Mr. Speaker, it is time for the House to give victims of sanctuary city policies a legal pathway to justice. This cannot happen again.

LESSONS FROM THE BP OIL SPILL DISASTER

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that some have already forgotten the lessons we have learned from the BP oil spill disaster. It was only a few years ago that we saw millions of gallons of oil being spilled into the Gulf of Mexico, and, sadly, many areas are still recovering.

In California, we have seen the disastrous effects offshore drilling can have on our oceans and the lives that depend on it. We had our own disaster in Santa Barbara exactly 50 years ago.

Night after night, we saw images of birds and sea otters drenched in oil and pictures of dead seals and dolphins. It was heartbreaking. And this is why we say never again.

Offshore drilling is not the answer to our country's energy challenges. We can and we must invest in clean, renewable energy.

California, as everybody knows, has one of the most beautiful coastlines in the world, and we have to keep it that way. So I urge my colleagues, vote to keep our oceans clean and reject more offshore drilling.

□ 1215

OPPOSING ENERGY BILLS

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to all three of the anti-American energy dominance bills on the floor this week. I am most concerned by H.R. 205, which bans energy development in parts of the Gulf of Mexico.

I do not rise as just another oil-and-gas Texan. I have unique insights, because, unlike most of the bill's supporters, I started my naval career, 9 years, at the cradle of naval aviation, NAS Pensacola, Florida, the home port of the Blue Angels.

I have flown over every ocean on Earth. I patrolled for Russian nuclear missile submarines to protect our Nation from nuclear war.

A blanket ban on this entire region hurts our national security. This bill is a hatchet, and we need a precise scalpel. I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and against all three bills, especially H.R. 205.

CONFRONTING GUN VIOLENCE

(Mr. LIPINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we return this week, we must confront our Nation's sickening gun violence. My commitment to act is even stronger after my own terrifying experience.

My wife Judy and I were at the Gilroy Garlic Festival when a shooter opened fire. We heard the pops, then screams, and we turned and ran for our lives. Three people were killed, but it could have been much worse if not for law enforcement's quick action. It almost seems like a bad dream, but it was real. Just as the threat of gun violence in our Nation is all too real.

This violence has social and spiritual roots, but there are commonsense laws we can enact to stem gun violence. I have had many people beg me for Congress to act, including proud gun owners who understand that we can pass gun safety laws while also upholding the Second Amendment.

This week the Senate should start by passing the comprehensive background check bill that we passed in the House earlier this year. Doing nothing is not an option. Congress must act.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, following a summer of horrific gun violence, we can no longer accept congressional failure to take concrete action. Mass shootings in Gilroy, El Paso, Dayton, and Odessa, as well as the unceasing daily gun violence in communities across our country, including close to my home in Chicago, define the summer of 2019. I hope the fall of 2019 will be remembered as the time when our leaders finally began to address our Nation's gun violence epidemic.

The simple fact is, this House already passed bipartisan bills on universal background checks and closing the Charleston loophole. This is commonsense legislation that more than 90 percent of Americans support. It would have closed the loophole that the Texas shooter used to acquire his weapon.

But Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL astonishingly continues to carry the water for the NRA and refuses to even allow a simple up or down vote on this bill. We need to tell Mr. MCCONNELL and the NRA that enough is enough. People are needlessly dying. The victims and their loved ones deserve more than mere thoughts and prayers. Congress must act now.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 10, 2019, at 11:29 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 349.

That the Senate passed S. 1689.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 831.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 57.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 205, PROTECTING AND SECURING FLORIDA'S COASTLINE ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1146, ARCTIC CULTURAL AND COASTAL PLAIN PROTECTION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1941, COASTAL AND MARINE ECONOMIES PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 548 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 548

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 205) to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to permanently extend the moratorium on leasing in certain areas of the Gulf of Mexico. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–29, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the

House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1146) to amend Public Law 115–97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge oil and gas program, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–30, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1941) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior including in any leasing program certain planning areas, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–31, modified by the amendment printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part F of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 548, providing for consideration of H.R. 205, Protecting and Securing Florida's Coastline Act of 2019; H.R. 1146, the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act; and H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act.

The rule provides for consideration of each bill under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of debate on each bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources. Additionally, the rule provides one motion to recommit on each bill.

Mr. Speaker, together these three bills block oil and gas drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the Atlantic and Pacific Coast, and in the eastern Gulf of Mexico.

For those of you that have worked with me over the years, you know that I have said, and I mean, that I will be the last person standing before offshore oil drilling is expanded off the coast of Florida. I am a native Floridian, and I have seen substantial changes in my State, and I have seen that coastline on either side threatened by a variety of issues that man should not be undertaking.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I am glad it didn't have to come to that. I am glad that the people's House is taking up these measures that undoubtedly will protect our Nation's environment, climate, and the economies of coastal communities that rely on tourism, outdoor recreation, and fishing. I am glad that the House of Representatives is demonstrating to the American people that we work for them, not for the oil and gas industry.

Mr. Speaker, last year, in a radical move, the Trump administration proposed a plan to open nearly all U.S. coasts to oil and gas drilling. This disastrous plan brought to mind the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster in the Gulf of Mexico, where the explosion not only killed 11 people and injured many, but it poured millions of gallons of oil into the Gulf waters and also killed hundreds of thousands of birds, marine mammals, fish, and sea turtles. Just the prospect of oily beaches led to hundreds of hotel cancellations along Florida's Gulf Coast, even in places the oil never reached.

Mr. Speaker, I was living there during that period of time, of course, and many around this Nation saw that continuous loop shown on television of oil spilling into the Gulf. It has not all gone away, and much of the industry along that coastline has been decimated.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration's plan is risking billions of dollars and millions of jobs from the industries that depend on a clean, healthy ocean. Make no mistake about it, our coastal communities are the backbone of the United States economy.

According to the National Ocean Economics Program, coastal States encompass over 80 percent of the Nation's population, GDP, and employment. Moreover, the ocean economy's tourism and recreation industry singlehandedly provides 71 percent of the jobs to the United States economy. In fact, our coastlines provide 12 times the amount of jobs of the offshore oil industry.

If that is not enough, in 2016, the U.S. Atlantic Ocean economy and California's ocean economy contributed more than $94 billion and $43.5 billion to the country's GDP, respectively, during that period of time. National parks on both coasts and in the eastern Gulf States contributed $6.2 billion to the local economies. And the Department

of Defense has made it abundantly clear that the continuation of the moratorium in the Gulf on oil and gas leasing is essential to vital military readiness activities.

Mr. Speaker, there is widespread bipartisan support for ending offshore drilling.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the entire Florida delegation for the work that they have done, with special emphasis to Ambassador ROONEY, Ms. CASTOR, Ms. SHALALA, and others of our colleagues who have been drilling down on these issues legislatively.

Opposition includes nearly all the coastal Governors; over 2,200 elected officials across the political spectrum; more than 300 municipalities, including all in my district; 47,000 businesses; and 500,000 fishing families.

Mr. Speaker, America needs to conserve energy, safeguard our natural resources, and look to clean energy and innovative ways to build a sustainable energy portfolio. Offshore oil drilling is simply not the answer.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HASTINGS for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, energy is a critical driver of the American economy and quality of life. Its production creates thousands of well-paying jobs. Energy is needed in almost every aspect of our lives, from fueling the trucks that transport our goods to stores, to powering the servers that make the internet possible.

The United States cannot reach or sustain our potential without large-scale access to developing our energy resources, but today, we are debating three bills that put American energy, American quality of life, and American national security at risk.

This majority wants to pass sweeping bans on harnessing domestic energy resources. They want to ban American energy from the Pacific, ban American energy from the Atlantic, ban American energy from Alaska. They want to ban it all, and American families will pay the price.

These bills ignore the economic benefits of domestic energy production. Energy development brings high-paying jobs, facilitates manufacturing and investment, and provides government revenues. Energy development in the United States also makes energy more affordable for everyone.

The average salary paid in the natural gas and oil development fields is $113,000 per year, and the energy industry supports 300,000 jobs in the United States.

These bills also ignore how affordable energy makes a higher standard of living accessible.

I spent this summer, part of it, back home in Arizona. Air-conditioning, of course, is essential in our climate in Arizona, but it is also a major driver of electricity bills. Our electricity bills are very high.

Many of my constituents are retirees living on limited incomes. I want to work to lower their energy costs by expanding American energy development, but instead, my Democratic colleagues, I believe, are doing the opposite.

Domestic oil production has allowed Americans to spend 28 percent less in fuel, resulting in nearly $1,000 in savings per family in 2017 alone. To my constituents, that is a lot of money.

The reality of our current situation in energy exploration is that 94 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States is currently off-limits to offshore exploration and development. We haven't even had a lease auction for areas of the Atlantic Ocean since 1984. We have made substantial gains in exploration technologies, drilling technology, and overall safety since then. Why not even just allow for exploration, to know what resources we have?

We must consider how access to domestic energy resources helps keep our Nation secure. Oil and gas supplies 67 percent of the energy Americans use, and total oil and natural gas consumption is expected to grow over the next 30 years, generating over 60 percent of America's energy. By limiting access to offshore areas containing resources, we risk being dependent on foreign actors, like the Russians for natural gas or Saudi Arabia for oil. In fact, California recently bought billions of dollars of oil from Saudi Arabia, which will benefit the Saudi Arabian royal family.

These bills will weaken our energy and national security.

Mr. Speaker, I do agree with many of my colleagues whom I have spoken with that we should be prudent with future offshore exploration and drilling. We must be mindful of the impact on our military training and testing, especially in Florida. However, we cannot do this with an outright ban. We must take a measured and thoughtful approach.

To make this point, the United States is one of the only countries along the Atlantic that is not actively exploring for energy in those waters. Nations with fewer resources and far less strict environmental regulations are adopting policies to proceed with offshore development, yet these bills before us today would halt all American progress.

I believe in an all-of-the-above energy approach. In my home State of Arizona, this is a reality and necessity. We have to rely on multiple and diverse sources to ensure affordable and reliable energy. I support nuclear, hydroelectric, coal, Sun, wind, and other alternative solutions, but I also support domestic oil and natural gas production.

I point to my State of Arizona. Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station sits just outside my district, generating about 3.3 gigawatts of clean energy for Phoenix and southern California. We also have several natural gas plants, such as the Agua Fria Generating Station. Just last month, I moderated a panel at Arizona State University where we discussed the Salt River Project harnessing rivers to produce hydropower.

An all-of-the-above approach like that in Arizona would benefit American families and their quality of life.

In contrast, the bans that my Democratic colleagues propose would harm the U.S. economy, threaten our national security, and increase energy prices and rates on consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my good friend, just enunciated the number of jobs that the oil and gas industry provides, and the figure that she reported was 300,000. There are 242,000 jobs as a result of solar energy in this country, 102,000 jobs on wind farms in this country, and the coastline that we are talking about provides 12 times the amount of jobs than the offshore oil and gas industry.

Mr. Speaker, I won't be here with you all 20 years from now, but I predict for you that the fossil fuel industry, interestingly enough, the leaders in that industry will own a lot of the solar in this country. It is just a matter of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA), my dear and good friend, and a member of the distinguished Rules Committee.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my good friend and a distinguished Congressman, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and these three bills that protect our coasts and our coastal economies.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to thank my fellow Floridians, Mr. ROONEY and Ms. CASTOR, for introducing the bipartisan legislation that places a permanent moratorium on oil and gas leasing in the eastern Gulf.

Beyond protecting coastal ecosystems, these bills help ensure military readiness, given the long history of military training and activities, particularly in the Gulf.

□ 1245

Offshore drilling is a dirty and dangerous venture that threatens our fragile coastal ecosystems, and in Florida, offshore drilling threatens our very way of life.

Mr. Speaker, millions of tourists come to Florida each year to join us in enjoying our pristine beaches and our clean water. Our livelihoods depend on a healthy and clean marine environment.

Offshore drilling threatens nearly 610,000 jobs and roughly $37.4 billion in GDP in Florida alone. The risk of another catastrophe like Deepwater Horizon is too great to endanger Florida's healthy ocean resources and thriving coastal economies.

In 2018, Mr. Speaker, Floridians spoke out loud and clear. A State constitutional amendment to ban offshore drilling in Florida's waters passed with nearly 70 percent of the vote. In the county where my district is located, Miami-Dade, it passed with nearly 80 percent of the vote.

Simply stated: We don't want offshore drilling. Instead, we should be investing our time and resources in renewable, clean energy that we know creates jobs and sets us on a course to combat climate change.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need offshore drilling, and we don't want offshore drilling.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly just talk about what my colleague, Mr. HASTINGS, said.

He mentioned that there are 242,000 solar energy jobs and 102,000 wind energy jobs, and that is great. Allowing oil and gas exploration is not going to take away those jobs. In fact, jobs in those industries are going to increase just naturally.

However, at this time, with our technology, I know that you need natural gas and other sources to spin up electric plants fast because the technology isn't there to store the energy for when it is needed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that what I don't understand about the bills is we are going to need oil and gas. Why would we want to go back to the seventies-type crisis, oil embargo crisis, when we are reliant on foreign nations that are often hostile to us? I just don't understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY), my friend.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. H.R. 205, the Protecting and Securing Florida's Coastline Act, makes the existing moratorium in the eastern Gulf of Mexico permanent.

I thank Congresswoman CASTOR, our coleader on this bill; Judge HASTINGS; Dr. SHALALA; and the rest of the Florida delegation who have signed up enthusiastically to protect Florida.

Offshore drilling is an existential threat to our tourism economy. Tourism is highly competitive. Any conditions or circumstances which could, however remote or circumstantial, stoke fear of oily beaches or ruined fishing grounds or dead birds will have a significant impact.

Just last November, Florida passed a constitutional amendment banning offshore drilling. The amendment received over 5 million votes and passed with nearly 70 percent of the vote.

Fishing, tourism, and recreation account for $37.4 billion in Florida, including $17.5 billion just from the Gulf Coast, and supports over 600,000 jobs.

Following the Deepwater Horizon disaster, the west coast of Florida lost economic value in both commercial and recreational fishing and in lost tourist visits despite the fact that, as Judge Hastings said, there was no oil that reached there. There was no impact. It is perception becomes reality in a competitive tourist industry.

In addition to the compelling economic need to make the moratorium permanent, the eastern gulf is home to the Gulf Test Range, a 120,000-square-mile military testing range that stretches from the Florida Panhandle to the Keys.

This unimpeded training and testing area is crucial to national security and cannot be carried out anywhere else in the United States or, perhaps, the world. Its vast size allows the testing of hypersonic weapons, combat maneuvers, drone testing, and future operations that will need space for testing and restricted access for classified operations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the majority of this activity is right along the area east of the military mission line at longitude 86 degrees 41 minutes, which we can see right here. This blue line is the military mission line.

As we can see, the military forecast is that the majority of testing is to take place adjacent to the east of this line—not out in here, but right in here, where it is most critical.

I have circled here all of the major bases, including one of the largest ones in the country, Eglin Air Force Base.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to protect both this military mission line and Florida's tourist-based economy by voting ''yes'' on the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), my good friend.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the rule and in opposition to these anti-energy bills.

America leads the world in both oil and natural gas production, and our gas prices are on track to be the lowest in 20 years. We are experiencing, Mr. Speaker, an American energy renaissance.

The oil and gas industry today accounts for over 10 million jobs, and we have the potential to add even more jobs in my State and others. However, this legislation before us today is a jobs killer. It increases our dependence on foreign oil and gas, and it reduces our ability to develop our own natural resources.

In order for us to continue to lead, we need to explore our abundant resources at home. By safely developing America's own energy resources, we can create a more abundant, affordable, and sustainable energy supply, while, at the same time, we can ensure strong protections for the environment.

Not only are there economic concerns, but there are also serious geopolitical implications. As a member of the Helsinki Commission, I know firsthand the national security concerns that come with turning over our share of energy markets.

Russia is the largest exporter of natural gas to the European Union, and they use this to bully our allies and grow their sphere of influence. By divesting our energy production, Washington politicians are handing over opportunities to Russia to expand their energy foothold and increase their influence over our allies. We should be countering Russian influence in any way that we can, not giving up our own economic and geopolitical power.

This opportunity will fade fast. If we don't take advantage of it now, the jobs, the money, and the bright economic future will all go to other countries, making our Nation and our allies more reliant on foreign energy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and on these underlying bills.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), my good friend.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about energy policy; we are here today to talk about jobs and national security; and we are here today to talk about the environment and climate change.

We have three bills that this rule addresses: We have an Alaska bill; we have an eastern Gulf of Mexico bill; and we have an Atlantic bill.

The idea here is that we are going to carry out policies that stop energy production in the United States for the purpose of protecting the environment. That sounds like a laudable goal: Let's protect the environment. I fully agree with that.

Here is the problem: When you look at evidence from the Obama administration, it shows that, by shutting down domestic energy production, it increases greenhouse gas emissions—increases, not decreases. It increases imports of energy from other countries, not decreases. It threatens our national security.

Mr. Speaker, do you want to see how this plays out? Case in point, let's go up to the Northeast last winter.

In the Northeast last winter, because they obstructed and prevented natural gas pipelines from being built into the Northeast to provide cleaner natural gas fuels to help warm these homes, heat these homes, they had to import natural gas from Russia.

The policies that these bills are advancing, all this is is a gift for Vladimir Putin. This is billions of dollars. This is American jobs. You are not

helping the environment. You are not helping the trade deficit.

We, very simply, came in and just said: Do you know what? We want to offer some amendments to help clean these up. Let's help these bills achieve their objectives. We offered 10 amendments. All 10 amendments were rejected by this rule.

If you want to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, fine. I am with you. Let's do that.

If you want to improve the environment, fine. I am with you.

Mr. Speaker, opposition to this rule is necessary. These bills do not achieve the objectives that are set.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the previous speaker that eight Republican amendments were made in order; perhaps none that he offered, but I thought that the rule was particularly fair.

I would also say to him that no oil that is being produced in this country right now is affected by anything having to do with this legislation.

Yesterday, Ambassador ROONEY made it very clear to us in the Rules Committee that, at the present rate of production of oil, we are producing enough oil to go into 66 years of oil production. That is at the present rate, without going anywhere else.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement about energy production today.

I want to remind the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that as we produce energy, we are extracting something. Therefore, new development in these areas is necessary in order to replenish the areas that are producing today.

I also want to remind the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that, if the United States is not providing energy to these countries where we are exporting today, in some cases, countries like Russia come in and fill that void. So it doesn't make sense for us to shut down these areas, to stop these areas, particularly in the eastern Gulf of Mexico where you have adjacent production. You have production attempts in Cuba, production in Mexico.

This doesn't do anything to help to protect this environment. I really think we need to look at this a little bit more carefully.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman had done well until he, in the words of my grandmother, ''stepped on the cutout'' when he talked about the eastern Gulf. I just offer BP as an example of what happens.

If he were to come and go down that coastline with me and see the businesses that went out of business, including all of those in the fishes industry, oysters, the whole coastline has been impacted. We are still suffering the residual.

And I might add, on the floor of the eastern Gulf of Mexico, they call it snow something that is on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's position, but I will be the last man standing on not having oil drilling off the coast of Florida.

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

□ 1300

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If we defeat the previous question, I have an amendment to the rule to prohibit the use of Federal funds for payments in support of campaigns for the offices of Senators or Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to explain the amendment.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mrs. LESKO, for doing a great job representing her constituents in Arizona.

This is an issue that has got to be addressed. As my friend said, though, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer my bill, H.R. 4261.

When the majority of Democrats proposed public financing of campaigns in H.R. 1 at the start of this Congress, I thought it was one of the worst ideas in campaign finance ever. Public financing of campaigns will fill the swamp and any Member that voted for it was voting to fill their own pockets and the pockets of political operatives nationwide.

At first, Democrats tried to use the tax dollars of hardworking Americans to fund their public financing sections of H.R. 1. Remember, H.R. 1 was a 622-page behemoth of a bill that was supposed to get money out of politics that initially had provisions to put public taxpayer dollars into Members of Congress' own campaign coffers.

Imagine, if more people watched C–SPAN, they would have been able to see so many Members of Congress vote to line their own pockets with public tax dollars for their own personal political campaigns.

That is not what my constituents asked us to do when cleaning up Washington. That is not what we should be doing. We need to work together now to make sure that it doesn't ever happen again.

This matching program would have created a six-to-one match of public financing. Well, once the public caught some sense that this was happening, the majority decided to change the way they do this. What they did instead was, they were going to use corporate fines.

Well, that criticism forced them to change it, but also not be able to get funding at the levels that are needed for every Member of Congress to be able to run this new publicly financed campaign. They would have had to subsidize the corporate fines with tax dollars. When the Federal Government fines a corporation that has broken a Federal law, it does so with specific intentions.

Remember, for every dollar that a donor gives to a campaign under the Democrats' plan, you would have gotten six times that in first-tax dollars and then so-called corporate-fine dollars. Imagine a scenario where a pharmaceutical company is fined for corporate malfeasance associated with the opioid epidemic and the resulting funds go not to those actually affected by this horrible epidemic, but, instead, they go to line the pockets and campaign coffers of Members of Congress, politicians.

Not to mention, this form of public financing would bring into question judges' partiality. If they knew a corporation's fine could end up helping their preferred political party, help them win elected office, what is to stop them from determining who specifically then receives the money?

Using taxpayers' dollars or money from corporate fines to publicly support a candidate and start yet another mandatory program, is irresponsible. There are better uses that would be more beneficial to our constituents than putting it back into Congress' own campaign coffers.

Call it what you want to call it, but we are now subsidizing private money with funds from corporate fines through campaign subsidies, and this is simply a money grab for politicians.

Imagine, if every Member of Congress, not counting all candidates in each of the congressional races—just the 435 of us who serve here—receives just $1 million in matched funds from the Federal Government. That is close to half a billion dollars going to just the incumbent politician's campaigns. In districts like mine, where the investment every campaign season is substantially higher, it would be even more.

Welcome to campaign finance socialism.

If the goal is to get money and corruption out of politics, public financing of campaigns is the wrong way to do that.

I thank my colleague from Arizona, and I thank my colleagues who are going to vote to make sure that we don't publicly finance campaigns of anyone in this institution.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, through you, I would advise my good friend from Arizona that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close whenever she is.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I am also ready to close.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the bills before us today, I believe, and many believe, are harmful to American jobs, Americans' quality of life, and Americans' security. These bills, like quite a few of the other bills passed by the Democrat majority, will die in the Senate.

These are just more messaging bills, but the message underlying these bills is the false notion that domestic energy production is harmful. I cannot disagree more. Domestic energy production creates hundreds of thousands of well-paying jobs, lowers electricity bills, and prevents us from being dependent on foreign countries for oil and gas.

As The Washington Post opined last year: ''As long as the economy requires oil, it must come from somewhere, and better the United States than a country with much weaker environmental oversight.''

In a bipartisan op-ed I have here, written by Jim Webb, a former Democratic Senator, and Jim Nicholson, it notes that: '' . . . because of current U.S. policy, major energy investments are moving to countries like Mexico where regulations could lag even farther behind ours.

''Over the last four years, as we have debated whether to open up carefully selected new areas for exploration on our side of the Gulf of Mexico, Mexico has leased over 20 million new acres on its side. The country's total acreage leased in the Gulf is now over 30 million acres, double that of the U.S.'s 14.7 million.''

Utilizing America's energy sources is a commonsense step for America's energy future. America must make safe and full use of all of its energy resources for our economy and for our national security. Much of that energy could be from offshore.

We should encourage an expansion of domestic energy production, but, instead, unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues in the majority seek to limit it.

There are numerous reasons why offshore natural gas and oil are important to the United States and why we should reject these bills:

One, 67 percent of the energy Americans use in total oil and natural gas consumption is expected to grow over 30 years.

Two, U.S. offshore has accounted for more than 1 million barrels of oil per day for the past 20 years.

Three, by 2035, the natural gas and oil industry could create more than 1.9 million new jobs.

Four, there are 89.9 billion barrels of oil and 327.49 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, potential energy resources, yet to be discovered in the United States' Outer Continental Shelf.

Five, there is about $900 million annually in funding for national parks and conservation programs from offshore development through the LWCF.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question, a ''no'' vote on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my friend just said that the three measures that we offer are going to be dead in the Senate.

One of the regrets in this country is that virtually everything that we are doing in the House of Representatives goes over to the Grim Reaper's office and dies on his desk. And that includes substantial measures having to do with prescription drugs, sensible gun regulations, and a variety of measures, adding up to close to 75 that are on his desk now that could be sent to the President of the United States.

I would imagine that we are going to continue down this path of when we offer sensible measures that will help the United States citizens, that one person is going to hold them up for whatever reason, and that includes sensible gun regulation, such as background checks that more than 90 percent of the American people want us to pass.

I don't know how the Senate works, but I do know that the Senate ain't working right now, and it is being held up by one person.

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough to oppose drilling off one's State's coastline. Oil spills travel and climate change knows no borders.

Our Nation's coastlines are vital, recreational, economic, and ecological treasures that will be polluted by expansion of offshore drilling. Let's underscore that all of the drilling that is going on in the Gulf right now is not affected by this particular measure. What we are saying is, no more. Please, don't give us your oil on our beaches, BP, and others in that industry.

House and Senate Republicans can stick their heads in the tar sands all they want, but pumping more fossil fuels out of the ocean and into the atmosphere will not sustain the American economy nor provide the economic prosperity that will benefit all Americans.

As I said earlier, I won't be with you 20 years from now, but I can assure you that during that period of time, we will have electrically driven cars. We will have moved substantially in the solar, and wind, and thermal areas in this country, and it will benefit us immensely as well as benefit this planet.

I can't imagine that we will have fossil fuel in 2050, and I can't imagine that our children would not be worse off if we did.

Now, one thing that you can be assured, the people with the money are going to control the deal. So when we move to solar energy, the existing energy mongrels are going to be about the business of owning solar energy. It is just that simple. They will know when the transition is going to take place.

In the meantime, what they want to continue to do, is to pollute the environment that we live in, destroy the habitat of the ocean that is provided for mammals that are there as well as fish and a variety of other spinoffs in our ocean activity.

We have polluted the ocean in a very bad way in many forms. We don't need to add to that with further development at this point.

I might add, America is the leading producer of oil and gas in the world. We are exporting oil and gas. Therefore, I don't see that we are suffering a single bit as we transition from fossil fuels to solar, wind, thermal, and other forms of energy that will be developed along the way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and a ''yes'' vote on the previous question.

□ 1315

The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 548

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4261) to prohibit the use of federal funds for payments in support of campaigns for election for the offices of Senator or Representative of Congress. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4261.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair