

Lipinski  
Loebssack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McBath  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Morelle  
Mucarsel-Powell  
Murphy  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Norcross  
Norton  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne

Perlutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Plaskett  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rose (NY)  
Rouda  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Sablan  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill

Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres Small  
(NM)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Watson  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill

Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams

Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall

Wright  
Young  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—20

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1946

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. KAPTUR. 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. HIGGINS of New York) having assumed the chair, Ms. UNDERWOOD, 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. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,  
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 436 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. 2740.

Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1950

## 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. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, with Ms. UNDERWOOD (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, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 61, printed in part A of House Report 116-111, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox) had been postponed.

## AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. BURGESS. 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:

At the end of Division E (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Each amount made available by this Division is hereby reduced by 5 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment would reduce appropriations in the Energy and Water Development division by 5 percent. The programs in this division have wide bipartisan support. This includes Federal spending on water infrastructure, basic science research, storm and flood damage reduction activities, and more.

These critical programs are necessary for the safety and health of our citizens and the continued growth of the economy. However, this legislation's top-line spending is out of sync with the Federal Government's ongoing fiscal predicament.

Congress must balance these initiatives with fiscal realism. Our national debt is over \$22 trillion and climbing, and the majority's legislation is only adding to this debt.

Let's work to improve this legislation in a bipartisan, bicameral effort to ensure that we fund the programs that we need today but not have our children pay for them tomorrow.

Madam Chair, I urge support of this amendment and a return to fiscal sanity, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment and point out that our country really can't neglect vital investments for the safety and welfare of the American people.

Our bill funds water resource projects that are critical, including in Texas; supports science and energy technology research activities necessary to build the future and our future competitiveness; and responsibly funds a credible nuclear deterrent and important non-proliferation efforts.

This amendment will harm all of these. It will harm job creation and reduce protections against flooding and natural disasters that all parts of our country have been facing.

One can be penny-wise and pound-foolish, and not making these investments will make the costs in the future even greater.

This amendment will also result in fewer investments in water resource infrastructure and energy research and development programs, all of which

## NOES—187

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Berman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Cook  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ferguson  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxx (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gallagher  
Gianforte

Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (OH)  
González-Colón  
(PR)  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hern, Kevin  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katzko  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lesko  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McAdams  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock

McHenry  
McKinley  
Meuser  
Miller  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Riggleman  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rooney (FL)  
Rose, John W.  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spano  
Stauber  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Watkins

create good jobs, have substantial returns on investment, and position our Nation for future needs.

We must continue investing in these areas to ensure our national security on many levels and to remain the global leader in energy and in science.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, it is actually a pretty easy equation. The Federal Government, under the budget caps agreement of 2011, is required to perform under budget caps.

For whatever reason, we have chosen to ignore that difficult fact of life while these appropriations bills were written. Top-line numbers were—well, back in math class in the eighth grade, we used to talk about imaginary numbers and irregular numbers. These numbers are certainly imaginary and irregular because they are not based on reality.

All I am asking for is that we make a good faith effort to save 5 cents out of every dollar that we spend in this appropriations bill. I don't think that is too much to ask. I don't think any one of us believes that every dollar that is spent by the Federal Government in the agencies is well spent and there are not savings to be had.

That is all this amendment is asking for: a limitation, across-the-board cut, 5 percent. Let's get it passed. Then let's get back to the table and decide, really, what the priorities are.

Because, you know what, Madam Chair, at some point, if we proceed down this path, the sequester is going to kick in, and it will not be pretty, and it will not be an easy path at that point. It will actually be dictated to us, not something where we have negotiation room.

Madam Chair, I urge an “aye” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, I call up amendment No. 64 to division E of H.R. 2740.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 620, strike lines 1 through 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, this amendment would strike section 108 of this bill that prohibits any funding used for border security infrastructure.

Let me say that again because I can't believe it myself.

This would strike section 108 of the bill that prohibits any funding being used for border security infrastructure.

There is a very clear humanitarian and security crisis on our southern border. Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement are strained by the enormous number of border crossings each and every day. In the month of May, over 144,000 individuals crossed our border without permission. Over 96,000 are unaccompanied children or family units.

But, instead of providing desperately needed aid to take care of these children and families, this bill only includes a provision to prohibit funding to secure our border. It is appalling that we have not considered supplemental funding to deal with this crisis.

As long as the doors remain wide open, irregular migration will continue, and the American taxpayer will have to foot the bill to care for another country's children.

We can no longer do nothing. I urge support of this amendment to allow security along our southern border, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which really doesn't belong in this bill.

Section 108 prevents the President from siphoning off funds from critical Army Corps projects to build a border wall. These include important flood control projects to protect and restore communities from natural disasters and navigation projects to keep our ports moving commerce.

Our bill protects more than \$20 billion in disaster funding appropriated since February of last year to rebuild damaged Corps projects and speed up flood control projects all over the country, including in my colleague's home State of Texas, which has been so hard hit.

□ 2000

It also protects funding for Corps projects that are currently underway, or soon will be, including projects in every district across America. Without this language, the President can raid funding from any Corps water infrastructure project he wants and divert those funds to a border wall.

Earlier this year, when it became public that the President was consid-

ering using the Corps' Civil Works fund to pay for a border wall, the backlash was swift and strong, with bipartisan opposition.

In fact, a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including those from Texas, tweeted that they had secured the commitment of the White House that the President would not raid disaster funding for their Harvey relief projects. If approved, this amendment would strike the language in the bill that protects those projects.

So I remind my colleagues that a “yes” vote on this amendment is a vote signaling that they are fine with the President raiding Corps water infrastructure projects in their district to build a border wall.

The President, on hundreds of occasions, may I remind you, promised that Mexico would pay for any border security necessary to restore order at our shared border. We cannot allow the President to dip into accounts with infrastructure funds to assist ravaged communities across our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

And I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), my esteemed colleague, chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Water Subcommittee.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

His amendment would strike from the underlying bill a provision in Section 108 that blocks the Trump administration from transferring existing funds from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, known as the Corps, for the construction of a wall or barrier along the U.S./Mexico border.

I have been a very vocal opponent of this President's never-ending political stunt to construct a wall along our southern border with Mexico.

Through emergency supplemental bills, Congress provided billions of dollars to help American families rebuild their lives after recent storms and natural disasters, as well as prepare our country for future disasters. This emergency money in the Corps budget is not a slush fund to be raided by the President for his political purposes.

Americans have seen their lives upended, their homes and towns destroyed, and havoc wreaked upon their local economies. Our government should not abandon them in their hour of need.

I support Section 108 of the Energy and Water Appropriations title of this bill that prohibits the President from transferring any funds appropriated in this or earlier bills from being used for the construction of this wall.

I was also pleased to join with the chairs of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. DEFAZIO, the Committee on Appropriations, Mrs. LOWEY, and the Subcommittee on Energy and Water, Ms. KAPTUR, in

challenging, in a letter, the underlying legal authority for the President to reallocate existing appropriated funds of the Corps' Civil Works program for the construction of a physical barrier along the southern border.

Madam Chair, I insert a copy of the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, January 16, 2019.  
Hon. DONALD J. TRUMP,  
The President, The White House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have publicly indicated several times that you may seek to declare a national emergency in order to fund the construction of a physical barrier along the southern border of the United States. Also, a number of news reports suggest you are considering utilizing a previously unused statutory authority to reallocate existing funds of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for this construction.

We believe that any suggestion that you could use this statutory authority for this purpose is misinformed. Simply put, this authority does not authorize you to reallocate existing Corps funds—including, but not limited to, approximately \$14 billion in disaster funds for communities impacted by the 2017 and 2018 hurricanes or other natural disasters—for the construction of the physical barrier. In addition, we oppose the reallocation of existing Corps funds from communities that are just starting to rebuild from the devastation they faced, and for which Congress provided emergency funds to help the lives and livelihoods of our citizens.

Section 923(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2293(a)) states that:

In the event of a declaration of war or a declaration by the President of a national emergency in accordance with the National Emergencies Act (90 Stat. 1255; 50 U.S.C. 1601) that requires or may require use of the Armed Forces, the Secretary, without regard to any other provision of law, may (1) terminate or defer the construction, operation, maintenance, or repair of any Department of the Army civil works project that he deems not essential to the national defense, and (2) apply the resources of the Department of the Army's civil works program, including funds, personnel, and equipment, to construct or assist in the construction, operation, maintenance, and repair of authorized civil works, military construction, and civil defense projects that are essential to the national defense.

As you know, this authority has never been used by the Corps since its enactment in 1986. Therefore, there is no historical precedent on its use by any Presidential administration. However, we believe that a plain reading of this statutory provision does not provide legal authority to reallocate existing appropriated funds of the Corps' civil works program for the construction of the physical barrier along the southern border you have called for.

First, section 923 unequivocally states that actions funded by this provision “require or may require use of the Armed Forces” (emphasis added). In our opinion, there is nothing uniquely related to the planning, design, or construction of the physical barrier that would suggest the Armed Forces’ (in this case, the Corps) involvement in these activities is required. We understand that the Corps has, on previous occasions and through its Support for Others authority, participated in prior design and construction activities related to existing barriers along with the southern border. But, it is also our understanding that these activities were, at

best, supportive roles to other Federal agencies, including the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and that none of these activities were paid for using the Corps' civil works funds.

The legislative history of section 923 further highlights Congress' intent that there be a military nexus as a prerequisite to use of this authority. In contemporaneous hearings before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, the then-Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) testified on the limited scope of this authority—noting that this authority “would be available only in two limited situations: in time of war declared by Congress, or in time of national emergency, *military in nature*, declared by the President in accordance with the National Emergencies Act” (emphasis added).

It is our belief that construction of a physical barrier along the southern border fails to meet either of these limited situations. On the former, there is no active declaration of war related to the border crossing. On the latter, there is no justification that construction of the physical barrier is military in nature. The term “military in nature,” again, implies that the situation requires the unique presence or involvement of the Department of Defense in its military (Armed Forces) capacity. While the Corps is a component of the Department of Defense, its civil works mission is focused on water resources development activities and emergency response to natural disasters. It is in that capacity that the Corps provides domestic construction-related assistance through its authorized civil works activities, or through its Support for Others authority. Yet, these authorities are solely distinct from the Corps' role in supporting the combat and installation readiness needs of the Department of Defense. In our view, because construction of a physical barrier does not necessitate the actions of the Department of Defense in its military capacity, the use of the Corps for construction of the barrier would not fall within the limited scope of section 923.

Second, section 923 also requires that any project, for which construction, operation, maintenance, and repair work is funded under this authority, be specifically *authorized* by Congress. As noted in the *Congressional Record* during Senate consideration of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, “[t]his section does not provide authority to construct any project not authorized by law.” Yet, the proposed physical barrier that you are contemplating is not specifically authorized by Congress—not as a civil works project, not as a military construction project, and not as a civil defense project. Therefore, your potential use of this authority for the proposed physical barrier would fail a second test of applicability.

Even if you were to ignore the plain text of section 923, and continue to pursue this authority to reallocate existing funds from the Corps, we want to be very clear who would be impacted by your decision.

It is our understanding that the administration has identified potentially \$14 billion in construction funds from the 2018 Supplemental Appropriations related to Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, as well as other disasters (Pub. L. 115-123) and an additional \$2.9 billion in supplemental appropriations related to Superstorm Sandy that remain unobligated. These funds were specifically appropriated by Congress to help communities in impacted states and territories recover from devastating natural disasters.

In July 2018, the Corps released its list of specific projects for which the 2018 Supplemental funds are planned to be utilized. This list includes, approximately: \$4.5 billion for

the State of Texas; \$2.4 billion for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; \$2.4 billion for the State of California; \$1.2 billion for the State of Louisiana; and \$700 million for the State of Florida.

Each of the states and territories that received an allocation of emergency supplemental funds by Congress were uniquely impacted by natural disasters.

For example, in the City of Houston, Texas, officials believe that 82 people were killed, 13,000 people were rescued, and more than 42,000 people were forced into shelters by Hurricane Harvey (in addition to the 6 million Texans who were otherwise impacted by the storm). Similarly, in 2017, Puerto Rico faced Hurricanes Irma and Maria, with Maria now designated as the third deadliest hurricane in U.S. history, killing thousands of citizens, and disabling the entire power grid of the Commonwealth for months. While these are just two examples of the devastating impacts of recent natural disasters, they are indicative of why Congress decided to provide robust emergency funding to these and similarly impacted communities that are only now starting to rebuild.

In our view, it would be the height of irresponsibility to take away vital reconstruction funds from communities impacted by recent natural disasters, leaving these communities at continued vulnerability to future disasters, and future loss of life.

Again, we believe that section 923 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 does not provide you with legal authority to reallocate existing Corps funds to the construction of a physical barrier along the southern border. In addition, we oppose the transfer of Corps funds away from communities that have already suffered enough from the impacts of recent natural disasters, and strongly urge you not to utilize these allocated recovery dollars for any purpose related to the construction of the physical barrier.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,  
Chairman, Committee  
on Transportation  
and Infrastructure.

GRACE F. NAPOLITANO,  
Member of Congress.

NITA M. LOWEY,  
Chairwoman, Committee on Appropriations.

MARCY KAPTUR,  
Chairwoman-designate, Subcommittee on Energy  
and Water Development and Related Agencies.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, the construction of the President's wall is the wrong way to address our Nation's immigration challenges. This amendment would allow the President to abandon families in California, Texas, Puerto Rico, Florida, the Midwest, and elsewhere, that were impacted by recent natural disasters, in their hour of need.

I thank Chairwoman KAPTUR for including much-needed funding in this bill for the Army Corps of Engineers to do their job, and for including Section 108 that protects the Army Corps from the political stunt of building a border wall.

Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, may I ask as to the time remaining on my side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, the truth is the President of the United States shouldn't be forced to have to make the tough decisions of figuring out how to secure our border without support from this institution, but that is precisely what is happening. The President of the United States is having to look at a crisis on our border that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle just simply straight up refuse to acknowledge exists.

When I was down at the border in McAllen in January, I was told of about 200,000 people that would be apprehended; maybe 200,000 that would not be apprehended. And I was told 90 percent of that was going to come through McAllen, as opposed to Brownsville. Why? Because there is fencing in Brownsville.

I would ask my colleagues whether they have ever been to the border, in the cane, along the river, talking to Border Patrol when they are there at 11:00 at night, and they have radios that don't work; cell signals that don't work. They can't see the river because the cane is too thick. They have no roads that are lateral that run along the river, so they can move up and down the river to protect our border. They are down there by themselves, and the cartels have operational control of the river.

The Reynoso faction of the Gulf Cartel, they own it. They are making hundreds of millions of dollars moving people through McAllen right now. And right now, little girls are going to be abused on the journey because we bury our heads in the sand.

The President is trying to secure the border, and the Democrats, in another cynical attempt to stop security, are putting provisions and poison pills in this legislation to prevent the kind of security that is needed for our border. I, for the life of me, don't understand it.

I appreciate my colleague from Texas standing up and making this point that we should be preserving the ability of the President to be able to do his job in the absence of a Congress willing to do its job.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I would just like to remind the gentleman—I think he is new to this body—that the President said he was going to get Mexico to pay for everything. He said that 1,000 times. Didn't happen.

He is not going to raid our accounts.

The gentleman has communities in his State. Unfortunately, he held up the money for a long time about a week and a half ago; and so now he comes to the floor and talks this way.

He is not going to raid the Corps budget under my watch; that is for sure. Communities across this country need this money.

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

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

It is a pretty simple equation. A “no” vote on this amendment is, in fact, a vote for open borders. As Mr. ROY correctly pointed out, there are far too many stretches of our border in Texas with Mexico, where there is no barrier at all. Carrizo cane and mesquite trees will not stop people who have it in their hearts to come across.

The operational control has been ceded to criminal gangs and cartels on the Mexican side of the border. This needs to stop.

This amendment simply removes a cynical obstruction to the President being able to do his job when the Congress will not do our job.

I urge an “aye” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR OF OHIO

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 436, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 65, 71, 73, 83, 88, 94, 105, 106, and 108 printed in part B of House Report 116-111, offered by Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio:

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue a permit under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the discharge of dredged or fill material from a project located within Water Conservation Areas 3A and 3B in the State of Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 640, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA OF ARIZONA

Page 631, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,400,000)”.

Page 637, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize the pro-

posed rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for General Service Lamps” published by the Department of Energy in the Federal Register on February 11, 2019 (84 Fed. Reg. 3120).

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. BERA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 621, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000) (decreased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. BRENDAN F. BOYLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reject any application for a grant available under funds appropriated by this Act because of the use of the term “global warming” or the term “climate change” in the application.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR OF MINNESOTA

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Energy to make a guarantee under section 1703 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16513) for a project that does not avoid, reduce, or sequester air pollutants or anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MRS. LEE OF NEVADA

Page 635, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 637, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. GARCÍA OF ILLINOIS

Page 631, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 629, line 19, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, this en bloc includes amendments from Representatives WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, LANGEVIN, GRIJALVA, CASTOR, BERA, BOYLE, OMAR, LEE of Nevada, and GARCÍA of Illinois. This includes a number of ideas that were not included in the original bill, and that we support.

Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the chair of the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I rise to support the en bloc amendment, which includes my amendment to protect Water Conservation Areas in the Everglades from oil wells.

It is important to point out that as of last year, the Federal Government and the State of Florida had spent more than \$3.7 billion to restore the Florida Everglades, the river grass. I am here to say, by offering this amendment, I want to ensure that we not roll back that progress.

My amendment would ensure that avaricious oil companies who care for

nothing but profit, cannot turn our famed river of grass into an industrial oil field.

An investment company has applied to drill an oil well just west of the city of Miramar in Broward County, my home county, much of which I represent.

Drilling an oil well in the middle of a Water Conservation Area that is 20,000 acres wide, between two canals, when you have 8 million people who rely, for their drinking water, on the aquifer beneath the Florida Everglades, is the definition of insanity.

My amendment would ensure that the Army Corps of Engineers could not issue this heinous permit when it is applied for.

We have, under the Federal and State Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, water managers who want to connect two conservation areas that are part of southern Florida's hydrological system. A lawsuit that is pending in Federal court argues that drilling violates the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, and I agree, and this amendment would ensure that the Army Corps must deny the permit.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I would like to address what the gentlewoman just said in just a minute.

While I may have been able to support some of the amendments that have been considered individually—and I noticed that as we listed the Members that have offered amendments they were all Democratic amendments; none of them were Republican amendments—the majority's decision to package them together like this means I must oppose an en bloc amendment.

I have concerns with multiple pieces of this en bloc amendment, but I would like to focus on two of them; one that was just spoken about by the gentlewoman from Florida.

First, this amendment includes language that would prohibit the Army Corps of Engineers from issuing a section 404 permit for any project in a specific geographical location.

Legislatively deciding individual permit outcomes is something the Energy and Water Subcommittee, under both Republican and Democrat leadership, have previously avoided. That restraint was not because we were never asked to legislate the outcome of a permit. We were asked many, many times.

Rather, it was in recognition that Congress has established a process by which the technical experts within the Federal agencies would evaluate projects to determine whether environmental impacts could be avoided or minimized such that the project could move forward.

Injecting politics into the process by inserting language into an appropriation bill sets the wrong precedent. It suggests that any future permit decision could be decided by the whim of a majority of Congress.

The second issue I would like to discuss is the language prohibiting the

Department of Energy from finalizing the rule relating to the efficiency standards of light bulbs.

I know there are some parties who have characterized the proposed rule as a roll back of efficiency standards. What it really does, though, is ensure the Department is following the law.

The previous rule, a rule promulgated at the very last minute of the Obama administration, revised certain definitions contrary to statutory language. That rule was challenged legally, and the settlement acknowledged the mistake.

The current proposed rule reduces the regulatory uncertainty by making clear that several types of light bulbs will continue to be sold. It also shows DOE's commitment to following the law, a novel concept. We should all support following the laws that Congress passes.

For these reasons, I must oppose this en bloc amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA).

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Chair, my amendment shifts \$5 million in funding for fossil fuel research and development to Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Research.

Increasing energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy, like wind and solar, are the most cost-effective ways of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. These funds can also fund research in more fuel-efficient passenger vehicles for transit options.

The Trump administration's 2020 budget proposed cutting over \$2 billion from energy efficiency programs, and authorized an additional \$116 million to fund new oil, gas, and coal projects.

□ 2015

As climate change continues to threaten our future economic prosperity and the lives of billions worldwide, we should be focusing our efforts on clean, renewable energy.

Madam Chair, I thank my colleagues on the Rules Committee for making this important amendment in order. I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment to further promote energy efficiency and renewable energy research and development.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, tribal energy resources are vast, largely untapped, and critical in our fight to move towards a secure and sustainable energy future. Despite this potential, many tribal homes lack access to electricity and affordable heating sources.

Our amendment increases the Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs by \$2 mil-

lion and reduces Fossil Energy Research and Development by \$2.4 million. This increase should be allocated specifically for renewable energy.

This amendment ensures that we place a higher priority on energy needs and capabilities within tribal lands and communities, by slightly reducing a growing and outdated fossil fuel account.

The funding will provide financial and technical assistance to enable tribes to evaluate and develop their renewable energy resources and to reduce their energy costs through efficiency and weatherization.

Funds may be used to offer education and training opportunities designed to foster clean energy technology adoption, promote green jobs and growth, and strengthen overall native communities' self-determination.

Through these projects, tribes can continue to build the capacity to manage their energy needs. Many tribes' energy costs are higher than the national average, making installation of renewable energy a permanent improvement in their finances and lives.

Investing in renewable energy technologies provides many benefits for tribes:

It creates economic stability by protecting these communities from fluctuations of conventional energy sources and by providing steady revenue into the future.

It creates employment in manufacturing, operations, and maintenance. Installing wind turbines, solar heaters, and solar panels in the communities provide opportunities for hands-on education and training.

Onsite renewable power can contribute to tribal energy self-sufficiency by providing electricity in rural areas underserved by the existing power grid and save tribes revenues.

Developing local renewable energy resources can improve local air quality and health conditions, as well as improve the communities' response to climate change impacts and extreme weather disruptions.

This amendment will help Indian Country by moving a small amount of funding away from old energy sources that are leaving us reliant on out-dated and harmful energy sources.

Despite the need to transition to a clean energy future, the Fossil Energy Research and Development account has increased \$72 million since 2017.

Currently there are 573 recognized tribes, yet the Office Indian Energy is appropriated at only \$25 million.

The longer we postpone an orderly transition away from fossil fuels the more vulnerable we become as a society—what better way to move forward than to present our Native nations with the opportunity to be leaders of our energy future.

This amendment will make a difference in the quality of life of American Indians and Alaska Natives by bringing renewable energy and energy efficiency options to their sovereign nations.

I would like to thank the chairman and the committee for their work on this bill. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this amendment, and I would urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR OF OHIO

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 436, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, and 113 printed in part A of House Report 116-111, offered by Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio:

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. FLEISCHMANN OF TENNESSEE

Page 639, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$123,000,000) (reduced by \$123,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MS. NORTON OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Page 610, line 23, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 641, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,500,000)”.

Page 641, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ OF NEW YORK

Page 611, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$45,000,000) (increased by \$45,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

Page 610, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 615, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

Page 630, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 637, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND OF LOUISIANA

Page 613, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 615, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND OF LOUISIANA

Page 613, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$75,000,000) (reduced by \$75,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND OF LOUISIANA

Page 611, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 615, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF ILLINOIS

Page 635, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000) (increased by \$15,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

Page 631, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 637, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. LOEBSACK OF IOWA

Page 629, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Page 611, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$40,000,000) (reduced by \$40,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Page 637, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 629, line 19, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 637, line 24, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER OF ILLINOIS

Page 631, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1)”.

Page 631, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 631, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,317,808.000)”.

Page 631, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,317,808.000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. BERA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 613, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$ 3,000,000)”.

Page 615, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$ 3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

Page 621, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000) (increased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. ROUZER OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 613, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 616, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. ESTES OF KANSAS

Page 621, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 621, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MISS RICE OF NEW YORK

Page 629, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$16,308,000)”.

Page 629, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,308,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 611, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,000,000) (increased by \$100,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. CLOUD OF TEXAS

Page 631, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 637, line 24, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. CLOUD OF TEXAS

Page 631, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 637, line 24, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MS. BLUNT OF ROCHESTER OF DELAWARE

Page 610, line 23, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. LAMB OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 631, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Page 637, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 629, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 611, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF CALIFORNIA

Page 649, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000) (increased by \$500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MRS. CRAIG OF MINNESOTA

Page 610, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 613, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 615, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MRS. CRAIG OF MINNESOTA

Page 611, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,500,000) (increased by \$7,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. MCADAMS OF UTAH

Page 620, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 621, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 625, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

Page 611, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$30,000,000) (increased by \$30,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, this amendment includes a number of bipartisan and non-controversial ideas that were not included in the original bill.

Madam Chair, I support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment. I thank Chairwoman LOWEY and Chairwoman KAPTUR for working with our side to include many provisions important to our Members. I appreciate the decision to offer this bipartisan en bloc amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK), a highly capable member of the committee.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I appreciate that very much.

My amendment will ensure level funding for distributed wind technologies and research within the Department of Energy's wind energy program.

Distributed wind is the use of typically smaller wind turbines owned primarily by rural and local entities, such as homes, farms, businesses, and public facilities, to offset all or a portion of onsite energy consumption. This type of energy production strengthens American communities by helping them become more energy independent while lowering costs for consumers.

Distributed wind also strengthens domestic manufacturing, as 90 percent of all small wind turbines sold in the U.S. last year were made in America.

The funding provided over the past few fiscal years has helped unleash distributed wind power's vast potential, but continued investment is needed to support the critical research and development that will reduce costs and maximize the benefits of distributed wind power throughout the United States.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I think Mr. LAMB is going to have a statement here coming up, and I thank Chairman LAMB in advance for his remarks. He has a jam-up amendment.

Nuclear energy has been one of my top priorities during my time on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. America has a long history of leadership in nuclear science. It is critical that we maintain that leadership, but our existing fleet of reactors is aging.

Many of our nuclear plants are nearing the end of their 40-year licenses and must reapply with the NRC to continue operation. While license renewals are important to ensure nuclear safety, the process requires robust analysis, planning, and science- and technology-based solutions to modernize nuclear plants.

Fortunately, the DOE is carrying out this critical R&D through its Light Water Reactor Sustainability Program. This program funds research in materials, modeling, and system analytics to support extending the operating life of the existing fleet.

By developing a science-based approach to understanding and predicting the ways materials and nuclear plants behave over time, DOE can help plant operators find ways to safely operate existing systems while mitigating potential damage to reactor components.

DOE also funds R&D to support plant modernization efforts. This includes developing ways to safely incorporate digital controls into existing plant de-

signs to help improve reactor efficiency, as well as efforts to help existing plants operate with more flexibility.

I believe advanced reactor designs are the future of emissions-free power around our world, but we cannot afford to throw away decades of investment in the safe, reliable, clean power produced by our existing light-water nuclear power plants. Through research to safely extend the life of our existing nuclear fleet, DOE can ensure we maximize this clean energy source.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman LAMB in advance for working with me on this amendment, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it once he does his fabulous presentation.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the indefatigable gentleman on our committee.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Chair, I thank the chair and ranking member for including and supporting my amendment in this bloc, and I thank Mr. FOSTER for his support.

The amendment redirects an additional \$15 million to the Leadership Computing Facility at Argonne National Lab. This facility will be home to Aurora, the first exascale computer in the U.S., if not the world.

We are currently in a race with China to build the first computer that can perform 1 billion billion operations per second. This will enable advanced simulations, such as climate modeling. It will also aid in the discovery of new therapeutic drugs and the development of new materials for solar energy production, batteries, and other advanced technologies.

It is an economic and national security imperative that the U.S. maintains leadership in supercomputing by developing a well-supported exascale computer, and this amendment will help do that.

Madam Chair, I thank the chair and ranking member for their support.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend from Idaho and my good colleagues from the other side of the aisle for allowing this amendment to receive consideration.

Hydropower is one of the Nation's most affordable and reliable renewable electricity resources. With over 100 gigawatts of installed capacity, hydro makes up nearly 7 percent, on average, of all U.S. annual electricity generation. As a matter of fact, hydro is the single largest source of renewable electricity, representing over one-half of all renewable energy generation in 2018.

This is due to the significant advantage hydropower generation, as a base-load source of energy, has over intermittent sources, like wind and solar. It provides predictable, continuous generation 24-7-365 without the need to hold backup generation in standby to

power the lights when the Sun goes down or the wind stops. Because of this important distinction, additional hydropower generation results in increased generation rather than just capacity.

If we want to be serious about increasing renewable energy, we need to focus on what works best. More can and must be done to significantly expand this vital energy resource. Only 3 percent of the 80,000 dams in the U.S. currently generate electricity, leaving substantial potential for additional generation from unpowered dams. As a matter of fact, in my home State of Pennsylvania, there is an estimated 678 megawatts of untapped hydropower.

The recent trend of closures among baseload power generation facilities threatens our Nation's ability to meet our energy needs. Unleashing the full potential of hydropower provides a remedy that is proven, reliable, and renewable.

Critical to realizing this potential is DOE's Water Power Technologies Office. This amendment increases funding for the office by \$2 million to continue their important mission.

Madam Chair, I ask the support of my colleagues for this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), probably one of the top scientists who has ever served in this Chamber.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chair, first, I am a proud cosponsor of Representative LIPINSKI's amendment, which would direct an increase of \$15 million to Argonne National Laboratory's Leadership Computing Facility.

The ALCF is a national scientific user facility that provides supercomputing resources and expertise to the scientific and engineering community to accelerate the pace of discovery and innovation in a broad range of disciplines. This money will be well spent.

A second amendment, offered by myself, instructs the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to include accelerator-driven systems in its evaluation of future nuclear technology and fuel.

There is a bipartisan and bicameral interest in accelerating investment in advanced nuclear reactors, which are walkaway safe and proliferation-resistant and have the potential to burn or minimize nuclear waste.

One proposed system uses a proton accelerator, a neutron spallation target, and molten salt fuel, but it remains subcritical, thereby greatly reducing the safety and security risks.

It can, without redesign, burn spent nuclear fuel, natural uranium, thorium, or surplus weapons material, such as surplus plutonium. It operates without the need for enrichment or reprocessing and may be used to produce the tritium needed to maintain our stockpile.

Madam Chair, I thank my colleagues for their support.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), my good friend.

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Chair, I appreciate the courtesy of my good friend from Idaho. I certainly appreciate his help and support with this amendment that is included in this package.

Put very plainly, my amendment is designed to get the attention of the Army Corps of Engineers and for a very good reason.

In the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act of 2016, language was included requiring the Army Corps of Engineers to work with localities that request a no-wake zone if there is a safety concern caused by speeding boats generating large wakes in stretches of federally maintained waters that run adjacent to a marina.

Southport, North Carolina, a beautiful waterfront community, has been waiting nearly 3 years to have a no-wake zone established. That is 3 years of speeding boats creating wakes that have caused fuel spills at Southport Marina and, thankfully, at least so far, only minor injuries to date.

Everyone back home knows this poses a significant safety concern. We just need for some who work in an agency known as the Army Corps of Engineers to understand it just as well.

Common sense tells us that at some point, there is going to be a major accident. This is a very high traffic area of recreational boats. Doing nothing, as the Corps appears to favor, is not an option.

Madam Chair, I thank my colleagues for their support of this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Chair, I rise today to express my support for this block of amendments to H.R. 2740.

Included is my amendment to provide \$2 million in critical funding for Bureau of Reclamation projects with a public health benefit, such as the Salton Sea in southern California.

The Salton Sea is a danger to California residents. Dust from the exposed lake bed contains harmful particulate matter that blows into communities and is inhaled by residents as far away as Los Angeles.

If we do not take decisive action now, the Salton Sea's decline will accelerate, exacerbating this public health crisis and leading more children and seniors to develop respiratory illnesses like asthma.

After Congress passed this amendment last year, the Bureau devoted \$2.5 million to mitigation projects at the Salton Sea. My amendment would continue this essential funding to invest in the health of families who live near the Salton Sea and beyond.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment to support the public health of children, seniors, and families across southern California, and I thank Chair KAPTUR for her support and interest in helping us with the Salton Sea.

□ 2030

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LAMB), a veteran.

Mr. LAMB. Madam Chair, I also rise to support these en bloc amendments, particularly my amendment to increase and emphasize the support for research in the Office of Nuclear Energy Light Water Sustainability Program.

In my district in Shippingport, Pennsylvania, we gave birth to the civilian nuclear fleet. President Eisenhower launched that plant in 1958, and many other plants have come up around the Nation providing carbon-free, safe, reliable energy, and many of them have served long past their useful life.

Tens of thousands of American workers keep these plants running today. They keep us safe. We have to protect these plants, protect these jobs, and, most importantly, protect our energy grid. We can do that with better research into how to make these plants run more efficiently, more cheaply, and more competitively.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairwoman KAPTUR and Ranking Member SIMPSON, and now I want to say thank you to my colleague, who has got an excellent amendment, and I applaud it very much. I want to say to all of my colleagues: Support it. It is a great amendment, and we look forward to passing it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a hardworking Member from the Wolverine State.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I am proud to support this bill, and I thank Chairwoman KAPTUR for her leadership.

I am especially pleased to see this bill's increased investment in the important work of the Army Corps of Engineers to advance key water infrastructure construction priorities.

My amendment prioritizes \$30 million of that funding for critically needed projects that improve the quality of freshwater bodies like Lake St. Clair in my district.

To make urgent water quality improvements to Lake St. Clair, to the Great Lakes, and to freshwater bodies across our country, we must prioritize Federal funding for improving Macomb County's Chapaton Retention Basin and other such sewer overflow systems that help us protect the water sources our communities rely on every day.

I would like to point out that I am working on this with the now director of public works in Macomb County, former Member of this body, Candice Miller.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise to ask for support of this amendment. Thirty-four of our Members, many have come to speak on their particular

interest. I have reached agreement on a bipartisan basis. I think that speaks for itself, and I ask the membership to support this amendment en bloc.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of an amendment to the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Division that seeks to increase support for water reclamation projects.

Millions of people and businesses throughout our country are able to enjoy a stable water supply thanks to this vital infrastructure.

One example is the Equus Beds Aquifer Recharge, Storage and Recovery project in Wichita, Kansas.

Equus Beds provides the main water supply for nearly 500,000 people in Wichita and the surrounding region.

In addition to servicing citizens, it is also vital for businesses and farms throughout the entire area that includes cities such as Wichita, Halstead, Newton, Hutchinson, McPherson, Valley Center and others.

Equus Beds became a key component of Wichita's Integrated Local Water Supply Plan in 1993, when it was determined that the city's water supply would not meet demand by the year 2015.

Thankfully since its implementation, the Equus Beds Aquifer has recharged 2.5 billion gallons of water to continue meeting the region's needs.

Clearly, water reclamation projects like Equus Beds are critical to sustaining the economy and quality of life in Wichita and throughout our country.

Today I urge support for amendment 95 to H.R. 2740 to increase support in the bill for water reclamation projects like the Equus Beds Aquifer.

I ask my colleagues to approve this amendment en bloc.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 80 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 89 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. MULLIN. 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:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare, propose,

or promulgate any regulation or guidance that references or relies on the analysis contained in—

(1) “Technical Support Document: Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866”, published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in February 2010;

(2) “Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866”, published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013 and revised in November 2013;

(3) “Revised Draft Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in NEPA Reviews”, published by the Council on Environmental Quality on December 24, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 77802);

(4) “Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866”, published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in July 2015;

(5) “Addendum to the Technical Support Document on Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866: Application of the Methodology to Estimate the Social Cost of Methane and the Social Cost of Nitrous Oxide”, published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016; or

(6) “Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866”, published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, my amendment would prohibit funds for implementing the social cost of carbon rule.

Congress and the American people have repeatedly rejected cap-and-trade proposals. The Obama administration continuously used social cost of carbon models, which can easily be manipulated in order to attempt to justify new job-killing regulations.

I believe in efficiently using the Nation's vast energy resources while protecting the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the land we live on.

The House has a clear, strong record of opposition to the social cost of carbon, voting at least 12 times to block, defund, or oppose the proposal. A carbon tax would inevitably be passed along to consumers, undermining the success of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act we passed last Congress.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, the amendment offered by my colleague

from Oklahoma prohibits the use of funds to prepare, to propose, or to promulgate any regulation or guidance that references or relies on analysis of the cost of social carbon.

It is really unfortunate that the Republican flat Earth faction is at it again. This amendment tells the agencies funded in this bill to ignore the latest climate change science. Astoundingly, the amendment denies that carbon pollution is harmful. Wow.

According to this amendment, there is zero cost of carbon pollution. That is denial at its worst. Ask any power plant operator who is retired who contracted emphysema because of their work on those power plants—and these people exist in our society if they haven't died already—or heavy truck diesel mechanics who worked on retooling engines when those fumes were in the garages when they gave their lives to the public sector and they now have COPD, pulmonary disease.

This amendment is tantamount to saying that pollution caused climate change, has no cost, and no one will ever get hurt. That is simply not true.

Tell the American citizens who lost businesses, homes, and loved ones to hurricanes, wildfires, and other recent natural disasters, and those who continue to face unrelenting flooding in the Midwest that there are no costs from climate change.

In the latest National Climate Assessment, our Nation's leading climate scientists reiterated what we have known for years: Climate change is real. It is evidenced by the climate-related indicators we have observed, including longer seasons, extreme drought, flooding, sea level rise, and more violent storms.

This amendment tells agencies funded in this bill to ignore reality and these scientific findings. This is not only irresponsible, but a blatant disregard to the well-being and security of this Nation and our people, whom we are sworn to protect and defend.

The truth is that climate change is having catastrophic social and economic impacts here in the United States and across our globe. These are real. Ask the nearest farmer—and I just have been with them this past week—who can't plant their fields in the Midwest. And those who are less fortunate face the heaviest impact.

Now is not the time. In fact, that group of citizens who live in the ninth ward in New Orleans below sea level comes to mind. Now is not the time to pretend that extreme weather events, rising seas, and more frequent storms do not have a cost.

Before the Trump administration abandoned common sense, the social cost of carbon was a very conservative calculation. The full costs of a rapidly changing climate are almost certainly significantly higher, but measuring the social cost of carbon is a much better way than believing the costs are zero. Unfortunately, that is what this amendment would require the govern-

ment to assume: zero harm and zero cost from carbon pollution and climate change.

Pretending that climate change doesn't exist won't make it go away. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, there is a lot to unpack there, and we can debate that all day, especially when you start bringing the farmers into it, because you are looking at one. I don't have to be with them because I am one of them, and I am from the Midwest.

But when you start saying that everything is the fault and everything is to blame because of climate change, it has been changing for quite some time, and we could go ahead and talk about that, too. However, I am not going to change her mind, so we are going to agree to disagree.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ROY. 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 Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 90 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. HUFFMAN. 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:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize the environmental impact statement for the proposed Pebble Project (POA-2017-271).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Chair, my amendment would stop the Army Corps of Engineers from moving forward with their flawed environmental impact statement for the proposed Pebble Mine.

Now, the Pebble Mine is a massive project that would be located in the headwaters of the Bristol Bay watershed in southeast Alaska. It threatens the entire Bristol Bay region: its people, its salmon, and its multimillion-dollar economy.

The Bristol Bay watershed supports 25 federally recognized Tribes that depend on salmon for food and their local economy and on a healthy watershed for their clean water.

Bristol Bay's wild salmon have sustained Alaska's indigenous communities for thousands of years by providing subsistence food, subsistence-based livelihoods, and the foundation for their culture and community. Salmon are the economic driver in Bristol Bay, and the region supplies half of the world's sockeye salmon and 83 percent of the country's salmon overall.

At about this time each year, commercial fishermen go to Bristol Bay to harvest that amazing sockeye salmon run. The commercial harvest results in more than \$1 billion in economic impact, \$500 million in direct income, and 14,000 jobs.

Bristol Bay is also one of the most sought after sportsmen's destinations. Hunting and recreational fishing draws visitors from around the world, resulting in over a thousand jobs and nearly \$80 million in direct spending.

The EPA has previously said the impacts of mining on fish populations in the region could be catastrophic and irreversible. Over 3,500 acres of wetlands and over 80 miles of stream, which are all connected to salmon habitat, would be directly impacted by this mine and its infrastructure.

The proposed project would also generate an average of 6.8 billion gallons per year of wastewater during operations, 11.8 billion gallons during closure, and all of it would require capture and treatment.

This is unprecedented. There is no other U.S. hard rock mining operation that captures and treats such a massive volume of contaminated mine water, which is harmful to fish and to public health.

We know that mines are not invincible. Things go wrong. And if any of the negative impacts on waterways and ecosystems that have resulted from other mine failures were to happen in Bristol Bay, the way of life for Alaska Tribes, fishermen, businesses, and residents would be devastated.

Bristol Bay already provides enough for a thriving economy and supports a way of life that is sustainable for future generations. The Pebble Mine puts all of that at risk, at risk of significant irreversible damage. That is why the majority of Bristol Bay residents and Alaskans oppose the project. It is why 53 other Members of Congress have joined me in telling the Army Corps they should not permit this mine.

While a thorough and rigorous review would clearly show that it is the wrong mine and the wrong place, the Federal permitting process for the Pebble Mine has been wholly insufficient. Tribal input is not being incorporated, nor are Tribal governments being meaningfully consulted. The Army Corps, itself, acknowledges numerous data gaps, and the review fails to analyze economic

feasibility and disaster scenarios or provide comprehensive reclamation and mitigation plans.

□ 2045

The rushed environmental review process has sparked wide-scale opposition from throughout the country.

Fishermen, Tribes, sportsmen groups, businesses, conservation organizations, all of them have weighed in in opposition to this shoddy, wrongheaded Corps project.

My amendment would stop the Pebble Mine. It would stop this flawed process. It prohibits funding to complete the process because there are fundamental flaws with the Army Corps' current analysis.

Bristol Bay is a national treasure. We have to do this right or risk losing an incredible resource. I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, let me just say, first of all, that everything you have heard from the former attorney for the NRDC is just nonsense, and the reason it is nonsense is because he doesn't know. Nobody knows. That is why we have a review of these procedures. That is why we have NEPA.

That is why the National Environmental Policy Act is in place, which many of my friends across the aisle view as the foundational environmental law. It requires Federal agencies to evaluate the environmental impacts of projects before the project can be approved. The Corps is in the process of doing that.

Now, I don't know if he is worried that the outcome might not be like he likes, but if everything he said is true, then they certainly won't permit it.

To be clear, I am not advocating for or against this particular project; I don't know enough about it. But what I am saying is Congress should stay out of the process of individual reviews. Setting the precedent of injecting political opinions into the NEPA process simply means that any project in the future will be subject to the whims of the majority party at the time.

Such a scenario should be a concern for all Members, Republicans and Democrats alike. Perhaps next time the interest will be in legislatively approving a specific project. This amendment would serve as a precedent.

What I am saying is let the process work. We have put in place the process. So all of the scenarios that he claims are going to be true, we don't know if that is true or not because nobody knows yet. They are just opinions.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Chair, what we do know about this process is that the Army Corps, itself, has acknowledged serious data gaps.

What we do know is that Tribal input has not been seriously incorporated into this process, and we know that the National Marine Fishery Services, which is the agency that should be there at the table as a participating agency to protect this iconic fishery, is not participating in this process.

So what this amendment would do is stop this deeply flawed process. If the administration wants to try to start over and get it right, I have just identified some of the ways in which this terribly flawed process could be repaired and they could move forward in the next budget.

But there are too many red flags waving. Bristol Bay and its salmon are too important to the people of that region and to this country.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, if those are flaws in the process, then I am sure that a court challenge by the NRDC will actually bring those out.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), my friend.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), ranking member of the committee, and I was interested in listening to this conversation.

I would really respectfully ask the Member to respect the district which I represent. I am not talking about the mine. I am talking about the process.

This is State land. They gave it to us, the Congress—State land. They put it up for discovery. It was discovered. And under the clause of the discovery, you have the right for exploration. Under the right for exploration, you have a right for production, if it is possible to process.

And the chairman, the ranking member put it very clearly: Let's go through the process. What this gentleman from California is saying: We are going to make a decision what is right for everything here, and they don't know a damn thing about it, nothing, because they are promoting people saying: This shouldn't be done. There is no science behind it yet.

Science is what they talk about all the time. It is the bedrock. EIS is the bedrock. And yet they are ignoring it, expecting this Congress that doesn't know squat about the mining in Alaska.

It is our land, not their land. It is not Federal land. It is our land.

I am saying, let the process work. Let the process go through. That is what we are here for. Not for us to make decisions.

The ranking member put it very clearly. What are we going to do next time? They will not be in the majority forever, and we will have some things they do not want, and we will say we are going to do it.

They are ignoring the science, and they brag about the science all the time. Let the science prove us right or wrong. That should be their responsibility, not saying they are for or

against a mine and give all these doomsday things there. They may happen. If that happens, it will not happen because it will not issue the permits.

I want everybody to think about this a moment. What is happening here tonight is for the interest of some environmental groups—which you used to be head of, by the way—environmental groups to stop a project that is not any of their business until science has not been proven. I am saying let's look for it. Let's look for proven. I am saying let's look for it. Let's look for the science. If that happens, then we will do it.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Madam Chair, this amendment also makes a mockery of our laws that govern the permitting process for mining operations and is a complete violation of basic fairness.

Specifically, this amendment supersedes the Democrats' supposed flagship environmental regulatory law, NEPA—unbelievable.

Currently, the Army Corps of Engineers is doing exactly what Congress intended it to do under NEPA with regard to the proposed Pebble Mine project. It is analyzing the environmental and socioeconomic consequences of the proposed mine.

A wonderful adage is good process builds good policy, builds good politics. We ought to embrace that. And if we really want to put our nose in other places, maybe what we ought to do, as I challenge my good friend from California, is, instead of focusing on this project, to look at his State in his own district. Maybe he ought to be focusing on the illegal marijuana farms in his district that are using pesticides and polluting local waters and damaging national forests and our plants.

This is something that is pertinent to Alaska, to the Member from Alaska. The Tribes have been consulted. It is just that the one Tribe that he is talking about, no process followed. But the people closest to this that are most involved have been for this mine. They want good process, and I oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, as the designee of Chairwoman LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), my dear colleague.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio may not yield blocks of time.

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

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for this opportunity.

I rise today in support of the funding in this appropriations bill for flood and storm damage reduction in economically disadvantaged areas.

Included in this bill, thank goodness, is \$15 million for Army Corps of Engineers projects in communities that have previously experienced devastating floods and where the per capita income is less than half of the State and national averages.

This type of funding, as we can tell, is critical for economically disadvantaged communities across our country to not only recover from, but prevent, destructive and deadly floods.

One of these areas is the Pajaro Valley in my district on the central coast of California, an area where flooding has consistently hit it for the past 25 years and caused millions of dollars of damage to the surrounding agriculture crops. But it has also displaced hundreds and hundreds of residents, many of whom work in those fields.

That is why this bill is very important, because it can provide important funding for projects that protect the people who need it the most, for businesses that need it the most, in my community and in communities all across this country.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this funding bill, and I thank Chairwoman KAPTUR for this time.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 91 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. GRAVES. 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:

In division E, strike section 106.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to bring up this amendment today.

This amendment is pretty simple. In division E, section 106 has a provision that says that no funds in this act or

any other act may be used to carry out any activities that would include transferring or effectively modifying the mission of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I understand that it is pretty clear plain language, section 106, division E.

The problem is this: If the performance of the agency were stellar, I would understand that, and perhaps we would try and protect it, but let me throw out a few statistics painting a picture of what it is that we are dealing with.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, today, has a \$100 billion backlog in authorized projects—\$100 billion. These projects are projects like sustaining communities, resilience projects, flood protection, ecological restoration, deepening navigation channels.

Let me tell a little about the performance of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Madam Chair.

You can look at ports in other countries. They have been able to facilitate the Post-Panamax, the larger vessels.

In the United States, we are years or decades behind where we should be, putting our ports at a disadvantage, resulting in our consumers paying higher prices for those goods that are being shipped.

In regards to ecological restoration in my home State of Louisiana, we lost 2,000 square miles of our coastal wetlands, had billions of dollars in restoration projects authorized, and none of them are moving forward—not even starting, in most cases.

We have hurricane and flood protection projects. I don't have to remind anyone here. Hurricanes Irma, Maria, Michael, Florence; North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands. These places were pounded. People died because of the lack of resilience, the lack of these projects being carried out.

Lastly, Madam Chair, my home State of Louisiana, going back to 2005, I heard a little while ago somebody talking about Hurricane Katrina. What people don't realize or don't understand, the project that was designed to stop that flooding, that devastation, the loss of 1,200 to 1,500 of my brothers, sisters, friends, relatives, neighbors, fellow Louisianians, that project was authorized, dates back to the 1970s, and it wasn't finished. It wasn't finished in 2005.

I am not asking to move the cord. I am asking to look at how to improve, how to modify this. Let's look at a better result to where we are not spending as we have in recent years, \$1.7 trillion responding to countless disasters across this country that have cost our Nation over \$1 billion a pop.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

I share the gentleman's frustration, but I would like to say that I think the answer is that so many projects within the Corps have never had the infrastructure funding that they have needed to move forward, and our bill does provide a leap forward in that direction.

I think it is an understatement to say that the Army Corps today has its hands full, and I don't think we need to add any confusion by trying to tinker around breaking up agencies and so forth at this moment.

□ 2100

Section 106 of the underlying bill was included in the bill after the administration proposed breaking up the Army Corps and transferring parts of it—arms, legs, heads—to other Federal agencies.

I don't really think that is in the Nation's interest. That plan was met with wide bipartisan opposition from both sides of the Capitol. Such a plan would require a plan to authorize that proposal, but of course, the administration never presented Congress with draft legislation.

Nevertheless, the administration doubled down on its shortsighted and misguided plan and was set to begin planning efforts until Congress stepped in last fall. The fiscal year 2019 Energy and Water Development bill authored by my colleagues from across the aisle, included this same provision which enjoyed bipartisan, bicameral support.

The Corps is responsible for the management of complex, multipurpose projects, some vast, requiring expertise in many areas. Instead of trying to break up and fragment the agency's responsibilities, I would suggest that the administration focus on how it can make the Corps successful in its current organizational structure, including deferring to the technical judgment of the Corps instead of the constant interference from OMB bureaucrats who have never laid a foundation, nor operated spillways along the Mississippi or the Missouri, and so many other responsibilities that the Corps holds across this country.

The Army Corps literally holds the lives and communities of the American people in its jurisdiction. Let them do their job. And if they are listening, they are cheering around this country.

I strongly oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same thing.

I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I appreciate my friend from Louisiana's passion on this issue.

Saying that the Corps has \$100 billion backlog, it is not really the Corps' fault for that. It is our fault in that we haven't appropriated money. And if you look back through the years, the Bush administration, the Obama administration, and, currently, the Trump administration, always propose

a budget that slashes and burns the Corps' budget. And it is the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee that won't let them do that and keeps putting money back into it.

Last year, the Office of Management and Budget issued a plan for reorganization of the Federal agencies that included moving the Civil Works program from the Army Corps of Engineers to multiple other agencies. Yet, very few details were provided to Congress. Congress was not consulted, and no statutory changes were enacted. Yet, some in the administration took steps to try to begin implementing the reorganization proposal.

In response, that is why the language was put in last year's act, and that is why it is in this year's act. I will tell the gentleman that we have had this discussion many times with General Semonite, and he is a go-get-'em guy. When he is given a mission, he will do whatever it takes to get that mission accomplished. I like what he is doing.

I wouldn't want to go with OMB in saying we are going to reorganize the Corps and not know exactly what they are going to do and have Congress have no input. But I appreciate the passion that the gentleman has for this, and I understand his frustration. And I think that it is better placed on the Transportation Committee in seeing if there are some reorganizations that can be done within the Corps and done legislatively that make sense.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chairwoman, I would like to thank the gentleman for those remarks and to say that I share his deep concern about the way that OMB, in particular, has a tennis match with Congress when it comes to the Army Corps of Engineers.

There is not a more important infrastructure agency at this moment in our country than the Army Corps. The administration said it was going to come forward with an infrastructure bill. Well, if they can't do whatever they are calling an infrastructure bill, this is the infrastructure bill for this country at this time.

The needs are enormous. I can't imagine. We have 8 divisions and 38 districts. I want to thank every single individual out there sworn to protect and defend the American people who work for the Army Corps of Engineers and give their lives to this profession across this country.

General Semonite is a great patriot, and as were his predecessors. It has a long history, and we really need to have more attention devoted to Corps funding by various administrations that sit over there in the executive branch and underfund these projects around the country. That is why Louisiana had so much trouble and that is why other places in the country have so much trouble.

So I do not support the gentleman's amendment. I urge opposition, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chairwoman, I just heard comments from folks saying that Congress needs to step in. The Transportation Committee should look at this and act, and perhaps propose reorganization legislation or studies, and other things. And I hate to bring this up, but Congress did just that.

Let me say it again. Congress did just that. Section 1102 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018, which you both supported, included language which actually says that the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, and the Corps of Engineers should enter into an agreement to look at more efficient delivery of Corps of Engineers' projects.

This amendment doesn't move the Corps of Engineers out. What it does is, it says, clearly, there is a problem. And if the problem is Congress and the funding, then that is what the study will determine. Let them go. Let them do the analysis, just like we did on a bipartisan basis.

Congresswoman Esty and I offered the amendment. It was unanimously accepted. It passed in this House twice, and it is law today. That is all I am asking for. I am baffled that folks are afraid of information, perhaps better ideas, on how to deliver these projects.

I understand that people have their perception of where the problems are. Madam Chairwoman, if I bring anything to this Chamber, I have spent more time working on Corps of Engineers projects than anybody else and, in fact, I am going to go so far as to say than everybody else in this Chamber combined.

I would be happy to throw the stats out. This is what I used to do. I used to work with the Corps of Engineers on a daily basis doing billions and billions of dollars' worth of projects.

This is a flawed process. We routinely were able to build projects that the Corps of Engineers designed for one-half to one-third the cost. Madam Chairwoman, what that does is, it allows it to build double or triple the amount of projects for the same cost.

If we need to get this backlog broken then, certainly, that is an efficiency that we can bring to the table. Why are people afraid of information? This status quo is not working. I shudder to think about what everyone is going to do and say next time we have a catastrophic disaster in an area where there is a Corps of Engineers project that sat there for decades.

This is a flawed process. The status quo has failed. I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. SHALALA). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

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

Mr. ROY. 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. BANKS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. BANKS. 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 E (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 1. Each amount made available in division E, except those amounts made available to the Department of Defense, is hereby reduced by 14 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Chairwoman, in total, the Energy and Water Development division cost the American taxpayers \$46.4 billion.

That is a 4 percent increase above the fiscal year 2019-enacted level. Specifically, the division includes \$23.3 billion for nondefense activities, which is an increase of \$1.1 billion above the fiscal year 2019-enacted level.

My amendment would apply a 14 percent reduction across the board to the nondefense activities included in this division. Without it, we are on track toward sequestration, which would have devastating effects on our national security.

This amendment is necessary because we are at a \$22 trillion national debt. That is trillion, with a T. Even before my friends across the aisle offered this reckless spending package, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that we were on track to spend \$1 trillion on interest payments in 2029. That means one-fifth of the entire budget would go to paying off previous years of irresponsible spending.

Madam Chairwoman, we simply cannot continue down this path. We must balance our books before writing new checks for this fiscal year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting Chair. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 Minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because really, it takes us backwards. The gentleman is from Indiana. I am from Ohio. I think both of us have seen individuals that we represent go off to war. How many wars have we gotten into over the issue of oil and the oil supply of the globe?

The Department of Energy has been inventing the future to a point where now, we are 90 percent self-sufficient inside the boundaries of this country.

This department helps to invent the future and helps America be more secure. Every one of us has some sense of what is happening with cyberattacks in our energy systems.

Over the weekend, a major retailer, Target, for whatever reason, all the cash registers went dead around the country. Was it just a satellite problem? Was it an attack by a foreign aggressor? I simply don't know. But I know this department isn't a place where we should be cutting.

Climate change, whether one wishes to admit it or not, is going to require a change in our way of life. This department is essential to help us move in that direction in a very organized manner. Every penny counts and every step we take to help the American people be more secure is needed.

This bill funds critical water resource projects and supports science and energy technology. It helps our businesses be more competitive. It funds a credible nuclear deterrent where we have commitments and also nonproliferation, which is important not just to our country, but to the world.

I think the gentleman's amendment will actually harm all of these fronts and reduce protections against what the American people are facing from coast to coast right now.

I think that the gentleman's objectives on balancing the budget are correct, but I don't think it should be taken out of the hide of these programs. There are other ways to do that—some of the giveaways to the billionaire class in this country who have had the privilege of living a good life and earning a great deal of money in this country. Everybody has got to pitch in. But I don't think where we are inventing the future and helping the American people become more secure in our way of life is the place to hack away.

I urge a continued investment in these areas for purposes of our national security and to remain a global leader in energy, water, and science. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Chairwoman, I was proud this year to lead the Republican Study Committee's effort in creating and drafting our own budget as part of the Budget and Spending Task Force.

I gathered together with several of my colleagues, coming from different States and different views, and we worked tirelessly for months to produce a budget that would cut wasteful government spending by \$12.6 trillion over a 6-year time period.

This is not just the only budget offered in this body that balances. It is the only budget that has been offered at all. The fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle refuse to even offer a budget shows a stunning lack of leadership.

This is my third amendment to cut across the board 14 percent in each of the divisions of these minibuses.

□ 2115

My amendment reflects the values of the RSC budget and is a necessary first step toward eventually achieving a balanced budget.

Madam Chair, I will continue to come back to this floor and offer this amendment time and time again because I refuse to condemn my daughters to a less prosperous America than the one that every Member of this Chamber has been blessed to know.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I urge opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ROY. 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 Indiana will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 103 will not be offered.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) having assumed the chair, Ms. SHALALA, 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. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 3056, BORDER CRISIS SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider a measure that I would like to speak about for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, to be clear, my request was to call up H.R. 3056, a measure to make sure we have the funding necessary to end the border security crisis that the President and his Office of Management and Budget sent to the Congress. It is Mr. ROGERS from Alabama's bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has noted, under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the