and creates hazards. The United States did, in fact, figure out how to close the nuclear gap.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman needs to speak to the point of order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I'm working towards that.

The Acting CHAIR. Well, the gentleman needs to speak to the point of order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The point of order that I would have wished to speak to, I will yield back my time and take up the subject later.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the levels

of budget authority or outlays in the bill.

Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from California proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), \$476,993,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for all programs funded under Fossil Energy appropriations in this Act or any other Act, the Secretary may vest fee title or other property interests acquired under projects in any entity, including the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 18, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$450,000,000)”.

Page 28, line 23, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$450,000,000)”.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. This amendment would transfer \$450 million from the Fossil Fuel Research Account to ARPA-E. The reason for the amendment is that we have to move off the 19th-century fuel, that is, coal and oil, and move to future energy sources, one of which I talked about a few moments ago, that is, the nuclear. The other energy sources are out there. We discussed on this floor here over the last hour the issue of solar. There are fuels, advanced biofuels. There are also wind, solar, wave, geothermal. All of these are being advanced at this time by the ARPA-E program within the Department of Energy. That's where the future is.

Now, we can make a choice here about staying with the past and trying to figure out how to create clean coal, which is probably the oxymoron of the century, or we can simply shift our resources to look at other energy sources, and that's what we have to do. The purpose of this amendment is to do that, to shift \$450 million into ARPA-E so that we can look for the energy systems of the future, providing the support that they need both in the research and in the early development of those resources.

There has been much success in this area. There have been numerous research programs that have been done not only at the Department of Energy facilities, but at universities around this country that have taken advantage of the ARPA-E program. It is modeled after the very successful and very long-lasting Department of Defense ARPA program, and it works. We've actually seen major scientific breakthroughs that have occurred as a result of the funding from the ARPA-E program.

Modest as it was, if this amendment were to be adopted, it would be a very big program, one that has the potential of advancing this Nation's future and freeing us—in the case of oil—from the petro dictators of the world and also, in the case of coal, from the extraordinary problems that coal brings to the environment and to communities throughout this Nation. I understand the coal industry and their desire to continue to dig for coal, but we know that at some point we're going to have to move away into the future, and that is what this amendment would attempt to accomplish.

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. With all respect, I do rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I appreciate his comments about ARPA-E. I appreciate the purpose behind its creation. And I will certainly acknowledge that it would appear at ARPA-E there is a new culture, if you would, at that element of the Department of Energy to move projects along and to have a conclusion to research.

As I indicated in my opening remarks in general debate on this bill, I wish the Department of Energy had brought the same vigor and that same commitment that they had to ARPA-E to existing programs at the Department of Energy because my concern is that at some point in time we have too many programs that are going to solve the problem and we're tripping over each other.

At this point, we have 46 Energy Frontier Research Centers, and there is a request to add three to eight more. We have a new administration, and it is not unique to the Obama administration that at the Department of Energy we need, as I would characterize it, a new silver ball to chase around. We need new hubs so that people can talk to each other about critical research. At this point in time, there are three hubs in place, as I understand, for about 18 months. There are two more called for in this bill, totaling five.

We need a bioenergy research center. There are now three in the United States: one in Berkeley, California; one in Madison, Wisconsin; and one in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. We also need defined

research being done at the Joint Genome Institute that was established in 1997 under President Clinton.

I, at this point in time, would like to make sure that ARPA-E works over a longer term, as advertised, and that as advertised the Department takes that culture that is being developed at ARPA-E and to infuse it into these other programs and to show the Congress of the United States there is communication between these numerous programs before we provide any additional monies over and above those called for in the bill.

So again, very respectfully, I would oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

□ 2120

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the amendment but also to associate myself with the ranking member's comments on ARPA-E, which I'm supportive of. Of course our colleague's amendment would add funding to ARPA-E, which receives some \$100 million in our bill; but the way he would do it would be virtually to eliminate funding for the Fossil Energy Research and Development program, I think causing excessive job losses. And I think the program makes major contributions.

Of course we can't forget that fossil fuels, coal, and natural gas generate about 70 percent of our Nation's electricity. ARPA-E may someday generate a much greater percentage than perhaps it potentially does today, but we're a long way from there. So I oppose the gentleman's amendment and certainly the source, using the Fossil Fuels account for this additional money, that he suggests.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. CONAWAY, 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. 2354) making

appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 12, 2011, 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:

2367. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Amendment To Allow Additional Exemptions [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0072; FV10-927-1 FIR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2368. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — User Fees for 2011 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [AMS-CN-10-0111; CN-11-001] (RIN: 0581-AD11) received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2369. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Suspension of Handling Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0019; FV11-916/917-5 IR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2370. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increases Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0104; FV11-925-1 FR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2371. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0115; FV11-932-1 IR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2372. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0090; FV10-989-3 FR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.