

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am a New York Representative whose district is about 10 miles from the World Trade Center, and I lost many friends and constituents in that horrendous attack.

Many years ago, President Roosevelt stood right here in this Chamber and talked about a day of infamy regarding the attack on Pearl Harbor. Certainly, also the day of these attacks was a day of infamy, September 11, 2001.

I remember days and weeks after the attacks you would just walk in my district and see burned papers sort of dropping from the clouds. It is really something that we will remember forever. We remember the brave responders. We remember the people that gave their lives so that others can live. It also told us that we in the United States have to continue to fight tyranny, have to continue to remember those poor 3,000 souls whose lives ended. It could have been any one of us. They lost their lives.

So I think that this is a time for all Americans to pause and say we cherish our values. We remember the people who lost their lives, and we will always fight against oppression wherever it rears its ugly head. God bless America.

#### RECOGNIZING OFFICER KAREN BROWN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Security Agency police officer Ms. Karen Brown for being named the 2019 Federal Law Enforcement Training Center Honor Graduate of the Year. The most prestigious award for FLETC students, Ms. Brown excelled with high marks in academics, physical fitness, and firearms training.

Originally from Ohio, Ms. Brown has worked at the NSA for the last 15 years serving in a number of roles at the agency; personal security, polygraph examination, counterintelligence threat examination, and more.

We thank Ms. Brown for her service to our Nation. A ceremony was held at FLETC to reward her accomplishments on Tuesday, August 27.

In addition to Ms. Brown's great work, I want to thank all of the students, recent graduates, and instructors at FLETC for their commitment to our Nation in bettering their workforce training. The Federal Law Enforcement Training Camp in Glynn County truly does an outstanding job in getting their students the necessary skills to thrive in any situation they may face in the field.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CICILLINE) 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 11, 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 11, 2019, at 10:53 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1881.

That the Senate passed S. 2035.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

#### COASTAL AND MARINE ECONOMIES PROTECTION ACT

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials on H.R. 1941.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 548 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House on the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1941.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1224

##### 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 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, with Mr. CUELLAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

The first question is, what do all governors, Republican and Democratic, along the entire East Coast and along the entire West Coast of the United States and over 330 municipalities and counties from these States all have in

common? You know what they have in common? They are all opposed to expanding offshore oil and gas development off their shores.

Today we are here to ensure that these coasts, the Atlantic and the Pacific, receive the assurance and the protection that they deserve. H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act would permanently protect the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts from offshore oil and gas drilling. From Maine down to Florida, from Washington to California, over 3,000 miles of the United States' coasts are threatened by the fossil fuel industry-driven agenda, which is driven by the Trump administration.

One of President Trump's first actions upon taking office was mandating the development of a new and totally unnecessary 5-year plan for offshore oil and gas lease sales. In January 2018, former Interior Secretary Zinke released a draft of that plan, which proposed opening more than 90 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf to oil and gas development. This proposal included the entirety of America's Atlantic and Pacific Coasts, and if enacted, drilling could endanger more than 72,000 miles of U.S. shorelines.

Expectedly, there was immediate pushback from citizens, elected officials, governors, business leaders, all who understood that their coastal communities are incompatible with offshore oil and gas.

The public knows that bringing in industry as risky and as dirty as oil and gas to the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts is dangerous on many levels. Our oceans sustain a rich diversity of marine life, and they provide immense value to America's coastal communities by helping to generate billions of dollars in economic output and by supporting millions of jobs.

For example, thriving fish stocks and healthy marine mammals off the coast of New Jersey, Maryland, and Florida support tackle shops, whale watching tours, and a massive seafood industry. And oil-free beaches and bays in Virginia and the Carolinas drive business for local restaurants, for vacation rentals, and for outfitters.

But coastal residents are not the only ones who will benefit from protecting these areas. Some of our Nation's most majestic national park units belonging to all Americans are along our coast, including Acadia, Biscayne, Cape Hatteras, and Point Reyes. People from all walks of life and diverse backgrounds and from both political parties cherish these special places, and they rely on healthy oceans, clean beaches, and the abundant fish and wildlife that come with them.

The inevitable spills and the variety of other onshore and offshore impacts from oil and gas drilling have no place along our East and West Coasts. Over one million people are employed by the tourism and recreation industries along the East Coast. These are real

jobs that exist now and will only grow if we continue to treat our oceans and coasts with care. That is over four times as many jobs as the industry-generated fantasies that come with opening the entire Atlantic seaboard to drilling rigs.

Four times as many jobs would be at risk from the industrial facilities that would be built along the coast. Four times as many jobs would be at risk from the chronic pollution and pipeline spills that are widespread with offshore oil and gas. And four times as many jobs would be at risk from a catastrophic blowout, like the one we saw in the Gulf of Mexico only 9 years ago.

□ 1230

None of these facts or the outcry from concerned citizens have influenced a Trump administration that is laser-focused on doing the bidding of the oil and gas industry. Instead of protecting our coasts, President Trump and Secretary Bernhardt have played politics and now are hiding their plan to drill near our communities.

In January 2018, immediately after the release of the draft leasing program, then-Secretary Zinke met with then-Governor of Florida RICK SCOTT at the Tallahassee airport and tweeted that he was removing Florida from the leasing program. However, it turned out that this was nothing more than a ploy meant to boost the political prospects of a Republican Senate candidate.

First Florida was in, then it was out, then it was in again, and now nobody except Secretary Bernhardt and President Trump knows for sure.

For 2½ years, this administration has based its offshore drilling decisions on politics, not on the needs or the concerns of coastal communities.

In April, the administration announced that its offshore leasing plans are now on hold due to a recent court decision that is related to Alaska. But that is only a short-term reprieve. At any moment, the administration can restart its efforts to auction off our Nation's marine resources, which will undoubtedly happen if the President were to get a second term.

Coastal communities need assurance that their businesses, beaches, and way of life will not be sacrificed to the fossil fuel industry by the Trump administration.

H.R. 1941 provides our Atlantic and Pacific constituents, including those along Florida's Atlantic Coast, the necessary protections from the dangers of offshore oil and gas, and it deserves this body's full support.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we are here on September 11. It is an anniversary of an event that has been impactful for all of us and has definitely changed our country. We cannot forget that. Hopefully, as a Na-

tion, we can learn from that experience and from the dedication that people gave during and after that particular experience.

Mr. Chair, we are here in what the Democrats have called their energy week with their energy week proposals. Their proposals are three very disjointed bills not based on science but based on the idea of paying off specific political interest groups for political purposes.

Earl Weaver, when he used to coach the Baltimore Orioles, loved to bait the umpires. One time, he went out to the umpire and said: Is this as good as it gets, or are you going to get better?

Of course, they threw him out of the game for saying that.

However, today, I want to turn to the Democrats and say: Guys, is this as good as it gets, or are you going to get better? Because what we have before us is not an energy policy, it is an energy nonpolicy.

When I was in college, gas was \$0.25 a gallon. I remember driving my car into those gas stations, and there would be a kid who would be my age or younger coming out and filling up my tank, cleaning the windshields, and checking the oil and the tires. Then, they gave me either a plate or a towel for showing up.

I then went to Europe for 2 years, and when I came back, the oil embargo had hit. No one came out to help me. Everything was self-service. No one gave me any more towels or dishes. Gas prices in the embargo era were going up to the astounding almost \$1.40 a gallon, which we could not believe.

Our new President at the time put on a sweater, started a fire in the fireplace, and came before the American people and told us, basically: Get used to it. Live with less. Take it as an honor to be cold in the dark. That is the process.

Fortunately, this country didn't go along with that, nor did the industry go along with that. Instead of being a country in which we were dependent upon OPEC countries, 60 to 70 percent of our energy coming from OPEC—and I am sorry, that is not what an Irish chicken does; that is a cartel. That is a cartel that was very against the interests of the United States. Instead of being that which was in the position to be bullied not by a major power but a secondary power into thinking they could extort this country into changing our foreign policy simply by exploiting our energy vulnerabilities, America changed, and instead, we decided that would not be our policy.

We came up with a process of not only expanding our energy production in the United States, but we expanded it in a way that produced energy more efficiently; that used it in a cleaner fashion; that used a smaller footprint to do it; that made us energy independent to the point where we could be, instead of an importing country, an exporting country in the concept of energy; and that energy was used not

only to support the United States' independence but also to support our allies and be able to confront negative forces like Russia, which was using energy as a political weapon and still would like to use energy as a political weapon.

Now, we are faced with three bills here today, one much different than the other two. But the end result of the Democratic vision of energy presented to us in this energy week is basically to use the rearview mirror and take us backward 50 years into the past, where we go back to the time when our economy was fragile, and our enemies thought they could take advantage of our energy dependency, and they could do that to bully the United States.

That is not what the process should be in creating an energy future for this particular country.

Mr. Chair, we have three bills that will be before us today. None of them are scientifically grounded. All of them are actually political, paying off political experts, taking science and basically throwing it in the trash and saying okay—which the majority can do. They have the votes to do it but don't have the audacity to stand up and say this administration or this side of the aisle doesn't believe in science because these particular issues are politically motivated.

There is no logic to what we are doing. In our committee, it was wonderful. We had the entire committee on the same day that the first bill was voted out also voting for LWCF. Everyone loved the Land and Water Conservation Fund, so we wanted to make this permanent. We wanted to triple the amount of money that we were putting into that fund. At the same time that we voted to triple the amount of money in that fund, we also voted for bills that would basically cut the revenues from those areas that produce the money to go into the fund in the first place, and we call that logical.

I call this hypocrisy as well because there is the vested interest, as the majority here was saying, that Governors in their States should have the ability to make decisions on Federal waters that are not within the boundaries of their States but in the same breath saying that Governors in the interior States should not have the ability to have decisions made on Federal lands within our States.

I am sorry. That is pure hypocrisy.

This is a lack of focus. It is a lack of focus when, a year ago, the Democratic leadership asked the President to find a way to cut down the cost of energy, oil and gas, to use his personal contacts to cut down the cost of that, and then we are bringing bills in here today that will drive up the costs, which will cut down our possibility of doing that in the future.

You can do it, but there is a hypocrisy to the very essence of what is going on.

Unfortunately, the three bills that will be thrown out here today by the

Democrats as their policy will have the net effect of destroying jobs and harming our economy, potentially turning us to an economic tailspin. That can happen.

More importantly, it is nice to have a visual contrast, because this morning, Republican leaders, led by Mr. SCALISE and Ms. CHENEY and several others, introduced a comprehensive energy package, an energy package that is for all energy, all of the above, both fossil fuel and alternative, one that will grow our economy, which will create more jobs, which will give a logical standard of what we should do going forward with a clear view.

The clear view of what Republicans would like to do with having a logical, comprehensive approach is in vast contrast to three disjointed, dispirited, nonscientific bills that simply want to pay off political communities.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act.

My bipartisan bill permanently protects the Atlantic and the Pacific Coasts from the threats of offshore oil and gas drilling. It reflects the tremendous importance that Members of both parties place on healthy shorelines and the State and local economies that depend on them. This bill acknowledges that if we don't act, drilling rigs could soon appear off of our beaches.

Folks from up and down the coast of my district understand that opposition to offshore drilling is not a partisan issue. Whether it be a first grader like Anna Caroline of upstate South Carolina who rallied 70 signatures to stop offshore drilling or a group of mayors like Billy Keyserling, Pat O'Neil, Tim Goodwin, Jimmy Carroll, or John Tecklenburg who worked tirelessly to defend our coastline, South Carolinians want to protect our community from the disastrous consequences that result from offshore drilling. The Lowcountry is a force to be reckoned with, and we stand firm in our opposition to drilling off of our shoreline.

Down in the Lowcountry, we know that offshore drilling would ruin our economy, our vibrant natural resources, and our unique way of life. That is why opposition to offshore drilling is not a partisan issue, and I am proud to work with both Democrats and Republicans to get this done.

Offshore drilling and the booming tourism industry that we have in the Lowcountry are mutually exclusive pursuits. Tourism in the Palmetto State is a \$22.6 billion-a-year industry and supports 1 in every 10 jobs in our State. South Carolina's tourism industry holds a great deal more promise for statewide economic prosperity.

I want to take a moment to also consider how natural disasters would im-

pact our State if we were to drill offshore. We have seen spills from onshore infrastructure in the path of a hurricane. Hurricane Katrina is the best-known example, with roughly 8 million gallons of oil spilled.

Last week, Hurricane Dorian was a sobering reminder that hurricanes and natural disasters can change course in a moment's notice and inflict tremendous damage on communities in the path of a storm.

If Charleston, Hilton Head, or Beaufort had onshore energy infrastructure similar to Port Fourchon or Galveston, the potential for a major spill or environmental calamity from Dorian's destruction would have skyrocketed.

Opposition to offshore drilling is an economic one, but it is also a moral one. The book of Genesis teaches us to be stewards and caretakers of all creation. I find it unconscionable that we can knowingly damage our waters and, consequentially, our marine life for such a pursuit.

Offshore drilling is reckless; it is harmful; and it is absolutely disruptive to the communities that we call home.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my bill that will permanently safeguard the First District of South Carolina and coastal communities across this Nation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), who has unusual socks on today and who has been through these wars before.

□ 1245

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this legislation which undermines the United States' energy dominance and makes us strategically weaker as a nation.

I remember Admiral Mike Mullen saying there is no national security without energy security. We get that by exploring and developing the natural resources we are blessed with in this Nation.

Currently, 67 percent of the energy used in our Nation is generated from oil and gas; 94 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf is off limits to exploration. The Department of the Interior projects that an estimated 89.9 billion barrels and 327 trillion cubic feet of natural gas has yet to be discovered on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Opening up the entire Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf could support nearly 265,000 new, higher paying jobs, \$22 billion a year in private investment, and generate almost \$6 billion in new revenue for the government within 20 years of the initial lease. Mr. CUNNINGHAM's bill blocks \$2.2 billion from going to schools, roads, and conservation efforts in South Carolina.

Through revenue sharing, oil and natural gas development are a critical source of funding for many valuable programs. Over the past 10 years, royalty payments from lease sales have generated \$73 billion for the Federal Government. Much of this money goes

into conservation programs, such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Many people on the other side of the aisle that will support this bill also supported the reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

In 2018, the LWCF received \$893 million in offshore revenues. South Carolina received \$1.5 million in 2018 from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Oil and gas royalties totaled about 90 percent of the LWCF's funding. Congress has already voted to permanently reauthorize in this Congress.

How do the supporters of this bill intend to make up nearly all of the funding for a program that they supported that they would be cutting with this bill? They would do it by taxing the hardworking American citizens, I guess.

Blocking offshore development would not only significantly harm our economy, but it would increase dependence on our adversaries for energy.

Just in 2018, there was a Russian LNG tanker that arrived in the Boston harbor. It traveled 4,500 miles from Russia to the U.S. when the United States has been the number one producer of natural gas since 2009.

New England relies on foreign countries for about 20 percent of its natural gas. Why? Because we don't have the pipeline capacity running from the Marcellus shale up to New England to provide American natural gas, so they are having to buy from Russia.

Development of our resources on the Outer Continental Shelf, opening up areas that were blocked by past administrations to energy development, exploration, and, ultimately, production, provides money for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and it provides national security for places like New England and lessens their dependence on a foreign source of natural gas. And that foreign source, ladies and gentlemen, is Russia.

Let this be a lesson in what is in store for this country if this bill is adopted. This bill leverages our adversary, Russia, while undermining our security.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank the sponsor of this legislation, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), and Mr. GRIJALVA for all of their work on this legislation.

I want to say that I do think a permanent moratorium on oil and gas drilling in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans' Outer Continental Shelf planning areas is something that we must do. It doesn't matter whether you represent the Atlantic or the Pacific Coast communities. A vote for a permanent moratorium on oil and gas development along these shores is a vote for our country's economic vitality.

I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the last two speakers talk about national security and

how we don't have an energy plan. The bottom line is that, if you look at the consequences to the economy of the country in these coastal communities from something like the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster, it was a 10-year projected economic loss of \$8.7 billion in fisheries from Texas to Florida, including 22,000 lost jobs just for fisheries.

Think of the impact on the tourism industry with the impact on local businesses if we have a spill of this magnitude. Tourism is now the number one industry in my State of New Jersey.

And don't tell me that we don't have an energy plan. In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we are very much in favor of all kinds of energy options—natural gas, nuclear power, whatever it happens to be—and we certainly have moved towards energy independence by having more natural gas and more production of oil.

All we are saying here today is that, when you talk about offshore drilling in the Atlantic and the Pacific, if you weigh any benefits that might come either in jobs or in money that comes back to the Land and Conservation, whatever, you cannot possibly compare the economic loss that we would have from a major oil spill to whatever gain you have from this relatively small amount of oil that is going to be captured by these oil companies in offshore drilling on the Atlantic and the Pacific Coasts.

After the BP oil spill—I was on the Natural Resources Committee at the time—there were recommendations that were put together by a bipartisan commission. Not all of those were adopted. But even with those recommendations, in the 7 years following the Deepwater Horizon tragedy, there were 34 additional oil spills of more than 2,000 gallons each.

There is no way to stop these oil spills from happening. They happen on a regular basis. The further out you go, the more chance there is that you are going to have a spill, and we cannot risk that.

The Jersey shore has already experienced a historic disaster in the past few years. It was called Hurricane Sandy. We don't need a man-made disaster that is going to shut down our businesses, cripple our housing market, harm our health, or hurt our environment. The ocean is strained too much by too much trash and disposal of plastics and the climate crisis that triggered an increase in sea temperatures and acidification.

In fact, we don't have to choose between a clean ocean and energy production. Any energy we harness off the coast could come increasingly from clean, renewable sources like offshore wind.

I am not saying that renewables are the only alternative. We still have to have fossil fuels, there is no question. But the damage that comes to our local economies cannot possibly compare to whatever jobs you think are going to be created or whatever money

you think is going to come from this offshore drilling. It is miniscule in comparison to the economic impact to our area.

So don't talk to me about jobs and loss of jobs when you see the loss of jobs that occurred after BP and could occur to our shores. There is absolutely no comparison, gentlemen. I have to say that over and over again.

Now, we have put 1-year annual moratoriums. We passed an amendment that I had in the appropriations bill, Interior appropriations, to have a moratorium on an annual basis in the appropriations bill, but it is high time that we have a permanent moratorium. It is not enough to just address this annually through the appropriations process.

Mr. Chairman, I want to particularly commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). I was actually in his district, and I just heard unanimous praise of his effort to stop this drilling.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, once again, I appreciate the opportunity to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), someone who realizes that not only does the base bill stop drilling, but if you add one of the amendments they have, you are going to stop any kind of seismic activity that would allow alternative activity to be developed in these sources, as well.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1941, a bill that would permanently block responsible oil and gas development in the Atlantic and Pacific planning areas.

As a Representative from a district that has overwhelming amounts of Federal land, I often find myself engaged with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about the importance of allowing local leaders to be able to manage the lands that are around them, making decisions about what happens on those public lands that surround their communities.

The argument I am met with is that public lands belong to all Americans, to benefit all Americans.

And it is true, the responsible energy development that happens on public lands in my district benefits all Americans in the form of reliable and low-cost energy sources, but we are here today debating a bill that would put the wishes of some States to close off submerged lands under Federal land jurisdictions ahead of the interests of all Americans.

When it comes to local control, why should local coastal States lead the way while landlocked Western States are told time and again that the Federal Government knows what is best?

I have been a longtime advocate for an all-of-the-above energy plan in the U.S. This means wind, solar, geothermal, hydropower, natural gas, oil, oil shale, and minerals.

An InsideClimate News article from January of last year outlined the investments offshore oil and gas compa-

nies are making in wind energy due to market demand and to the unique position that they are in, having already made significant onshore infrastructure investments.

According to a 2017 Wood Mackenzie study, annual revenues from wind and solar could represent one-twelfth of the revenues in oil and gas by 2035 as some major oil and gas companies seize opportunities in the wind power market.

If the goal of my friends on the other side of the aisle is to reduce our country's reliance on fossil fuels, why push policies that cut off the source of the investment of oil and gas companies that are making renewable energy? We should be supporting industry and market-led shifts to renewable energy, not imposing drastic policies like H.R. 1941 that hamstringing these efforts.

Finally, earlier this year, the House and Senate overwhelmingly passed a public lands package that permanently authorized the Land and Water Conservation Fund. All States benefit from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, so we can't ignore the fact that the bill we are debating today would cut off the source of funding for the program, which, as we all know, is offshore oil and gas revenues.

There have been many calls from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to be able to pass a measure that will provide for mandatory funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. How can we push for mandatory Land and Water Conservation Fund funding and, at the same time, advocate for a bill that completely cuts off Land and Water Conservation Fund sources?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the underlying bill.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act, to ban new offshore drilling along the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts.

My district is home to over 50 miles of beautiful California coastline. It is home to some of the world's premier marine research institutions, not to mention some of the best surfing in the country.

In San Diego and Orange Counties, the ocean economy accounts for \$7.7 billion and sustains more than 140,000 jobs in coastal tourism and recreation. All it will take to jeopardize those jobs is a massive spill like the one we saw off the coast of Santa Barbara in 2015, which poured 142,000 gallons of crude oil into the water and onto beaches across southern California. That is why the people I represent have made their voices heard loud and clear: No more drilling off our coast.

We can't allow the fossil fuel industry and their friends in the Trump administration to exploit our oceans for their own profit, roll back safety regulations that help prevent spills, and threaten hundreds of thousands of jobs.

I expect we will hear a lot more from my friends across the aisle, many of whom represent landlocked districts, who claim there is nothing to worry about. Well, they should know that the folks who actually live in coastal communities won't stop fighting to protect our oceans and our jobs.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), our new Member in his first term here.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I come from the Commonwealth of Virginia, a Commonwealth which is rich in natural resources. We have an abundant supply of energy sources, but this legislation would destroy the untapped potential for research and investment in oil and gas resources off our coast.

This bill would stifle innovation, prevent job creation, and severely limit the ability of our Nation to realize its full potential of achieving long-term energy independence.

Studies have shown that exploring offshore oil and natural gas resources would bring thousands of jobs to Virginia and significantly boost its economy.

□ 1300

Earlier this spring I traveled with Congressman SCALISE and a delegation of Members to his district in Louisiana, and helicoptered off into the Gulf of Mexico where I was able to see firsthand the great strides that have been made in energy exploration, technology, and innovation, and the great benefits that have accrued to Louisiana: Louisiana schools, Louisiana roads, and port projects as a result.

The amazing developments in ensuring that energy resources can be explored and extracted safely and with minimal impact to our environment, demonstrated to me that similar efforts can be achieved back home in the waters off the coast of Virginia, and that our environmentally sensitive areas would be protected for future generations to enjoy, while we can lower energy costs for residents and businesses across our great Commonwealth.

H.R. 1941 would block millions of dollars from going to Virginia and other coastal States. If South Carolina doesn't want the money, fine, but the Federal Government should not be in the business of halting Virginia and, in turn, America's economic growth. Failing to give States like mine the ability to explore the resources off our coast would be a grave disservice to my constituents, our Commonwealth, and our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act.

Mr. Chair, the administration's proposed 5-year plan for expanded oil and gas leasing would pose significant danger to our Nation's coastal waters which are home to thousands of plant and animal species that rely on a well-balanced marine ecosystem.

According to Oceana, oil and gas exploration could have untold effects on fish and marine wildlife, from decreasing fish catches, to increase stranding or beaching of marine mammals.

On top of this, our oceans are an enormous driver of our States' economies. In my home State of Rhode Island, ocean industries such as fishing, tourism, and recreation account for nearly \$2 billion in annual economic activity and support more than 41,000 jobs.

Throughout New England, it accounts for more than \$17 billion annually. Our States cannot afford to risk the dangers posed to our oceans and coasts by the administration's misguided proposal to expand oil and gas drilling in the Atlantic. We cannot afford to sit by and watch the President plunder our oceans for the benefit of the big oil companies at the expense of polluting our oceans, endangering fishing and tourism industries, and harming coastal communities.

I was proud to introduce legislation earlier this year, the New England Coastal Protection Act, which would prohibit drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf off of the coast of the New England States, which I am proud to say has the support of every Member of Congress from New England, and which is incorporated in this bill before the House today.

It is imperative that this country pursue a cleaner, more sustainable energy future which protects our oceans and coastlines, stimulates innovation, and spurs job growth.

I strongly urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST), who happens to be the Republican co-chair of the House Congressional Steel Caucus.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, for years, we have been told that we live in a resource-poor Nation. We were also told that the domestic oil and gas reserves were depleted. But, today, we know how wrong those predictions are.

America is now the world leader in energy development. But don't forget about the jobs. Oil and gas production is a jobs multiplier. According to recent studies, more than 10 million American jobs can be attributed to oil and gas production. For each drilling and oil job, many more are created in manufacturing, transportation, and service industries.

In my district, the U.S. Steel Granite City Works facility produces the steel for Oil Country Tubular Goods. These products are used in oil and gas production. These are good-paying jobs with great benefits.

In addition to the steel jobs in Granite City, approximately 10,000 Illinois manufacturers have jobs that have oil and gas industry ties. According to some estimates, an additional 1 million manufacturing jobs could be created through oil and gas development.

We need to think about this as the political fringes try to shove the Green New Deal down our throats.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his work on this and for yielding me the time.

Today I rise in support of the Coastal Marine Economies Protection Act and to defend Maine's coastline for future generations.

This summer, I was blessed to, once again, become a grandmother. With the birth of my new grandson, I am now lucky enough to be the grandmother of four. All four of my grandchildren played in and around the ocean this summer, the Gulf of Maine, just as their parents have done and so many other Mainers do every summer.

The Gulf of Maine is an irreplaceable natural resource that is a draw for millions of tourists each year, and it is critical to the Maine economy. It should not be exploited for oil and drilling.

The climate crisis has already taken a toll on our waters. It has caused ocean acidification and rising sea levels, and the warming of the ocean has put Maine's vibrant fishing industries in peril.

Drilling for fossil fuels in the Gulf of Maine when we should be investing in renewable energy, is like trying to put out a fire by dousing it with kerosene.

I believe it is our duty as elected leaders to leave this Nation better than we found it. That means ensuring we preserve our oceans for our children and our grandchildren, and we fight this climate crisis with all we have got.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Maine.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting H.R. 1941, because sacrificing our coastline to further this Nation's dependence on fossil fuels is nothing short of irresponsible.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to this bill and the other two natural resources bills that we will be considering this week.

Let me start by saying that it is unfortunate that we are in this position today. One of the predominant reasons for this disappointment is that I, like many of my colleagues, both support

energy development, while looking after our natural and ecological resources.

I love my district dearly. I was born and raised there. I have lived there all of my life and will continue to live there the rest of my life. I value the beautiful coastline that we have in my district.

But blanket bans instituted by these bills across the Atlantic, Pacific, Gulf, and Arctic are misguided and are, quite plainly, the wrong approach.

In January of last year, I raised concerns with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management about how this plan would affect Georgia and my constituents. In April of this year, after the Georgia General Assembly passed a resolution opposing energy exploration in Federal waters off of Georgia, I sent a letter to Secretary Bernhardt requesting he exclude Georgia from consideration under this plan.

Mr. Chair, I have taken public service seriously for my entire life. When I was elected to serve the people of the First District of Georgia, I knew that I would be representing the will of my constituents up here. That is why I have been firm in my stance that Georgia be removed from consideration due to concerns from the State legislature.

But while my request to remove Georgia from consideration under this plan stands, I firmly believe it would be unwise and counterproductive to move forward with this blanket ban on U.S. Federal waters.

Knowing these bills would be coming to the floor, I knew I needed to do something to support the request I heard in the district that waters off of Georgia be removed. That is why I, in order to abide by my commitment to my constituents in our community, submitted three amendments to the Rules Committee.

Unfortunately, my amendments, which would empower States to decide what is best for them, remove Georgia from consideration, and address undersea national security, were not accepted by my colleagues across the aisle.

Let me be clear. This wasn't a rejection of including the amendments in the bill. This was a rejection of the ability to even debate them.

My colleagues across the aisle who had championed the will of the States to decide what is best for them when it comes to this topic, would not let my amendments move forward. For those who were so opposed to energy development offshore, I didn't even have the opportunity to have an amendment removing Georgia from consideration debated on the floor of this House.

Mr. Chair, it is really unfortunate that we are voting on these bills which would sacrifice tens of thousands of jobs and millions in economic benefits for political grandstanding.

To step back on domestic energy development is to promote foreign energy consumption. I can still remember when the United States was held hostage to Middle Eastern resources, and we can't allow that to happen again.

While I believe Georgia should be removed from consideration, these bills are not the solution. I oppose these three bills, and I hope my colleagues will actually work with us on real solutions rather than promoting messaging bills.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, chairman, and ranking member, I rise today on behalf of our oceans and the communities, economies and ecosystems they support.

My home State of New Jersey boasts a multibillion dollar commercial and fishing industry. That's 50,000 jobs and \$7 billion every year. Potential spills from oil and gas development imperil every one of these jobs and every one of those industries. That is 50,000 jobs and \$7 billion a year, not to mention the threat to exacerbating climate change.

An oil spill could trigger even greater devastation to the nearly 500,000 jobs supported by our State's tourism industry. Visits to the beautiful shore generates \$16.6 billion in wages and adds \$5.5 billion to the State's tax coffers. Too much is at stake.

We cannot auction off our environment. We can't auction off our economy, and we sure as heck can't auction off our future to the highest bidder.

We need to move away from dirty fossil fuels that would forever change the character of our coasts for the worse. We need to protect the Atlantic Coast by permanently banning offshore oil and gas drilling.

Mr. Chairman, we need a concrete plan of action like this because the climate is changing in a way that threatens our national security, or ecosystems, and our economy.

Thanks to H.R. 1941—and I commend the sponsors—the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act, we are acting to permanently protect the Atlantic from offshore oil and gas drilling right now. I thank the chairman, Mr. Chair, and the ranking member for this bill.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chair, I rise today because I wholeheartedly support the Coastal and Marine Economy Protection Act, authored by my good friend, Congressman CUNNINGHAM.

This bill does what seems obvious to almost everyone. It bans offshore drilling in the Atlantic Ocean. It is an issue that brings together business groups, environmental groups, sportsmen groups, and many, many others. It is an issue that transcends party lines.

In my district, we had a press conference in support of this legislation and banning, and we had Republicans, Democrats, Independents, businesspeople, as well as environmentalists all together.

In south Jersey, our coast is our lifeblood. It is everything. It is our econ-

omy, it is our culture, and it is our way of life.

Our fisheries and tourism industry are worth nearly \$50 billion a year, supporting well over half a million jobs statewide. If an oil spill would occur on our coastline, our beaches, natural resources, and coastal properties would be wiped out in a heartbeat.

Our fishermen, casino workers, hospitality industry, restaurants, and small businesses would all, each and every one, suffer.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1941.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

□ 1315

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I thank Representative LOWENTHAL for his leadership.

Today, I rise in support of this legislation by Representative CUNNINGHAM to ban offshore oil drilling in both the Atlantic and Pacific. This would apply to new offshore oil drilling. Such oil drilling is both dangerous and harms coastal economies.

My congressional district spans the coast of Los Angeles from Palos Verdes to Malibu. Its natural beauty is rivaled by few, and the tourism, recreation, and other ocean-related industries flourish because of it.

Just a few years ago, in 2015, an oil pipeline ruptured in Santa Barbara to the north of my district, spilling 100,000 gallons of oil into the ocean, killing wildlife, and forcing closure of beaches in my district as their oil flowed down. This oil spill can affect large pieces of land and our environment, and our economy suffered.

H.R. 1941 is a forward-thinking bill that will protect California's coast and help turn us away from fossil fuels. At a time when tackling the climate crisis is absolutely critical, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I thank Mr. BISHOP for his leadership as well.

I rise in strong support of this bill introduced by Mr. CUNNINGHAM from South Carolina and two other bills on the floor this week that will be considered. All three are bipartisan bills.

I thank Mr. CUNNINGHAM for his leadership on this particular issue.

A permanent moratorium on offshore oil and gas development in pristine, untouched areas will help protect ecosystems and economies all along our Nation's Atlantic and Pacific Coasts. The other bills we will be considering this week will prevent oil and gas drilling along the Gulf Coast of Florida and



protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

The Trump administration is forcing a false choice between energy security and the health and safety of our coastal and Arctic environments. If we fail to protect vulnerable coastal and Arctic ecosystems, then we put at risk the livelihoods of millions of Americans in those communities that depend on their continued health and abundance.

In coastal communities on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the Gulf of Mexico, tourism, outdoor recreation, and fishing are crucial to their economies. In Alaska, the Gwich'in people rely on the carefully balanced Arctic ecosystem for hunting, fishing, and their ancient way of life. Drilling in these areas creates an unacceptable risk both to our environment and to the people who live in those communities.

Mr. Chair, the United States is now the largest producer of oil and gas in the world. No one would have thought that possible even a decade ago, yet here we are. Thank to advances in technology, over the past 6 years, we have doubled the amount of oil we export. All of that has been made possible without touching vulnerable environments like the Arctic refuge or off the coast of my home State of Maryland, the Atlantic or the Pacific.

The Trump administration is proposing to open the entire eastern seaboard for oil and gas development, from the Gulf of Maine to the Straits of Florida. States up and down the Atlantic, including my own State, oppose this move. We have seen what happens when something goes wrong, as was the case with the Deepwater Horizon disaster in 2010. An oil spill making its way into the Chesapeake Bay and destroying our world-class fisheries or harming the beautiful beaches of Maryland's Chesapeake and Atlantic shores would, frankly, be devastating.

Instead of doubling down on fossil fuels, we ought to be working to reconfigure our economy to meet the challenges of climate change and seize opportunities from developing new clean energy technologies and leading the world in transitioning to a low- and eventually zero-carbon economy.

The Democratic-led House already, Mr. Chair, took action on climate change earlier this year with the passage of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, which would uphold our commitment to the Paris climate agreement that the President inadvisably withdrew from.

We will also continue taking meaningful action to stop the Trump administration's rollback of rules meant to protect clean air, clean water, and natural environments for generations to come. Our children, Mr. Chair, and our grandchildren—and, yes, our great-grandchildren—deserve to inherit an Earth and an America that is clean, healthy, and sustainable. We ignore this challenge, Mr. Chair, at our peril.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for

leading this effort; I thank Mr. CUNNINGHAM; and I rise in strong support of the legislation we are going to consider.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL), who is a highly respected Representative.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act, to ensure we safeguard our environment against the threats of offshore oil drilling. I am proud to have worked with Chairman GRIJALVA, Chairman LOWENTHAL, and Representative CUNNINGHAM to make sure that this measure also includes my legislation, H.R. 279, the California Clean Coast Act. This would make certain that there is no future offshore oil and gas leasing off California's coast and put the interests of the American people first.

We cannot put corporate profits of Big Oil above protecting our environment. My constituents in the central coast have seen firsthand the damage oil spills inflicted on our communities and our local economies. During the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill, over 100,000 barrels of crude oil spilled into the Santa Barbara Channel. This was the largest oil spill in California's history. It fundamentally harmed Santa Barbara's unique marine ecosystem and wildlife, recreational interests, and commercial fishing.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Paired with the 2015 Plains Refugio oil spill, where cleanup costs hit \$92 million, these incidents show us that we cannot afford another disastrous oil spill.

In contrast, California's coastal region tourism generates over \$1.9 trillion of GDP per year. It also supports more than \$731 billion in wages. Any future oil drilling would pose a direct threat to our local economies and the success of local businesses that are tied to clean oceans and healthy ecosystems. We must safeguard our planet and economy for future generations, including my two grandchildren, Roman and Gianna. This is why I urge passage of H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administrative Policy, which indicates the President's advisers would recommend a veto of this particular bill in the unlikely event that it will actually be considered by the Senate, but, Mr. Chair, you can bet your Social Security payments it won't be.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 205—PROTECTING AND SECURING FLORIDA'S COASTLINE ACT OF 2019—(REP. ROONEY, R-FL, AND 18 COSPONSORS)

H.R. 1146—ARCTIC CULTURAL AND COASTAL PLAIN PROTECTION ACT—(REP. HUFFMAN, D-CA, AND 182 COSPONSORS)

H.R. 1941—COASTAL AND MARINE ECONOMIES PROTECTION ACT—(REP. CUNNINGHAM, D-SC, AND 51 COSPONSORS)

The Administration opposes H.R. 205, the 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. These bills would undermine the Administration's commitment to a prosperous American economy supported by the responsible use of the Nation's abundant natural resources. Development of our resources enhances our energy security and energy dominance, and produces high-paying American jobs; provides increased revenue to the Treasury, States, tribes, and local communities; and is a critical source of conservation funding.

H.R. 1146 would prohibit the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management from administering an oil and gas leasing program in the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) in Alaska. The bill would repeal a provision of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 that directed the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program for the development of the Coastal Plain that would allow the use of no more than about 0.01 percent of the total acreage of ANWR for surface development of production and support facilities. The Administration supports environmentally responsible energy development in the Coastal Plain, also known as the 1002 Area, of ANWR. Such development is expected to increase America's energy security and independence, create jobs, and provide affordable, reliable energy for consumers while providing much-needed revenue to both the State of Alaska and the Federal Government.

Similarly, H.R. 205 and H.R. 1941 would both restrict future oil and gas development in the Federal waters of the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). H.R. 205 would amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act (GOMESA) to make permanent the current temporary leasing moratorium on offshore leasing in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, off the west coast of Florida. H.R. 1941 would amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA) to permanently remove from consideration acreage for offshore leasing on both the Atlantic and Pacific OCS. Both of these bills would undermine OCSLA, which established a periodic, multi-stage planning process involving State and tribal consultation and a thoughtful comparison and balancing of the benefits and impacts to all the regions of the OCS. These bills would permanently constrain this careful administrative process. Under the bills, large swaths of the OCS would be off limits for resource development without the benefit of periodic assessments of the potential economic, social, and environmental effects of development, as required by existing law. Excluding these areas from leasing consideration could place more pressure for development on other OCS areas and constrain our ability to meet national energy needs as required by OCSLA.

Additionally, each of these bills would eliminate the potential for future direct revenue that would otherwise be provided to the Treasury, and through revenue sharing, to the States, tribes, and counties where the development activities occur. In Fiscal Year

2018, energy development on Federal and Indian lands and waters generated approximately \$9 billion in direct revenue from royalties, bonus bids, and rents. Of that revenue, \$1.78 billion was disbursed to 35 States. The top States receiving Fiscal Year 2018 revenues were New Mexico (\$634.9 million); Wyoming (\$563.9 million); Colorado (\$112.5 million); Louisiana (\$91 million); and Utah (\$76 million). Additionally, more than \$1 billion was disbursed to Indian tribes and individual Indian mineral owners; \$1.22 billion to the Reclamation Fund; \$970 million to the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF); \$150 million to the Historic Preservation Fund; and \$3.5 billion to the general fund of the Treasury.

Prohibiting energy development in new Federal areas would hinder future administrations' efforts to make up for revenue lost as production declines from leases in aging energy fields. Such restrictions will tie the hands of future administrations and reduce their ability to enhance energy security through strong domestic energy production and to ensure affordable energy for American families.

If these bills were presented to the President, his advisors would recommend he veto them.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I also include in the RECORD a letter of strong opposition to the bill by over 20 entities, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Consumer Energy Alliance, and a letter in opposition from the Laborers' International Union of North America.

SEPTEMBER 5, 2019.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We rely on American made energy to power our daily lives, communities and to grow a more prosperous future. Americans deserve clean, safe, reliable, abundant and affordable energy so that our families, communities and businesses can all share the opportunities American energy creates. Our country cannot afford to block access to new energy supplies and risk losing our energy advantage. That's why we ask you to oppose legislation being considered by the U.S. House of Representatives next week that would slow scientific surveys and prevent access to new sources of American offshore energy in the Outer Continental Shelf.

For more than seven decades, energy development in the Gulf of Mexico has worked collaboratively alongside tourism, fishing and Defense Department training activities. But H.R. 205 would permanently extend the eastern Gulf of Mexico moratorium on oil and natural gas activities. The Congressional Budget Office conservatively estimates that this could cost taxpayers \$400 million in revenue over the next 10 years. Similarly, H.R. 1941 would block offshore energy development in the Pacific and Atlantic planning areas, and H.R. 1146 would lock up energy resources in the Alaskan Coastal Plain.

Congress should support progress. Modern energy technologies have enabled an impressive record of environmental stewardship and innovation. But when the government chooses to arbitrarily and permanently close off areas to exploration and potential development, we simply increase our dependency on foreign sources. This reality is visible in places like California and Massachusetts. Despite abundant offshore oil and natural gas resources, California imports 57 percent of its oil supply, a staggering 37 percent of which comes from Saudi Arabia. Meanwhile, to meet energy needs each winter, Massachusetts imports liquefied natural gas from Russia.

American energy is produced with a smaller carbon footprint under significantly stronger environmental protections than energy produced anywhere else in the world. We ask you to embrace these homegrown opportunities that benefit American families, create high-wage jobs, strengthen the U.S. economy and protect our environment.

Next week, the House of Representatives is expected to consider legislation undercutting domestic energy security and economic opportunity by limiting American energy access. We urge you to reject these bills and instead stand up for energy produced in America, by American workers for the benefit of American families.

Sincerely,

American Chemistry Council, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Forest & Paper Association, American Gas Association, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Petroleum Institute, American Pipeline Contractors Association, Consumer Energy Alliance, Distribution Pipeline Contractors Association, Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance, Independent Petroleum Association of America.

International Association of Drilling Contractors, International Association of Geophysical Contractors, Laborers' International Union of North America, National Association of Manufacturers, National Ocean Industries Association, National Utility Contractors Association, Offshore Marine Service Association, Portland Cement Association, Power and Communication Contractors Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Oil and Gas Association.

SEPTEMBER 9, 2019.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of the 500,000 members of the Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA), I want to express our opposition to H.R. 205, which would permanently extend the moratorium on oil and gas leasing in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico; H.R. 1146, to once again prohibit oil and gas drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR); and, H.R. 1941, which would bar offshore drilling along the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts.

Once again, jobs of LIUNA members who work in the energy sector are being targeted for elimination by environmental radicals for purely political purposes. There is absolutely no chance for these "message bills" to be enacted into law this Congress. So, instead of working to enact real job creating infrastructure legislation, union members see their jobs once again being denigrated and belittled.

Energy independence is central to the future of the American economy and our standard of living. Unfortunately, the enemies of job creation continue to try to wall off and strand our domestic energy resources from development; killing jobs, prolonging our energy dependence on unfriendly foreign regimes, and saddling middle-class and lower-income families with rising energy costs.

LIUNA members, in Alaska and elsewhere, know first-hand that when done responsibly, with union-trained workers, energy development can coexist with environmental stewardship. LIUNA and the other building trades unions invest significant resources into the training of our members that help develop the knowledge and skills they need to work safely and productively while constructing energy and other infrastructure to the highest standards.

For the hard-working members of LIUNA and other building trades unions, these jobs put food on their families' tables and roofs over their heads. These jobs enable them to put their children through college, to save for retirement, and to spend money in business establishments that employ others.

I urge you to vote against these ill-conceived bills.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

TERRY O'SULLIVAN,  
General President.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, may I ask a question of the ranking member about how many more speakers he has.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If the gentleman asks nicely.

Yes. I am waiting for one more speaker coming over who may or may not be here.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. He just arrived, Mr. Chair, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), who is head of the Congressional Western Caucus and a valuable member of our committee.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend and Ranking Member BISHOP for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided legislation. This legislation will put the United States at a distinct disadvantage with the rest of the world by taking some of our country's most valuable energy deposits off-limits to exploration. By the way, these are the people of the United States' resources.

Under the current administration, America is experiencing an energy renaissance. By taking an all-of-the-above approach to energy policy, this administration has kick-started unprecedented growth in our energy production. For the first time since the 1950s, the United States will become a net exporter of oil and natural gas, providing great benefits for our economy and our national security. However, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to make these successes short-term phenomena.

By permanently putting both the Atlantic and Pacific Outer Continental Shelves off-limits to oil and gas exploration, this bill ties one hand behind our Nation's back. Instead of making potential bountiful energy deposits off-limits to development, this Congress should be interested in making sure that these deposits are responsibly developed. Technological advancements in offshore energy development have made it safer than ever before.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to clarify a couple of things that have been said in this wonderful discussion, and I



thank all the speakers for coming before us.

The sky is not falling. Let me repeat that: The sky is not falling. It has been pointed out and reported that if we do not have drilling in the Atlantic and Pacific, it will badly hurt the Land and Water Conservation Fund because it is funded from offshore revenues. The idea that the passage of H.R. 1941 will hurt the LWCF is completely false. This bill will not affect the LWCF at all.

Let's talk about it. All the money for the LWCF from this fund comes from the existing oil and gas activities in the central and western Gulf of Mexico. Of the resources that come into the Federal Government from these areas, the central and western Gulf of Mexico, the Land and Water Conservation Fund gets the first \$900 million. That is what comes in, and then it is distributed.

Last year, what came in for the conservation fund should have been over \$4.7 billion. In fact, in the last 19 years, we have brought in, at a minimum, \$2.8 billion, far in excess of the \$900 million that goes to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

There are projections that the existing activity in the Gulf of Mexico is enough to keep the LWCF funded for many, many decades to come. We don't need to drill in the Atlantic or the Pacific to fund the LWCF. Revenues are not the problem.

What is the problem then? The real problem is that only twice in the history of the LWCF has Congress appropriated the full \$900 million. As I have pointed out, much more money has come into the Treasury. Only twice have we ever fully appropriated the money.

□ 1330

In fact, we have collected almost \$40 billion in revenues that should have been spent on the LWCF, but we have appropriated less than half of that, which is \$18.4 billion.

So I am glad that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are very concerned about the LWCF, but I would like to point out that we should make sure we work together, that we get the full \$900 million that we should be getting every year and that we are not getting every year.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers, and I am ready to close.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the concern that the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) has for the LWCF.

The issue though at hand is not necessarily what we have been appropriating for LWCF. The issue at hand is that you want to triple that amount.

If you are actually going to cut the potential revenue that is going to come from these areas, don't ask to triple it at the same time. And I would still ask you—and remind you—I have got a park backlog bill that I want to have funded here. Don't take those funds away from the park maintenance backlog. That is far more significant than what we are talking about.

But the real issue we are having here is a difference in the approach to the country's energy solutions, our future. You have three disjointed bills, none of them based on science—a lot of them based on mythology that we have heard here today, none of them scientifically based—but they are here in an isolated way, which the whole goal is to cut stuff. Let's just not produce.

Now, at least when Jimmy Carter put on that sweater and started the fire and he talked to the American people, he was at least honest enough with them to say, You are going to have to lower your expectations. You won't be able to live the lifestyle you want to have in the future.

At no time has anyone who is purporting this type of an approach that has been pushed by the Democrats talked about lowering or being willing to lower their thermostats in the winter or cut down on their air-conditioning in the summer, or stop driving their boats as often as they want to, or no longer going on planes, trains, and automobiles.

Now, they just expect—miraculously—energy to be produced by other areas that they can then enjoy it in some particular way. That is not a logical approach. It can be done, but it is not a logical approach. It doesn't just miraculously happen.

The difference is, what the Republicans have placed on the table today is an overall approach to energy, a comprehensive approach to energy. Not just a comprehensive approach of how we build on our fossil fuels, but also how we build alternative energy and how we involve the States in that concept, because every State has a different requirement, a different initiative, and a different need. And we are trying to do that, not some one-size-fits-all blanket approach as we are going to have in this bill and the third bill that we will actually have tomorrow.

The approach the Democrats are doing is saying we won't develop American sources because we might spill. Instead, we will try to rely on, maybe, them coming from somewhere else. Some of our colleagues have already talked about how the Russians are already importing into Boston. How California is already getting 57 percent of its energy coming from Saudi Arabia, and they come in tankers.

And, Mr. Chairman, the problem is that we fail to realize, if you really want to have a higher mathematical possibility of oil spills, it is significantly higher when it comes from tankers than it is if we do our own drilling.

So not only are we not talking about being self-sufficient, not only are we not talking about now trying to be a source of support for our allies, not only are we not trying to be somewhere where we can be a major player in this world, we are going to cut back automatically and actually make a greater risk in the process of doing it.

This is a silly approach, and it contrasts specifically with what we are attempting to do. We can have jobs and we can have a future. And we can have a country that will no longer be bullied by other countries, seeing that we are energy-weak, if we approach it the way the Republicans want to approach it.

But if we still do this disjointed, dispirited, nonscientific approach based on more myth than reality, then, actually, we are going in the opposite direction.

The Democrats in their energy-weakness, would march us back 50 years to a time when America was much more fragile and in which second-rate powers thought they could bully us into submission simply by taking advantage of our lack of a strong, coherent energy policy. And that is what Republicans do not want to see happen again.

And that is why I would urge you all to look at the bill that was introduced today—the Republican approach to it. That is the way of the future.

It is bright. It is big. It is positive. It moves us forward. Not what we are doing today with a bunch of bills that piece-by-piece take us back from where we came, and we should never return again.

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

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

I just, in closing, would like to make a few statements that kind of reiterate what has already been said, I think so well, and how we must protect our coast.

Right now, the United States produces, in totality, 12.3 million barrels of oil a day—crude oil, each and every day. It is an all-time U.S. record. We have done that in 2018, and we lead the world now in terms of export production.

Of that 12.3 million, we export over 3 million barrels of crude oil a day. It is more than is exported from all the other nations of the world, except for two OPEC nations.

We are the number one producer of natural gas. We are a net exporter of natural gas, but we also say we do—by not opening up the Atlantic and the Pacific, we are not putting this tremendous resource of oil development at risk. Right now, in the Gulf, open for development in the future, we normally put up almost 80 million acres in the Gulf for leasing each year.

Right now over 72 percent of the potential Gulf that is open for oil and gas development, 72 percent has not yet been developed. There is an estimated 43 billion barrels of oil in the Gulf yet

to be discovered and produced. There is enough oil there for the next 66 years of production at the same level that we have today. We must protect our coast. We must protect the future.

Mr. Chair, I urge swift adoption of H.R. 1941, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to H.R. 1941, which will block oil and natural gas lease sales in the Atlantic and Pacific.

To start, this bill reduces the United States' ability to develop our domestic energy resources. Furthermore, it emboldens Russia to continue to use its oil and gas as a weapon against Europe.

At a time when Putin is using all available tools to sow discord and chaos around the world especially in Europe and the Middle East, we need to work together to stop him from further harming our national security interests and those of our allies. This bill is a step in the wrong direction and will further empower Putin.

In addition to this bill's geo-political ramifications, it also ignores the fact that American energy extraction technology and techniques are the best in the world. Inhibiting U.S. energy production will create a void for Russia and others to fill with their more ecologically damaging methods, while also sacrificing American jobs.

Based on the negative effects H.R. 1941 will have on global security, the environment, and our economy, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 116-31, modified by the amendment printed in part E of House Report 116-200, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

#### H.R. 1941

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 "Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act".

#### SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON LEASING IN CERTAIN PLANNING AREAS.

Section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act is amended by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (h) and (i) respectively, and by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

"(g) The Secretary shall not include in any leasing program under this section any area within the Atlantic Region planning areas or the Pacific Region planning areas, as such planning areas are described in the document entitled 'Draft Proposed Program Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2019-2024', dated January 2018."

#### SEC. 3. INSPECTION FEE COLLECTION.

Section 22 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1348) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) INSPECTION FEES.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall collect from the operators of facili-

ties subject to inspection under subsection (c) non-refundable fees for such inspections—

"(A) at an aggregate level equal to the amount necessary to offset the annual expenses of inspections of outer Continental Shelf facilities (including mobile offshore drilling units) by the Secretary of the Interior; and

"(B) using a schedule that reflects the differences in complexity among the classes of facilities to be inspected.

"(2) OCEAN ENERGY SAFETY FUND.—There is established in the Treasury a fund, to be known as the 'Ocean Energy Safety Fund' (referred to in this subsection as the 'Fund'), into which shall be deposited all amounts collected as fees under paragraph (1) and which shall be available as provided under paragraph (3).

"(3) AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, all amounts deposited in the Fund—

"(A) shall be credited as offsetting collections;

"(B) shall be available for expenditure for purposes of carrying out inspections of outer Continental Shelf facilities (including mobile offshore drilling units) and the administration of the inspection program under this section;

"(C) shall be available only to the extent provided for in advance in an appropriations Act; and

"(D) shall remain available until expended.

"(4) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—For each fiscal year beginning after fiscal year 2020, the Secretary shall adjust each dollar amount specified in this subsection for inflation based on the change in the Consumer Price Index from fiscal year 2020.

"(5) ANNUAL FEES.—Annual fees shall be collected under this subsection for facilities that are above the waterline, excluding drilling rigs, and are in place at the start of the fiscal year. Fees for fiscal year 2020 shall be—

"(A) \$11,500 for facilities with no wells, but with processing equipment or gathering lines;

"(B) \$18,500 for facilities with 1 to 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells; and

"(C) \$34,500 for facilities with more than 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells.

"(6) FEES FOR DRILLING RIGS.—Fees shall be collected under this subsection for drilling rigs on a per inspection basis. Fees for fiscal year 2020 shall be—

"(A) \$33,500 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of 500 feet or more; and

"(B) \$18,500 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of less than 500 feet.

"(7) FEES FOR NON-RIG UNITS.—Fees shall be collected under this subsection for well operations conducted via non-rig units as outlined in subparts D, E, F, and Q of part 250 of title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, on a per inspection basis. Fees for fiscal year 2020 shall be—

"(A) \$13,260 per inspection for non-rig units operating in water depths of 2,500 feet or more;

"(B) \$11,530 per inspection for non-rig units operating in water depths between 500 and 2,499 feet; and

"(C) \$4,470 per inspection for non-rig units operating in water depths of less than 500 feet.

"(8) BILLING.—The Secretary shall bill designated operators under paragraph (5) annually, with payment required within 30 days of billing. The Secretary shall bill designated operators under paragraph (6) within 30 days of the end of the month in which the inspection occurred, with payment required within 30 days after billing."

#### SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Com-

mittee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, is in order except those printed in part F of House Report 116-200. Each such further 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. MCCLINTOCK

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part F of House Report 116-200.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 12-13, strike "or the Pacific Region planning areas,".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment removes the Pacific Coast for the total moratorium on oil exploration imposed under this legislation.

It will make my California Democratic colleagues' heads explode, but there are also many other reasons to support this amendment.

California is already pursuing these Green New Deal policies pioneered by Jerry Brown and Arnold Schwarzenegger, and Californians are now paying among the highest electricity and gasoline prices in the country as a result.

In the last decade, while U.S. oil production has grown 130 percent, it has declined in California by 20 percent. In 2000, California produced 50 percent of the petroleum it consumed every year—50 percent. That figure is now down to 30 percent.

In 2000, California imported 25 percent of its oil from foreign countries. Today, it imports 60 percent. In just the last year, California's oil purchases from Saudi Arabia ballooned from 98 million barrels to 135 million barrels. These foolish policies are contributing to one of the highest unemployment rates, the largest homeless population, and the highest effective poverty rate in our Nation.

Yet, leasing the 240 million acres that are currently off limits could support an additional 165,000 jobs and inject \$15 billion into our economy every year.

President Trump reversed the Obama-era war on energy, and last year America became the largest petroleum producer on the planet, outpacing both Saudi Arabia and Russia for the first time.

These policies are also contributing to the lowest unemployment rates for Americans of African and Hispanic heritage in our Nation's history, rising wages after an entire lost decade of economic stagnation, and an overall rate of economic growth almost twice what we are seeing in Europe or that we saw under the Obama Administration.

And let us consider the environment. California's coastal waters suffer from natural oil seepage of 86,000 barrels a year into the Pacific Ocean, the equivalent of one Santa Barbara oil spill every year. Development of our offshore resources reduces the pressure that produces seepage.

Having grown up in coastal Ventura County 50 years ago, I can tell you firsthand of the conspicuous decline in natural seepage that has occurred in the years since the Channel Islands field opened. And lest we forget, it is the abundance of natural gas that has reduced our country's carbon dioxide emissions far below what expensive and oppressive government regulation has accomplished in Europe.

California leads the Nation?

Let me repeat: While our Nation's oil production is up 130 percent, California's is down 20 percent. While our Nation has achieved energy independence, California's reliance on foreign oil has more than doubled. That is trailing the Nation, not leading it.

My State, that has among the most bountiful oil and natural gas resources in the Nation, has the least political will to develop them. I offer this amendment to highlight this point and to warn the rest of the Nation where it leads. And also—let's be honest—to watch my California Democratic colleagues set their hair on fire.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time so we can now watch. And I am ready to close when they are.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Chair, there is absolutely no sense in making a special exception to open the waters along the Pacific Coast for drilling.

Supporters of this amendment clearly represent districts many miles from the nearest coastline. Maybe they never saw the environmental devastation on southern California beaches after the Santa Barbara Plains oil spill in 2015; maybe they haven't visited with small businesses in coastal communities like mine that depend on tourism and recreation to survive; maybe they don't know that offshore drilling threatens nearly 746,000 jobs and nearly \$53 billion in GDP along the West Coast.

However, I have seen that devastation. I visited those small businesses. And I am well-aware of how many jobs could and would be lost if we suffer from another spill along the Pacific

Coast. I also know that more than 90 West Coast municipalities and all three Pacific Coast State governors formally oppose offshore drilling.

The people I represent in San Diego and Orange County certainly do as well. They know that the risks far outweigh any benefit that fossil fuel companies will reap from drilling off our coast, and I am here to raise their voices.

Mr. Chair, many of my Republican colleagues in the Committee on Natural Resources try to justify their push to destroy our coastal communities with offshore drilling by claiming that the alternative to expanded drilling is imported foreign oil.

If my friends on the other side of the aisle were serious about addressing oil imports, they would not sit idly by as the Trump administration works to completely undermine our country's fuel efficiency standards.

If they were serious, they would support the State of California as it works to strengthen fuel economy, so that this country is not dependent on oil, period. And so that Americans can save money at the pump.

California is working to reduce oil imports with its vehicle emissions standards and low carbon fuel standard, but the Trump administration is fighting tooth and nail to stop it by revoking the State's Clean Air Act waiver and challenging its groundbreaking agreement with automakers to set strong standards.

Those who support the Trump administration's efforts are hitting my constituents—not once, but twice. First, they are making cars less efficient, which drives climate change and hurts air quality in southern California. And now, supporters of this amendment are seeking to increase the chances of an environmental catastrophe that could do irreparable damage to my constituents' communities and our local economy.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize the impact that this amendment will have on Pacific Coast economies by strongly opposing it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I readily concede that this amendment is anathema to the ruling elite in Sacramento. They have had their way with California. The policies they advocate on the House floor today are the same policies they have inflicted on my once Golden State during my lifetime.

Those policies have produced the highest effective poverty rate in the Nation, among the highest energy prices in the country, and a historic exodus of Californians fleeing to other States.

The road to Venezuela leads through California, and I urge the rest of the Nation to ask themselves: Is that really a road they want to take?

We went down that road in the 1970s. The bill's author is, perhaps, too young

to remember those dark days when our Nation was held hostage to foreign oil, when cars lined up for blocks to get gas and every meeting of the OPEC nations was a national crisis.

I check the daily AAA survey of gasoline prices. Today, in California, the average price of a gallon of regular gasoline is \$3.63. In South Carolina, it is \$2.23. That is a \$1.40-a-gallon difference, and I ask the bill's author from South Carolina to consider if his constituents are ready to enact California policies and then pay for them through the nozzle.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part F of House Report 116-200.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, beginning on line 2, strike "COASTAL AND MARINE ECONOMIES PROTECTION" and insert "RUSSIAN ENERGY RELIANCE AND UNITED STATES POVERTY".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that changes the title of this legislation to something more fitting, that being the "Russian Energy Reliance and United States Poverty Act."

The consequences of this legislation becoming law would have devastating, long-term impacts on the economic and national security of the United States. Putting both the Atlantic and Pacific Outer Continental Shelves permanently off-limits to oil and gas development puts the United States at a distinct disadvantage to the rest of the world.

We have already seen how policies from liberal States that are along the same lines of this legislation have caused certain parts of the country to become dependent upon Russian energy. New England, for example, was forced to import Russian natural gas in the wintertime because of the ludicrous decision by the State of New York not to allow pipelines to be built through the State.

The legislation before us today would have similar consequences. As existing oil and gas deposits begin to run dry, new deposits will need to be extracted, many of which are located on the Pacific and Atlantic Outer Continental Shelves.

Putting these deposits off-limits would cause us to go back to the old days of the old normal that had become

commonplace under the previous administration. The old normal of relying on foreign adversaries such as Russia to meet our energy needs is preposterous.

The Members across the aisle may try to hide their intentions, but they are becoming clearer every day. They want to dismantle our domestic oil and gas industry, an industry that employs close to 10 million people and plays a critical role in our Nation's energy security.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment so that the American people are aware of the true ramifications of this misguided legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chair, this is a pointless amendment, and I am, frankly, a little bit embarrassed that we are even discussing it. Not only does it not improve the bill, but it is also based on a false premise.

Let's be clear: We are not reliant on Russian energy, and the United States is not stricken by energy poverty. In fact, it is the complete opposite of the present reality.

The Atlantic and Pacific have remained off-limits to new oil and gas development for decades, but the United States now produces 12.3 million barrels of crude oil each day, which is an all-time U.S. record, and it produces the most in the world. It exports over 3 million barrels of crude oil a day, more than all but two members of OPEC exported in 2018.

We are the number three exporter of oil. We are also the number one producer of natural gas in the world, and we are a net exporter of natural gas.

Look, if we really want to lead in energy, we should be taking a bigger role in the production of renewable energy. Costs for renewable energy have plummeted, and our global competitors are jockeying to lead the world in clean energy development.

Unfortunately, Republicans seem to have dusted off the same tired talking points that they were using 10 years ago—and even longer, 20 years ago—before U.S. energy production skyrocketed.

Even worse, the Trump administration acts like it believes those talking points and continues to believe that the future lies in coal, oil, and gas.

Mr. Chair, this is a silly amendment, and it achieves nothing. For this reason, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I find it interesting that we are even debating this because, if it was such a poor decision, maybe the Rules Committee should not have made it in order. So, there is compliance from the other side.

When we start looking at this aspect, we have to be truthful to the American people. The American people see the jargon that we actually come up with in this body, and they want to have a straight shot—common sense. This is exactly what it should be titled because we are taking inventory off that belonged to the American people.

Yes, I am one of those who believes in all-of-the-above energy policies. What we have to tell them and explain to them is that there is a difference between baseload power and intermittent power.

Renewables do not have baseline power. To have a reliable electric grid that everybody depends upon, we have to have both. Green energy does not produce that application of baseload power, unless we are talking about hydro, and that we don't even consider a green energy anymore, from the other side.

I think we need to be clear to the American people where these jobs are. They are good-paying jobs, \$90,000 and above with benefits.

When we take away these types of reserves, it really is victimizing the American people. That is not something I want to do. I want to make sure that they are empowered.

These resources belong to the American people, and there is no reason why we shouldn't be able to use them and extract them diligently and cleanly.

Mr. Chair, I ask everybody to vote for this, to be clear to the American public what this stands for, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I oppose the Gosar amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The 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 MRS. LESKO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part F of House Report 116-200.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. 5. RISK TO NATIONAL SECURITY.**

The Secretary of the Interior, after consulting with the Secretary of Defense, shall report to Congress on whether this Act poses a risk to national security due to potential increase in dependence on foreign oil.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, my amendment would require the Department of the Interior, in consultation with the Department of Defense, to report on whether the policies of this bill would put our national security at risk.

There are many reasons to support domestic energy production, many reasons to oppose the bans this bill proposes, but I believe chief among them is that harnessing the natural resources our country has been blessed with makes our Nation and our allies safer.

American energy production makes us less reliant on foreign actors. More American oil means we will less likely have to use Saudi Arabian oil. More American natural gas means our allies are less likely to rely on Russian natural gas.

Our homes, factories, and vehicles need energy. Our allies need energy. As our world grows, so will our demand.

Oil and natural gas are estimated to comprise 60 percent of global demand in 2050. The question is, where will the United States get it? Will we take it from our own shores, or will we rely on OPEC, whose Arab petroleum-exporting countries previously stopped oil shipments to the United States and caused gas prices to soar and threatened our national security.

I support an all-of-the-above approach, which includes solar, wind, hydropower, nuclear, and coal. I also support domestic oil and natural gas. I believe an all-of-the-above energy approach benefits American pocketbooks and quality of life and, especially, our security.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of my amendment because I believe our government should fully understand the security risks these bans in these bills entail, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LAWSON of Florida). Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, we do not have any concerns with the amendment and do not believe it undermines the underlying legislation.

Furthermore, it is our firm belief that, if the Department of the Interior were to consult with the Defense Department, they would find H.R. 1941 poses no national security risk to the United States.

The underlying bill does not affect a single producing offshore lease, and oil and gas companies now have tremendous opportunities for new offshore development in the United States.

Let's be clear: The United States offers nearly 80 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico for new leasing every year, and companies now hold only 13 million acres of the Gulf under lease, which means that 72 percent of the acres that have been offered are not yet developed.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I thank Representative LOWENTHAL, my colleague from California, and thank my other Democratic colleagues. I think this is a commonsense amendment, and it sounds like the gentleman approves of it.

Mr. Chair, I think it is common sense, and I am hopeful that it will be voted on with "yes." I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1400

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part F of House Report 116-200.

Mr. LANGEVIN. 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:

Add at the end the following:

**SEC. 5. STUDYING THE IMPACTS OF OFFSHORE DRILLING ON COASTAL COMMUNITIES AND COASTAL ECONOMIES.**

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the impacts of offshore drilling on coastal communities and coastal economies.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) address how oil and gas companies interact with local stakeholders in advance of a siting decision, including their meetings with fishermen;

(2) investigate the impacts of offshore drilling on tourism, including tradeoffs during normal operations and economic impacts after a spill;

(3) describe how the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management works with other agencies, including the National Marine Fisheries Service, to include stakeholder input in advance of a siting decision;

(4) address how quickly response teams can mitigate environmental damage after a spill and how long regional ecosystems take to recover following a spill;

(5) describe any limitations on the quantity of comparative data available on impacts to regions of the Outer Continental Shelf that have not been sited for drilling;

(6) describe the impacts on commercial and recreational fisheries from offshore drilling; and

(7) address the economic impacts of oil spills on the food supply of a region, including those food sources that are distinctive to a region's culture.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, the Atlantic Coast has never been a site of

significant offshore drilling, and for good reason. In my home State of Rhode Island and all along the coast, we know the importance of these waters to tourism and to the fisheries that they sustain. Indeed, waterways are part of our way of life. It is part of our identity and who we are.

This amendment will instruct GAO to perform a study on the costs and the impacts of drilling on the coastal communities and their economies. This study will address how oil and gas companies interact with local stakeholders, including fishermen. It will explore how the Interior Department's Bureau of Ocean Energy Management works with other Federal agencies during siting. It will examine how response teams have reacted to offshore oil spills and the cost of those spills to tourism and the food supply of the affected region.

And finally, it will analyze the caliber of the data that we have on hand today regarding these undrilled areas of the Outer Continental Shelf, and whether such data can be reliably used to gauge the impact of proposed drilling.

These are all questions that have arisen during my conversations with fishermen, tourism leaders, and other Rhode Islanders deeply concerned about the risks of drilling off our coast.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that offshore drilling puts the safety of our waterways at risk, which we have seen from numerous spills over the years, including the devastating Deepwater Horizon blowout.

We owe it to those who live in our coastal communities to be honest about the damage that such drilling can cause to them.

Mr. Chairman, it will take decades to recover from an incident like the one we experienced with the Deepwater Horizon spill. While the news cycle eventually moves on, the coastal communities and the people that are affected have to deal with the consequences and often continue to suffer.

That is why I am putting forward this amendment today, so that we can properly understand the full costs of drilling off our coast.

I would like to thank Congressman CUNNINGHAM from South Carolina for sponsoring the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it and my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This amendment is perhaps well-intentioned. I am going to make that assumption. But the problem with this amendment is it is not a comprehensive amendment.

The goal of this amendment is to specifically illustrate what kinds of issues will be studied by this GAO report, and they are all the negative aspects that could come from this report.

There is no aspect here, I mean, it neglects totally to try and set any kind

of benefits that would happen from development of oil or gas consumer. Now, that would be a true study. That would be a fair study. That would be a good study. That would be a valuable study.

What this has done, in a statement of what will be considered, basically skewed what the GAO will do, so you have come up with a predetermined outset. We can predict exactly what will come out from this study because it is not comprehensive and it hasn't tried to be inclusive.

What you should have done is simply direct the GAO to evaluate how taking resources off the table like this will affect our dependence on imports from foreign actors like Russia, whose environmental standards, whose efficiency standards, and whose human rights standards certainly are unacceptable to us in the United States. Doing so—if you had done that, that would have been a comprehensive, that would have been an accurate representation, and that would have been a good and decent study.

So I oppose this particular amendment because I think it missed the mark.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments and his insights. I see that this amendment gets exactly the right information that we need. I am certainly not opposed to the gentleman's suggestion, and if at a later date he is going to offer such additional information to be gathered by GAO, I would certainly like to look at it and perhaps even support it.

But this is the amendment that we have before us. I believe it is well thought out. Again, it is a GAO study to perform—to look at the costs and the impacts of drilling on coastal communities, which my community would be directly affected, and how they would be affected and their economies. And I think having more information is better. I think this hits the right mark, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, in the original speech the gentleman from Rhode Island said he yielded back the balance of his time. Had he not yielded in the first speech?

Mr. LANGEVIN. I reserved the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am sorry. Had that actually been said after the first speech, I would have reserved. But I have yielded back. I am done with this. Unless you really want to go on, I would urge the gentleman to yield back and we will go on with the vote.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have said everything I need to say, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part F of House Report 116-200.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, after line 3, insert the following:

**SEC. 2. PUBLICATION OF INSPECTION RESULTS.**

Section 22(c) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1348(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall make the following available to the public:

“(1) Any reports produced under this subsection.

“(2) The following information about each payment made into the Ocean Energy Safety Fund under subsection (g):

“(A) The facility that was inspected.

“(B) The name of the operator of such facility.

“(C) The amount of the payment.”.

On page 1, line 4, strike “2” and insert “3”.

On page 2, line 1, strike “3” and insert “4”.

On page 5, line 16, strike “4” and insert “5”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chairman, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act requires existing offshore oil and gas operations to undergo inspections and make payments into the Ocean Energy Safety Fund. My amendment would make this information available to the public.

The Trump administration’s 2018 proposed opening of more than 90 percent of U.S. Federal waters to offshore oil could endanger at least 42,000 miles of our Atlantic and Pacific coasts to the extreme risks posed by offshore drilling and spilling.

I came to Congress to advocate on behalf of the people living in my coastal district. The American people have a vested interest in the health of their environment and the wealth of their local communities. It is essential that the public is aware of the companies who are extracting oil from our shores so that we can hold them accountable in the event of a disaster or an accident.

Offshore drilling impacts more than just coastal communities; it impacts future generations of Americans. Transparency is a key democratic principle. Citizens deserve to know which companies are drilling off our shores, the location of their facilities, and the safety and state of their operations.

In Orange County, this critical legislation helps make sure generations can come and continue to sail Newport Harbor, become junior lifeguards, surf

the Wedge, catch halibut, and enjoy our pristine beaches.

This legislation is essential to maintaining our quality of life, and I thank my colleague from South Carolina for his leadership.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment and passage of this bill.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I guess kind of in opposition. It really is not in opposition to the amendment in and of itself, except it illustrates some of the problems the Democrats have in creating this approach to an energy policy coming through here, because the inspection fees that we have mandated by the amendment, if you tack it on to the bill itself, really are based on politics and not the cost of the administration of this particular inspection. In fact, it actually no longer becomes a cost of a service; it actually becomes a tax levied on the committee.

What it illustrates is a deeper problem on how the Democrats decided to put these three bills up here on their energy week, and it also maybe indicates why they don’t really expect it to go any further, because the offsets are so bizarre.

In each of the bills, the Democrats have decided to use—the rules require an offset. In each of the bills, there is a different offset that is required. For the one that we will talk about tomorrow, it is going to be \$900 million. I think this one is \$400 million. The next one is \$200 million. And in each bill, the Democrats have decided to use the same offset to pay for each bill.

Now, ironically, if you did the one tomorrow and then you paid for the bill with that offset, then you would have taken that off the table. But that is not good enough here. Now we are using that same offset money to pay for this particular bill.

I am sorry. This is simply an accounting smoke and mirrors trick that is being used by the Democrats to actually get these three bills onto the floor. For that, I don’t really mind it, per se, because it doesn’t affect the impact of it, but it is a sneaky way of trying to cover the bases and check the boxes and using money in double and triple amounts.

If this offset is actually the way we are doing offsets in the future, then my parks bill doesn’t have a problem going forward because we can use this money for that at the same time.

Although, it is ironic that the money that they are going to use to offset these bills will be reduced because you are stopping the energy production in all of these areas. Everything comes together in some particular way.

This is cute. This is not necessarily effective, but it is cute, and it is not

the way the rules for offsets were intended to try and bring clarity to the situation within the House.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague’s comments, and I do appreciate, I think, and I hear from him that the other side does support transparency and accountability, which is welcomed in today’s atmosphere of politics to have greater transparency and accountability.

I am prepared to close, but I will reserve the balance of my time until my colleague is prepared to close as well.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I will make it easier for him.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part F of House Report 116-200.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. 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, add the following:

**SEC. 5. MORATORIUM ON SEISMIC ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OIL, GAS, AND METHANE HYDRATE EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTH ATLANTIC, MID-ATLANTIC, SOUTH ATLANTIC, AND STRAITS OF FLORIDA PLANNING AREAS.**

Section 11 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1340) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) MORATORIUM ON SEISMIC ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OIL, GAS, AND METHANE HYDRATE EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTH ATLANTIC, MID-ATLANTIC, SOUTH ATLANTIC, AND STRAITS OF FLORIDA PLANNING AREAS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no agency of the United States or person may conduct or authorize any other person to conduct geological or geophysical activities in support of oil, gas, or methane hydrate exploration and development in any area located in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Straits of Florida Planning Areas of the outer Continental Shelf.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 1415

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my bipartisan amendment establishes a moratorium on seismic testing in the Atlantic Ocean.

I would like to begin by thanking my friends, Chairman LOWENTHAL, Chairman GRIJALVA, and Congressman CUNNINGHAM, for leading this bill and for working with me on this provision. I also thank my cosponsors, Congressmen SMITH, BEYER, and VAN DREW, for



their partnership and for their long-standing commitments to leading on this issue.

During seismic testing, ships pull giant airguns through the ocean that release loud, pressurized blasts of air into the seafloor in search of oil and gas. The best evidence from scientists tells us that noise from these airguns can disturb, injure, or kill marine animals from zooplankton, the base of the food web, all the way up to large whales. In addition, airgun noise can reduce catch rates for fish and disrupt essential behaviors in marine mammals, including dolphins and whales.

I believe we need to be building a clean energy future, but seismic airgun blasts lay the groundwork for more dangerous fossil fuel extraction that is bad for our economy and for the environment.

I am proud to support H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act, because I share the concerns of so many of my own constituents who have reached out to me urging Congress to reject proposals that open our waters and coastlines to expanded offshore drilling.

In the 7 years following the 2010 BP Deepwater Horizon disaster, the U.S. oil and gas industry experienced more than 4,000 explosions, collisions, and related incidents, including 34 oil spills of more than 2,000 gallons each.

This bill will help us end these disasters once and for all, and I thank my friend Congressman CUNNINGHAM for his leadership here. My bipartisan amendment takes an extra step to make this legislation stronger yet.

Even if we ban offshore drilling, the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, BOEM, could still issue permits for seismic testing in the Atlantic. We know, for example, that BOEM is currently reviewing applications from seismic testing companies looking for oil and gas beneath the Atlantic Ocean floor.

A legal prohibition on seismic testing, which my amendment includes, is the surest way to prevent such testing in the Atlantic, protecting our environment, marine life, and the health, safety, and livelihoods of millions of people involved in tourism, recreation, fishing, and associated sectors. My bipartisan amendment is about saving the whales for sure, but it is also about saving people, saving our economy, and saving our planet.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment simply because the seismic activity that we are talking about has not been updated since the 1980s. So the biggest problem we have in here is, if you are going to do it with the Atlantic, you are doing this in the darkness of not

actually understanding or knowing what the scientific results will be, and this will eliminate that permanently.

So the technology for seismic studies has improved significantly over the years and is getting better at all times, but now we have a situation where the underlying bill stopped production on these lands, and this amendment would stop any scientific study to know what we could have done or what we should do at this time.

But it is a little bit more insidious than that because this amendment only stops seismic study for oil and gas development; it doesn't stop seismic study for anything else.

So, if, indeed, the argument is that the seismic study hurts the animals, that Flipper is offended by these seismic studies, all this amendment does is say Flipper can be offended and harmed if you are going to put in a windmill, but Flipper can't be offended and harmed if you are going to put in an oil rig. And no one really knows, because we won't do the study, whether Flipper is going to be offended. For all we know, Flipper is out there laughing at us right now for going through this silly exercise.

But this amendment is not comprehensive, it doesn't meet the need, and it stops us once again from doing any science to know about it. So once again, this bill, these approaches, this is politics. This is not science. This is pure politics. For that reason, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his comments. I would only point out that the seismic testing involved in preparing for possible offshore wind is orders of magnitude less disruptive. It is not at all comparable to the seismic testing done for oil and gas exploration, and it doesn't have an anywhere similar level of harm, and that is why it is a different matter.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Part of this body's responsibility is the public charge of looking at the resources of the American people. These resources do not belong to a single State, whether it be South Carolina, California, New Jersey, Wyoming or anything else. These are the public charge of the American people to this body of Congress, and part of the public charge is to understand what type of resources and the value those resources have to that public charge in regard to the people of this country.

So doing our due diligence, it is a mandatory aspect that we undertake this charge to understand what that responsibility is to the American people. In some of the next amendments, you

will actually see some of that public charge in that regard.

This is an undertaking that is specifically null and void based upon what we owe the American people for the due diligence of this body in regard to the ownership of which they have of the Outer Continental Shelf. The magnitude is of inconsequential application. I ask everybody to vote against this amendment.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my esteemed colleague.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. LEVIN, for his leadership on this amendment.

I have been invested in this issue throughout my time in Congress, and earlier this year my Republican colleague, Chris Smith, and I introduced the Atlantic Seismic Airgun Protection Act, a standalone bill that would amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil, gas, and methane hydrate-related seismic activities in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Straits of Florida. This amendment would do just that.

Our coastal economy relies on healthy ocean ecosystems that generate \$95 billion in gross domestic product every year and support nearly 1.4 million jobs every year.

Seismic blasting poses a major threat to marine life, including the critically endangered North Atlantic right whale, which is on the verge of extinction. Because they are extremely loud, these dynamite-like blasts are likely to have significant, long-lasting, widespread impacts on the behavior and survival of fish and marine mammal populations. If these are impacted, it is a serious danger to our coastal economies.

This amendment will protect our marine life and our coastal economies, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his tremendous leadership on this issue.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Once again, as we talk about seismic, realize there is a different approach to it. Not this administration, but the prior administration said there is no scientific policy that says any seismic study actually hurts any of the animals, whether it is for fossil fuels or it is for alternative types of energy.

But the issue at hand is, if you are going to try and deny any seismic so you don't have any studies and we are going to go in the darkness and not really know what we are talking about, then you do it for everything. To try and distinguish between oil and gas and alternatives is simply an arbitrary reason that has no purpose in being there.

However, if the underlying bill passes and you are not going to be drilling

there anyway—in which case we basically say as a Congress we don't care about understanding what we are doing, we are just thinking it is the right thing to do, so we will go ahead and do it—this is bad policy. It is bad policy for the underlying bill. It is bad policy for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Levin-Beyer-Smith-Van Drew amendment to H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act. This amendment, which I'm proud to cosponsor, would ensure that H.R. 1941 not only proscribes future oil and gas leases of the Outer Continental Shelf in the Atlantic and Pacific planning areas but also prohibits any seismic activities in the Atlantic Ocean planning areas.

Seismic activities are performed to first test for the possibility of oil and gas but in and of themselves, these activities pose countless risks to marine life and, by extension, our fishing industries and the health of our coastal ecosystems. Seismic airgun blasting in particular can deafen or seriously maim marine wildlife which rely upon sonar power for movement and can significantly affect local fish populations, which in turn harms New Jersey's fisheries as well as the fishing industry—a vital contributor to the economic well-being of my district on the Jersey Shore.

I have continuously stated my strong opposition to offshore drilling and have made it clear that the people of New Jersey do not want oil rigs offshore, and we do not want our pristine beaches and waters at risk from oil spills.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to H.R. 1941 and to support the underlying bill.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part F of House Report 116-200.

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. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

Section 2 of this Act shall not be effective until the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, finds that the prohibition under section 2 will not adversely affect jobs available to minorities and women.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, 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 rise today to offer an amendment that allows the section 2 moratorium in this bill to go into effect when the Department of the Interior, in consultation with the Department of Labor, certifies that the offshore energy moratorium in the bill will not kill a substantial number of minority and women jobs.

Under the current administration, unemployment has reached record lows. In August, the national unemployment rate sat at 3.7 percent, with the unemployment rate for African American workers sitting at 5.5 percent, breaking the previous record of 5.9 percent which was set in May of 2018 under the same administration.

According to a recent jobs report from The Washington Post—hardly a bastion of conservative credentialing—nearly 90 percent of the jobs added under this administration have gone to minority communities. This is astounding. This can be attributed to the first time a majority of new hires are people between the ages of 25 and 54, and they are from the minority communities.

According to statistics published by the American Petroleum Institute, minorities will comprise one-third of the total workforce in the oil and gas sector by 2030. Women already comprise more than 15 percent of the oil and gas workforce. These are good-paying jobs, paying \$90,000, that hardworking families depend upon.

This legislation puts these employment opportunities at risk by putting off limits potentially viable and valuable offshore energy opportunities in the eastern Gulf of Mexico that are the property of the American people.

For the first time since the 1950s, the United States will soon be a net exporter of oil and natural gas, something that at one time was unthinkable. America's energy renaissance has boosted the economies of previously left-behind towns throughout the country and turned them into vibrant communities.

Mr. Chairman, this commonsense amendment protects minority and women jobs and puts the interests of the American workforce first and foremost. It is very clear-cut, something that the American people can fully understand.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chair, this amendment has nothing to do with the bill and is simply an attempt to block protections for the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts, and it is based upon a false concern for women and minorities' jobs.

We know that Members from both sides of the aisle understand that our existing coastal economies are incompatible with more offshore oil and gas development. I believe that enacting this underlying bill and protecting the Atlantic and Pacific coast from the dangers of offshore drilling will, in itself, safeguard jobs in the coastal tourism and recreational industries, many of which are held by women and people of color.

□ 1430

For example, thriving fish stocks and healthy marine mammals off the coasts of Oregon, New Jersey, Maryland, and Florida support tackle shops, whale watching tours, and seafood markets.

Oil-free beaches and bays in Virginia and the Carolinas drive business for local restaurants, vacation rentals, and outfitters.

People from all walks of life, from diverse backgrounds, and from both political parties cherish these special places and rely on healthy oceans, clean beaches, and the abundant fish and wildlife that come with it.

For example, last week, the Business Alliance for Protecting the Pacific Coast wrote to this body and expressed its strong support for the underlying bill. According to the business coalition, which represents more than 4,000 businesses along the West Coast, offshore drilling threatens nearly 746,000 jobs and nearly \$53 billion in GDP.

The real threat to jobs and economic opportunities in coastal communities would be failing to protect permanently our shorelines from dangerous oil drilling.

This is an unserious amendment that does nothing to protect jobs belonging to women and minorities, and it keeps the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts at risk.

Mr. Chair, for these reasons, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I thought I heard that this has nothing to do with the bill. If that is the case, I take umbrage with that, and maybe we ought to take it up with the Parliamentarian. The majority actually put this in order, so I think it does pertain to this bill.

I also heard that we can't have our cake and eat it too, that it is all about visitation and enjoying the outdoors. How does that work for Colorado? How does that work for Wyoming? How does that work for Arizona? We actually have our cake and can eat it too.

Once again, I remind everybody that these are the property of the American people, not of individual States.

I get it. You are closest to this, so you are implicated in some way or form. But I also want to remind you that, particularly in the Pacific, natural slicks of oil exist naturally. It is something that nature actually takes care of. With that aspect, it is very important.

The power of a job is very, very important. It empowers people. It doesn't victimize them. It is very important that we are astute as to where we are putting people to work.

By the way, if we don't have good jobs, how can we travel to go visit these wonderful sites, enjoy a boat ride going out and fishing in those areas?

When you start to look at some of our plentiful playgrounds of these areas, look no further than Alaska, one of the most plentiful, bountiful areas for fish and wildlife. People come from

around the world to see that, yet they have their cake and eat it too.

Once again, I want to make sure that people are empowered with these good-paying jobs, particularly those of minority, those of gender. These are important applications that facilitate upward mobility of people.

This is a very timely amendment, something that is vastly overdue. We need to consider the consequences when we do actions that are consequential.

Mr. Chair, this is a very timely amendment. I ask everybody to vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I oppose 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. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part F of House Report 116-200.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:  
**SEC. 5. ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY.**

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a study to determine the potential economic impact of offshore drilling on tourism, commercial fishing, recreational fishing, boating, transportation, and other waterfront-related and coastal-related business.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, this amendment adds a provision to the bill that would require the Department of Commerce to complete an economic impact study of potential damage related to offshore drilling. This assessment would include tourism, commercial and recreational fishing, boating, transportation, and other waterfront and coastal-related businesses.

The 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill, which was once the largest oil spill in United States waters and now ranks third after Deepwater Horizon and the 1989 Exxon Valdez spills, killed thousands of birds and marine animals. Commercial fishing was suspended, and tourism plunged.

California's economic drivers are concentrated along California's coastline, and an oil spill from a Federal platform, pipeline, or barge transporting oil would have a catastrophic impact on California's and the Nation's economy and natural resources. In fact, 40 percent of all goods shipped into the United States come through the Long Beach and Los Angeles ports of entry, and these goods go to all 435 districts across the United States. Every community would be impacted.

Offshore drilling for oil and gas threatens key economic drivers in coastal districts and States. Disasters on the scale of the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, one of the largest environmental disasters in American history, cost our country more than \$60 billion in economic damages and environmental damages beyond calculation.

Let's not lose sight that even a small spill has the potential to devastate important marine and coastal resources and the communities and businesses that depend on them.

California is home to more than 800 miles of coastline, and its coastal economies annually generate hundreds of billions of dollars in wages nationally and nearly \$2 trillion in GDP. A disaster could put at risk nearly 746,000 West Coast jobs and \$53 billion of GDP that rely on healthy ocean ecosystems and a clean marine environment.

Mr. Chair, I thank Representative CUNNINGHAM for his leadership on this important issue and the efforts to protect our coasts from new oil and gas leasing. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment and the passage of this critical piece of legislation.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, clearly, the best thing that can be said about this amendment is it is the last one of this particular bill, and we can move on.

The negative part that I have to say about this amendment is the same thing I said about the other amendments. It is a study that is halfway there; it is not comprehensive; it doesn't cover all elements that should be studied; and in fact, it will produce a skewed result because of what narrowly comes within it.

There should be a study that says what jobs will or will not happen from this. That would be a study. That would be a portion of it that would be worth it. But it is not covered in what we are attempting to do here.

In fact, if you think about it, this is kind of a bizarre approach to things. We already have a base bill to be passed that will ban this activity, and then we are going to institute a whole bunch of studies to see if we should

have done the base bill in the first place. This is totally backward in the way bills should be done.

If the gentleman really believed in the study and wanted to get the data, for heaven's sake, do that before introducing a bill that bans the activity in the first place.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, I appreciate my colleague's comments, but I do want to point out the purpose of this is simply to make sure that if we are going to entertain offshore leases, we fully understand the economic impact in the event of a potential disaster occurring. That seems to be a reasonable obligation of Members of Congress to taxpayers of America and working families across America, to make sure that we protect them against future environmental disasters.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, once again, same thing: It is superfluous.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CASTOR of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, 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. 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### PROTECTING AND SECURING FLORIDA'S COASTLINE ACT OF 2019

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 205.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 548 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 205.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1443

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole