

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

House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 205) to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to permanently extend the moratorium on leasing in certain areas of the Gulf of Mexico, with Mr. LAWSON of Florida 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 not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 1445

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 205, the Protecting and Securing Florida's Coastline Act, would permanently protect the eastern Gulf of Mexico from oil and gas drilling.

Nearly all of the eastern Gulf remains protected under a leasing moratorium until 2022 under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006. This bill would permanently extend that moratorium and, in doing so, would safeguard Florida's marine resources, environment, and coastal tourism economy.

Some of Florida's more valuable assets are tied to its beaches and its coastal ecosystems. These drive a tourism economy in Florida that brings in billions of dollars each year and supports over 1.4 million jobs.

Over 2,000 Florida businesses, including restaurants, hotels, and outfitters, have expressed their strong support for permanently protecting the eastern Gulf because they know firsthand the economic consequences of an offshore oil spill.

Following the 2010 Deepwater Horizon disaster, Florida suffered a \$7.6 billion loss in tourism revenue, and bookings for hotels and for-hire fishing trips dropped significantly. Even for places that were left unscathed, the perception of oil-covered shores was enough to redirect vacationing tourists to other coastal States. That is why voters in the Sunshine State, Democrats and Republicans alike, have made clear time and time again that offshore drilling has no place near Florida's shores.

The eastern Gulf of Mexico also has incredible value as a military test and training range, and enactment of H.R. 205 is critical for America's national security and military preparedness.

In 2015, the Department of Defense determined that offshore oil and gas in the eastern Gulf of Mexico would jeopardize the ability of the military to conduct operations in the region.

Even the Trump administration, which bends over backwards to support

the oil and gas industry, understands how deeply unpopular offshore drilling is in Florida and has manipulated the offshore leasing process for political reasons.

Five days after proposing to offer all of America's oceans to oil and gas companies, former Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke rushed down to Tallahassee to meet with then-Florida Governor RICK SCOTT. Understanding that Governor Scott was facing a tough Senate race but could never oppose anything from the Trump administration, Secretary Zinke tweeted that he was "removing Florida from the draft offshore plan" at the Governor's behest.

However, Secretary Zinke was contradicted less than 2 weeks later when a top Interior Department official stated that Florida was, in fact, still under consideration for offshore leasing. Then, at one of our hearings in the Natural Resources Committee, Secretary Zinke seemed to say that Florida was both safe yet still being considered.

The problem for Secretary Zinke was that the oil and gas industry really wants to drill in the eastern Gulf, and this administration wants to do whatever this industry wants. But the people of Florida do not want the industry near their shores, and this administration needs Florida to vote for it next year.

So now the administration has paused the new leasing program because they can't show their true intentions before the next election. With a wink and a nod towards industry, the administration has paused their plans for new leasing. But it is only a sham disguised to convince Florida that it is safe, while also making it clear to the industry that, if they get a second term, the eastern Gulf will be open for drilling.

In May, I wrote to Interior Secretary Bernhardt requesting a copy of the leasing program as it currently exists so we could settle the debate over whether Florida was in or out. Unsurprisingly, Secretary Bernhardt has failed to turn over that plan.

The fact is that Florida's beaches will not be safe from the threat of offshore drilling until we have passed the two bills we are debating today: this one to protect Florida's Gulf Coast and H.R. 1941 to protect Florida's Atlantic Coast.

Florida voters should not have to worry over the next 16 months whether drilling rigs will one day appear on the horizon. H.R. 205 provides Florida's Gulf Coast permanent protection from offshore oil drilling and deserves this body's full support.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we have three bills in this package of supposed Democrat energy. This is different than the other time.

In the last bill we were talking about here on the floor—at least the five people who actually were here on the floor to talk about it—that was an ideological approach. This is different. This deals with the military. This deals with military issues on water that is legitimately put off limits for its military purpose.

There are military bases of significance in Florida, specifically Eglin. There is a military test and training range on the waters in Florida. They are significant, they are important, and, indeed, they need to be preserved for our military.

If, indeed, the military has an area that is essential to military preparedness and readiness, we should be cognizant of that. There is no problem with that. The problem was in this military line, it was simply arbitrarily drawn.

You take the latitude and the longitude and you just go down the line, which means the line, itself, is bizarre and arbitrary. The line, itself, is actually closer to New Orleans than it is to Florida. The line, itself, has a greater impact on the economies of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana than it does in Florida.

What we should have done, were we wise in this process, is to try to seek some kind of variance to make sure that the science was actually used and that we don't just take a ruler and draw a straight line on some map. Already in the areas that are west of this line—the other things that are already open for oil and gas exploration—there is cooperation between the Interior Department and the Department of Defense in how you do it.

Thirty-six percent of all the drilling that is done in the rest of the Gulf is already under some kind of stipulation with the Department of Defense. In fact, there is a memo of understanding between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior that has been there since 1983 which mandates they cooperate and they consult and they work through these things in an appropriate way.

Were something like that to be part of this bill, I know I could support it. And to everyone else who is on the floor, I would argue to do the same thing. The sad part is this bill doesn't do that. Instead, it simply locks up the issue on the one line that happens to be there.

Now, here is where I don't blame anyone seated on the floor, the six of us who actually are here. I do blame the Rules Committee.

The Rules Committee made a very bad rule and abused some of the powers that the Rules Committee has to deal with it. Not only did they make several amendments self-executing—and, I am sorry, I was on the Rules Committee for a long time. I thought when we did that, that was lousy policy. But it was also lousy policy in this rule to make some of the amendments self-executing.

But then they forgot other amendments that could have brought something into conclusion so that we could simply say, if there is a military reason, then, yes, and allow the military to make that decision. That would have been something I would have bought, and I would have been happy to support this particular bill.

But instead, the Rules Committee insisted that there be miscellaneous amendments that have nothing to do brought up here and that have nothing to do to try to bring some kind of cooperation together.

So we are now faced with a bill that will be done on an arbitrary standard without study. It will be done on an arbitrary line without science being given to it. It will be an arbitrary line that will simply call everything out simply because somebody drew a line on a map without thinking about it.

It did not have to be that way. That is the sad part about this particular bill.

I respect the sponsor of this particular bill. I respect what he is trying to do. I agree with most of what he is trying to do. But this could have been a much better bill. This could have been a bill that I could support and I think most other people could support and we could move forward, that would have a much better option and chance of actual passage in the Senate as well as passage by a President who would sign it, rather than actually putting forth an SAP which indicates that he would be advised to veto it. That did not have to happen.

The reason it is not happening in a better way is simply because the Rules Committee refused some of the options that were in front of them, and they should have done it. They could have done it, and it would be a much better situation than what they had done.

So, in this situation, because we now have a bill which, once again, takes science and throws it into the trash can like the other bill did and like the next one tomorrow will do, I have a bill here which I have to oppose, and it did not have to be that way in the long run.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY), the original sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative CASTOR, our colead, for coleading this effort with me and our bipartisan Florida delegation for their support.

I have talked repeatedly about the existential threat offshore drilling poses to us on the west coast of Florida. It jeopardizes our tourist and recreational economy.

Last year, 70 percent of Floridians voted to ban offshore drilling because tourism accounts for \$37.4 billion of GDP, including \$17.5 billion right there on the Gulf Coast, and supports over 600,000 jobs.

Following the Deepwater Horizon disaster, the west coast of Florida faced lost economic value for commercial and recreational fishing and many canceled tourist trips, despite the fact that there was no impact to our coastline. Perception became reality.

A 2018 study by the Gulf Restoration Network describes the continual spills in the Gulf. The Taylor Energy leak, for example, has released approximately 1 million gallons of oil over the last 14 years. Even Shell, which is a good operator, had a spill from a jumper pipeline in 2016 that dumped 1,900 barrels of oil into the Gulf. The following year, LLOG had a similar leak that dumped as much as 9,350 barrels into the Gulf.

As long as humans and complex pipeline and well bore connections are involved, there will be significant environmental risk. These undersea connections are difficult to maintain and examine.

Additionally, as documented in a study by the Pew Research Center, large quantities of bentonite and other chemicals are released in the water while drilling.

My colleagues have raised concerns about energy security and energy independence. That is an important thing. As this export-import chart shows, we are energy independent and have become net energy exporters. It was radically different. Ten years ago, these big lines were coming that way, now they are coming that way.

The exploitation of shale deposits via horizontal drilling coupled with hydraulic fracturing has revolutionized the energy industry. Once again, our American free enterprise system has brought competitive innovation to energy to change the game.

In the Permian Basin of west Texas, for example, there are three shale zones. One of them, the Wolfcamp, is said to contain 20 billion barrels of oil and natural gas liquids—yes, billion. We have more reserves in the United States now than Russia or Saudi Arabia have in conventional reserves. A radical shift in the import and export flows of oil and gas has taken place due to American innovation.

In addition to the compelling economic case for making the moratorium in the eastern Gulf permanent, the eastern Gulf is the home of the Gulf Test Range, a 120,000-square-mile range that stretches from the Florida Panhandle to the Keys. This unimpeded training and testing area is a crucial national security asset. It cannot be replicated anywhere else in the United States—or possibly the world. Its large scale supports testing of hypersonic weapons, combat maneuvers, drone testing, and evolving weapons technology that need space for testing and restrictions for classified work.

In May 2018, the DOD published a report, "Preserving Military Readiness in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico." This report examines the ongoing operations of the Gulf Test Range, its inability to coexist with oil and gas operations, and its projected usage of the range.

□ 1500

What this chart shows here is that the projected use of the range—here is the line right here, south of Eglin Air Force Base. Alabama is way over here. It is not Alabama. It is Destin, Florida. It shows that the most intensive projected use in the foreseeable future for this testing range is right out here, smack dab next to the military mission line. We can't let this thing move an inch east.

This is why we need to ban drilling east of the line. In 2006, this moratorium was enacted by a bipartisan Congress, President George W. Bush, and aided and abetted by Governor Jeb Bush, and I might say, Bill Nelson and Mel Martinez teamed up on this.

As we look forward to extending this moratorium now, we are a unified team in the Florida House delegation, working with Senator RUBIO and Governor DeSantis. We have been doing that for some time on a combined strategy.

All of them agree that we must protect this national security asset in Florida's coastline. As we move forward, we will work together to convince President Trump of the critical importance of this moratorium to Florida.

Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, and Natural Resources Committee Chairman GRIJALVA have all stepped up and committed to protect Florida. Now we need the Senate and the administration to do the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 205, which is hostile to U.S. energy production and unnecessarily takes domestic resources off the table.

This legislation overly restricts offshore exploration and development, which would eliminate opportunities to create jobs, grow the economy, and increase U.S. energy development to lower prices for consumers.

In fiscal year 2018, offshore oil and gas development generated over \$3 billion for the United States Treasury, and over \$200 million for the Gulf States. So why would we move bills like this that would stop all the progress that we have made in the American energy renaissance?

Members of Congress who support bills like this, they still like to drive their cars. They still like to fly in airplanes. They like that 24/7, 365 baseload power supply that heats and cools their homes, provides the electricity for

their cold drinks, and provides the power for the manufacturing processes when they are in their district.

Admiral Mike Mullen said that there is no national security without energy security. I firmly believe in that. We are going to weaken our national security by taking areas off the table for exploration and production. What that means is, we are going to be more reliant on foreign sources of energy.

I talked about New England States receiving LNG ships from Russia to provide natural gas, which we have an abundance of here in this country, but New England States are getting natural gas from Russia. I find that horrid and abysmal when we have the resources in this country to provide the energy to meet our needs.

Instead of focusing on anti-energy bills like H.R. 205, we should be pursuing policies that encourage safe, reliable, and affordable energy to the American people through free-market solutions.

We are in an American energy renaissance thanks to President Trump and Republicans' pro-growth policies, and anti-offshore bills like H.R. 205 hamper these hard-earned gains. Taking domestic energy production off the table would mean one thing—I reiterate—reliance on foreign energy, and that is wrong when we have the resources here in this country.

We should explore. We should find. We should develop. We should produce. We should benefit from those productions. And we should benefit from the royalties that come back to the States and the United States Treasury. To fund things like the Land and Water Conservation Fund that sets land aside for posterity funded through royalties through oil and gas production offshore. How are you going to fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund if you take those royalties off the table?

I tell America, what they are going to do is raise taxes on you because they like the conservation policies. They are going to fund it with raising taxes. Royalties provide that funding for conservation. I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chairwoman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), an original cosponsor—along with Mr. ROONEY—of this legislation before us, H.R. 205.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I want to thank Chairman GRIJALVA for being a champion for America's natural resources. In doing so, the gentleman is a champion for jobs and the economy.

We know this in Florida. That is why I rise in strong support of H.R. 205, Protecting and Securing Florida's Coastline Act of 2019.

It is a pleasure to be here on the floor with my Republican colleague, FRANCIS ROONEY. He is passionate about protecting the State of Florida because our way of life is at risk when you put oil rigs off of our beaches.

It threatens our way of life. And the gentleman understands very well, as a successful businessman, that when you threaten our way of life, and you threaten our natural environment and our beaches, you are threatening our economy and jobs.

Even though it was 9 years ago, the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster is still fresh in my mind, and it is fresh in the minds of my neighbors who live all across the Gulf Coast. It was devastating.

April 20, 2010. You all probably remember because CNN had the video from the oil well that continued to spew oil into the Gulf of Mexico through May, through all of June, all of July, August, and they didn't cap the well until late in September.

It wreaked havoc not just on Florida's economy and not just on our beautiful environment, but on people's lives. I remember very well holding a woman in my arms who was a small business owner from the Clearwater area. The oil didn't even wash up on the shores of Tampa Bay or the beautiful Pinellas coast beaches, or down to Sanibel Island, but the economy took a hit. They lost everything they had.

It wiped out mom-and-pop businesses, restaurants, hotels, and everyone that relies on clean water and clean beaches for their livelihood. Fishermen couldn't fish. It was a catastrophe. Gulf seafood was off the menu. That meant people weren't coming to the mom-and-pop restaurants for their meals.

In addition to all of that, whether it was deformed fish and species, there was permanent damage to the ecosystem. Researchers that I work with at the University of South Florida say that even today on the floor of the Gulf of Mexico in the trench off of the beautiful Florida Panhandle, there is still a layer of what they call dirty snow.

Because if you remember, they had to pour dispersants and chemicals onto the area of the blowout to make sure that the oil dispersed.

Well, that didn't just disappear. It ended up in the food chain and in the entire ecosystem, and it is still out there today, impacting the food web and everything we love about the State of Florida.

In fact, the University of South Florida's College of Marine Science has done a lot of research on this. They did 12 separate voyages over 7 years on the USF Research Vessel Weatherbird II. They say, interestingly, the areas where you have oil rigs, they have determined that fish species in that area of the Gulf are gone. There is lack of diversity there.

The entire food web is impacted. This is going to impact us for decades to come, and there is no way to make it up. The deep sea is not recovering. In fact, clearly visible abnormalities have been chronicled just recently.

The environmental impact is right in front of us; the economic impact, as well as the impact on small business

owners. The U.S. Travel Association estimates that we lost \$22 billion due to the BP disaster.

Our bill will ensure that that never happens again because it says permanently. That moratorium that had a bipartisan vote that Congress took in 2006 which said that until 2022, you can't drill in that part of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, this bill will extend that permanently because this is a dangerous, dirty business.

Florida, over time, has chosen not to industrialize its coastline. Our economy is based on clean beaches and clean water. And Floridians have spoken, by the way. Last November, there was a constitutional amendment on the ballot that said we are going to ban offshore oil drilling in State waters. It often is just a few miles off the coast. It passed by 69 percent.

I wish the Trump administration would listen. But when you install an oil lobbyist as the head of the Interior Department, I guess we know that Big Oil is calling the shots. We are going to say no today. We are going to say, the people of Florida—in a bipartisan way with a united Florida delegation—we are going to say no. It is not needed. It is not wanted, and it is not the future.

It is not needed because America is already an exporter of oil and gas. We don't need to expand into areas that are too precious to drill. It is not wanted. It is not welcome.

Even the Department of Defense has said that this is an important military testing area off of the bases in the panhandle. They have already weighed in to say: Don't bring the oil rigs into this military testing zone. It is too special to drill.

Today, once again, a united Florida delegation is asking Congress to continue to recognize this part of Florida as a special place, and to continue the moratorium permanently. Floridians and folks all over the country that come to our beautiful State to vacation, they know. It is not wanted. It is not needed.

Our future is clean energy. That is what we should be investing in. That is what we should be debating and spending time here today on. That is the future of the United States of America. That is where the jobs of the future are going to come from. Jobs in solar and wind energy are already far surpassing jobs in fossil fuels.

The climate crisis requires that America be smarter, and we don't double down on the dirty policies of the past—dirty oil drilling.

For all of those reasons, let's demonstrate it here today and push back on the Trump administration's attempt to open up the Gulf beaches to oil drilling. Let's say no. We have got a bipartisan Florida delegation that is standing up, united, and I want to thank all of my colleagues from Florida for their leadership year in and year out on this issue.

Let's send a strong vote today. Let's send a strong message today and vote "yes" on H.R. 205.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this bill and my colleagues' efforts to impede the rapid growth of American energy exploration. This bill is flawed in a number of ways, as we have recounted here already during this debate.

First and foremost, it is clear that banning energy exploration will increase the prices that families pay at the pump and the prices they pay to power their homes.

Unfortunately, the tax on our Nation's energy producers aren't new. We know what happens when government intervenes by imposing burdensome regulations and senseless moratoriums like we are seeing today.

For years, New England States have pushed restrictive energy policies, and what we are considering here on the floor is no exception.

A handful of Governors and State legislatures are narrowly focused on hindering the exploration and development of critical energy resources. What those policies have resulted in are increased prices for consumers, and they have done nothing to reduce demands for fossil fuels.

In fact, as Congressman DUNCAN recounted just a few moments ago, last year, those policies culminated in a Russian tanker delivering natural gas to the Boston Harbor. Why? Because there weren't enough pipelines available to bring it from nearby Pennsylvania. You heard it right.

Despite being just a few hundred miles from the Marcellus Shale, one of the largest natural gas reserves in the country, our New England States were forced to import natural gas from Vladimir Putin. Nobody on this floor—the advocates of this bill—seem to have a problem with that.

Now my colleagues want to implement these policies on a Federal level with moratoriums on drilling. The event in Boston shows us that the legislation before us would have no impact on reducing demand for fossil fuels. We would simply have to import more from our adversaries. That is not good policy.

□ 1515

As has been explained, to add to the madness, the bill is completely irreconcilable with the Land and Water Conservation Fund, one of the biggest priorities of the Natural Resources Committee in this Congress.

The LWCF receives its funding from oil revenues generated off the coast of States like Louisiana, my home State. On the very same day that the Natural Resources Committee marked up these bills to ban offshore oil and gas exploration, the committee marked up another bill to permanently fund the LWCF. The majority wants to see mandatory spending of \$900 million per

year out of the LWCF, but at the same time, it wants to eliminate completely its funding source. That is just simply nonsense.

Our country is blessed with an abundance of natural resources. We have the right to use those God-given resources to create jobs, foster economic growth, and pave the way to an era of American energy dominance. Oppressive policies like the ones before us today have been our own worst enemy, forcing us to rely on hostile, foreign nations to meet our energy demands. We simply can't do that any longer.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, if drilling off Florida is the only thing that is going to keep us from having high energy prices and a reliance on foreign energy, I don't know why that hasn't happened yet. Right now, we are not drilling off the coast of Florida, and we are energy dominant in the world. We are not drilling off the coast of Florida, and we continue to see energy prices dropping.

As my colleague Representative CASTOR said, 69 percent of Floridians do not want to see drilling off our shores. Madam Chair, if you would like to drill off the coast of Louisiana or South Carolina, I would say have at it, but leave my beloved Florida alone.

There are many reasons to oppose drilling off Florida's shores: our environment, our tourism economy, and our real property values. But I come to the floor today to plead the case for northwest Florida's military mission.

The Gulf of Mexico test range is one of the only places in the world where we launch live-fire over water and land it on land. I cannot believe that I have to come here to make the argument that it is an incredibly stupid idea to launch experimental missiles over active oil rigs. That would seem to be obvious to most people. I know it is obvious to many in my district.

This military mission is what keeps us safe. It is ludicrous to suggest that we have more to fear from LNG from Russia than we have from a China that continues to close the technological capability edge with our country. The Gulf test range is one of the places where we will be testing hypersonic and supersonic weapons. If we do not continue to maintain that advantage, everybody had better brush up on their Mandarin because we won't be able to protect our country, and that is the far more significant venture.

In Florida, we will protect our environment from the Congress. Please don't do anything to harm us.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I appreciate the last gentleman's statements. He may remember he still has the land range in Utah to use.

Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I respect the bill's author, and I understand that he is faithfully representing the opinions of the majority of his district in seeking to permanently place our offshore petroleum reserves off the coast of his State off-limits to exploration and development.

All of our Nation's coastlines are beautiful, and they all support all sorts of tourism, commercial activities, and military activities important to their local communities and our Nation. For more than a century, offshore energy development has shown itself to be entirely compatible with these uses. To suggest that it is in some places but not in others is manifestly silly and wrong.

For 22 years in the California Legislature, I represented California's Channel Islands, including the Santa Barbara Channel, which, by the way, is the home of the Pacific missile test range.

Yes, in 1969, an outdated drilling technology produced the third-largest oil spill ever recorded, devastating tourism and fishing that year. I fully understand the fears of the supporters of this bill. But a little perspective is needed.

The economic losses caused by the spill were fully compensated, and the environmental damage was quickly healed. I might add that the second-largest oil spill in history was the wreck of the oil tanker *Exxon Valdez*, which is the alternative to offshore production.

For more than 50 years, offshore production in the Channel Islands has been an immense positive for the region and is entirely compatible with military operations there. It has supported thousands of jobs; it has pumped a fortune into the local economy; and it has generated enormous revenues for local, State, and Federal coffers.

By the way, if you ask any sports fisherman in the region where the best fishing is, he will tell you that it is by the rigs.

I am not here today to argue for what is right for local communities in other States and other regions. I understand that offshore production suffers from what Bastiat called the paradox of the seen and unseen. We see the danger of a blowout like Santa Barbara in 1969 or the Deepwater Horizon in 2010. But what we don't see are the enormous economic benefits generated day in and day out by American energy production or the critical role it plays in our Nation's prosperity.

This is where the national interest must be put ahead of parochial "not in my backyard" protests. Procedures have been long established to ensure that offshore production can occur alongside commercial fishing, recreation, and, yes, military testing and training. They have proven themselves to be entirely compatible during many decades of practical experience.

Indeed, one of the many ironies of this NIMBY movement is that commercial fishing and military operations are

highly dependent on precisely the abundant and affordable petroleum produced by offshore drilling, so too, by the way, is the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Offshore production is the main funding source for this program, and another shortsighted irony is that the same markup that produced this bill to shut down offshore production off the Florida coast also permanently reauthorized the very fund that depends on offshore production for its very existence.

If the Congress were to enact a permanent moratorium on production for one part of our coastline, it begs the question: Why are some people more equal than others?

Madam Chair, we are all advocates for our local districts, and the bill's author is an able and respected advocate for his. But our collective responsibility as Congress is not to local interests but to the national interest, and it is in the national interest that our Nation is energy independent, prosperous, and strong. This bill undermines these vital national objectives.

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

For the record, this bill will not affect LWCF funds at all. All the money for the fund comes from existing oil and gas activities in the central and western Gulf of Mexico. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is credited with the first \$900 million in offshore revenues. Last year, those revenues were \$4.7 billion, and projections are that existing activity in the Gulf of Mexico is enough to keep the fund going for a long, long time.

We don't need to drill in the Atlantic or the Pacific or near Florida to find more money. Revenues are not a problem. The real problem is that only twice in the history of the fund has Congress appropriated the full \$900 million that it should get. In fact, over time, we have collected \$37.8 billion of revenue that should have been spent on LWCF, but Congress has appropriated less than half, \$18.4 billion. Revenue is not the issue.

This permanent protection for Florida coastal areas is not going to hurt the fund. It has been stated three times already by my friends on the other side of the aisle, but that is completely false.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administrative Policy on this particular bill.

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

LiUNA,

Washington, DC, 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,

TERRU O'SULLIVAN,  
General President.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member for the recognition to talk about this legislation.

Madam Chair, we are talking about legislation that has to do with energy policy and energy production. We are talking about the goals here, as I heard different speakers talk about protecting our fisheries and our environment. I heard speakers talk about protecting our military mission, those military servicemembers and that military edge and the technology we have. I heard people talking about jobs and the threat of spills.

Madam Chair, I support those objectives, and I know that this may sound counterintuitive: This bill undermines the very objectives that it is purported to advance. Let's go through them. Let's go through those things.

Number one, talking about the environment, that this bill will cause damage to the environment and it will undermine ecological productivity. Madam Chair, if you take a look at this graphic right here, you probably think this is where energy infrastructure is. You probably think that is what this is. This depicts the intensity of energy infrastructure in the Gulf of Mexico from the Texas coast to right there in Alabama.

In reality, oh, my goodness, look at that, if it is not red snapper landings. This is actually where the fish are. This shows the landings of where the fish are. This actually increases ecological productivity by creating habitat for fisheries.

I heard a speaker on the other side talk about how there was devastation of fisheries in the State of Florida after the spill, the disaster in 2010. In 2011, the State of Florida had 117 million pounds of fisheries. In 2011, that was more than the fisheries they produced in the most recent year recorded. Let me say that again. In the immediate aftermath of the spill, in 2011, there were more fisheries landed worth more money than there was in the most recent year recorded, which is 2017.

I hate to sit here and continue to undermine all these narratives, but let's go on.

We are saying that this bill is designed to protect our environment. Actually, Madam Chair, you can look at statistics, and as far as I understand, they use cars and airplanes and have air-conditioning in Florida. That requires oil and gas. Since you are producing it and need it, the safest way to transport is to produce it domestically

and then put it in a pipeline. That is not my statistic; it is from the National Research Council.

Once again, Madam Chair, you are not protecting habitat; you are actually preventing habitat from being established. You are not helping ecological productivity; you are undermining it. You are not protecting the environment or preventing spills; you are providing a greater risk for that. My friend from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) made reference to the Valdez spill. That was a boat.

Let's go on to the other one, the military. I heard a speaker say: Oh, we can't have energy production here because that is going to prevent our ability to fly and practice with weapons in the Gulf of Mexico.

Madam Chair, when we go into war and go up against adversaries, do we say: Hey, we need you to take that building down so my missile can shoot straight in?

No. That is absurd. You operate under real conditions, which includes, in some cases, obstructions.

I want to make reference here that we are talking about thousands and thousands and thousands of square miles. You can produce here with very, very little surface infrastructure. Most of it is subsea, having zero impact.

□ 1530

Now, Madam Chair, I heard somebody talking earlier about 2006 and how Congress stepped in and provided a moratorium. Yes. But do you know what that moratorium is provided in exchange for? Moving the Military Mission Line to the east.

There was an agreement. The 181 leasing areas, that was agreed to. We actually added more production areas in exchange for a temporary moratorium. But what is being proposed now is a greater threat to the environment. It is putting a moratorium in place, and it is not doing any type of balance.

We can step in and protect our military mission, we can protect our environment, and we can have jobs and energy production in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I also heard talk about the Land and Conservation Water Fund and, yes, the irony of the fact that there is legislation that the chair pushed that permanently authorizes the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Legislation moving it permanently funds it at \$900 million; \$150 million a year goes to the Historic Preservation Fund.

But in reality, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is not limited to \$900 million. It is not. I have heard people say it over and over again. That is not accurate.

There is an additional 12.5 percent that comes from revenue sharing that

also goes to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, putting it over \$1 billion a year. Plus, you add \$150 million from the Historic Preservation Fund.

Plus, just to put it in perspective, Madam Chair, when you add up just between 2011 and 2016, \$55 billion—\$55 billion—was generated for the U.S. Treasury from energy production on Federal lands and waters.

Madam Chair, that doesn't just fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Historic Preservation Fund. That funds our veterans' benefits. It funds environmental programs. It funds healthcare for our elderly. It funds early childhood education. It funds infrastructure.

This, according to the Government Accountability Office, is one of the largest nontaxed streams of revenue. And we are talking about stopping it.

Production doesn't go on in perpetuity. You need additional layers. It takes 10 years to go from leasing to production, so we have got to start planning now to produce safely to ensure we can continue to have a vibrant economy, jobs, to continue having a safe environment.

This bill undermines the very objectives that it was purported to advance. Madam Chair, I urge objection to this uninformed legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, as a point of reference, the BP oil spill cost the fishing industry at least, at the minimum, \$94.7 million and, at the maximum, \$1.6 billion in 2010. I mention that because, you know, oil spills are not necessarily good for fisheries in the long haul.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), ranking member, for some time to speak in opposition to this bill.

Madam Chair, like the previous legislation, this bill represents a step backwards in ensuring American energy security, but making certain sections of the eastern Gulf of Mexico permanently off limits to oil and gas development, this legislation once again ties one hand behind our Nation's back.

As chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus and the ranking member of the House Committee on Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, I have a unique insight into many of America's energy issues.

Many on the Western Caucus and Republican members on the Committee on Natural Resources have a different vision for America, a vision that doesn't pick winners and losers and includes a true all-of-the-above energy strategy that embraces wind, solar, nuclear, hydropower, coal, oil, and natural gas. Our vision encourages innovation and less burdensome mandates. We know responsible energy production and protecting our environment go hand in hand.

The offshore coalition, a group of at least 17 members, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Laborers' International Union of North America, sent a letter opposing H.R. 205, H.R. 1941, and H.R. 1146. In the coalition's letter, they state: "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."

"We rely on American-made energy to power our daily lives, communities, and to grow a 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 this week that would slow scientific surveys and prevent access to new sources of American offshore energy in the Outer Continental Shelf."

Our previous speaker actually alluded to this very aspect. It takes 10 years to go from inquiry to actual production. I couldn't agree more with the sentiments expressed by this broad coalition, by previous Members here on this side of the aisle that have opposed it, and I urge Members to oppose H.R. 205.

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

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

Madam Chair, I appreciate the debate that we have had on this particular bill—kind of.

Florida does have the right to do whatever it wishes to do on its property and on its State lands and State waters, and they should have the right to do it unless there is some kind of impact to Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, and Mississippi, in which case, them doing something strictly for Florida's purposes that doesn't take into account the other States is wrong-minded.

But for this particular bill, we are really not talking about the economy and the tourism and everything else. This bill is about a military line and military issues.

As I have stated earlier, yes, there are military positions in Florida. There is a military testing training range on the water, which is not as good as the land-based one but is on the water in Florida.

Those are there and they deserve to be protected, and when the military wants those things set aside without any kind of disturbance, that is logical. That is limited. That is logical, and it

is something we should approve, which is why this issue should not be a bill before us. This bill should have been decided as part of the NDAA.

But the question here is: Is everything on this arbitrary line that was drawn, is it all needed for military use? It should be the military that makes that decision; and, I am sorry, in the past, they have simply said, no, they don't need it all.

So if we were wise, if we were really doing the right thing for this country, if we were really doing the right thing on this issue, we would simply say the military can exclude what the military needs; and what they don't need should be allowed to be open for other kinds of exploration that could benefit Mississippi and Alabama and New Orleans and Texas, because they happen to be closer to the line than Florida is. That is the right thing to do.

We should not do an arbitrary rule that just says to take the ruler and make the damn line down the middle of the map. That is wrong. That is a violation of everything that is logical. That is a violation of everything that is scientific that we are supposed to do. That is a violation of even taking away the ability of the military to make decisions for themselves. That is why this is a failed opportunity on our part.

Had the Rules Committee simply decided to take more rules into effect, we could have modified this bill to make it something that almost everybody in this room could have accepted. But the Rules Committee refused to do that. For whatever political purposes they had in mind, they simply refused to do that.

So, we have the option of instead of doing a bill that is the right thing to do and a good thing to do, we have a bill that is going to be questionable here. It is going to be questionable in the Senate. It is going to be questionable on the deck.

We could have done the right thing. We should have done the right thing. Hopefully, before this bill is all the way through the system, we will do the right thing. But for that, this is a failed opportunity, and I do blame the Rules Committee for refusing to try and expand the discussion so we could actually make a bill that is viable.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the opportunity and all those who have spoken on this bill. I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, I thought I would close by talking a little bit about, because it relates to the discussion that we are having today, protecting these very valuable coastal areas in this country.

My Republican colleagues introduced the American Energy First Act today, and, frankly, it is quite frightening. It is really the "Earth isn't burning fast enough" legislation, as I like to call it.

America is already the number one producer of oil and gas in the world.



This administration is lifting protections on hundreds of millions of acres of public lands for even more drilling.

Our Republican colleagues feel that is not enough. It is never enough for them. For them, President Trump's extreme antienvironment, anticlimate agenda needs to be pushed even further. They are rolling out a bill to give even more money away to their oil and gas polluter friends.

This Republican bill that was introduced today by the minority would force the Florida Gulf Coast for offshore oil and gas, let States decide where energy development should happen on Federal public lands, gut Federal regulation, shorten environmental review times, give vast amounts of public money to four States in the Gulf of Mexico, and make Americans pay if they wanted to object to a government decision.

Think about it. Right now, oil and gas companies get to nominate public lands for leasing without paying a dime. If Republicans had their way, oil and gas companies would keep the free ride, and anyone who wants to protest a lease would have to pay a fee to challenge them.

These ideas are destructive, and they couldn't even pass in an all-Republican government. Nearly all of this legislation was introduced in various forms by Republicans in the last Congress when they controlled everything: the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Presidency. But the bills that were introduced today are so pro-polluter, so backwards-looking, they weren't able to pass them in the House under Republican control.

If my House colleagues just can't or won't take climate change seriously, then we shouldn't take this bill seriously at all. The American people want us to act on climate. They reject the Trump administration's pro-polluter agenda. That is why we are voting to protect our coasts today, and that is why I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 205.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

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

An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-29, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-200, is adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the 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. 205

*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 "Protecting and Securing Florida's Coastline Act of 2019".*

#### SEC. 2. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF MORATORIUM ON LEASING IN CERTAIN AREAS OF THE GULF OF MEXICO.

Section 104(a) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note) is amended by striking "Effective during" and all that follows through "the Secretary" and inserting "The Secretary".

#### 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 facilities 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) annu-

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

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report. 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. CRIST

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

Mr. CRIST. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, after line 10, insert the following:

#### SEC. 3. PRODUCTION SAFETY SYSTEMS AND WELL CONTROL.

Subparts D, E, F, G, H, and Q of section 250 of title 30, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on January 1, 2018), shall have the same force and effect of law as if such subparts had been enacted by an Act of Congress.

Page 1, line 11, strike "3" and insert "4".

Page 5, line 5, strike "4" and insert "5".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRIST. Madam Chair, I was Governor of Florida in 2010 when the Deepwater Horizon rig exploded off the coast of Louisiana. It killed 11 people and sent millions of barrels of oil into the Gulf of Mexico.

I witnessed firsthand the tar balls on our beaches, the marine life drowning in oil, and the billions of dollars of economic damage inflicted on countless families and small businesses.

As the largest offshore oil spill in American history, this should have been a huge wake-up call to everyone. Floridians said never again and voted almost 70 percent in the last election to ban offshore drilling because, as we learned, drilling doesn't have to take place right off our shores to upend your way of life.

My amendment is simple. It reinstates two critical rules regarding offshore drilling and safety regulations,

the Well Control Rule and the Production Safety Systems Rule, that were put into place after the Deepwater Horizon disaster itself.

Sadly, the current administration has chosen to ignore the mistakes of our past and has, instead, weakened these rules, opening the door to self-regulation and less stringent standards. That is why my amendment codifies these rules in their previous form, reinstating critical safety requirements and reducing the risk of another tragedy.

□ 1545

I would like to thank the bipartisan cosponsors of my amendment, the Rules Committee for making the amendment in order, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGAN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for their tireless efforts to support these regulations.

Finally, on behalf of Florida's 13th District, I give my heartfelt thanks to the distinguished bipartisan colleagues from Florida, Representative CASTOR and Representative ROONEY, for their tireless leadership on the underlying bill to keep drilling out of the eastern Gulf of Mexico for good.

In a perfect world, we wouldn't have to drill at all. But as long as drilling does occur in the western and central Gulf, the site of the Deepwater Horizon spill, we must do everything in our power to make sure that history does not repeat itself.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment so that no State ever has to endure another Deepwater Horizon.

Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), my colleague, the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his thoughtful and necessary amendment that will restore offshore drilling regulations and that will reduce the risks the Gulf communities face from offshore development.

I thank him for that, and I very much support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The administration, rightfully, took a second look at the well control and production safety system rule that was implemented by the prior administration. They didn't make a whole lot of changes. About a 17 percent change to the overall rule was all that was done there.

But the colleagues that I have heard and, also, those in the press who have talked about this have been opposed to the revised rules because they erroneously argue that they allow BSEE to issue the so-called waivers to oil companies that give them a free pass to comply with the well control rule. In reality, that just is not what is happening.

The rule allows BSEE to approve alternative compliance measures for

companies that can prove there is a better way of handling a particular requirement that is at least as safe as the original regulatory rules were. So, in fact, the practice is nothing new.

In the Obama administration, they approved these types of measures more than the current administration is doing it. The average during the Obama administration was roughly four times per day. The current administration does it roughly 2.3 times per day.

BSEE isn't allowing oil companies to get away with not complying with the well control rule. They have simply found a better way of doing it.

To codify this rule the way it was before takes away the flexibility and the ability to use technology and new ideas and new science to come up with a better way of solving the problem.

This amendment does great harm not only to the process. To attach it to this bill, which ought to be about the military line, simply means, were this to pass, this amendment would make it more difficult for the ultimate bill to reach a solution in the Senate.

It is an amendment to the wrong bill. It should have been on the earlier one. It is an amendment that is not needed. It is an amendment that moves us back. It is an amendment that takes out of the administration the ability, simply, to do things the right way. If they can find a better way of doing it, let the administration, at any time, authorize that better way of doing the well control protection rule.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRIST. Madam Chair, first, I thank the chairman for his support of the bill. I appreciate that very much.

In response to my colleague from across the aisle, what is necessary and what is important is to make sure that we have stringent rules on this dangerous industry, to make sure that we protect our ecosystem and our environment.

As I said, we, as Floridians, already understand it, voting almost 70 percent of the vote in the latest election to ban offshore drilling from our beautiful coast.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, once again, I am somewhat confused as to the point and direction of this particular amendment.

If it is about the military line, this amendment does nothing to it. If it is about protecting the coast of Florida, this amendment does nothing to it.

It is about having a better way of doing the system to provide more protection. It moves us back and removes the ability of the department—BSEE, in this situation—to protect and realize that because it takes away their creative alternatives.

There are always better ways of doing something. This prohibits us from doing it. This is the wrong amendment on the wrong bill that gives us the wrong direction.

Madam Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. BARRAGAN

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

Ms. BARRAGAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. 5. STUDY ON BSEE OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS OPERATIONS INSPECTION PROGRAM.**

The Secretary of the Interior shall contract with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to complete, not later than 21 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the study entitled "Review and Update of Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement Offshore Oil and Gas Operations Inspection Program" that the Secretary of the Interior had previously contracted with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to complete.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BARRAGAN. Madam Chair, earlier this year, I introduced a bill called the Safe COAST Act to protect our coasts from offshore oil and gas drilling. A vital element of that bill was to protect the offshore oil and gas operations program. This critical piece of the Safe COAST Act is offered in this amendment.

As this body may remember, in December 2017, the administration placed a stop-work order on a critical study of the inspections program for offshore oil and gas operations, in an attempt to delay the study and alter its management. The administration later changed its mind and resumed the study, but it doesn't mean the administration can't change its mind again and halt it or take away the study from the National Academy of Sciences and contract it to an oil and gas industry-friendly entity.

We can't take that chance because this study is too critical. For example, this study ensures that vital aspects of the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement's regulatory mission are being met.

The study would evaluate the Bureau's current risk assessment inspection process and provide recommendations for its improvement. It will also evaluate and migrate best practices into the Bureau's inspection protocols. Lastly, it will assess the potential role of safety-enhancing technologies, such as remote and real-time monitoring.

In short, it will assess the use of emerging technologies, potential risks,

and improved safety and environmental protection practices.

Our coast needs these protections. My amendment will ensure the study remains operational and in the objective and trustworthy hands of the National Academy of Sciences.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to help protect our oceans and support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I don't want to try to be snarky on these kinds of amendments, but it is already being done.

It is a nice concept. It was stopped, but it has also started again. So this calls for a study to continue and resume. They have already done it.

Back in October, in the Department of the Interior, they already resumed the meetings. They are ongoing. Everything you want is actually happening.

I think a better study may be figuring out how five noes can be outweighed by three ayes. Nonetheless, this is a redundant amendment because it is already happening.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Chair, the bottom line is this administration cannot be trusted when it comes to protecting the coastline.

This administration already issued a stop order and changed its mind. Again, there is nothing to prevent this administration from changing its mind again or, as I mentioned, from taking it away from the National Academy of Sciences.

This amendment just ensures that the study remains operational and in the hands of the National Academy of Sciences so that there can't be a change. This is a protection we need for the coast.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I am going to end with the final conclusion, again, that it is a redundancy because it is already being done.

Why don't you just mandate that everything we are doing in every other department be done at the same time? It would have the same kind of impact, the same kind of effect. It is cute, but it is a waste of our time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of 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 Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, finds that the moratorium under such section 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.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. GOSAR:

Strike "Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service" and insert "Secretary of Labor".

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman of Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, 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.

We heard arguments from the Democratic Members on the other side of the aisle against a similar amendment, that this amendment doesn't matter and is meaningless. How callous that response.

I tell opponents of this amendment to tell that single mother working to put food on the table for her two children that her job doesn't matter. How about the minority family who just moved into a new neighborhood so their kids could go to better schools? Tell those hardworking, minority parents that those jobs don't matter either.

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 set in May 2018.

According to a recent report by The Washington Post—once again, the bastion of conservative reporting—nearly 90 percent of the jobs added under this administration has gone to minority

communities. This can be attributed to, for the first time, a majority of new hires are people between the ages of 25 to 54 and are from 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 permanently putting off-limits potentially viable and valuable offshore energy opportunities in the eastern Gulf of Mexico.

For the first time since the 1950s, the United States will soon be a net exporter of oil and natural gas, something that was once unthinkable.

America's energy renaissance has boosted the economies of previously left-behind towns throughout the country and turned them into vibrant communities.

Madam Chair, this is a commonsense amendment that protects minority and women jobs and puts the interests of the American workforce first. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Madam Chair, first of all, let's start with the premise here. The premise of protecting jobs for women and people of color is a laudable one. But on the eastern coast, at this point, there are no jobs to lose or protect because there are no jobs. If there was to be any activity, it would be when the moratorium would be lifted in 2022.

The point of this amendment has nothing to do with the bill, and it is simply an attempt to block protections for the eastern Gulf based on a fake concern for jobs for women and people of color.

I recall the hearing we had yesterday about the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management reorganization and its transfer of central activities to Grand Junction, Colorado. In that, the majority asked the question: What about the retention of senior, female, and of-color staff in this move? How many are we going to lose? Do they need to be protected?

At the hearing, the minority Members told us that was not an issue, that we shouldn't worry about it, that nothing was going to be lost and everything was going to be protected.

□ 1600

Here we have the issue being raised again, but from another perspective. I believe that enacting this bill and protecting Florida's shore from the dangers of offshore drilling will safeguard

jobs in coastal tourism, recreation industries, and many others that are held by the people of Florida, including women and people of color.

For example, the Florida Gulf Coast Business Coalition is a diverse coalition of businesses and industries committed to protecting Florida's Gulf Coast, and they have offered strong support for the underlying legislation.

The real threat to jobs and economic opportunity in Florida would be failing to extend the existing moratorium. This is why elected officials, including the entire Florida congressional delegation and the Florida Governor, oppose drilling in the eastern Gulf and support H.R. 205.

This is not a serious amendment and does nothing to protect jobs belonging to women, to people of color, and, conversely, keeps the Florida Gulf Coast at risk.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, if that supposition that has been proposed is actually true, then an easy certification by the Secretary of the Interior is in the works that there is no denominational change in regards to those jobs, in regards to the oil and gas industry with this permanent moratorium. So, once again, it gets us back to that permanent moratorium in section 2 does place those at risk.

Again, I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to think of that single mother who is working to put food on the table for her two children. Tell her that her job doesn't matter.

Again, think of the minority family that just moved into a new neighborhood so their kids could go to better schools. Tell those working minorities, those parents that their jobs don't matter.

Think of the statistics that we repeatedly looked at from, no less, The Washington Post. These are real jobs. They are helping real people. They are part of a real economy, an economy that needs all of the above.

Once again, we can have tourism, we can have clean energy production and protect the environment, and we can have the good-paying jobs that are empowering women and minorities.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, again, the amendment is not necessary, and it is an attempt to delay and to put further risk to the Florida Gulf Coast, and I would urge its defeat.

More importantly, I think concrete, real policy initiatives to enhance opportunities for women and people of color in this country are something this Congress should undertake as a whole. But crocodile tears on this particular piece of legislation and this amendment aren't going to do it.

I urge opposition. I urge its defeat.

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

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

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 251, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 520]

#### AYES—182

Aderholt	Gooden	Nunes
Allen	Gosar	Olson
Amodei	Granger	Palazzo
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Pence
Babin	Graves (MO)	Perry
Bacon	Green (TN)	Posey
Baird	Griffith	Ratcliffe
Balderson	Grothman	Reed
Banks	Guest	Reschenthaler
Barr	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Bergman	Hagedorn	Riggleman
Biggs	Harris	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Hartzer	Rodgers (WA)
Bost	Hern, Kevin	Roe, David P.
Brady	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Buck	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Bucshon	Holding	Roy
Budd	Hollingsworth	Scalise
Burchett	Hudson	Schweikert
Burgess	Huizenga	Scott, Austin
Byrne	Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Shimkus
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Simpson
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Smith (MO)
Chabot	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Smucker
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Spano
Cloud	Keller	Stauber
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Steil
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Stewart
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Stivers
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Taylor
Conaway	LaHood	Thompson (PA)
Cook	LaMalfa	Thornberry
Crawford	Lamborn	Timmons
Crenshaw	Latta	Tipton
Curtis	Lesko	Turner
Davidson (OH)	Long	Upton
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Wagner
DesJarlais	Lucas	Walberg
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Walden
Duncan	Marchant	Walker
Dunn	Marshall	Walorski
Emmer	Massie	Waltz
Estes	McCarthy	Watkins
Ferguson	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Flores	McHenry	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	McKinley	Westerman
Foxx (NC)	Meadows	Williams
Fulcher	Meuser	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Miller	Wittman
Gianforte	Mitchell	Womack
Gibbs	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Wright
Gonzalez (OH)	Mullin	Yoho
González-Colón (PR)	Newhouse	Young
	Norman	Zeldin

#### NOES—251

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Castro (TX)
Aguilar	F.	Chu, Judy
Allred	Brindisi	Cicilline
Amash	Brown (MD)	Cisneros
Axne	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Barragán	Buchanan	Clarke (NY)
Bass	Bustos	Clay
Beatty	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bera	Carbajal	Cohen
Beyer	Cárdenas	Connolly
Bilirakis	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Correa
Blumenauer	Case	Costa
Blunt Rochester	Casten (IL)	Courtney
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Cox (CA)

Craig	Kildee	Raskin
Crist	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Crow	Kim	Richmond
Cuellar	Kind	Rooney (FL)
Cummings	King (NY)	Rose (NY)
Cunningham	Kinziger	Rouda
Davids (KS)	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Ruiz
Davis, Danny K.	Kuster (NH)	Ruppersberger
Dean	Lamb	Rush
DeFazio	Langevin	Rutherford
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ryan
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Sablan
DelBene	Lawson (FL)	San Nicolas
Delgado	Lee (CA)	Sánchez
Demings	Lee (NV)	Sarbanes
DeSaulnier	Levin (CA)	Scanlon
Deutch	Levin (MI)	Shakowsky
Diaz-Balart	Lewis	Schiff
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schneider
Doggett	Lipinski	Schrader
Doyle, Michael	Loebsock	Schrier
F.	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Engel	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Escobar	Lowey	Serrano
Eshoo	Luján	Sewell (AL)
Espallat	Luria	Shalala
Evans	Lynch	Sherman
Finkenauer	Malinowski	Sherrill
Fitzpatrick	Maloney,	Sires
Fletcher	Carolyn B.	Slotkin
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Smith (NJ)
Frankel	Mast	Smith (VA)
Fudge	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Gabbard	McAdams	Soto
Gaetz	McBath	Spanberger
Gallego	McCollum	Speier
Garamendi	McGovern	Stanton
Garcia (IL)	McNerney	Stefanik
Garcia (TX)	Meeks	Steube
Golden	Meng	Stevens
Gomez	Moore	Suozzi
Gonzalez (TX)	Morelle	Swalwell (CA)
Gottheimer	Moulton	Takano
Green, Al (TX)	Mucarsel-Powell	Thompson (CA)
Grijalva	Murphy	Thompson (MS)
Haaland	Nadler	Titus
Harder (CA)	Napolitano	Tlaib
Hastings	Neal	Tonko
Hayes	Neguse	Torres (CA)
Heck	Norcross	Torres Small
Higgins (NY)	Norton	(NM)
Hill (CA)	O'Halleran	Trahan
Himes	Ocasio-Cortez	Trone
Horn, Kendra S.	Omar	Underwood
Horsford	Pallone	Van Drew
Houlahan	Panetta	Vargas
Hoyer	Pappas	Veasey
Huffman	Pascarell	Vela
Jackson Lee	Payne	Velázquez
Jayapal	Perlmutter	Vislosky
Jeffries	Peters	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Peterson	Schultz
Johnson (SD)	Phillips	Waters
Johnson (TX)	Pingree	Watson Coleman
Kaptur	Plaskett	Welch
Katko	Pocan	Wexton
Keating	Porter	Wild
Kelly (IL)	Pressley	Wilson (FL)
Kennedy	Price (NC)	Yarmuth
Khanna	Quigley	

#### NOT VOTING—5

Abraham	Lawrence	Radewagen
Clyburn	McEachin	

□ 1633

Messrs. HASTINGS, CISNEROS, PASCARELL, Meses. FINKENAUER, HILL of California, TLAIB, Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, GONZALEZ of Texas, and RICHMOND changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. WITTMAN, WILSON of South Carolina, HUNTER, TURNER, PALAZZO, CALVERT, RICE of South Carolina, and LONG changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, 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. 205) to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to permanently extend the moratorium on leasing in certain areas of the Gulf of Mexico, and, pursuant to House Resolution 548, she reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 180, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

YEAS—248

Adams	Connolly	Fudge
Aguilar	Cooper	Gabbard
Allred	Correa	Gaetz
Axne	Costa	Gallagher
Barragán	Courtney	Gallgo
Bass	Cox (CA)	Garamendi
Beatty	Craig	Garcia (IL)
Bera	Crist	Golden
Beyer	Crow	Gomez
Bilirakis	Cummings	Gonzalez (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Cunningham	Gottheimer
Blumenauer	Davids (KS)	Green, Al (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Bonamici	Davis, Danny K.	Haaland
Boyle, Brendan	Dean	Harder (CA)
F.	DeFazio	Hastings
Brindisi	DeGette	Hayes
Brown (MD)	DeLauro	Heck
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Herrera Beutler
Buchanan	Delgado	Higgins (NY)
Bustos	Demings	Hill (CA)
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Himes
Carbajal	Deutch	Hollingsworth
Cárdenas	Diaz-Balart	Horn, Kendra S.
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Horsford
Cartwright	Doggett	Houlahan
Case	Doyle, Michael	Hoyer
Casten (IL)	F.	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Dunn	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Engel	Jayapal
Chu, Judy	Escobar	Jeffries
Cicilline	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Cisneros	Espallat	Johnson (TX)
Clark (MA)	Evans	Kaptur
Clarke (NY)	Finkenauer	Katko
Clay	Fitzpatrick	Keating
Cleaver	Foster	Kelly (IL)
Cohen	Frankel	Kennedy

Khanna	Nadler	Shalala
Kildee	Napolitano	Sherman
Kilmer	Neal	Sherrill
Kim	Neguse	Sires
Kind	Norcoss	Slotkin
King (NY)	O'Halleran	Smith (NJ)
Kirkpatrick	Ocasio-Cortez	Smith (WA)
Krishnamoorthi	Omar	Soto
Kuster (NH)	Pallone	Spanberger
Lamb	Panetta	Spano
Langevin	Pappas	Speier
Larsen (WA)	Pascarell	Stanton
Larson (CT)	Payne	Stefanik
Lawson (FL)	Perlmutter	Steube
Lee (CA)	Peters	Stevens
Lee (NV)	Phillips	Suozzi
Levin (CA)	Pingree	Swalwell (CA)
Levin (MI)	Pocan	Takano
Lewis	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Lieu, Ted	Posey	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski	Pressley	Titus
Loeb sack	Price (NC)	Tlaib
Lofgren	Quigley	Tonko
Lowenthal	Raskin	Torres (CA)
Lowe y	Rice (NY)	Torres Small
Luján	Richmond	(NM)
Luria	Rooney (FL)	Trahan
Lynch	Rose (NY)	Trone
Malinowski	Rouda	Underwood
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Van Drew
Carolyn B.	Ruiz	Vargas
Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Veasey
Mast	Rush	Velázquez
Matsui	Rutherford	Visclosky
McAdams	Ryan	Waltz
McBath	Sánchez	Wasserman
McCollum	Sarbanes	Schultz
McGovern	Scanlon	Waters
McHenry	Schakowsky	Watson Coleman
McNerney	Schiff	Webster (FL)
Meeks	Schneider	Welch
Meng	Schrader	Wexton
Moore	Schrier	Wild
Morelle	Scott (VA)	Wilson (FL)
Moulton	Scott, David	Yarmuth
Mucarsel-Powell	Serrano	
Murphy	Sewell (AL)	

NAYS—180

Aderholt	Fleischmann	Lesko
Allen	Fletcher	Long
Amash	Flores	Loudermilk
Amodei	Portenberry	Lucas
Armstrong	Fox (NC)	Luetkemeyer
Arrington	Fulcher	Marchant
Babin	Garcia (TX)	Marshall
Bacon	Gianforte	Massie
Baird	Gibbs	McCarthy
Balderson	Gohmert	McCaul
Banks	Gonzalez (OH)	McClintock
Barr	Gooden	McKinley
Bergman	Gosar	Meadows
Biggs	Granger	Meuser
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Miller
Bost	Graves (LA)	Mitchell
Brady	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Brooks (AL)	Green (TN)	Mooney (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Griffith	Mullin
Buck	Grothman	Newhouse
Buchson	Guest	Norman
Budd	Guthrie	Nunes
Burchett	Hagedorn	Olson
Burgess	Harris	Palazzo
Byrne	Hartzler	Palmer
Calvert	Hern, Kevin	Pence
Carter (GA)	Hice (GA)	Perry
Carter (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Peterson
Chabot	Hill (AR)	Ratcliffe
Cheney	Holding	Reed
Cline	Hudson	Reschenthaler
Cloud	Huizenga	Rice (SC)
Cole	Hunter	Riggleman
Collins (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Roby
Collins (NY)	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Comer	Johnson (OH)	Roe, David P.
Conaway	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (AL)
Cook	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Joyce (OH)	Rose, John W.
Crenshaw	Joyce (PA)	Rouzer
Cuellar	Keller	Roy
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Davidson (OH)	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Davis, Rodney	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
DesJarlais	Kinzinger	Sensenbrenner
Duffy	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Duncan	LaHood	Simpson
Emmer	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Estes	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Ferguson	Latta	Smucker

Stauber	Upton	Westerman
Steil	Vela	Williams
Stewart	Wagner	Wilson (SC)
Stivers	Walberg	Wittman
Taylor	Walden	Womack
Thompson (PA)	Walker	Woodall
Thornberry	Walorski	Wright
Timmons	Watkins	Yoho
Tipton	Weber (TX)	Young
Turner	Wenstrup	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Abraham	Lawrence
Clyburn	McEachin

□ 1645

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COASTAL AND MARINE ECONOMIES PROTECTION ACT

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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1941.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) kindly take the chair.

□ 1647

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 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 Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 8 printed in part F of House Report 116-200, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA), had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part F of House Report 116-200 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.