

And now, this Congress wants to continue to egregiously spend money on this failed project in fiscal year 2019 appropriations.

So once again, I am here to fight to prevent nuclear waste from ever coming to my home State of Nevada. That is why I have introduced an amendment to H.R. 5895, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2019.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, would strike \$190 million for the licensing of the nuclear waste depository at Yucca Mountain.

I routinely hear from my Republican colleagues on the need to reduce our deficit and debt. I fully agree with the sentiment. Congress should not waste another \$190 million of taxpayer money on a project that will not come to fruition.

But you should support my amendment not just on the fiscal basis. Mr. Chairman, my home State of Nevada, which has no nuclear energy-producing facilities, should not be the dumping ground for the rest of the country's nuclear waste.

And this is not just an issue facing Nevadans. It is an issue that impacts constituents from 329 congressional districts in 44 States and Washington, D.C.

Putting a nuclear repository in Nevada's backyard means that this high level nuclear waste must travel through your backyards first as well.

Your constituents will see high level nuclear waste transported through their communities on rail and by truck. A simple car crash or train derailment will leave your constituents at risk and cost our taxpayers more money to clean up the mess.

It is clear that reopening Yucca Mountain is fiscally unsound, presents threats to people across the country, and is unwanted by the people of Nevada. That is why I encourage you to support my amendment to prevent nuclear waste from ever coming to Nevada.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), my colleague.

□ 1815

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of our amendment, which would strike funding for the Yucca Mountain project.

Like the vast majority of Nevadans, I firmly oppose any attempt to turn my State into the Nation's nuclear waste dump. Dumping nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain wouldn't only endanger the health and safety of my constituents, who live just 90 miles away in the Las Vegas Valley, it would threaten millions of Americans in 44 States.

This ill-conceived plan would mean transporting tens of thousands of metric tons of radioactive waste across this country. Those shipments of hazardous material would travel on our highways and railways to Nevada

through over 329 congressional districts on a weekly basis for more than 50 years.

Finally, reviving Yucca Mountain would jeopardize military testing and training at our defense facilities.

Our amendment would strike \$190 million for the licensing for this administration's plan to turn Nevada into a dumping ground. That is the bulk of the funding for this dangerous failure of a project. We shouldn't waste another dime of taxpayer money on failed efforts to try to send nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain.

It is time to move on from this reckless and costly project, so I urge my colleagues to support our amendment to remove this licensing funding and, instead, work with us on alternative solutions that repurpose Yucca Mountain into something that can create jobs and keep our families safe.

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

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, let me be clear what this amendment does.

This is 1,000 pages of the safety and evaluation report by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission—5 volumes. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is our independent safety agency on all things nuclear.

What my colleague from Nevada's amendment does is strip the money for what they keep telling me they want. They want to prove the science. They want to say it is not safe. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission says it is safe for a million years.

Now, if my colleagues from Nevada want to debate the science, then they can do that, per the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, through the licensing project. But, no, they don't want to put their science up against our independent nuclear safety agency. They want to adjudicate this in the court of public opinion and deprive the money to have that final science debate.

So this amendment is really an anti-science amendment to not debate the NRC's finding, because we know that in their conclusion they say storing nuclear waste in a long-term geological repository—and this is the world consensus—in a deep geological repository is what the world's scientists say is the safest way to store spent nuclear fuel and defense waste.

That is not just the United States. That is France. That is Norway. That is Great Britain. That is many of our allies and friends and their scientists. Again, 1,000 pages, 5 volumes, public record.

This amendment takes that money away so we don't have a debate on the science. It is either in the desert underneath a mountain, 1,000 feet above the ground table, 1,000 feet below the top of the mountain, or it is on the Pacific Ocean. Those are the choices that we had debated in H.R. 3053.

And not only that, the Chamber as a whole, in a bipartisan manner, said—340 Members—actually, more Democrats supported H.R. 3053 than opposed it—340-72. Why? Because we have a national problem which requires a national solution. We have to keep our promises.

These are the operating commercial and nuclear reactors. This doesn't even talk about the defense issue. The national media from around the country is on our side as far as moving forward if the science is found to be reliable.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission says a million years. The State of Nevada says: Not so. Let's have the debate. Let's not strip the money away to have that final debate. That is why I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad this amendment came, because our job now is to educate, not only the State of Nevada, but it is also to educate our colleagues from across the country that the science debate, the final decision needs to be through the licensing.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, our independent Federal nuclear safety agency, says it will be safe for a million years. Nevada says: Not so. Let's have the debate. Let's not strip the money.

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) assumed the chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2377. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 200 West 2nd Street in Dayton, Ohio, as the "Walter H. Rice Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

S. 2734. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). It is now in order to

consider amendment No. 24 printed in part B of House Report 115–711.

Mr. GOSAR. 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 30, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$325,000,000)”.

Page 30, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$29,250,000)”.

Page 64, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$325,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, the ARPA-E program first began receiving funding through the 2009 Obama stimulus and is currently unauthorized.

ARPA-E grew out of those years’ overly optimistic perception of the Federal Government’s ability to lead in areas of commercially viable energy research and technology, particularly in renewables.

The obvious problem with this premise is that the government, unlike our Nation’s industries and corporations, has never been in the business of cost-benefit maximization, as other blunders from that period, like the Solyndra scandal, demonstrated.

This is because the Federal Government is competent and accomplished in the areas of basic, early-stage scientific research but poorly positioned to move research from concept to market. And ARPA-E provides even further demonstration of that. The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies defunded the program in their FY18 draft passed bill.

The administration and the Republican Study Committee have both advocated eliminating this stimulus-era program and have continually indicated that the proper role of government in energy research is at the level of basic research taking place in existent, well-funded programs like the Office of Science and the applied energy research and development program.

Those DOE programs that they point to are more worthy recipients of Federal dollars, are effective, and produce results because they focus on the right goals.

For this reason, the administration is also strongly opposed to continued funding for the ARPA-E program. The White House stated in its fiscal year 2019 budget proposal:

Appropriations for ARPA-E were only authorized through 2013 under the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010. In addition, there has been concern about the potential for ARPA-E’s efforts to overlap with research and development being carried out, or which should be carried out, by the private sector.

No new appropriations are requested in 2019. The Department would request re-

programming of prior-year unobligated balances for program closeout activities to ensure full closure of ARPA-E by mid-2020. Any remaining contract closeout and award monitoring activities would be transferred elsewhere within DOE.

This proposed elimination reflects both a streamlining of Federal activities and a refocusing on the proper Federal role in energy research and development.

In a May 15 view letter to House Appropriations on the Energy and Water bill, the White House stated: “The Administration is disappointed that the bill does not eliminate ARPA-E. The Committee is encouraged to explore options to incorporate certain ARPA-E attributes, such as cross-cutting research coordination and enhanced flexibility, into the Department of Energy’s primary research efforts within the Office of Science and Applied Energy Research Programs rather than maintain a separate program through ARPA-E.”

In a June 5 Statement of Administration Policy, the White House stated: “The Administration believes that the continued funding of ARPA-E makes little strategic sense given the existence of applied energy research elsewhere within the Department. The Congress is urged to eliminate ARPA-E and incorporate its more successful elements, such as coordination with industry and cross-cutting research, into the Department’s applied energy programs.”

The innovations ARPA-E supporters crow about must come from the market or from academic research institutions, because the Federal Government’s track record of responding to commercial incentives in a cost-beneficial way to the taxpayer is absolutely poor.

The proper Federal nexus for research is the early-stage work being done at the existing Office of Science and the applied energy research program, not projects foisted onto the government that weren’t compelling enough to receive private funding.

Heritage Action, Freedomworks, Club for Growth, and the National Taxpayers Union are key-voting this amendment. The amendment is also endorsed by the Americans for Limited Government and Taxpayers for Common Sense.

I urge adoption of this amendment that supports President Trump’s agenda.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. Ross). The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

My colleague’s amendment would eliminate the Advanced Research Project Agency—Energy, otherwise known as ARPA-E.

ARPA-E’s mission is to fund projects that are not yet addressed by the pri-

vate sector but that can bring transformational shifts in current energy technologies. From reducing the energy involved in producing aluminum to creating new battery storage technologies, these are projects that have impacts in almost every industry.

Since 2009, ARPA-E has provided funding for more than 660 projects. As of this year, ARPA-E projects have produced 245 patents, formed 71 new companies, and have raised more than \$2.9 billion in follow-on funding from the private sector to bring technologies to market.

These are successes, and successes help ensure our Nation’s energy security and create a manufacturing edge in the energy sector. These are energy technology goals all Members can support.

I would remind my friend from Arizona, our job is not to be lemmings for the administration. It is to make our own independent judgment.

While I appreciate and look at the reason that they would like to eliminate ARPA-E, I disagree with them. So do a majority of the Members of Congress, as they have demonstrated in the past.

So we must exercise our independent judgment on what is best. While we respect the administration’s position, we just disagree with it.

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

□ 1830

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, any program that receives this much funding has individual successes proponents can point to. The problem with this program is that the ratio of successes to the failures is far lower with this one than comparable Federal research programs.

It also targets an area of research that is inappropriate for Federal research. Basic early-stage research is a profit avenue for Federal dollars to go, not late-stage research on projects approaching commercialization. If a concept or technology is nearing commercialization, that is the right nexus for private industry to get involved.

Our country’s major companies in tech, engineering, and energy are flush with cash, and projects that they think are commercially viable are getting more funding than ever before. Failure by the government to salvage a project means that the projects, on the whole, aren’t worth being salvaged by government, industry, or anyone.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise to strongly oppose the Gosar amendment to completely eliminate the ARPA-E advanced energy research program, which helps propel our Nation forward as a global leader.

I could just say to the gentleman from Arizona, for some of the firms

that have contacted me, the Chinese are hacking into their intellectual property every week as they struggle to maintain a global lead in new energy technologies.

Yes, ARPA-E is a pioneering program. It was designed to be that way. Yes, it is high risk. Yes, it is high end, so much so that the private sector won't do what ARPA-E is conducting. The research is so high in science that most companies in this country can't even touch it. And, frankly, I don't want the Chinese designing our future.

They are actually doing research before the private market can drive it forward with a commercial product.

I would like to point out that, in 2011, an American Enterprise Institute-Brookings Institution breakthrough study called for ARPA-E to be funded at \$1.5 billion, annually, because of other countries around the world beginning to do research in a way that was competing with our own.

The American Energy Innovation Council, a panel of many of the Nation's top business leaders, including Bill Gates, have called for ARPA-E to be funded at \$1 billion a year. And last year, Republican officials—oil and energy executives, business leaders, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—told Congress, ARPA-E is a blueprint “. . . that boost our competitiveness by keeping America at the forefront of global energy technology research.”

These are some of the best people in our country. We ought to be listening to them. We are their representatives. As the program focused on new possibilities, new patents, ARPA-E has been nothing short of remarkable, with 136 projects attracting nearly \$3 billion in private sector follow-on funding.

They won't do the research, but they will take what we have invested and really do something in the marketplace with it; but beyond just the marketplace, something that might have something to do with our defense, for example, something to do with our national security—inventing the future.

And yet we have come to expect this administration, they want to eliminate funding, and some of their allies here in the Congress want to eliminate funding. You eliminate the future if you do that. You really do eliminate the future.

So I rise and strongly oppose this amendment. Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on the Gosar amendment.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, once again, this is an unauthorized program and it treads on existing jurisdictions at the Department of Energy, specifically, the Office of Science and Applied Energy Research program. It is a program in search of justification.

Let's take, for example, Solyndra. That is a wonderful success. Really? Private sector couldn't do that? They could do it a ton better than that type of application.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment. This is sound.

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

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 32, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. SIMPSON and Ms. KAPTUR for working to try to put forward a bill and to recognize the unfortunate addition of riders, which we would hope that we could pass these kinds of bills in the appropriate manner. But I thank them for their work, and I thank the Rules Committee for making this amendment in order.

This is an important part of the Energy and Water legislation in Appropriations, and that is the Department of Energy's departmental work that it does with environmental justice.

My amendment would ask for an additional \$1 million to be placed in that program under the administrative office's responsibilities, and to do so because it is an essential tool in the effort to improve the lives of low-income and minority communities as well as the environment at large.

Many of my Members here have worked on this issue, in particular, JIM CLYBURN and the Congressional Black Caucus, over the years. I add to their work by making sure that this is a focus of the Department of Energy.

Maintaining funds for environmental justice that go to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, minority-serving institutions, Tribal colleges, and other organizations is imperative to protecting sustainability and growth of the community and environment. In particular, those individuals who study this issue in those particular institutions of higher learning go out to communities and are a source

of research and aid to communities that suffer from the lack of environmental justice, for example, in Flint, Michigan. It is clear that that is a place where there was an infusion of experts on how to deal with unclean water.

I worked with Dr. Hotez, one of the renown infectious disease physicians in Houston, Texas, when the Zika virus began to take over in the summer in, particularly, minority communities.

DOE's Environmental Justice Program provides dollars to be awarded to an important cause of increasing youth involvement in STEM and promoting clean energy, weatherization, cleanup, and asset revitalization.

Weatherization is extremely important. The housing stock in my congressional district, as in rural communities, is extremely old and sometimes weak and subjected to the whims of bad winter weather and the whims of very hot summers. These dollars can assist in these kinds of programs.

The Community Leadership Institute is another vital component of the Environmental Justice Program, and it promotes environmental sustainability. It brings important factors, including public health and economic development. It is an important program that helps Native Americans and Alaskan Natives.

So I hope that my colleagues can support the Jackson Lee amendment because it deals with an expanse and an emphasis on the importance of a quality of life that can deal with a good environment.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, since the amendment does not change funding levels in the bill, I will not oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, with that in mind, what we are glad to say is that we emphasize and ask for that amount of dollars within the administrative account to be increased on the Environmental Justice Program.

We are grateful for the statement of the chairman, and with that in mind, we want to remind our colleagues that STEM programs, the program that helps in leadership, in particular, that will help young people learn more about environmental justice, the issues that we see in communities with clean water, clean air, the Zika virus, and other elements that impact on minority communities, the Environmental Justice Program can be very helpful and very useful. I would ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk; No. 25.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The crisis in Flint, Michigan teaches us how important it is that minority groups and low-income communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to environment threats and hazards like lead in drinking water or nesting areas for mosquitos carrying the Zika virus.

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

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

This program provides better access to technology for underserved communities.

Together, the Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture have distributed over 5,000 computers to low income populations.

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

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

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

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

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

The DOE also works to increase low income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. It is Lee amendment No. 26.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 33, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$65,000,000)".

Page 34, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$65,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, let me thank our Rules Committee chair, Mr. SESSIONS, also our ranking member, Mr. MCGOVERN, as well as all of the members of the committee for making this amendment in order.

My amendment is very straightforward. It would cut the \$65 million included in this bill for low-yield nuclear weapons and transfer it to the defense nuclear nonproliferation account. My amendment strikes one of the most harmful and controversial recommendations of the Trump Nuclear Posture Review.

Mr. Chairman, funding this warhead would set a dangerous precedent. The last thing we should do is arm our submarines with a low-yield ballistic missile. We have never done this before in the many decades of nuclear deter-

rence, and there is absolutely no reason to start now.

What is worse, this warhead lowers the threshold for nuclear weapons use and puts us on a dangerous path to war. At a time when we should be reducing the threat of nuclear war, we are doing just the opposite.

While the Trump administration claims that another low-yield warhead would help deter Russia from using these weapons first, that is far from the truth. In fact, funding this nuclear weapon could only provoke Russia and heighten the risk of nuclear war.

Let me be clear: This additional funding is both unnecessary, and it is dangerous. Our Nation already processes hundreds of low-yield warheads. In the coming decades, we will invest another \$150 billion despite the fact that we already have the capacity really to destroy the world many times over.

This is a waste of money and a danger to our national security. Instead of provoking another nuclear arms race with Russia, we should be investing in diplomacy and disarmament. The \$65 million would be better spent at the DOE's nuclear nonproliferation program which secures nuclear material both here at home and globally.

It is hard to think of a more vital national security issue than protecting and securing nuclear material, and yet Republicans have cut funding for that important program by \$97 million from fiscal year 2018. This is dangerous and, again, does nothing for our national security.

Rather than fund another low-yield nuclear weapon that we don't need, we should use the \$65 million to increase nuclear nonproliferation accounts and prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. That is exactly why my amendment is so important, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Assuring funding for the modernization of our nuclear weapons stockpile is a critical national security priority of this bill. The bill provides necessary funding to extend the life of our Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile and to address the continued deterioration of infrastructure at the NNSA sites.

The amendment targets a new proposal to modify a limited number of W76 warheads that are currently undergoing refurbishment in order to provide for a low-level variant of the warhead. They will either be refurbished with a high-yield warhead or a low-yield warhead.

This modification does not provide the U.S. with any new nuclear capabilities. The U.S. has the capability and will continue to maintain that capability to deliver warheads at this yield

with the Air Force's B61 bomb and the air-launched cruise missile.

These lower level warheads are necessary to provide a credible deterrent against the use of warheads of similar yields that exist in large numbers by other nuclear weapons states.

Specifically, possessing a warhead at this yield shows any aggressor that the U.S. has the capability to provide a proportional response to the use of a nonstrategic or tactical nuclear weapon against the U.S. or its allies. That is why the U.S. nuclear strategy under both the Obama administration and this administration advocated maintaining and modernizing both the B61 bomb and the nuclear-tipped cruise missile.

Given that the U.S. has possessed this same capability for many years, I disagree with the idea that this modification will serve to destabilize relations with other nuclear weapons states. Rather, the intent of this warhead modification is to improve stability to demonstrate that the U.S. has the ability to deliver this capability on platforms that are not vulnerable to air defenses.

□ 1845

It is intended to improve the credibility of our nuclear deterrent and show that the U.S. has the resolve to respond to nuclear threats. Credibility is the most basic requirement for nuclear deterrence to work.

The amendment would also reduce the size of the current W76 stockpile because the funding supports not only the low-yield modification but also the refurbishment work that is needed to extend the life of these warheads.

Mr. Chairman, I support the modification. I urge all Members to vote "no" on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy and her focusing on this.

I agree wholeheartedly; we don't need to go down this path again. The Republican Congress in 2005 looked at a similar proposal and eliminated it from a spending bill.

The notion that we have low-yield weapons that are going to enable us to advance forward from the submarine launch is troubling. This actually will make the submarine exposed for being able to know where it is and attack it.

And the "low-yield" terminology is a little disquieting. Think of the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima. These are amazingly destructive. Being able to have gradations of response and buy into that notion I think is deeply troubling and is, in fact, destabilizing.

The \$1.6 trillion episode that we are embarked upon in terms of modernization and enhancement could be well spent in other ways, especially not in this direction.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. THORNBERRY), who is the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, we voted on a similar amendment on this topic a week before last in the National Defense Authorization Act. It was defeated then, and it should be defeated now.

Mr. Chairman, I think there must be some misunderstanding. We are not talking about a new weapons system. What we are talking about is taking an existing weapon and taking some of the fissile material out so that it results in a lower yield.

As the chairman from Idaho pointed out, we have similar low-yield weapons that are air-delivered. The only difference here is a different delivery system through the submarines.

Now, by the way, submarines already have the higher yield delivery system. We are multiplying, though, with a low yield two different delivery systems to complicate adversaries' calculations.

Now, why would we want to do that? Well, it turns out the Russians have hundreds and hundreds of these lower yield weapons. And not only that, they write and speak openly about using them, even in conventional sorts of conflict.

So the point of the Nuclear Posture Review is we need the full range of nuclear capability, from higher yield to lower yield, to make it clear that our nuclear deterrent is credible at every level. Whatever they may think they can get away with they cannot get away with.

As Secretary Mattis has written to Leader MCCONNELL on June 3, 2018, this "warhead is meant to reinforce the credibility of our response, which strengthens deterrence by denying potential adversaries the advantages they appear to believe they could realize from nuclear first use."

It seems to me that that should be the thing that all of us come together on in national security. It is having a credible nuclear deterrent to ensure that no adversary—Russia, North Korea, no one—believes that they can get away with using these weapons. That is the reason this is so important.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would strike \$65 million for the development of the W76-2, or low-yield, nuclear warhead and move that funding to the nuclear nonproliferation account.

The development of these warheads is based on the fallacy that nuclear war can be small and contained using smaller, lower yield weaponry. The idea that a nuclear war can be contained or minimized is dubious at best and terrifyingly dangerous at worst.

Former Secretary of State George Schultz has affirmed this, saying that "nuclear weapons are nuclear weapons" and that the only logical path of a nuclear strike is escalation to higher yield weapons.

This sentiment was recently reiterated in a letter signed by Secretary Schultz and nearly three dozen other current and former national security experts and officials, including former Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Richard Lugar and former Secretary of Defense William Perry, opposing the development of these types of warheads.

Further development of these types of weapons creates a greater possibility for a nuclear confrontation that will be impossible to contain. Instead of making us safer, it will only increase the chances that countless lives could be wiped out in an instant.

This is an excellent amendment. It will make America safer.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the excellent amendment by the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Ranking Member LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank Congresswoman LEE, my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, for offering this very important amendment, and I rise in support of it.

Please let me remind my colleagues who may not agree with our position that if this particular proposal for developing a low-yield nuclear weapon were so important, why was it not included in the administration's initial budget submission to us?

The process by which this has been handled for a nuclear weapon—if this were a conventional, then maybe there is a little room there for maneuver. But in terms of a nuclear weapon, it has many consequences beyond the weapon itself, including the understanding of our allies and including many of the treaties that are currently in place.

I was actually shocked when the Secretary of Energy and many people from the Department of Energy came before our committee and they could not answer any questions on this. The nuclear security agency, when they came up before our committee, at that point this had not been proposed. It came in late; it was thrown over the transom. And I think the manner in which this has been handled is actually terrible.

We have the most capable and sophisticated nuclear arsenal in the world. It is credible enough to deter and respond to any threat right now. We have what we need.

But if we are to alter the combination of weapons that we have in our arsenal, then, for heaven's sake, why not come up under regular order?

We owe it to the American people and to our allies to have a full discussion and debate and assess how others will react to what we are doing and what we need to respond to. This may not be the most perfect response. And we don't want to wander down a path to a variety of nuclear weapons without the kind of debate on deterrence, on security, on cost, on schedule, and on relation to existing systems that we have in place in our own country or others.

So I really think the manner in which this was handled was absolutely awful. For something that deals with nuclear weapons, this Congress deserves more respect, the American people deserve more respect, and the world community deserves more respect. We are not saying we will never support this, but this is not the time to support this.

I think the Congresswoman has proposed the proper amendment, and that is to strike the low-yield missile at this point.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

I also want to compliment my colleagues on the other side of this argument: the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; I see our friend from Colorado and others here. All of us have the same goal, and that is to assure that the United States, and indeed the world, is safe from a nuclear war. We use deterrence as the way of accomplishing that.

Every President since Ronald Reagan has strived to achieve a safer world by reducing the number of nuclear weapons. However, in recent years, beginning with President Obama and being carried on today, we are now involved in a new nuclear arms race.

Not only are we going to build new nuclear weapons—bombs, if you will—such as this 762, presumed to be low-yield, which is still extraordinarily devastating, we are also creating new delivery systems, new land-based missiles in the Upper Midwest, new submarines and new rockets and new stealth bombers—all of that costing more than \$1 trillion.

At the same time, we are developing new sensing devices and new ways in which we might protect those sensing devices and communications.

All of this is creating an extremely dangerous world for our future, not a safer world. We are going in the absolutely wrong direction of increasing the likelihood of a mistake.

I don't think anybody on any side would ever want to initiate, but this particular bomb presents the opportunity for an escalation, a tit for tat. Russia escalates to deescalate, we escalate to deescalate, and they escalate,

and we escalate, and pretty soon it is all gone.

I would just ask all of us to step back and ponder for a moment why it was that Reagan and George H.W. Bush and Clinton and George W. Bush and Obama all went the other direction, to reduce the number of nuclear weapons.

But here we are in the midst of a new nuclear arms race—\$1.7 trillion. And all of us know that there are numerous needs that we have.

So I would ask us just to pause for a second and to accept this amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, is all the time expired on that side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 15 seconds of her original 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me just say a couple of things.

Our country should not expand the number of scenarios under which the United States might consider the use of nuclear weapons. We should never be in a position that the U.S. is using nuclear weapons first, which would lead us to a catastrophic war.

I think Members on both sides of the aisle can agree to this, and I urge my colleagues to support this critical amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, is all of the time expired on my side from the original 5 minutes?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, let me just say in this 30 seconds, first of all, addressing the gentlewoman from Ohio's concern, the administration waited until the Nuclear Posture Review was done before they could submit their request for this funding.

The budget request had been being worked on from clear last September before that, and they came up within days of each other, but the administration was waiting for the NPR to be finished before they submitted.

We might not have liked the way that turned out, but that is just the reality. I don't think it was anybody's intent to try to misguide Congress or anything like that, while I understand her concern.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), let me say the impression here is that we are increasing the number of nuclear weapons. We are not. We are doing refurbishment of the current weapons.

And 50 of them would not be high-level; they would be low-level, low-yield nuclear weapons. It doesn't increase the numbers.

All of this is compliant with all of our nuclear treaties—compliant with all of our nuclear treaties.

When I first heard about this, I actually had the same concerns I am hearing from the other side of the aisle: How does this increase our safety? Doesn't it make it more likely it would be used if it was a low-yield rather than high-yield?

Then I went to some briefings and talked to some people, people who wrote the NPR and a few things like that, and what I found out was that Russia already has hundreds and hundreds—as the chairman of the committee said, has hundreds and hundreds of low-yield nuclear warheads.

Why are they doing that? Would they possibly do that? Because they think it will give them a strategic advantage in a traditional war.

If our only response to their use of a low-yield nuclear weapon is Armageddon, then their bet is that we are not going to go to that level. For deterrence to work, it has to be credible. They have to understand that if they even use a low-yield nuclear weapon we will respond and that we have the capability to do it in proportion without destroying the world.

But you also have to understand we are not talking about first use by us. This is meant to decrease the likelihood of a nuclear exchange.

□ 1900

I have come to the conclusion that if we don't do this, we are going to increase the likelihood of a nuclear exchange. Otherwise, why are they creating hundreds and hundreds—and China and North Korea are looking at it also—why are they creating nuclear low-yield weapons? Why is that in their interest?

Stop and think about it a minute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Idaho, and I appreciate his remarks. I also thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee from Texas.

Let me point out that in the 2018 Nuclear Posture Review, Secretary James Mattis conducted a very clear-eyed assessment of nuclear threats. He said: "We must look reality in the eye and see the world as it is, not as we wish it to be."

As has been pointed out, Russia has hundreds and hundreds—actually, thousands—of low-yield nuclear weapons, including nuclear artillery shells, nuclear land mines, nuclear torpedoes, and others that they have announced. Russia regularly trains with its "escalate-to-deescalate" doctrine, which they believe will force the U.S. to surrender early in a conflict.

Under James Mattis, the Nuclear Posture Review rightly says: "Correcting this mistaken Russian perception is a strategic imperative."

Also, dozens of current and former defense officials and military officers

have confirmed that this lower-yield weapon is necessary to enhance deterrence.

Here is President Obama's last Secretary of Defense, Ashton Carter: "My views are reflected in the latest NPR," Nuclear Posture Review, where he agrees with this doctrine.

So that is the last two Secretaries of Defense from two different political parties and from two different administrations—very different administrations, I might add—and they are in full agreement that we need to do this for U.S. capability to stop Russian potential aggression.

The amendment should be rejected. The agenda behind the amendment is totally outside the bipartisan mainstream of serious national security leaders like Secretary James Mattis and Secretary Ashton Carter.

As has been said, I would remind my colleagues that this House has already debated this issue in the fiscal year 2019 NDAA we passed 2 weeks ago by a vote of 351–66—about a six-to-one ratio—and we rejected similar amendments at that time.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 115–711.

Mr. CONNOLLY. 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 33, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$97,219,000)".

Page 34, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$97,219,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program by \$97 million. To offset this increase, my amendment funds the nuclear weapons activities program at \$460 million above its FY 2018 appropriation. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment returns the nonproliferation account to its FY 2018 enacted level of funding, and still provides the nuclear weapons activities program nearly a half a billion-dollar increase.

I would say this amendment is a simple trade off: support for nuclear proliferation at the expense of nuclear clear weapons. But the numbers reveal this amendment offers us not so much as a tradeoff as it does a win-win solution by making nonproliferation whole again while sacrificing relatively little in terms of nuclear weapons spending. That is because this underlying bill includes more than \$180 million above what the President is requesting for nuclear weapons activities in FY 2019 and \$557 million above the FY 2018 appropriation. That makes this a win-win amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Both of these accounts fund nonproliferation and stockpile reduction programs that I think we can all support. But I fear we are underfunding nonproliferation in a manner inconsistent with our stated security priorities.

In the 2018 Nuclear Posture Review, the administration stated: "Nuclear terrorism remains among the most significant threats to the security of the United States, our allies, and partners."

The National Nuclear Security Administration's Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program works globally to prevent state and non-state actors from developing nuclear weapons or acquiring weapons-usable nuclear or radiological materials, equipment, technology, and expertise. This includes programs for nuclear material removal, international nuclear security, nuclear smuggling detection deterrence, international nuclear safeguards, and nuclear detonation detection. It also includes the Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response program. However, the administration's rhetorical concern for nuclear terrorism is, sadly, not matched by its budget request or the funding level provided in this bill.

Additionally, I am concerned that the current funding level does not help us lay the groundwork for the immense nonproliferation challenge now posed by a possible denuclearization agreement all of us hope will occur on the Korean Peninsula.

The administration's Nuclear Posture Review declared, "North Korea's illicit nuclear program must be completely, verifiably, and irreversibly eliminated." I share that goal. If you want to ensure that inspectors for the International Atomic Energy Agency have the training and expertise they need to implement a complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization program for North Korea, then you must support the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program and you do not want to see it cut by \$97 million.

Additionally, there are nuclear weapons programs funded in this bill that

are unnecessary, such as funding for the development of low-yield nuclear weapons and an uncertain plan for the expansion of plutonium pit production. Eliminating both of these programs would help return the nonproliferation program to its 2018 level.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to my friend from Virginia's amendment. This bill shows strong support for the nonproliferation programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration, something that I support.

Funding for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation is \$1.9 billion, it is \$39 million above the budget request. That includes increases above the request for research and development activities for which we received Member requests.

I have also supported increases in the past for these activities. The \$2 billion amount that this amendment seeks to achieve is the result of an increase of \$206 million above the fiscal year 2018 request.

The NNSA's nonproliferation account has significant unexpended balances that are the result of slow progress on international nonproliferation agreements and the infusion of additional funding added by Congress in prior years.

It is not enough to just say we support nonproliferation and we support it by increasing the budget. That is how much we support it. It has to go towards something. You have to have agreements with international partners for nonproliferation activities.

In May, the NNSA reported that it had \$2.6 billion in available funds to carry out its nonproliferation mission, of which more than \$733 million is left over from prior years. You have \$733 million left over from prior years, and you want to add to that.

Given the increasing amounts of unused balances, it is not clear that the NNSA will be able to expend additional funding in a timely manner.

Not only would the amendment continue to add to programs beyond which the agency has said it can accomplish, it would do so at the expense of funding necessary to sustain our nuclear weapons stockpile, refurbish aging infrastructure, secure facilities where U.S. nuclear weapons are stored, and support a science-based stockpile certification strategy without nuclear testing. That is why I oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is left on my side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank Congressman CONNOLLY for yielding me his last minute and rise in support of this very important amendment to move \$97 million to the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account.

Without question, we are going to undergo modernization of our entire nuclear stockpile in this country. We are going to spend well over a trillion dollars.

In addition to that, we have had discussions this afternoon and debate about this new low-yield nuclear weapon, which many people have misgivings about in view of the way it has been handled in committee here.

There is no more important time in terms of the world, when we look at many unstable regimes that hold nuclear weapons within their stock, for us to have the most capable people with the most technical expertise to advise, not just people here in the United States, but our friends and allies abroad and international organizations concerned about nuclear proliferation.

So the gentleman's amendment increases our ability, doesn't harm our ability, to monitor and verify arms control agreements and prevent other countries from acquiring nuclear weapons.

I support the amendment. I think it makes sense with what we are doing with our own arsenal and what is happening globally. It makes ultimate sense that we should never cut these accounts.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would ask the gentlewoman from Ohio and the gentleman from Virginia is: What are they going to do with the additional \$97 million? What are you going to do with it?

You have got \$733 million sitting there right now that they can't spend. We have to have agreements with foreign countries to do nonproliferation work. Where are they going to spend it?

I have been complaining—not complaining, but arguing, I guess—with Members for the last several years that want to put money in to show their support for nonproliferation: Why don't you just put more money into it? I ask them: What do you want to do with it? They can't tell you.

By saying we increase the nonproliferation account, it shows we support nonproliferation. But you have got to have something you are going to do with it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I do have a list of projects totalling between \$100 million and \$190 million that could be funded with this \$97 million.

I would also just add, and then I will yield back, given the fact that the President ripped up the Iran nuclear agreement that was working, we are going to have to spend a lot more money in Iran. And given the fact that we are having a summit with North Korea, hopefully, we are going to have to spend a lot more money in North Korea.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, I guess you have got an agreement there with Iran to do nonproliferation work?

The reason we have some excess money is because the agreements with Russia, when things got a little cold between our two countries, some of those agreements kind of went by the wayside.

I would like to know what the projects are. If there is something that somebody has come up with, if there are agreements to do those types of things. You can't say: I want to spend another \$97 million on top of the \$733 million.

If that is accurate at \$190 million, we've got \$733 million to do it right now. So why throw another \$97 million on top of it? It just doesn't make sense to me.

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

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. 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. 28 OFFERED BY O'HALLERAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. 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 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 1915

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, I rise to bring attention to a matter of critical importance to the health and safety of my constituents and citizens across the country.

We need to act swiftly to clean up abandoned uranium mines in the Southwestern United States. On the

Navajo Nation alone, there are over 500 abandoned mine sites that remain unaddressed and pose a danger to area residents.

Many of these mines provided uranium to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission for defense activities between 1947 and 1970, putting them in the purview of the Defense-Related Uranium Mines Program. While this program is working to inventory and assess sites, we must begin planning to clean these sites up.

This past week, I was in Cameron, Arizona, a community on the Navajo Nation which has been impacted by uranium mining. The town sits right above the Little Colorado River, and the mine sites are not far from the river, whose water eventually flows into the Grand Canyon.

In Cameron, I heard stories about how these sites have gone decades without the necessary cleanup. At this same meeting, I heard from community members and Tribal leaders that sites like this are a growing concern across the Navajo Nation. These communities need us now, Mr. Chair.

Across northern Arizona, uranium mining has a toxic legacy, and many of my constituents continue to fight the cancers and diseases that were caused by radiation exposure decades ago. This exposure was so severe that Congress went so far as to pass the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.

Today we understand these health risks, and we know that unaddressed sites pose a danger to public health and will continue to pose risks until they are remediated or reclaimed.

In some communities, abandoned mines are near water, near schools, or are places where livestock graze. The potential contamination of these areas that are so critical to our communities and our food and water resources is a serious issue that we have put off for too long. We must step up now and clean these sites.

My amendment simply designates funding to expedite cleanup of sites through the Defense-Related Uranium Mines Program. This amendment will ensure that we are doing our part to improve public health for long-neglected communities in Arizona and the Southwest.

It is past time to turn the page on the Federal Government's disgraceful failure to address this issue for the families affected spanning decades. I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment on behalf of these families and their communities.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I appreciate my colleague's support for the DOE's efforts to take action on the defense-related uranium mines that are a

legacy of the Cold War. The amendment does not change funding levels within the bill, and I do not oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 40, after line 24, insert the following:  
WAPA ADMINISTRATOR SALARY

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The salary of Mark Gabriel, the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that utilizes the Holman rule to hold WAPA Administrator Mark Gabriel accountable.

On Gabriel's watch, millions of taxpayer and customer dollars were flushed down the drain on fraudulent and improper transactions while a culture of fear from the highest echelons of the agency enforced silence as to the true nature and scope of these misdeeds.

Wasteful and fraudulent expenditures by WAPA in recent years include things like ammunition; specialized weapons, including numerous purchases of \$1,200 rifle scopes; an unauthorized ATV at a cost of \$14,000; a John Deere lawn tractor; personal clothing; prohibited purchases of \$349,000 to accessorize personal cars; \$271,000 at book stores; \$102,000 to deck out motorcycles from shops and dealers; and questionable expenditures from one employee to the tune of \$50,000 per month.

Now, in response, the Western Area Power Administration slow-walked investigations, covered up the fraud, and intimidated anyone bold enough to call it out.

A 14-year Federal employee who once worked for the U.S. Attorney's Office told reporters: "Instead of aggressively going after corruption, WAPA's bosses slow-walked the investigation, retaliated against those who uncovered fraud, and failed to protect them from threats."

Unfortunately, this employee is not alone. A former WAPA vice president for procurement went on record to

state that, during his 30 years of Federal service, he had never seen anything like this and certainly had never felt unsafe at work until he worked at WAPA on a daily basis.

Disturbingly, 20 complaints of violence in the workplace occurred over the last 3-year period. The mismanagement, corruption, and culture is so bad at WAPA that an independent consultant did a violence assessment in late 2015 and found: "Multiple employees reported having been threatened directly or heard others being threatened regarding the current investigations. . . . Several indicated they had not bothered to report the incidents for reasons of fear and/or the belief upper management would not act. Because of past failures to address these issues more seriously, it is very likely the incidents will increase in number and severity."

Assessors also reported: "Employees mentioned bosses who actively seek to intimidate employees, especially women, and who tolerate and perhaps promote a culture of unacceptable behavior in their teams."

Equally troubling, Administrator Gabriel is routinely and publicly insubordinate as an agency head. At an April 12, 2018, budget hearing, Mr. Gabriel took a public position contrary to that of the current administration, advocating for tip funding even though the budget proposal proposed to eliminate such funding.

This commonsense amendment seeks to hold this rogue bureaucrat accountable to the American people and the victims who have suffered under his tenure.

I am pleased to have the support of FreedomWorks, who is key voting this amendment; Club for Growth, who is key voting the amendment; the Tea Party Patriots; Americans for Limited Government; Texas' Michael Q. Sullivan; the Grand Canyon State Electric Cooperative Association; the Mohave Electric Cooperative; the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative; Arizona Pork Producers; New Mexico Cattle Growers Association; New Mexico Wool Growers; Sulphur Up North Jobs, Incorporated.

Numerous customers and Federal employees no longer want Mr. Gabriel in charge, having understandably lost faith in his leadership. It is far past time that the Department of Energy clean house and show this Obama administration holdover the door.

Mr. Chair, I commend the chairman and the committee for their efforts on this legislation. I urge support of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I recognize my colleague's concerns about certain actions and practices of the Western Area Power Administration. I applaud his dedication to im-

proving the functionality of the agency for the benefit of his constituents. In fact, he has worked with this committee to make improvements related to appropriations, and I would encourage him to continue to engage with us on appropriate oversight measures.

This amendment, though, will not improve the effectiveness and transparency of this agency. Rather, it is simply a punitive one toward one individual, and I cannot support such an effort. That is why I opposed the Holman rule that was adopted by the rules package, I guess—what?—last year or something like that, the year before last.

The problem is you have got an individual here, and there have been claims about his behavior or his inability to do his job, and we are going to debate whether he is going to have a salary or not or whether you are going to essentially fire him, reduce his salary to \$1, in a 10-minute debate on the floor.

Is that really fair? Is that right? I don't think you should do that.

If the activities that have been suggested by the gentleman from Arizona have occurred, why isn't the Government Oversight Committee looking at this? Why aren't they calling him in, having a hearing on it? Why isn't the Energy and Commerce Committee doing the same?

That is the appropriate way to do that when you have got someone who has misbehaved as an Administrator, not to come on the floor with a 10-minute debate, make charges which may or may not be true—I just don't know—but then ask us to essentially fire somebody. I just don't think that is right.

For these reasons, I must urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, the current application of the Holman rule authorizes three specific uses in an appropriation bill: the reduction of amounts of money in the bill, the reduction of the number and salary of officers of the United States, or the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out in the treasury of the United States.

Let's go back through this. Look at this fraud. Look at these 20 complaints of violence.

I have to tell you: Are you sure you want to defend this guy? Inconceivable. Inconceivable that we are going to allow this. We owe it to the Federal employees under this gentleman to have an employment environment to be well taken care of.

Mr. Chair, I ask for the Members to vote on behalf of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, nobody is defending this individual. What he has presented is 20 accusations. I think he ought to be able to have his day in a proper hearing before the proper committee to decide whether it is the right

thing to do, not sit here and say, “I agree with these accusations.” I don’t know if they are true or not. Nobody on this floor knows whether they are true or not.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding, and I rise in opposition to this amendment, not completely understanding what it is the gentleman is objecting to.

I know that you have an individual about whom you are upset. The gentleman is from the State of Arizona.

Am I correct?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

Ms. KAPTUR. The State of the gentleman is under this Western Area Power Authority. We don’t have that sort of power umbrella in our region of the country. I have read all about the fights in the West among all these Western States, a dozen and a half Western States: Arizona fights with California; California fights with Washington; Washington fights—it is unbelievable. So I am a little reluctant as a non-Westerner to believe anybody until we get a proper tribunal to assess whether what you are saying is correct or not. For all I know, this man put some power in another State that hurt Arizona. I don’t know.

I look at the controversies out there, and I just think that this amendment targets one person and reduces their salary to one dollar without any trial, without any tribunal. It sort of reminds me of the way in which the gentleman’s side of the aisle handled the firing of the chaplain and then, because we finally tried to get some justice here, he was brought on.

Mr. Chair, you don’t do this to people. We have a judicial process in this country, and you have to go through the proper channels. I think we have to focus on fair ways in which to adjudicate if, in fact, there is something going on out there. I really question whether what is really going on here is a fight between Arizona and adjoining States.

Mr. GOSAR. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SHIMKUS). The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Idaho may yield to you, if he so desires.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, has my time expired?

The Acting CHAIR. No. The gentleman from Idaho controls the time. The gentlewoman from Ohio cannot yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, this isn’t a jurisdictional aspect of power across the West. This is fraud. This is workplace violence—20. This has nothing to do with jurisdictional application of water or power. This is an unsafe appli-

cation within the workplace. This is a bully in an agency who is weighing in and doing unwanted things.

We have an obligation, an absolute obligation, to rein somebody in like this. That is what is wrong here. If we can’t do this to a swamp creature of this magnitude, then what can we do.

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

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

Mr. KEATING. 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 55, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to ensure adequate resources for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC, to provide for safe and effective decommissioning of nuclear power plants.

In 2016, Entergy Corporation, the owner and operator of the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Plant in Plymouth, Massachusetts, announced that the plant would be decommissioned by 2019 after facing severe losses in revenue and plagued by safety concerns.

Since coming to Congress, I have been concerned by the safety of Pilgrim’s day-to-day operations as well as the security of its spent fuel storage. Following Entergy’s announcement, I have worked with State and local representatives to prioritize the safety of the decommissioning process, security of the plant’s spent fuel, and the displacement of over 600 workers who are employed at the site.

The NRC has previously issued reports revealing that Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station comes up short on critical systems maintenance, and it is currently the worst performing reactor in the entire country.

While this infraction ultimately falls on the responsibility of Entergy, it is equally important that the NRC has

the necessary resources to address concerns as they arise, including through cooperation with local communities.

As we have often cited, decommissioning of nuclear power plants has an enormous economic and financial impact on host communities. We have urged that decommissioning funds be used for the safe removal of spent fuel to dry cask storage, to restoration, to remediation of the site and maintaining emergency preparedness and security resources throughout the entire process.

Finally, it is my hope that the NRC prioritizes worker protections as it oversees decommissioning both in my district and around the entire country. As the number of decommissioned plants increases, the potential exodus of highly skilled experienced workers presents a serious threat to our safety. The people in my community rely on the workers in Plymouth to keep them safe, and we hope the NRC will facilitate workforce continuity throughout the entire decommissioning process.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for their consideration of this amendment and urge their support. Again, I would like to thank the chairman from Idaho.

We started the day working on issues from the Pilgrims to the Mayflower, too, to things the Pilgrims never envisioned, like decommissioned nuclear power plants. So rest assured that when we celebrate the 2020 400th anniversary in the town of Plymouth, America’s hometown, that he will be very welcomed, and I will give him a personal tour of the awe-inspiring view of Plymouth Rock.

Thank you again for your help, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Mr. BEYER to offer an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 62, beginning on line 16, strike section 505.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment preserves the National Ocean Policy. The National Ocean Policy is a commonsense way to facilitate multistakeholder collaboration on complex ocean issues, and it promotes economic opportunity, national security, and environmental protection.

I think we can all agree that we want thriving ocean and coastal ecosystems that promote the economic vitality of our communities. The National Ocean Policy is doing exactly that with the Northeastern region having completed its plan and the West Coast and other regions well on their way.

Prohibiting the allocation of funds to this important program will stifle collaboration among stakeholders on complex issues relating to environmental protection, national security, economic opportunity, and ocean policy.

I represent a coastal district in southern California, and I know firsthand that we can have a thriving ocean economy and at the same time protect and conserve our precious ocean resources.

Off the coast of my district, there are marine-protected areas, State waters, Federal waters, and Department of Defense installations. We are a marine life hotspot. Some of the best blue whale watching happens just a few miles from our shore. We have a booming recreational fishing section. We have a large shellfish aquaculture ranch that is now operating. We have beautiful beaches. We also have oil and gas activity with some rigs right near our shore. My district is also home to the Port of Long Beach, which is the second busiest port in North America.

With so much activity happening, it simply makes sense to have the Navy at the table when NOAA is working on siting of new aquaculture installations. It makes sense to have the Fishery Management Council weigh in when oil rigs are being decommissioned, and it is a no-brainer that NOAA, the Coast Guard, and the ports all work together to get these massive ships in and out of our port safely.

So as we move forward, the need for an overarching policy only grows. Issues like sea level rise and ocean acidification are too big and too serious for any one community or agency to tackle alone. Increased aquaculture development and new technologies for clean, local energy are creating economic opportunities, but they must be thoughtfully implemented.

The National Ocean Policy is the tool we have right now to promote smart shared use of our ocean resources. All of our districts benefit from our oceans, whether we represent coastal districts or not. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, on July 19, 2010, President Obama signed Executive Order 13547 and sought to implement a new National Ocean Policy. According to the House Committee on Natural Resources: "In this unilateral action, he established a top-down

Washington, D.C.-based approval process that will hinder rather than promote ocean and inland activities and cost American jobs. . . . This has the potential to inflict damage across a spectrum of sectors, including agriculture, fishing, construction, manufacturing, mining, oil and natural gas, renewable energy, and marine commerce, among others. . . . Over 80 national and local organizations representing agriculture, forestry, energy, fishing, boating, mining, transportation, and construction wrote to then Appropriations Committee Chairman HAL ROGERS requesting a prohibition on funding for the implementation of the President's National Ocean Policy."

Our oceans are home to a variety of industries, and it is critical that we maintain our offshore environments and promote a robust offshore economy. The National Ocean Policy represents the previous administration's heavyhanded, top-down approach to Federal land and water management and does not reflect the realities of our working oceans and coastal communities.

Our offshore assets contribute billions to the U.S. economy, and the National Ocean Policy's vague directive sharply discouraged the development of American energy, sustainable fisheries, and our coastal economies. Policies like this cause industries to turn outside of the U.S. to do their business.

Adding duplicative layers of permitting and consultation to our already highly regulated ocean industries and subject all parties to virtually unlimited legal exposure, we are seeing this firsthand in the Northeast, where direct conflict in the ocean user groups has resulted in litigation. This is the exact thing that this policy is supposed to alleviate. Years into implementation, this policy is incapable of achieving its stated goal.

U.S. oceans industries are major global players, and we need to keep our industries competitive. The National Ocean Policy does the opposite. As such, I strongly oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Here is the bottom line. Ocean planning works, and I can assure you that this is not a top-down approach. Ocean plans are regionally led initiatives where stakeholders and researchers collect data and then come to the table to voice their concerns and work out their differences.

With ocean planning, we can use our waters wisely and sustainably. In the Northeast and mid-Atlantic, we have already finished our plans.

Now, for some reason, many of my colleagues across the aisle don't believe in this open discussion among stakeholders, but we have seen what

happens when oceans are brought to the brink. Species have been pushed to the edge of extinction undermining the livelihoods of our fishermen and destroying the vibrant ocean ecosystem.

It baffles me that we continue debating this. Ocean planning is the way to ensure local and regional voices are heard and that we sustainably pass our waters on to the next generation.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, which I thank Mr. BEYER for leading.

I also want to recognize and commend my colleague in the other Chamber, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, for his extraordinary work in combating climate change and fighting for a sustainable ocean policy.

This is the right thing to do, again, regionally led, definitely not a top-down approach.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, although I am supportive of the stated goals of the National Ocean Policy, such as more interagency coordination and decision-making, there are many troubling aspects here.

This amendment seeks to strip underlying language that prevents Federal agencies from using ambiguous authorities in the National Ocean Policy to encroach on a wide variety of ocean and inland activities.

I have heard from farmers and irrigators from throughout the Pacific Northwest concerned that ill-defined terms such as "ecosystem-based management" give broad authority to Federal agencies to adversely impact terrestrial agriculture that is hundreds of miles from the Pacific Coast in the name of ocean management.

Before imposing these burdens on farmers who feed our Nation, it is necessary for Congress to evaluate such a policy to ensure that all affected stakeholders have a seat at the table. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I thank my colleague from California for yielding me this time.

Now, every year, we have this battle.

It is a battle to simply recognize the importance of our oceans and ocean planning. We have already learned about the fact that ocean planning works, and it is working already in New England and the mid-Atlantic; and instead of arguing hypotheticals about things that could happen, might happen, we should talk about the story of what actually happens in regions like mine where we live and work on the ocean.

The story of National Ocean Policy isn't national at all. It is about local control, local stakeholders, local input, and local decisionmaking.

In Maine, we have some great success stories of fishermen, lobstermen, Native American Tribes, local communities, and other stakeholders developing voluntary regional ocean plans. It is a great story of coordination among varied interests, all with the same goal of better understanding our oceans, protecting them, and working with them and in them.

□ 1945

By including those who work on and near the ocean, we are coordinating ocean activities for efficiency and coordination.

But the language in today's underlying bill would make it even more difficult for Federal agencies, for State agencies, and for local communities to work together on the future of our ocean resources.

Mr. Chairman, this rider has no place in this bill, and I urge my colleagues to strike it.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

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

Let me first state that Idaho is not next to an ocean, although we do have the furthest inland port of any State in the country.

The point of this is that you all make great arguments—arguments that ought to be held and debated in the authorizing committee.

The point is that the ocean policy here was put in effect without ever going through Congress. It has never been authorized. It is not that it has been authorized and the expiration dates just expired, like many programs, far too many programs. This has never been authorized by Congress.

I might agree with you in the end, but it ought to go through the proper process instead of just doing an executive order.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment which would remove the provision in this bill which prohibits funding from being used to implement National Ocean Policy.

This provision represents yet another in a long line of attempts by House Republicans to weaken an effective, common sense policy that protects our nation's oceans.

National Ocean Policy allows federal agencies to coordinate implementation of more than 100 ocean laws, and allows state and local governments to have a say in the ocean planning process.

In my home state of Rhode Island, the Ocean State, a strong National Ocean Policy is vital to our economy.

Rhode Island's ocean economy generates more than \$2 billion annually, including more than \$1.4 billion from the travel and tourism industries, and nearly \$94 million from the commercial fishing industry.

On top of this, Rhode Island's Ocean economy supports more than 41,000 jobs.

My state, as well as all coastal states, depends on clean, viable oceans to support these industries, which is why it is such a terrible idea to undermine the development of a strong National Ocean Policy.

National Ocean Policy does not create any new regulations, supersede existing regulations, rather, it helps coordinate the implementation of and compliance with existing regulations in order to ensure a more efficient and effective decision making process.

The funding prohibition in this bill would undermine good, effective policy, and would undermine effective stewardship of our nation's oceans and coastlines.

I strongly support this amendment to remove the provision, and encourage its adoption.

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

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. 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 NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. KIHUEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

Mr. KIHUEN. 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 63, beginning on line 7, strike section 508.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to H.R. 5895, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2019.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. It would strike language that would prohibit the closure of Yucca Mountain.

This site sits in my congressional district, less than 100 miles away from Las Vegas, a city that sees 42 million visitors each year, with many of these visitors coming from your districts. Nevada depends on these visitors. Nevada's economy depends on these visitors.

Putting a nuclear repository this close to millions of Americans is simply irresponsible. And I have grave concerns with the transportation of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain should this project move forward against the will of Nevadans.

Mr. Chairman, Nevada has no nuclear-energy-producing facilities, and it should not be the dumping ground for the rest of the country's nuclear

waste. The bottom line is this: If your State generates nuclear waste, then you should keep it in your backyard.

Or if any of my colleagues are okay with sending nuclear waste to my State, then maybe they should consider keeping it in their own State. I will be more than happy to work with them on an amendment.

So, again, Mr. Chairman, the people in Nevada do not want this nuclear waste stored in their backyard. Yucca Mountain needs to close, and that is why I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), my colleague from the First Congressional District.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Congressman KIHUEN for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Earlier this evening, we heard from the distinguished Member from Illinois, who continues to push the "Yucca or bust" policy of the last 36 years.

He claimed that the Nevada delegation is trying to circumvent the adjudication process to determine if Nevada should be the dumping ground for the Nation's highly radioactive nuclear waste.

He said Congress should reject another amendment to save \$190 million from being thrown away on this failed proposal because we should let the licensing process play out without some preconceived outcome.

Well, I am sorry, but that is just more BS. If he really believed that, he would be joining us in support of amendment No. 32, which strips the unnecessary policy rider that prohibits closing down the already-shuttered Yucca Mountain.

It predetermines that Yucca Mountain will be the Nation's nuclear waste dump and handcuffs the administration from choosing another site regardless of what any studies show.

If we are serious about solving this problem, we should change direction and allow consent-based siting. We could start that process today and right now by supporting this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues from Nevada for allowing us to have this debate once again.

Two weeks ago, we had this debate on the floor of the House. We had a pretty good vote, a bipartisan vote: 340 of our colleagues supported continuing to move forward; 72 disagreed with that position.

Part of this debate allows me to just lay out the true facts, and the facts are that this body and this Nation decided 30-plus years ago to address a national

problem with a national solution. So we have been moving forward as a Nation for 30 years—30 years, \$15 billion, the most studied piece of ground on the planet. Fortunately, it is in the State of Nevada, and Nevada can claim that they have the safest location for a geological repository.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, in exhaustive research—and I was wrong. It wasn't 1,000 pages; it is 1,928 pages. This is one of five volumes.

And, yes, the previous amendment was to say: Let's don't adjudicate the difference. My colleagues from Nevada keep saying it is not safe. I trust our independent Nuclear Regulatory Commission that says it is safe for a million years. The only way you resolve this is to follow the law and go through adjudication of the complaints.

Now, the State of Nevada doesn't want to go through the adjudication because I believe that, once the science is debated, the decision will be in line with the independent Nuclear Regulatory Commission and their exhaustive research.

Now, let's talk about this current amendment. What this current amendment does is just says: Let's disregard the will of 49 States and our territories and 30 years of law to respond to the State of Nevada's opposition, not even scientifically based.

So what does that mean? What it means is that spent nuclear fuel in a place in California—this is San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. It is between Las Vegas and San Diego. It is right on the Pacific Ocean. What it means is that it stays right there.

What it means for my colleague DAN NEWHOUSE from Washington State is that the defense liability of Hanford, right on the Columbia River, stays right there.

What it means for my friends in Chicago is that the Zion Nuclear Power Generating Station, right on Lake Michigan, stays right there.

What about the Savannah River Site? Well, it stays right next to Savannah River versus 90 miles away in the desert, underneath a mountain, on Federal property.

So when the local concern is addressed about the local issue, the local consensus is really the Department of the Interior, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Energy. That Federal land is larger than the State of Connecticut. That is the local concern that we are dealing with and we are addressing here.

This is all of the operating commercial nuclear power plants. That is why there are 31 States and 121 locations. And that is why this debate is important. Because more and more, as we are able to lay out the facts, the consensus by the national media is that it is time to move forward and finish the project, whether that is The Washington Post, The San Diego Union-Tribune, the Aiken Standard, the Los Angeles Times, or the Chicago Tribune.

So I say to my colleagues, I understand the "not in my backyard," but

there is more nuclear spent fuel in Chicago, Illinois, in Chicagoland—in Chicagoland, not 90 miles away. And Chicago has 55 million visitors, not 33 million—more than Las Vegas. It is not going to hurt their tourism. Actually, it is going to help diversify the economy.

I understand the argument and debate. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for letting me address this again in this Chamber so that I can fully not only educate our colleagues but move the Nation forward.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to sell the transmission assets of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Western Area Power Administration, or the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment on a critical matter for the Bonneville Power Administration and our Nation's other power marketing administrations, or PMAs, including the Southwestern Power Administration and the Western Area Power Administration, as well as the Tennessee Valley Authority, or the TVA.

The President's fiscal year 2019 budget request, released earlier this year, included a misguided proposal to sell the transmission assets of these entities. It is unfortunate this proposal was offered once again, as the matter was met with resounding rejection by Congress last year when it was offered in the fiscal year 2018 budget request.

The sale of these assets would result in the Federal Government abandoning a successful and efficient solution for providing affordable power to rural, urban, and tribal communities across the country.

This one-time Federal debt reduction proposal would create energy production and delivery issues for my constituents, as costs would inevitably rise.

Mr. Chairman, this ill-advised proposal is once again a Federal attempt to fix something that is not broken.

I fully support efforts to improve energy infrastructure across the Nation. However, I do not believe that this goal should come at the expense of existing infrastructure—infrastructure that successfully fills a need where market-based pricing would not be sustainable.

My constituents, especially in rural communities, depend on the Bonneville Power Administration to provide stable and affordable electricity service. Divesting BPA's assets would create needless uncertainty for regional energy markets and ratepayers in central Washington.

In a climate where BPA continues to face unnecessary challenges, whether from the imprudent Federal proposal to move to market-based rates or the incessant use of litigation brought forward by radical environmentalists for the past three decades, I offer this amendment which simply prohibits any funds from being used to sell the transmission assets of the three PMAs and the TVA.

□ 2000

Mr. Chairman, I come before the House today as a champion for the Bonneville Power Administration, an advocate for public power, and a steadfast representative for ratepayers across central Washington State, the greater Pacific Northwest, and the entire Nation. I encourage the administration to listen to this resounding bipartisan message that I bring along with my colleagues today: we reject this proposal and prohibit the divestment of these assets.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the amendment.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is something that is important to us and to the nearly 10 million Tennessee Valley ratepayers that they serve each and every single day. As the gentleman said, something is not broken, so it does not need the Federal Government to come in and try to fix it.

Mr. Chair, I stand with the gentleman supporting the PMA's, the TVA, and those that are utilizers of this service.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I am proud my amendment is cosponsored by at least 18 bipartisan colleagues, and I would humbly urge the rest of my colleagues to support and vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I propose each and every year because I think this is something that is worthy of discussion.

We are facing \$21 trillion in debt in this Nation. We have annual deficits that continue to climb. We have to look at how you are going to grow your way and cut your way out of this Nation's debt.

Now, we know that this appropriations bill is something that is at \$44.75 billion. A lot of hard work by the members of the Appropriations Committee has gone into this. We appreciate that they have made an effort to keep the spending down, even some years they have been below the level that was actually enacted the previous year. This year that is not the case. They are a little bit above, but they are working diligently, and I am grateful for that.

I think we need to work a little bit harder, and that is why I bring this, a penny out of a dollar, one penny, making that type rescission in what we are spending, making certain that we are engaging rank-and-file Federal employees after they receive their appropriated funds, saying: "Let's go back to the drawing board. Let's take one penny out of every dollar we spend." We are doing it for our children and our grandchildren, facing the fact that our Nation has a climbing debt.

Now, Admiral Mullen said July 6, 2010: "The greatest threat to our Nation's security is our Nation's debt."

This is an issue that deserves a better effort. We have given it good efforts. Let's give it a better effort and give it our best effort to get this spending under control.

The reason, with these discretionary funds, we say let's do it with across-the-board cuts is because across-the-board spending reductions work. It has been proven by many of our States, where Democratic and Republican Governors have made across-the-board reductions in order to get budgets in balance. It is done by cities; it is done by counties; it is done by the private sector; it is done by families.

It is time for us to engage the bureaucracy and say to them: "Find one penny out of a dollar and help us preserve our freedom for future generations."

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, this would not be an appropriation bill if we didn't have this amendment before us. Every year, this amendment has been offered, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee and I have debated this many times in the past.

While I commend my colleague for her consistent work to protect the taxpayers' dollars, this is not the approach that I would endorse nor can I support.

The bill in its current form balances many of the needs. The bill prioritizes funding for national security and critical infrastructure, yet the gentlewoman's amendment proposes an across-the-board cut on every one of these programs, including increases in funding that are sorely needed to modernize our nuclear weapons stockpile and to protect our Nation's electrical grid from emerging cyber threats.

Across-the-board cuts make no distinction between where we need to be spending or investing in our infrastructure, promoting jobs, and meeting our national security needs and where we need to limit spending to meet our deficit reduction goals. That is what we actually do when we write a bill in the Appropriations Committee and have the hearings and so forth.

The main reason this bill is \$1.5 billion above last year and the reason that the chairman gave this allocation to the Energy and Water Subcommittee is because there was a need in rebuilding our nuclear security infrastructure. That is where the majority of that money went.

The next major portion of it went to the Army Corps of Engineers to build the waterways and infrastructure that need to be replaced. There is something like a trillion dollars—I know it is not the exact number, and I don't know if that is the correct number, but it is pretty close—of backlog, of needs within the Army Corps of Engineers, with an aging infrastructure: locks and dams, harbors that need to be maintained for our economy, that need to be dredged. That is where the majority of that money went. That is why the Appropriations Committee put the additional \$1.5 billion into this.

Yes, reducing the deficit and addressing our debt are critical things that need to get done, too, but everyone here, including the gentlewoman from Tennessee, who is my good friend, knows that it is not the discretionary spending that is driving this debt and deficit each year; it is the huge increases in mandatory spending. Those are primarily Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, interest on the debt. That is what is driving the debt.

If you look back 40 or 50 years ago, out of the entire Federal budget, 70 percent of it was discretionary spend-

ing. That is what we spend money on that everybody thinks as government when they think of government. About 30 percent of it was the mandatory programs.

It has reversed. Now a little over 70 percent of the Federal Government is mandatory. It is on autopilot. Unless we change the law underneath it and have the courage to do that, it continues to grow.

If you look at our budget today on the discretionary side, we spend less today than we did in 2010. That is 8 years later. We spend less today on discretionary spending than we did in 2010. That is the reality.

So while I appreciate the effort to address the debt and the deficit, this is not the way to do it. It is not addressing the main problem that is driving our debt.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

I would just say, you know, there used to be an old expression. They asked Jesse James, "Why do you rob banks." He said, "That is where the money is."

So I think about the situation we face in our country today. I am not willing to take the money out of this budget, which I consider critical to America's security at home and abroad, and meanwhile, in other fora, to give trillions of dollars to the top 1 percent in this country who aren't really interested in what we are doing here much, don't appreciate it sometimes. I am not willing to leave off the hook the Wall Street bankers that took us into the 2008 recession, not a single one went to jail.

It is interesting where the gentlewoman is looking for money. One of the reasons I chose to be on this subcommittee is I am sick of going to war for energy. Too many people from my region have died.

I think part of America's solution is becoming energy independent and being able to conduct war where we have to. This bill allows us to do that for the sake of the Republic.

I think the gentlewoman has a good intention to try to balance the budget. I think she is looking at the wrong end of the telescope.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, when you talk about where you are looking for money, it is coming out of the hardworking taxpayers' pocket. And what they say is, "Do something about the debt," because they are the ones who are footing the bill.

Now, it is easy for us to say, yes, the mandatory spending eats up most of the budget. That is very true. The chairman is correct on that. But is that a reason to not do something about discretionary? Absolutely not.

Should we continue to exercise the ability to find efficiencies, to try to do more with less? Absolutely, we should.

Should we make government more effective, more efficient, and more responsive? Should we utilize new technologies? Absolutely, we should, because every penny that we appropriate in this Chamber comes from the taxpayers of this Nation, who are working hard. They know government never runs out of an appetite for their money. They know that government is always going to ask for more. They are looking at the \$21 trillion in debt.

Let's take these steps. Let's cut a penny out of a dollar and do it because we know this debt is going to land on the heads of our children and our grandchildren.

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

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

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Investigations", and increasing the amount made available for the same account, by \$3,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, all over the Nation, we face a series of disasters that come in many different forms: fires, volcanoes, and heavy rain.

My amendment deals with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the important aspect of its investigatory work by redirecting \$3 million for increased funding for postdisaster watershed assessment studies that are typical across the Gulf region and even up the East Coast, where we know Hurricane Sandy was devastating just a few years ago.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plays a critical role in the building, maintaining, and expanding of the most critical of the Nation's infrastructure.

□ 2015

My amendment would address the question of pre-preparedness. As we were facing the disaster of Hurricane Harvey, so many wondered how much more we should have pre-prepared.

Many were aware of the fact that we flooded in 500-year and 1,000-year flood areas. We are aware of the devastation in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The Army Corps of Engineers can be very instrumental in assessing ahead of time the potential impact of flood and storm damage and, through the investigations, can reduce this and create savings.

I am optimistic, as we go forward, and hopeful that we will receive in the Gulf region a regional watershed assessment flood risk management feasibility study.

But I think it is important to note that we are probably not out from under the weather of future disasters. On April 15, 2016, 240 billion gallons of water fell in the Houston area over a 12-hour period and, as well, 2016, another major flood causing major damage.

And, finally, this is not atypical, it seems, as we watched the hurricane season of last year all over the Gulf region and we found Hurricane Harvey dropped 21 trillion gallons and 300,000 homes were lost.

So the investigatory part of the Army Corps of Engineers is an important tool for the whole Nation when it comes to dealing with pre-preparedness and assessing how we can do better in natural disasters.

Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk; it is number 35 on the roster.

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

My amendment speaks to the need for robust funding for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers "Investigations" account by redirecting \$3 million for increased funding for post-disaster watershed assessment studies, like the one that is being contemplated for the Houston/Harris County metropolitan area.

As the federal agency that collects and studies basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and conducts detailed studies, plans, and specifications for river and harbor, and flood and storm damage reduction, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plays a critical role in the building, maintaining, and expanding the most critical of the nation's infrastructure.

We understand this very well in my home state of Texas and the Eighteenth Congressional District that I represent.

The Army Corps of Engineers has been working with the Harris County Flood Control District since 1937 to reduce the risk of flooding within Harris County.

Current projects include 6 federal flood risk management projects:

1. Sims Bayou

2. Greens Bayou
3. Brays Bayou
4. White Oak Bayou
5. Hunting Bayou, and
6. Clear Creek

In addition to these ongoing projects, the Army Corps of Engineers operates and maintains the Addicks and Barker (A&B) Detention Dams in northwest Harris County.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased that the bill provides that the Secretary of the Army may initiate up to six new study starts during fiscal year 2018, and that five of those studies are to consist studies where the majority of the benefits are derived from flood and storm damage reduction or from navigation transportation savings.

I am optimistic that one of those new study starts will be the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment Flood Risk Management Feasibility study.

Such a study is certainly needed given the frequency and severity of historic-level flood events in recent years in and around the Houston metropolitan area.

On April 15, 2016, an estimated 240 billion gallons of water fell in the Houston area over a 12 hour period, which resulted in several areas exceeding the 100 to 500 year flood event record.

Some of the areas that experienced these historic rain falls were west of I-45, north of I-10, and Greens Bayou.

Additionally, an estimated 140 billion gallons of water fell over the Cypress Creek, Spring Creek, and Addicks watershed in just 14 hours.

The purpose of the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment is to identify risk reduction measures and optimize performance from a multi-objective systems performance perspective of the regional network of nested and intermingled watersheds, reservoir dams, flood flow conveyance channels, storm water detention basins, and related Flood Risk Management (FRM) infrastructure.

Special emphasis of the study, which covers 22 primary watersheds within Harris County's 1,735 square miles, will be placed on extreme flood events that exceed the system capacity resulting in impacts to asset conditions/functions and loss of life.

Mr. Chair, during the May 2015 Houston flood, 3,015 homes were flooded and 8 persons died; during the April 2016 Houston flood, 5,400 homes were flooded and 8 deaths recorded.

The economic damage caused by the 2015 Houston flood is estimated at \$3 billion; the 2016 estimate is being compiled and is estimated to be well above \$2 billion.

Mr. Chair, minimizing the risk of flood damage to the Houston and Harris County metropolitan area, the nation's 4th largest, is a matter of national significance because the region is one of the nation's major technology, energy, finance, export and medical centers:

1. The Port of Houston is the largest bulk port in the world;

2. Texas Medical Center is a world renowned teaching, research and treatment center;

3. Houston is home to the largest conglomeration of foreign bank representation and second only to New York City as home to the most Fortune 500 companies; and

4. The Houston Watershed Assessment study area sits within major Hurricane Evacuation arteries for the larger Galveston Gulf Coast region.

The Jackson Lee Amendment No. 35 is particularly important in light of the devastation of Hurricane Harvey and its aftermath.

At its peak on September 1, 2017, one-third of Houston was underwater due to Hurricane Harvey flooding.

There was over 41,500 square miles of land mass impacted by Hurricane Harvey and the subsequent flooding that covered an area larger than the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont combined.

Hurricane Harvey dropped 21 trillion gallons of rainfall on Texas and Louisiana, most of it on the Houston Metroplex.

In September 2017, NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory reported that Hurricane Harvey's rainfall created 275 trillion pounds of water, which caused the crust in and around Houston to deform and sink nearly 1 inch because of the weight.

Over 300,000 structures flooded in southeastern Texas, where extreme rainfall hit many areas that are densely populated.

Hurricane Harvey is the largest housing disaster to strike the U.S. in our nation's history.

Hurricane Harvey damaged 203,000 homes, of which 12,700 were destroyed.

Texas flood control districts are still struggling to recover from this record breaking flood event.

Nineteen trillion gallons of flood waters poured into the Houston Ship Channel from area rivers and bayous on the way to the Gulf of Mexico.

As a consequence, tens of millions of tons of sediment and debris flowed through the biggest waterway in the nation.

Today, the Port of Houston is operating with draft restrictions that may last a year or longer.

Draft restrictions are adding costs to oil and gas and Petrochemical operations, which are passed on to wholesalers, who pass these costs to consumers at the pump.

The Port of Houston produces 27 percent of the nation's gasoline and about 60 percent of the U.S. aviation fuel.

Investments in all aspects of our nation's water infrastructure pays dividends in the form of economic activity.

The Houston Ship Channel generates \$617 billion in the U.S. with \$265 billion of that in Texas representing 16 percent of the state of Texas's GDP.

The Port of Houston sustains 2.7 million jobs nationally with 1.2 million of them within the state of Texas.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 35.

I thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their work in shepherding this bill to the floor.

I am asking my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

First, let me assure my colleague that I understand her interest in ad-

ressing flood risks in her district. In fact, the Appropriations Committee has worked very hard to prioritize these activities, including significant funding in the supplemental bill earlier this year, in the fiscal year 2018 appropriations act, and this fiscal year 2019 bill before us today.

Since the amendment does not change funding levels within the bill, I will not oppose the amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

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

First of all, let me thank the chairman of the committee for what has been ongoing support of our efforts. And I hope he sees that these are efforts for across the Nation as well.

To be clear, I am glad that we do not alter the account but we redirect and focus moneys on this important investigatory area. I thank him for his support.

I would be happy to yield to the ranking member, who, likewise, has helped me over the years to address this question of flooding.

But I want to make the point that what we saw in the last hurricane season is that it reaches across the Gulf region, including the U.S. Virgin Islands and, of course, Puerto Rico.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the distinguished ranking member.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for yielding and for the incredible work she does representing the Gulf region in its fullness.

I understand, through her and through my own studies, the damage done by Hurricane Harvey and the need for studies such as these to advance flood control projects to mitigate future damage. I think she has been such an articulate spokeswoman, reminding us that times are changing and we have to pay attention to coastal communities.

I have to also mention that there are funds in the supplemental bill we passed earlier this year for purposes such as these, and we have plussed up the Army Corps budget in this particular bill. So I think that will serve Texas very well.

And the gentlewoman mentioned the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. We are all deeply concerned.

So I thank my colleague for offering this amendment. I thank her for her great leadership and urge all of our colleagues to support her amendment.

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

Let me take this moment again to acknowledge the funds that have been put into this bill that focuses on what we experienced in the last year. And I would indicate that the investigatory account, which will see this focus, is

important. The dollars that we have received from this Congress I do appreciate.

And the final word I would say in closing is that we work and hope to work with the administration for those funds to get to the local jurisdictions. We are right in the middle of trying to get those dollars down from Washington into our local jurisdictions.

With that, I thank the manager and the chairman and the manager who is ranking member again and ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science" may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, this is an educational amendment, if you will. It is to emphasize the importance of the Department of Energy's program that deals with the emphasizing of educating minority students across America with STEM. Now we have moved and advanced to STEAM. That includes arts.

But the Office of Minority Impact that is in the DOE has as its major focus—and we are still behind in the numbers—to ramp up the numbers of men and women and minorities in the STEM effort. Women and minorities make up 70 percent of college students but only 45 percent of undergraduate STEM degree holders.

If we are to be a 21st century and 22nd century country—and as I was sitting in some meetings today—competing with countries on the question of cybersecurity—I know that we are in the Energy and Water approps, but if we are to reach beyond the boundaries of research that help in energy and water, I think it is important that we continue to try and do outreach to increase the numbers of women and minorities to go into the STEM fields.

The energy and science education programs funded in part by this bill

will help ensure that members of underrepresented communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environmental sustainability, preservation, and health. The larger point is that we need more STEM educators and more minorities to qualify for those positions.

Mr. Chairman, there are still a great many scientific riddles left to be solved, and perhaps one of these days a minority engineer or biologist will add to the others and will come up with some of the major solutions in our time.

I would offer to say that education efforts with teachers and students under this program are extremely important because the students of today, teachers who are teaching the students of today, are the scientists and problem-solvers of tomorrow.

So I again want to emphasize to my fellow Texan, Secretary Perry, who is Secretary of the Department of Energy, to focus and to grow the department that deals with educating young people in the science, technology, engineering, and math. We are waiting for them. We need them, and the Nation needs them.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I conclude by saying: Let's provide more opportunity for these students.

I want to emphasize the Energy Institute High School in Houston and, as well, to cite high schools across the Nation that are working to provide these students with this kind of training. And I hope these dollars will help them do so.

I ask for the support of my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 36.

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

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 36 simply provides that:

"None of the funds made available by this Act for 'Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science' may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.)."

This amendment was approved and adopted in identical form on April 29, 2015, during the 114th Congress as an amendment to H.R. 2028, the Energy and Water Resources Appropriations Act of 2016 and on July 7, 2017, during this Congress as an amendment to H.R. 3219, the Energy and Water Resources Appropriations Act of 2018.

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

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

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

This large pool of untapped talent is a great potential source of STEM professionals.

As the nation's demographics are shifting and now most children under the age of one are minorities, it is critical that we close the gap in the number of minorities who seek STEM opportunities.

I encourage Energy Secretary Perry to surpass the commitment of his predecessors' toward increasing the nation's economic competitiveness and enabling more of our people to realize their full potential.

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

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

The energy and science education programs funded in part by this bill will help ensure that members of underrepresented communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environmental sustainability, preservation, and health.

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

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

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

The DOE also works to increase low income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

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

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

My amendment will help ensure that underrepresented communities are able to participate and contribute equitably in the energy and scientific future.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 36.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to purchase heavy water from Iran.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a simple limitation amendment. No funds made available by this act may be used to purchase heavy water from the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Why are we doing this? Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, fomenting discord all across the Middle East, funding Hamas in the Gaza Strip and Hezbollah in Lebanon while supporting the Houthis in Yemen.

Iran provided deadly, military-grade explosives to militias in Iraq, killing hundreds of American servicemembers during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Iran has never been held accountable for that. They still have major control over portions of Iraq, and the Shiite militias they back are running rampant.

Furthermore, we know that Iran is working to be the key outside player in Syria in an effort to expand control from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean Sea.

As you know, the JCPOA was effectively an Obama executive agreement, never ratified by Congress or enacted into law. It was sold using lies and propaganda, and it provided Iran with an economic lifeline. It provided Iran with \$150 billion in sanctions relief and even airlifted \$1.7 billion in cold, hard cash to Tehran.

Just yesterday, we learned that the Obama administration secretly granted a license authorizing the conversion of Iranian assets worth billions of U.S. dollars using the U.S. financial system despite repeated assurances to the public and Congress that Iran would not be granted access to the U.S. financial system.

The Obama administration continually offered gratuitous concessions to Iran that went beyond even the unilateral concessions contained in the Iran deal.

And that is where this heavy water limitation amendment comes in. The Obama administration was using tax dollars to purchase heavy water from Iran. That is money over and above what the Iran deal provided. And that damage has been significant.

Now, President Trump has withdrawn the U.S. from the JCPOA. My amendment, though, is simple. We just should not use tax dollars to subsidize Iran's nuclear activities through the purchase of heavy water.

I don't think the President would want to do that, but I think it is important that we continue with this in

law, which we have had now for over a year. I think it will ensure that the mistakes of the past are not repeated.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, though I think he intends it well.

I want to inform him that the Department of Energy has said it does not have plans to purchase additional heavy water from Iran. So I think this amendment is really irrelevant.

Frankly, I would rather that the United States take whatever Iran has rather than letting them sell it to Russia or somebody else. But the Department of Energy has clearly said they don't have plans to purchase additional heavy water from Iran.

And so the gentleman's amendment is unnecessary, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

I just urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment. It has been in law before. We have passed it out of this House 2 years in a row. We should do it again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2030

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 115-711.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$1,500,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, with the passage of the bipartisan budget agreement back in February, Congress essentially gave themselves a blank check to spend billions and billions more of taxpayers' dollars over the next two fiscal years.

Our national debt stands at over \$21 trillion and we decided to spend more. How does that make any sense? People back home continuously ask me why our government keeps spending and spending. You know what I tell them?

I have no idea. I have no idea why Members of Congress willingly go along with this abysmal continued spending. I have no idea why we would cut taxes for millions of Americans, grow our economy exponentially, and then decide to spend more.

If anything, now is the time to get spending under control. Now is the time to rein in reckless spending habits. My amendment should not even be controversial. It simply cuts spending back to what they were last year. \$1.5 billion is a drop in the bucket compared to our national debt. We need to start somewhere.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. TENNEY). The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. While I agree with my colleague that we need to be finding savings where possible, this amendment is not the approach that I can support.

The bill in its current form takes a balanced approach to meet a number of needs, not just wants or wishes or anything else, but actual needs. The bill prioritizes funding for national security and critical infrastructure and reduces funding for certain activities that did not need sustained funding at prior year levels to accomplish their mission in fiscal year 2019.

These tradeoffs were carefully weighed for their respective impacts, and the increases proposed are responsible and, in some cases, are absolutely essential.

Approximately half of the funding in this bill is for national defense activities. This bill includes \$15.3 billion for the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons security program which provides funding to maintain our Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile and for the Navy's nuclear propulsion programs that supports our Navy's fleet of submarines and aircraft carriers and for nonproliferation activities that are reducing global nuclear threats.

In February, the administration released a Nuclear Posture Review that described a sobering view of the current global nuclear threat situation.

Russia is modernizing its full range of nuclear systems.

China is modernizing and expanding its already considerable nuclear forces, pursuing entirely new capabilities.

North Korea's nuclear provocations threaten regional and global peace.

Iran's nuclear ambitions remain an unresolved concern.

Global nuclear terrorism remains a tangible threat. This amendment would slash funding for the activities in this bill that are an integral part of the United States' national security strategy to address these nuclear threats.

For that and many other reasons, I would oppose the gentleman's amend-

ment and suggest that maybe we ought to look at what is causing the debt to go up, and that is the mandatory spending and not the discretionary spending that we have. I would urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I just wanted to say, the gentleman who is offering this amendment, I oppose the amendment, and you and I view the world very differently.

I view the Government of the United States as a bulwark for social and economic stability in this country. If I look at why we have a deficit going back, one of the reasons is oil wars.

This department is one of the most important departments in the country to lead us to energy independence as a country. I don't think we should do what you are asking us to do here. If we look at our trade deficit, we haven't had balanced trade accounts since the mid-1970s.

Adding trillions of dollars to our trade deficit every year is making it harder to fund Social Security and Medicare, programs that are essential to social stability in this country. If we look at the 2008 crash and the trillions of dollars that cost us as a country, nobody on Wall Street went to jail.

It is interesting to me where people want to pick away, pick away, pick away when you look at the big money, the moneys for war, the money for paying for imported goods as opposed to producing here at home, the causes of what happened in 2008, and there was no justice that was given to the Republic.

So, to me, energy independence is critical, if you look at the trillions we have added to the deficit because of war. So we look at the country through different ends of the telescope, I think, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I really think the result of your amendment will be less investment in the Republic, less investment in water resource infrastructure and energy development, and less investments that create good jobs and have substantial returns on investments such as modernizing our ports and all of the infrastructure that helps us to achieve social and economic stability in this country, which isn't easy to do.

So I thank my colleagues for listening, and I would urge opposition to this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) having assumed the chair, Ms. TENNEY, 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. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the consideration of H.R. 5895, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 923 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5895.

Will the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) kindly resume the chair.

□ 2039

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Ms. TENNEY (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today pursuant to House Resolution 918, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 115-711 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) had been postponed.

Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-712 shall be considered as adopted.

The text of the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-712 is as follows:

Page 165, after line 14, insert the following:  
SEC. 239. For an additional amount for the Department of Veterans Affairs, \$1,138,000,000

for the programs and activities authorized in the VA MISSION Act of 2018 and the amendments made by such Act, which shall be in addition to amounts otherwise made available in this Act for such purpose, of which—

(1) \$600,000,000 shall become available for the Veterans Community Care Program under section 1703 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by the VA MISSION Act of 2018, on the effective date specified in section 101(b) of such Act; and

(2) \$253,000,000 shall be available for the Family Caregivers Program under section 1720G of title 38, United States Code, as amended by such Act:

*Provided*, That amounts made available under this section shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report and available pro forma amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 918.

Each further amendment printed in part B of the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 918, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 7, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,030,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Chair, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR. I wish the whole country could be here to watch how hard you have worked, not just tonight, but throughout the year to bring this important legislation before us. It would give them great hope and faith in the process, and I commend both of you, your committee members, and your staff for the work that you are doing here.

Madam Chair, I will be brief. My amendment would add \$1 million to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' aquatic nuisance control program. In effect, it would double the annual funding to \$2 million for the important and critical research that is needed to combat some

1,500 terribly destructive invasive species in our lakes and waterways, including six new invasive species of foreign zooplankton that were just discovered in Lake Superior. I am not sure where it came from and what kind of damage it will do.

A little quick history here: I am only going to take a couple of minutes. My amendment to the 2014 water resources bill added fish and other aquatic creatures to the official definition of invasive species, a definition that had been previously reserved only to plants. So that opened the door for us to have a way to combat these aquatic species.

And in so doing, the Congress gave the Army Corps the authority to do the research to eradicate invasive species like Asian carp, zebra mussels, and so many hundreds of others that are causing so much damage to sport and commercial fishing, to shipping, navigation, and to harbor maintenance.

The aquatic nuisance control program is supposed to be leading the way with cutting-edge research, and it is doing a good job. But the fact is, it is terribly underfunded, leaving little resources to address the influx of the aquatic species.

As a result, the aquatic invasives like zebra mussels have infested more than 130 lakes in my own State and thousands of lakes across the country. To give you an idea of how fast these zebra mussels, for example, spread, a female zebra mussel can produce a half a million offspring each year.

And the simple truth is, the zebra mussels are just choking off all kinds of snails and clam and other native fishes—even bird species. In fact, they killed over 10,000 loons in Lake Erie alone because they ate something that had zebra mussels in them, and the zebra mussels had a botulism that killed 10,000 loons. That is how devastating these things can be.

□ 2045

For outdoor recreation, our people are getting their feet cut and getting all kinds of injuries by stepping on these zebra mussels. Thousands of good jobs and slowdowns of our economy are caused, delaying ships as they are painstakingly having to remove these zebra mussels. They are just one of more than 1,500 invasive species.

So I urge my colleagues to approve this amendment so the Army Corps can get to work cleaning up our lakes and waterways and putting an end to the invasive species that are causing so much costly damage and destruction to our lakes and waterways.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for yielding me the time.

Talk about working hard, you are here at 9 o'clock in Washington and the day started very early.

I thank the gentleman for being here and defending the Great Lakes. I support his amendment. I personally represent about 200 miles of Lake Erie's