and the evidence against particular 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 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 forms 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 coal plants and natural gas plants 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. The question about climate change is, 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:

“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.”

“In Korea or anywhere else.”

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

As noted at markup in the Committee on Natural Resources, the temporary 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, 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 public drinking 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 quant 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 theseNative 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 administration reviewed job opportunities in the region. They found that mining could likely support 296 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 industry, which would help all the communities in this 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 recreation 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. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, through the Chair 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, 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 Hopi’s operating budget per year is given 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.

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.

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 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. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part of the record 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:

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.
The amendment cuts an exception post-2012 uranium mining. 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 concentration 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 from the water shed nature. 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. 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 all along. Once again, you have an exposed breccia pipe. You have a ravine that carries water that sheet's off. Once again, by taking out, taking that breccia pipe out, it facilitates permeation down into lower aquifers replenishment of surface water that was 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. GRJALVA. 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 of 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. That is absolutely amazing. 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. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The withdrawal under section 2 of this Act shall 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.

Mr. Chairman 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 oil and gas leasing and production on over a million acres of land in Arizona. This nonsensical 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 Acting CHAIR. The temporary 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 $20 billion in overall regional economic activity.

The previous amendment’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 geo-thermal potential. We should at least know all the minerals and resources potential in this million-acre area before we studenly look 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.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, 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, the emergency 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 the 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 decades upon decades 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 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

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