

and the evidence against particulate matter only gets stronger. That's why every major journal that looks at it concludes that nuclear is the safest way to make reliable electricity.

All of this leads to an uncomfortable conclusion—one that the climate scientist James Hansen came to recently: nuclear power has actually saved 1.8 million lives. That's not something you hear very much about.

What about the waste? This is the waste from a nuclear plant in the United States. The thing about nuclear waste is that it's the only waste from electricity production that is safely contained anywhere. All of the other waste for electricity goes into the environment including from coal, natural gas and—here's another uncomfortable conclusion—solar panels.

There's no plan to recycle solar panels outside of the EU. That means that all of our solar in California will join the waste stream. And that waste contains heavy toxic metals like chromium, cadmium, and lead.

So how much toxic solar waste is there? Well, to get a sense for that, look at how much more materials are required to produce energy from solar and wind compared to nuclear. As a result, solar actually produces 200 to 300 times more toxic waste than nuclear.

What about weapons? If there were any chance that more nuclear energy increased the risk of nuclear war, I would be against it. I believe that diplomacy is almost always the right solution.

People say what about North Korea? Korea proves the point. In order to get nuclear power—and it's been this way for 50 years—you have to agree not to get a weapon. That's the deal.

South Korea wanted nuclear power. They agreed not to get a weapon. They don't have a weapon.

North Korea wanted nuclear power. I think they should have gotten it. We didn't let them have it, for a variety of reasons. They got a bomb. They are testing missiles that can hit Japan and soon will be able to hit California.

So if you're looking for evidence that nuclear energy leads to bombs you can't find it in Korea or anywhere else.

Where does that leave us? With some more uncomfortable facts. Like if Germany hadn't closed its nuclear plants, it's emissions would be 43 percent lower than they are today. And if you care about climate change, that's something you at least have to wrestle with—especially in light of the facts I've presented on the health impacts of different energy sources.

I'd like to close with a quote from somebody else who changed his mind about nuclear power, and somebody else who was a huge childhood hero for me, and that's Sting: "If we're going to tackle global warming, nuclear power is the only way to generate massive amounts of power."

Thank you for listening.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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. McCOLLUM) having assumed the chair, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, 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. 1373) to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the

Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1401

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TORRES of California) at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

GRAND CANYON CENTENNIAL PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 656 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. 1373.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) kindly take the chair.

□ 1403

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. 1373) to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, with Mr. CUELLAR (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, all time for general debate had expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1373

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act".

SEC. 2. WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA.

(a) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this Act, the term "Map" means the map prepared by the Bureau of Land Management entitled "Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act" and dated July 11, 2019.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 1,006,545 acres of Federal land in the State of Arizona, generally depicted on the Map as "Federal Mineral Estate to be Withdrawn", including any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States after the date of the enactment of this Act, are hereby withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The Map shall be kept on file and made available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 116-264. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 116-264.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), and 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 the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not be effective until the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, finds that the withdrawal under section 2 will not adversely affect jobs available to Native Americans, other minorities, and women.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, my amendment states that this act shall not become effective until the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, finds that the withdrawal will not adversely affect jobs available to Native Americans, other minorities, and women.

I believe deeply in protecting the environment for my grandchildren, but I also believe in protecting the potential employment opportunities of Arizonans, especially those in underserved communities. Resource development benefits the economies of local communities.

As noted at markup in the Committee on Natural Resources, the temporary political mineral withdrawal imposed in 2012 by the Obama administration, which focused on banning mining, cost Arizona and Utah thousands

of jobs and \$29 billion in economic activity.

We should not entertain any withdrawal without confirmation that this bill will not adversely affect jobs, particularly for Native Americans, minorities, and women.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not a good faith effort to protect Native communities, minorities, or women. It is simply a “gotcha” amendment intended to kill the bill.

It is truly insulting that our colleagues across the aisle would try and use Native communities as pawns to kill this proposal, knowing full well that Native people have too often had to bear the brunt of uranium’s toxic impacts.

On the Navajo Nation, there are hundreds of abandoned uranium mines waiting to be cleaned up. These toxic sites pollute water and damage public health. A recent study found dozens of contaminated water sources on the Navajo Nation, and nearly one-quarter of the residents had elevated uranium levels in their health screenings.

The Havasupai fear this same danger for their community. They live downstream of the Canyon Mine and of other proposed mines, and they worry that they, too, will be forced to bear that toxic burden.

That is why the Havasupai, the Navajo Nation, the National Congress of American Indians, and the Inter Tribal Association of Arizona, along with other regional Tribes, all support a permanent withdrawal.

These indigenous voices are not props at a press conference. They are not quaint or docile. They are smart and passionate advocates for their people, for the situation now, and, more importantly, for future generations to come. They deserve our respect. Anything less, I think, crosses a line.

Republicans aren’t lifting these Native voices. They are ignoring Native voices and threatening the continued health of Native communities to score some cheap political points.

This amendment won’t help Native communities. It will kill the very protections they are asking this Congress to enact.

Mining is not, and will never again be, the future of job creation in that part of Arizona, and that is especially true for women and minority communities.

During the extensive, multiyear analysis and public comment process that went into the original withdrawal, the previous administration reviewed job opportunities in the region. They found that mining could likely support 295 direct jobs—295 jobs. This is in contrast to nearly 12,000 jobs directly supported by Grand Canyon National

Park, all of which rely on a healthy, uranium-free Grand Canyon.

If we are serious about job growth in this part of Arizona, we need to be talking about how we can better support our outdoor recreation and tourism economies. That would help all the communities in the area.

Mining, in particular, is not a field known for its diversity. In 2018, less than 14 percent of all workers in mining, quarrying, and extraction were women, and less than 13 percent were minorities.

Meanwhile, the outdoor rec industry is making a major push to diversify, developing outreach programs and pipelines to bring people of color and women into that space.

There really isn’t much of a comparison here.

Mr. Chairman, if you still aren’t sure if this amendment was made in good faith, I would point out the original sponsor’s voting record.

The original sponsor voted against the Violence Against Women Act, in which an amendment therein contained a particular focus on missing and murdered indigenous women throughout this country.

She voted against the Equality Act. She voted against the Carcieri fix, one of the most important votes in this Chamber to protect Tribal sovereignty.

The Democratic Caucus has offered numerous opportunities to champion the causes of Native Americans, women, and people of color. The original sponsor and many of her colleagues have declined those opportunities.

I am more than happy to work with any of my colleagues to uplift traditionally underrepresented voices, but this amendment is not a legitimate attempt to do so. It is simply an attempt to weaponize the communities that our party has worked so hard to protect.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, through the Chairman to the gentleman on the other side, I would like to know if the gentleman actually supports a mine in Arizona.

That is a question.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, once again, now we find out the true understanding of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), that he doesn’t approve of any mines whatsoever. And why that is so important here is that we talk about indigenous people and empowerment. Well, let’s focus back on this.

Recently, the Navajo Generating Station, which was commissioned by Congress to provide power for the water for CAP that revolutionized Arizona for its growth, the delivery of water, was all given to the Tribes, the Navajo and Hopi—not just the coal mine, but the power plant as well. These were great-

paying jobs. They had benefits. It empowered the Native Americans.

Now, what is interesting about that is that now we are shuttering this enterprise down. Eighty percent of the Hopis’ operating budget per year is going away; 60 percent of the Navajos’ operating budget is going away.

And, interestingly, what is our answer from our colleagues on the other side? Welfare.

Oh, my Lord, my God, I can’t believe what I am hearing. Welfare, that is the answer.

So let’s go back and have a little bit of a geological conversation again, because rock sets you free.

Once again, these breccia pipes are on this part of the Grand Canyon. This is where everybody goes.

Look at these breccia pipes that are exposed. They are water soluble. That drains down. Gravity takes it down. That is why you are getting that infiltration into the water.

I am not here to hurt anybody. I refuse to do that. But I am not here to turn my back on Native Americans who are empowered instead of victimized.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a “gotcha” amendment. The substance of the amendment is misdirected, to say the least, and it ignores history and ignores the reality that we are in right now.

That reality is that, when I began to get involved in this issue more than a decade ago, it was in response to discussions that I had with the Havasupai Tribe, with the Navajo Tribe, with the Hopi Tribe, and with other indigenous nations in and around the Grand Canyon. The consensus and the unity around the issue that we have to protect the Grand Canyon was important, not only for religious, cultural, and sacred reasons, but also for the fact that that is their home.

At the end of the day, the vote today is a response to that work, to their advocacy, to their support, and to the input that they had on the legislation. It is a vote to affirm by this Congress that, indeed, the concerns that they raised are real and important.

Mr. Chair, I would urge a “no” vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, once again, my points have been made.

This is a good amendment because what it does is it looks at the overall application to make sure that we are not blindsiding our Native Americans.

There is hardly consensus whatsoever. We heard from numerous groups over and over again that they do not agree with this bill.

In fact, when the gentleman from Arizona on the other side actually had a press conference, they gathered leaders, and the leaders had no idea what they were there for the press conference with.

Once again, as I asked previously what mine would the gentleman from

Arizona on the other side actually endorse, the answer was crickets.

That tells you who he is playing for. It is not for Native Americans.

Maybe it is the Sierra Club. Maybe it is The Wilderness Society. And I wonder if they get any of their payments from China and Russia. I wonder if there is a collaboration here.

□ 1415

Once again this is a great amendment. It talks about empowering people with jobs, holding their dignity, and directing the aspects of their life. That is what is invigorating about America. Victimization does none of that.

I ask all my colleagues to vote for 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 Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 116-264.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 3. APPLICATION.

The withdrawal under section 2 of this Act shall not apply to any Federal land depicted on the Map as "Federal Mineral Estate to be Withdrawn" located in the 4th Congressional District of Arizona, as configured on the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

What this amendment basically does is, it takes my district out of this withdrawal. Seventy percent of the active mine sites and proposed mine sites are in my district, and we want to make sure that we are not victimized, that we are taken out of this withdrawal area.

This body actually had rules that they tried to follow that they didn't usurp Members' districts, they worked with those Members' districts. And with that, I would ask that we endorse that and withdraw my district from this withdrawal.

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

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

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

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

I recognize there is some sensitivity, or even a misunderstanding in this Chamber to legislating in other Members' districts, but I would point out that it is something we do almost every day that we are here. We vote on policies that impact the Nation, which is why we are a national legislature.

I would also point out that the gentleman from Arizona offered numerous amendments to a bill in New Mexico, the Chaco Canyon legislation, that will be considered later today, and those lands are certainly not in his district.

If each of us only ever legislated in our own district, we would be doing a disservice to the American people, but we would never get anything done, as well. Furthermore, every Member of the Chamber has a responsibility to support sovereign Tribal Nations who have asked this body to protect the Grand Canyon.

Serving the American people requires that we take a national view into account. The lands protected in H.R. 1373 are public lands belonging to every American. They protect an iconic American landscape, the Grand Canyon, important to people across this country. I can also easily think of 30 million Americans, most of whom are outside the gentleman's district, who want to see the clean waters of the Colorado River protected.

The Colorado River provides drinking water to Phoenix, Tucson, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, and to countless cities and towns across the west. It needs to be protected from uranium mining. The lands in the gentleman's district were not included in this bill arbitrarily. They were added after an extensive multiyear study and public process that accounted for a long list of regional factors before recommending withdrawal.

The land in the gentleman's district is essential to protecting the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River watershed from uranium's toxic impacts.

We also need to consider the support for this proposal on the ground. In a bipartisan poll, almost two-thirds of Arizonans supported permanent protections for the lands around the Grand Canyon, including those in the gentleman's district.

Representative O'HALLERAN, who represents the vast majority of the lands in this bill, is an original cosponsor and a vocal supporter, because he knows that this bill is important to all his constituents. H.R. 1373 receives vocal support from Tribal communities, including Havasupai, Navajo Nation, Hopi Nation, the Hualapai, the Inter Tribal Association of Arizona, and the National Congress of American Indians.

The bill receives support from Coconino County and the city of Flagstaff, who have a major stake in protecting the clean waters of the Grand Canyon. H.R. 1373 is supported by recreationalists, sportsmen, conservationists, and hundreds of local organizations and individuals from Arizona and across this Nation.

This bill is a broadly supported effort to protect public lands that belong to all Americans. The bill is an effort to protect the Grand Canyon. A vocal minority of opponents who will never be swayed should not stop the overwhelming voice of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Once again, I am sure glad that the opposition actually brought that up about New Mexico, because what we are actually doing is, we are representing the voices that didn't get a chance to speak out on behalf of their claim, their allotments, but we will get to that. And we will be showing you exactly why we are doing that.

In my district, there are eight historic mines included in this withdrawal area. Six are in my district. Also included in the withdrawal area is the potential for 20 new mines that would provide hundreds of high-paying jobs to the local communities in Mohave County north of Grand Canyon. Not only am I opposed to the inclusion of Mohave County in this bill, but so are the Mohave County Board of Supervisors, who unanimously voted to oppose this bill.

In addition to the board of supervisors, local business organizations are also opposed to this bill, including Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce, Arizona Rock Products Association, Arizona Pork Producers Council, plus many others.

I say to my colleagues, local residents and businesses in Mohave County should have a say. They should not be swayed.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the letter against this bill, H.R. 1373, from the Mohave County Board of Supervisors.

MOHAVE COUNTY RESOLUTION No. 2019-065

OPPOSING H.R. 1373 WHICH SEEKS TO MAKE PERMANENT THE 2012 URANIUM MINING BAN

Whereas, Mohave County is located in Northwestern Arizona and the Mohave County Board of Supervisors is committed to wise stewardship and land conservation and continued recreational access for hunters, anglers, campers, and other recreationists, as well as allowing for productive uses, including agriculture, timber production, mining, and energy and natural resource development;

Whereas, on January 9, 2012, President Barack Obama's Interior Secretary, Ken Salazar withdrew from mineral entry 1.07 million acres of subsurface estate in Coconino and Mohave Counties, in northern Arizona;

Whereas, one of the richest grades of uranium ore in North America sits untouched in the northern region of Mohave County due to the 2012 withdrawal. The 375 million pounds of uranium deposit in the area is the equivalent of enough electricity generating capacity for the entire state of California's 40 million people for 22.4 years;

Whereas, the affected area included in the withdrawal was specifically left open for multiple use as part of an open 1984 compromise agreement directed at the behest of House Interior Committee Chairman Morris Udall among environmental groups, the mining industry, the livestock industry, both states of Arizona and Utah and signed into law by President Ronald Reagan;

Whereas, That compromise created 6 to 8 mile protective buffer zones around the Grand Canyon National Park in the form of 300,000 acres of designated BLM and 800,000 acres of National Forest Wilderness areas while releasing lands with high potential for mineral extraction and livestock grazing and recreational purposes;

Whereas, the uranium industry in the southwest has historically been a major economic driver for the region. Mohave County and our neighboring State of Utah could see major economic potential with the opening of more uranium mining near the Arizona Strip. Mining in the area can bring in over \$40 million annually in payroll, \$9.5 million in mining claim payments and fees to local governments in Arizona and Utah, and over \$30 billion over a 42 year life span, helping to finance local schools, roads, hospitals, and other infrastructure;

Whereas, Congressman Raul Grijalva has introduced H.R. 1373, titled the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act that aims to make permanent the 2012 uranium mining ban along with including a mining ban on any land or interest in land acquired by the United States after enactment of the bill;

Whereas, H.R. 1373 is very misguided with its title. Since the 1984 Compromise there has been no mining allowed within BLM Wilderness areas or within the Grand Canyon National Park itself;

Whereas, the Government's own Draft Environmental Impact Statement stated that there is no evidence to show that mining activities outside the Grand Canyon National Park pose a risk to areas within the Colorado River drainage or inside the National Park itself;

Whereas, Modern mining industry reclamation techniques are vastly superior to those used by the United States government during the Cold War era uranium boom of the 1950 and 1960s, which did bring harm to Native American and local populations and are demonstrably improved and safe;

Whereas, Arizona and neighboring Utah have abundant in-ground uranium resources, considerable existing uranium infrastructure, and large numbers of qualified workers capable of supplying defense and energy needs for decades to come;

Whereas, the permanent ban of uranium mining in the Arizona Strip area would be detrimental to our local economy and cause severe economic harm to local communities without promised economic benefits from tourism; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Mohave County Board of Supervisors that Mohave County strongly opposes H.R. 1373 and any attempt to make permanent the 2012 Uranium Mining Ban in the Arizona Strip area of Mohave County.

Adopted on this 17th day of June, 2019:
Mohave County Board of Supervisors: HILDY ANGIUS,

Chairman.

ATTEST:

GINNY ANDERSON,
Clerk of the Board.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, let's go back through this. You know, we have heard all about the health implications, but rocks set you free.

Once again, we look at these breccia pipes that are outlined in this yellow and red. The red are the most concentrated parts of this. What ends up happening is you see them dissolve in water and in air.

And so when you look at the Grand Canyon, you are seeing this seepage that comes into the Grand Canyon watershed naturally. What we are actually doing is cleaning this up. Wouldn't that be amazing, amazing that we are actually interceding on the best behavior and the best acknowledgements of the people around there? Amazing.

And I would hardly call this a problem. In fact, immediate restoration of these lands is impeccable. Yes, we have this negative connotation about what the past has done. But this is where history and our new technology actually intercede, where we are actually intervening on this, making and improving the landscape. That is amazing. That is absolutely amazing.

Once again, this is untouched. Man is not here. This is what nature has done to expose this. Once again, you have an exposed breccia pipe. You have a ravine that carries water that sheets off. Once again, by taking that out, taking that breccia pipe out, it facilitates permeation down into lower aquifers replenishing limited water supplies that we actually have. It is amazing what the rocks do. They set you free.

And my district has said, listen, exclude us from this overreach by the Federal Government. The Federal Government has hardly been a champion in regard to Native Americans and people in this area. We rule by fiat and scare people.

Once again, this is a good bill. We want to be excluded from this withdrawal. I would hope that everybody would listen to the people from my district.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for everybody to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time in opposition to the amendment.

As I said earlier, I think we keep forgetting the essence of what we are talking about here today. And the essence is the Grand Canyon, something that is recognized nationally, not only as an environmental icon, but the dependency that 40 million people have on the water of the Grand Canyon. And while we want to minimize this, the reality is that the history tells us and current health studies tell us of the impact that Native communities have suffered because of uranium contamination in their water, in their air, and in their land. Those are reasons enough to put aside a very special place and permanently ban uranium mining.

This amendment cuts an exception based on territorial imperative or some provincial thought that we are not all

part of one great Nation. This is a national issue and should be treated that way.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 116-264.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The withdrawal under section 2 of this Act shall not go into effect until the Secretary of the Interior completes a mineral survey of the area proposed for withdrawal, including uranium, rare earth elements, geothermal and oil and gas resources, and determines that there are no mineral resources, geothermal resources, or critical minerals present other than uranium.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

H.R. 1373 permanently bans oil, natural gas, geothermal, uranium, and other critical minerals and rare earth leasing and production on over a million acres of land in Arizona. This commonsense amendment does not kill the bill. It delays the effective date until we have done adequate mapping and surveying of the minerals and resources in this area.

Specifically, the amendment allows the bill to go into effect when the Secretary of the Interior completes a mineral survey of the area proposed for withdrawal including uranium, rare earth elements, geothermal, and oil and gas resources, and determines that there are no mineral resources, geothermal resources, or critical minerals present, other than uranium.

The temporary political mineral withdrawal imposed in 2012 by the Obama administration that focused exclusively on banning mining cost the surrounding areas in Arizona and Utah between two and 4,000 jobs and \$29 billion in overall regional economic activity. The previous administration's misguided actions killed more than 7,000 hard-rock mining claims in the area over a 3-year span.

This legislation would expand the withdrawal area and also expand the mineral withdrawal in the withdrawal area to include oil and gas leasing, geothermal leasing, and other mineral development in addition to mining.

Mr. Chairman, there are rare earths and other valuable minerals, including copper and uranium, in this area. There is also a great amount of geothermal potential. We should at least know all the minerals and resources potential in this million-acre area before we permanently lock it up. This just requires mapping and surveying of the targeted areas for the withdrawal.

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

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

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

□ 1430

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, this amendment would allow Secretary Bernhardt to kill this proposal in pursuit of information we already have.

My colleagues across the aisle continually allude to the lack of information we have about this region, the lack of study, and the lack of science. They seem to ignore the extensive, multiyear study that preceded the current withdrawal.

That study looked at local economies. It reviewed the best available science. It took into account public comments. It considered how uranium mining might impact the Grand Canyon region.

In the end, the review produced a 1,500-page environmental impact report outlining, in detail, the rationales for different actions. Within the report, there was a detailed analysis considering other mineral resources in the region, the very study the gentleman is now trying to predicate the withdrawal on.

The study did, indeed, find there were a handful of other mineral resources in the region, but the study also made clear that these elements were secondary to uranium and that they occurred in quantities insufficient to drive mine development. This is why, when you look at mineral claims in the withdrawal area, they are almost all for uranium.

We know uranium is the primary resource here, and we know the major threat that uranium poses to clean water, to public health, and to the Grand Canyon itself.

Uranium mines have polluted ground water and destroyed many communities across the Southwest. The landscape is littered with abandoned mine sites.

We only need to consider Kanab Creek Uranium Mine. It sits on the edge of the Grand Canyon and has been offline for years, yet virtually no remediation has been done. You can see the

site is still covered in waste rock, uranium ore tailings, and pond sludge. This toxic waste is exposed to the environment, escaping beyond the mine, infiltrating the soil, and elevating local uranium levels.

This mine is only one of hundreds of closed mines awaiting remediation. Industry likes to pretend like practices have changed, but they provide no assurances that they will do anything but despoil the land and leave taxpayers with the bill.

Despite protests from the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), we know what the resources are, and we know what the threats are to this region.

We don't need to duplicate a study to tell us that we shouldn't be mining in the Grand Canyon, and we certainly should not let misinformed talking points kill this bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, this is a typical breccia pipe, and you are seeing the collapsing of the geological formations. What is so interesting about that is that it concentrates different minerals there, not just uranium. Copper, vanadium, there are a number of things here that have all of a sudden become very critical in our technology sector.

This is a very important application here, and we want to make sure that we are studying that properly.

Now, if we are talking about the reclamation process, well, here we go. Yes, 80 years ago, we didn't reclaim mines right. We didn't ask them to be bonded. We didn't go back and investigate them for mitigation.

This is what American mining actually does. It takes what they need; it returns it. And I would be very interested in taking a Geiger counter to check this versus this when it started. I wonder if there is an improvement.

Deja vu? It is. So, once again, the arguments are bland. They are fraudulent. In this aspect, we show mitigation.

What we can do when we have a mine site like this is we can actually leverage them and say: Listen, in order to do this, we need you to mitigate some of these other mining sites.

It has been something that our side has proposed nonstop, but the other side refuses to let that happen because, they claim, that it is not going to be up to standard. That tells you people are scared of their own laws.

This looks pretty good to me. When I look at the mitigation aspects and what is here and available, that is for the common cause for the American people. It is an investiture. You are not doing your due diligence unless you know exactly what you have for today and the future.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment. It is smart. It is critical and, from that standpoint, empowering. I ask everybody to vote "yes" on the amendment.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in closing, and in opposition to the amendment, in July, the President formed a nuclear working group, the Nuclear Fuel Working Group, essentially to deal with the questions coming from the uranium mining industry, in particular, Energy Fuels and Ur-Energy.

The issue there was an attempt to try to defend the indefensible in trying to open up the Grand Canyon once more, looking at lifting the moratorium. So the urgency for the legislation before us is based on acts that the administration has taken at this point.

One should note that Secretary Bernhardt represented Ur-Energy USA from 2009 to 2012.

My point is that enough advocates exist for the mining industry as we stand.

What we are asking, in defeat of this amendment, is that the public interest has some advocates, and that Members of this body can take care of that public interest and not the profit interests that seem to be driving any decisions around mining and particularly uranium mining.

The public interest is the public health, the Grand Canyon, the water supply for 40 million people, and the Tribes and indigenous people and communities that exist there that have been for decade upon decade coming to this Congress, coming to their leadership, asking for support and relief. This bill begins to provide both.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TONKO) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, 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. 1373) to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CHACO CULTURAL HERITAGE AREA PROTECTION ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members