



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2019

No. 145

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TORRES of California).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 11, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable NORMA J. TORRES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

AND STILL I RISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise on this 9/11, a day that will live in the annals of history eternally, a day when there were more questions than answers, a day when we thought that our country was—and, indeed, what we thought was correct—under assault.

I remember the day because I was at work, and as the judge of a small claims justice court, we were so moved

by what was happening that we paused to sing God Bless America. I remember at least one person sobbing. It was a day when people within that courtroom were faced with uncertainties unlike we had seen before, a day when all of our first responders were challenged.

But allow me, please, for just a moment, to talk and say a few words about those who were there at the site of the Twin Towers.

We could see on television the cloud of dust as it started to emerge and settle, people rushing, bodies covered. It was intuitively obvious to the most casual observer that this was not a place to run to. As a matter of fact, you could see people running away.

But there were those who took their duties and responsibilities seriously, and as others were rushing away, as fear would have us do, they were rushing in. These were the people, many of whom lost their lives trying to save the lives of others. These were the people, many of whom still suffer today because they were bound by duty to do that which most of us would not.

These are the people whom we must never forget. Their lives have been changed and altered forever. But we have a duty and a responsibility here to share our thoughts and our feelings with them, but also to make sure we take care of their health issues.

There is something to be said about this term, “in the line of duty.” Until you have had the opportunity to visit one of the memorial services, it just may not impact you as it can. It will never impact me the way it impacts the family members.

But I want this country to know that those who lost their lives in the line of duty on that day will never be forgotten, and those who served and still serve will always be remembered.

So I take this moment for my personal privilege, and I will lower my head for a moment of silent prayer.

God bless the United States of America.

COMMEMORATING THE 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today, on the 18th anniversary of September 11, 2001, to reflect on the events of that fateful day and to honor the lives lost and the heroes that united us.

At 8:46 a.m., American Airlines Flight 11 roared over Lower Manhattan and into Tower 1 of the World Trade Center. Shortly after, Flight 175 struck Tower 2.

Our country was under attack. Many of us could never imagine such evil taking place in our own backyard.

The terror did not stop in New York City. The Pentagon, center of our Armed Forces and national defense and our Nation’s Capital, was also a target of evil. Flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon at 9:38 a.m. It was a turning point in our history and changed the way we would view the world forever.

The fourth plane hijacked that day was United 93, crashing into a field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Here in the Capitol, as you exit the north side of the rotunda, a plaque displays the names of the 40 passengers and crew of United 93.

One of those aboard was Flight Attendant Sandra Bradshaw. Sandra had always wanted to be a flight attendant and was living out that dream, traveling and meeting new people.

At 9:30 a.m. on 9/11, she called her husband and told him that United 93 had been hijacked. She said the crew and passengers had decided to try to take back the plane. Their sacrifice saved countless lives, and I can’t help but think they may have saved this very building where we sit today from destruction.

Our country’s fight against terrorism did not happen on a battlefield on the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7599

other side of the world but over the skies of Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia by ordinary American citizens.

The courage and bravery of Flight 93 was not the only heroism on display that day. Firefighters, police officers, and first responders jumped into action without hesitation. When planes crashed, they ran in. When fires ignited, they ran in. When buildings collapsed, they ran in. Their courage never wavered.

We will never forget the lives lost and must always remember the heroism that was shown. And while we cannot bring our loved ones back, we can honor their memory through acts of service.

To maintain the spirit of unity and compassion that stem from the attacks, every year our country proclaims September 11 as Patriot Day. It is a great way to honor the souls we lost and pay tribute to all who sacrificed their lives.

As President Bush said when he addressed the Nation: "Terrorist attacks can shake the foundations of our biggest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America. These attacks shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve."

COMMEMORATING THE 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Madam Speaker, September 11, 2001, is one of those days when everyone of age can remember where they were and what they were doing when the first plane hit.

I was a police commander assigned to the Orlando International Airport. It appeared to be a normal day, and then the events unfolded. The planes hit. The towers collapsed. The Pentagon burned. The passengers of Flight 93 mounted their heroic resistance.

It appeared time stood still as the world watched the results and the actions of the hijackers, evil men who set out to attack America, to kill Americans. But they could never have killed the idea of America. You see, that idea belongs to us. It will endure as long as we continue to believe in it, to perfect it, and to make it worth fighting for.

2,977 lives, 343 firefighters, 23 New York police officers, and 37 Port Authority officers—they took much from us that day.

As a mother, I think of the roughly 100 babies who will turn 18 this year having never known their fathers.

Today, I remember the passengers and crew. I remember the first responders who rushed into fire and smoke, dust and rubble in a desperate fight to save whomever they could; who worked for weeks on end, breathing deadly particles, trying to find survivors, or at least identify the dead; heroes who died that day or from illnesses contracted

from the search, rescue, recovery; heroes who died as they lived, in service to others, who believed in service above self. These men and women didn't just save lives; they defined what it means to be a hero for a generation.

On the day of the worst terrorist attack on American soil, our first responders showed us the best of us. I am relieved that, earlier this year, Congress passed lifetime funding for the 9/11 Victims Compensation Fund.

Yes, evil men took much from us that day; but the heart and soul of America, the courage and tenacity, the ability to endure and to stand no enemy can take away from us.

The work of caring for those individuals who answered the call that day must go on, just as our work will go on to secure our Nation, to ensure that we will never again suffer the injury we did on that morning.

But today, on September 11, we pause from that work to remember and to honor the victims and to acknowledge the service of 9/11 is not just something to be memorialized, but to be emulated, to put service above self. May we stand united and serve in the people's House with courage, devotion, gallantry, compassion, and grace.

COMMEMORATING THE 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, 18 years ago, America experienced the worst act of terrorism in its history. Nearly 3,000 people were killed, with many others in emergency services and law enforcement suffering long-lasting health complications, sometimes resulting in death.

September 11, 2001, a day none of us will ever forget, had a deep and lasting impact on the lives of all Americans. I was one of the thousands who answered the call to serve and to hunt down those responsible.

When I woke on that tragic day, I was serving in the United States Air Force as an intelligence officer at Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho with the 366th Air Expeditionary Wing, 34th Bomb Squadron—the B-1 bombers. I was and am a proud Mountain Home Gunfighter. Our squadron deployed almost immediately as the on-call wing. By early October, I and my brothers and sisters in arms were mission planning the first bombing runs into Afghanistan.

I still remember the morning of September 11. Memories come to my mind as vividly as if they were yesterday: buttoning the buttons on my uniform when my wife yelled at me up the stairs that a plane had hit the World Trade Center in New York; a phone call seconds later that I, in no uncertain terms, needed to get my butt into the squadron to brief my commander on

the situation and start loading Conexes; working through the night while the base was in lockdown and much of the country was in a fog; trying to answer questions from my young daughter, wife, and friends about what was happening.

You are seeing my daughter, here, as I came home from deployment.

My memories are not unique, and every American has a different viewpoint on what happened that day. Some lost friends or family, and the tragedy we as a nation felt that day should not be forgotten.

But the impact of those attacks was not limited to that day, and history will write that heroic Americans responded with valor and bravery.

One of the most heinous acts ever committed on American soil did not bring us down but brought us together. In the words of former President George W. Bush: "One of the worst days in America's history saw some of the bravest acts in Americans' history."

Less than 24 hours after the first plane hit the towers in New York, deployment orders came. I still remember that feeling, standing on the tarmac and then watching from the plane as my three daughters, all younger than 10 years old, waved small American flags from down below. I was deployed on Active Duty and would be spending the next weeks planning bombing runs on Afghanistan to respond to these attacks.

Our Armed Forces are asked to make sacrifices; leaving their families is often one of them. But after 9/11, when so many Americans had sacrificed so much more, my brothers and sisters in arms were willing to make that sacrifice. Inspired by the heroism of so many firefighters, first responders, law enforcement, and citizens who answered the call, we knew that America would emerge stronger.

Eighteen years later, we remember the heroes of 9/11, honor their sacrifice, and admire their patriotism. Their memories will last for us forever because we will never forget what they gave us, heroic Americans who answered the call.

I was proud to serve with heroes like General Seve Wilson, Bull, Bullet, Eli, Scar, Jimbo, Rooster, Mongo, IROC, Stainless, Lost, Krenkle, Frengle, Sergeant Lowery, Migo, Psycho, Sassy, Tank, Rachel, Linda Vadnais, Atteberry, and so many more. From Ground Zero in New York to the Pentagon and across the country, American heroes answered the call, and we are forever in their debt.

God bless the United States of America.

□ 1015

REMEMBERING 9/11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today on the 18th anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attack to honor the nearly 3,000 individuals, brave men and women who lost their lives. Most Americans remember where they were during that day. There have been few times in our Nation's history that we have faced such an atrocity. And the effects are still being felt today.

But instead of shrinking in the shadow of such adversity, we rose to the challenge and came together to help one another. We became a Nation of one. But it also has changed our Nation and the world that we live in today forever, the way we work, the way we view our security.

This past July, I was pleased that the House and Senate with the President came together to reauthorize the 9/11 Victim's Compensation Fund for police and firefighters, first responders who answered the call after the attack in New York and Washington, D.C. These heroic men and women deserve all the help we can give them, and we must never forget September 11, 2001. We must remember 18 years ago today when we were all one as Americans. We need that more today than ever before.

HONORING DAVID HUERTA

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, in my home State in the San Joaquin Valley we recently lost a wonderful individual, a leader who I would like to honor today, Fresno State Police Chief David Huerta. David was loved by all. He passed away in mid-August after serving honorably in that position for 15 years.

A lifelong resident of Fresno County, Chief Huerta dedicated his life to serving his community by teaching and providing public safety as a police officer. During his career he was recognized as Officer of the Year. And Fresno State President Joseph Castro said David served with integrity, even in the most challenging of situations.

David will be greatly missed by his wife Cynthia, his four children and three grandchildren. It is with great respect that I ask my colleagues today to join in honoring Police Chief David Huerta.

RECOGNIZING CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO AND UC MERCED

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this moment to recognize the recent achievements of two outstanding universities in my district, California State University, Fresno and UC Merced University of California.

According to the U.S. News and World Report's 2020 Best College rankings, Fresno State University, my alma mater, ranked number three in graduation rate performance for public universities.

UC Merced made the biggest leap of all on the college list. They ranked number one in the Nation for student outcomes, including number one in outperforming expected graduation rates.

Both of these universities currently have over 70 percent of their student

body who are the first in their family ever to attend a university. These universities are doing what a higher education should be doing for all Americans. Go Bulldogs. Go Bobcats.

CONGRESS MUST ACT ON GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I would like to rise to urge Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL to keep his word and act on gun safety legislation.

Every day it seems that there is coverage of another shooting on the news. Americans are just frustrated. Since Congress has begun their district work period in July there have been four high-profile shootings in this country. Those shootings resulted in the death of 51 Americans and over 90 that were injured. The threat to public safety today is simply unacceptable in our country.

In February, the House passed two key gun violence pieces of legislation. It has been nearly over 200 days since we passed these bills, but nothing has been done in the Senate. Despite the countless Americans who have lost their lives in these senseless shootings, including children, Leader MCCONNELL has refused to bring these up for debate. We should be doing our work and trying to provide gun safety for all Americans.

After the shootings in Dayton and El Paso, the American public has demanded action. The overwhelming majority of Americans want us to take commonsense action to provide better public safety. So Leader MCCONNELL said he would be doing just that. I think it is time that we hold him to his word.

This Congress must act. The President should take the leadership, ensuring we can do everything we can to protect Americans throughout our land.

REMEMBERING 9/11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the nearly 3,000 people who were killed on this day in 2001. At dawn, September 11, 2001, was a morning like every other, that is until everything changed. Terrorists, who were intent on destroying our country and our way of life attacked.

But through this tragedy we saw our country unite. We saw unmatched courage and bravery from our first responders, servicemembers, and everyday citizens. Now, 18 years later, we find ourselves with a new generation that did not experience the horrors of that day. They only know a post-9/11 world. That makes it all the more important that we teach them what happened that day, honor the victims, and discuss the impact those terrorist attacks have had on our world.

But today, we remember. Today, we pray. Today, we honor Americans of every background who, in the after-

math of that fateful day, united under our flag, bound together by a sense of unflappable courage, duty, and patriotism.

HONORING SCOTT KIMBRIEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TRONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my good friend, Scott Kimbriel, who died on August 12 after a year-long struggle with prostate cancer.

I met Scott sometime before kindergarten and we stayed close for almost 60 years. He used to come over and work on our farm while we grew up, and over many decades our friendship remained strong as we moved across the country.

At his core, Scott was a gifted entrepreneur and businessman. He was able to learn from his mistakes and relentlessly marched forward. He was a giver, able to exercise so much compassion with absolutely no strings attached because it was simply the right thing to do for his friends. I was better off for having known Scott.

In 2019 the American Cancer Society estimates over 174,000 people will be diagnosed with prostate cancer. Over 31,000 of those diagnosed will die from the disease. I, myself, am a cancer survivor.

Right now the National Cancer Institute, which is located in my district is working on prevention, detection, and treatment of prostate and other cancers. But we are leaving so much on the table. We need to invest more in research. We need to invest more in innovative solutions that could save lives like Scott's.

In Congress we must be determined and unified to eradicate cancer and eliminate the heartache that it brings so many families across our great country.

Scott Kimbriel was a special person, and it hurts knowing I can no longer pick up the phone and hear Scott's ever cheerful voice answer, "DT." But instead of looking in the rearview mirror, Scott would want us to look out the front window thinking about how we could support those in the future who might suffer from this horrible disease.

I know I am committed to this fight, and I ask my colleagues to join me in this fight.

REMEMBERING 9/11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, on this day nearly 20 years ago our great Nation suffered a loss unlike any she has suffered before or since. Almost 3,000 American citizens were killed on September 11, 2001, and thousands more have died or become seriously ill since from their response that day, whether

at Ground Zero or in the Middle East. Men and women, young and old were stolen from their families, their communities, and our country.

As she always has during our darkest hour, this country came together in a courageous way. We were one people uniting to heal a terrible wound. May we all strive today to soon find that same unity—now, not just in times of tragedy. Americans and her people will be all the better for it.

May God bless the memories of those who died on September 11, and may God bless this great country.

STRIVING TO MAKE KANSAS A BETTER PLACE TO LIVE

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, last week I completed my tour of all 105 counties in Kansas. I enjoyed meeting folks of all backgrounds and learning about their passions, concerns and what they need their representatives in Washington to do to deliver for Kansas.

From Dodge to Topeka, Pratt to Leavenworth, the message I heard from Kansans is they want their way of life preserved. They want their representatives to fight alongside President Trump, reduce Washington red tape, and advocate for new and fair trade agreements so our farmers can feed the world.

For the most part, Kansans just want a decent job with a good wage and a fair shot at the American Dream. Aside from the safety and security afforded to them, most would otherwise be happy to not have Washington involved in our day-to-day lives.

Despite folks' disagreements on some issues, Kansans are a people who largely agree on the importance of faith, community, and hard work.

After completing this tour of all 105 Kansas counties, I have a greater appreciation for the challenges of Kansans of all walks of life. Each conversation was an opportunity to hear an individual's story about the burden of securing affordable healthcare for a loved one, finding good workers to grow a small farm or business, finding a home to raise their family in, and protecting and nurturing the communities they love and cherish.

I don't have all the answers or quick fixes for our challenges, but I will continue to strive to make Kansas a better place to live. Each day I am blessed with the opportunity to represent Kansas in Congress. I carry that message in my heart, that we are the breadbasket of the world and home to some of the best, hardest working and most decent people on Earth.

AMERICANS MUST REJECT A RADICAL SOCIALIST AGENDA

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, last week a socialist senator seeking higher office proposed increasing abortions across the world as a way to slow population growth and combat climate change. Worse yet, he directly stated that he wanted U.S. taxpayers to pay for these abortions. As many Kansans are coming to understand, this is just one of the many disgraceful and dis-

turbing socialist agendas increasingly embraced by my colleagues across the aisle.

There is no policy proposal at present which more represents the Democrats' quest for total control over every aspect of our lives than the Green New Deal. This deal is nothing more than a rebranding of overwhelming government control under the guise of environmental stewardship. Just ask its sponsor's former chief of staff who said, "It wasn't originally a climate thing at all. . . . we really think of it as a how to change the entire economy thing."

The Green New Deal demands we completely overhaul our energy and transportation infrastructure, which would kill the jobs of millions of Americans working in the oil, and gas industry, manufacturing, and aviation industries, to name a few. The plan would crush Kansas beef producers by placing a hefty tax on our farms with estimates costing nearly \$2,000 per cow. The Green New Deal would be the greatest centralization of power in the hands of Washington elites in American history.

But destroying America's means of energy and food production isn't all this radical socialist agenda seeks to do; as we learned recently, the new Democrat party's to-do list includes everything from banning private health insurance to plastic straws nationwide, positions numerous Democratic candidates for President have already endorsed.

Democrats want to dictate what you can drink, how you drink it, what you can eat, and where you can work, and what healthcare you can have, all while you are forced to pay for abortions overseas. And don't forget about the proposed 90 percent tax rates on Americans either.

We must emphatically reject this radical socialist agenda and work instead to implement innovative solutions to provide for greater prosperity and equality for all. Our children and our grandchildren's future and the future of Kansas and this great Nation depend upon it.

□ 1030

MAKE HOMEOWNERSHIP EQUALLY AVAILABLE TO ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address how racially discriminatory housing policy has contributed to the unjust racial wealth gap in our Nation.

Currently, Madam Speaker, 72 percent of White households own their own homes, while just 41 percent of Black households do. The roots of this disparity can be traced to the discriminatory practices implemented by the Federal Housing Authority, which resulted in only 2 percent of federally backed loans being issued to African

Americans between 1934 and 1968. This was a supra-classic form of kinematic, organic, and institutional racism.

The ongoing ramifications of this most insidious example of discrimination continue to be felt acutely by people like many of my constituents. A recent study by Duke University found that the systemic denial of federally guaranteed loans led to the widespread use of predatory home sale contracts in Chicago's Black communities.

These contracts, Madam Speaker, led to a situation where Black home buyers paid, on average, over \$71,000 more—I repeat, Madam Speaker, over \$71,000—for their homes than White homeowners who had unfiltered access to federally backed loans.

In total, Madam Speaker, redlining, the practice of rating predominantly Black neighborhoods as "high risk" for traditional mortgage lenders, stole \$3.2 million—this is by conservative estimates, \$3.2 million—stole up to \$3.2 million from Chicago's Black families.

This is just one example of how homeownership, a pillar of the American Dream, has been placed out of reach of far too many Americans due solely to the color of their skin. It is incumbent, Madam Speaker, upon all of us to make this American Dream equally available to all, regardless of their skin color and regardless of their ZIP Code.

Fortunately, Madam Speaker, there are steps that this Congress can take to support Black American homeownership. For example, as the Urban Institute notes, factoring rental payment history into credit-scoring models could increase financial opportunities for Black home buyers.

Passing the Home Loan Quality Transparency Act, a bill I am proud to cosponsor, will restore a critical provision of Dodd-Frank, requiring mortgage lenders to report crucial details about their borrowers, including credit scores, racial and ethnic breakdowns, and other data.

Madam Speaker, \$3.2 million stolen.

RESTORE TRUTH AND COMPASSION TO IMMIGRATION DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about immigration in America.

My father was born in Italy. He came to the United States as a young boy. I am a first-generation American, and I don't like the hateful and divisive rhetoric being used about immigrants today. I am appalled at the way my country is treating the children and families of immigrants.

My dad came to America in the early 1920s. He was the first of his neighborhood to graduate from college. During World War II, he served as a navigator on a B-24 and was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross with three oakleaf clusters. He returned home and

graduated from Harvard Law School on the GI Bill.

As a young, Harvard-educated lawyer and Italian immigrant, however, my dad couldn't find a job. Italians were not respected, and after Hitler teamed up with Mussolini during the war, Italian Americans were not trusted, either.

My dad decided to return to Glen Cove, where he teamed up with another Italian lawyer, ran for city court judge, and became the youngest judge in the history of New York State.

My father achieved many other great successes, and he would always say, "What a country." His life was the very essence of the American Dream.

Our American Dream, however, is at risk. It may soon be the American nightmare.

Well, I still believe in my father's American Dream, and I am committed to keeping it alive.

Immigration has been an issue for decades, yet after all these years, Congress has yet to pass immigration reform.

President Trump's cruel, divisive, and simply unworkable positions have made things worse. His policies and rhetoric have exacerbated the problem, permeating a culture of fear that forces many immigrants further into the shadows.

I have been an advocate for fair and reasonable immigration policies for more than 25 years. As mayor of my hometown of Glen Cove, New York, in 1994, I created the very first shape-up center on the East Coast of the United States of America. It gave newcomers from Central and South America a safe place to get hired and made sure they got paid for the work they did. If they didn't get hired, they could stay and learn English or new job skills.

As county executive, in 2007, I refused to let ICE work with my Nassau County Police Department because ICE was acting like cowboys, drawing guns and knocking down doors, intimidating children and families who were not even subject to their raids and all of who together presented no risk of violence whatsoever.

Today, those same guys who gathered on the street corners of Glen Cove now own their own businesses and own their own homes, and their kids attended school with my kids.

But now, President Trump's heartless immigration actions are separating parents from their children, and children are being housed in cages.

I have seen it with my own eyes. This past July, I traveled to McAllen and Brownsville, Texas, to personally inspect the detention and relief centers, visit points of entry, speak with migrant families, and meet with humanitarian aid organizations. My visit to the detention centers along our southern border was heartbreaking. I saw men, women, and children being held in awful conditions.

Our system is broken. These centers are overcrowded, unsanitary, and clear-

ly ill-equipped to care for people in great numbers.

Meanwhile, the administration continues to promulgate more callous and mean-spirited decisions aimed at further attacking immigrants. Deporting children with cancer and diverting funds from military programs to build the wall, including money that was meant to go toward building schools for military families, and keeping immigrant children locked in indefinite detention are unconscionable.

These decisions endorsed by this administration are not consistent with American values. America is founded on the fundamental principle that "all men and women are created equal." It is not that everyone with a green card or U.S. citizenship is created equal; it is that every man and woman is created equal and should be treated with human respect and dignity.

We must continue holding congressional hearings on forced family separation; the detention of children for prolonged periods of time; the decision to end TPS and DACA, the Dreamer plan; and the overwhelming backlog in U.S. immigration courts.

We must also defund hate, as my friends at Bend the Arc are advocating, and set a floor for refugee admissions at 95,000, as my friends at the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society are advocating.

In addition to defunding the hateful policies of this administration, we must also strive for comprehensive immigration reform that treats people like human beings, lives up to the American Dream, gives a path of citizenship for TPS recipients and Dreamers, gives protection to millions of others, and secures our borders.

Robert F. Kennedy once said, "When we tolerate what we know to be wrong, when we close our eyes and ears to the corrupt because we are too busy or too frightened, when we fail to speak up and speak out, we strike a blow against freedom and decency and justice."

We need to restore truth and compassion to the debate over immigration in America, and we need to do it now, because the promise of the American Dream demands it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

God of Heaven and Earth, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Today we remember a day 18 years ago, begun in terror and violence, and ended in heroic effort and courage. We mourn those whose lives were snatched from them, and wish to comfort those left behind who still strive to cope with their loss. May You, O God, give them peace and healing.

We thank You again for the almost universal, international response to a great American tragedy, which all the world recognized as theirs as well. All Your children of good will could see the horror of actions by men, who would presume to act in Your name, causing so much death and destruction. May Your spirit of peace and justice continue to fill the hearts of people of all faiths, races, and nations. Help us to recognize Your creative love in the lives of all who share this beautiful planet.

Bless the men and women who serve this great Nation in the Senate and House of Representatives. May they be reminded of the importance of standing together to face the dangers presented by America's historical enemies.

May they be confident in the knowledge that all Americans stand behind them in their common effort to forge legislation that will reflect the resilient greatness of our Nation, protect our democratic process, and build a vibrant economy into a safe and secure future.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LEVIN of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

COMMEMORATING THE 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACKS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, how familiar this day is.

As a Member of the United States Congress who was in this building on 9/11, it was a bright and shiny day in New York and Washington, D.C. as we fled this building, saw the billowing smoke in the Pentagon, and knew that the other towers had already fallen by someone telling us something had happened. Hearing rumors that planes were flying into the White House and the State Department, we wondered about the resilience and the freedom of this Nation.

How grateful I am to stand here, 18 years later, to remind Americans and those who were not yet born that that was a day that should be reminding us every day of the greatness of our freedom, the value of our democracy, and the power of our people.

We honor those who fell, those families who still do not know of their missing loved ones, those who went to war, those who have come back.

But most of all, this day is to remind us of the wonderment of the representation of this Nation, the diverse Nation that it is, people from all walks of life, that whatever we have to overcome, whatever divisiveness we may see yesterday, today, or tomorrow, it will never—it will never—undermine the greatness of this country.

I will always, as one who was here, I will always remember and I will never forget. And I honor those whose lives were lost, pray for their families, but celebrate this country as we sang on the east steps, “God Bless America.”

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER THE 11TH IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on the 18th anniversary of the September 11th attacks, Patriot Day, we remember Islamic extremist terrorists hijacked passenger jets to murder nearly 3,000 innocent Americans in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania. It is sickening to think of the men and women and children who were slaughtered. Our remembrance promotes the legacy of the people who were mercifully murdered.

I am humbled and inspired by the strength and resilience, just as my colleague, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, of our country when we stand together to remember this mutual tragedy. Today, I remain inspired by Todd Beamer’s heroic immediate response, “Let’s roll.”

This summer, I visited the sites of Islamic extremist attacks in Buenos

Aires, Argentina, of 1994 and in Mumbai, India, of 2008. The brave people of America, Argentina, and India are prepared to stand together to resist further mass murder.

On this day, we honor the lives of those affected by the attack. It is also a day to salute our military who served to protect our freedom and to deny Islamic extremists a safe haven in Afghanistan.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE GRANDVIEW BEACH BLUFF COLLAPSE

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

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to recognize an unimaginable tragedy that occurred in my district last month.

On August 2, three women from the same family died when a coastal bluff at Grandview Beach in Encinitas collapsed on top of them: Julie Davis, Annie Clave, and Elizabeth Charles. They were enjoying a day at the beach with family and friends celebrating Elizabeth’s triumph over breast cancer. Suddenly, all three were lost.

There is a lot that I would like to say about the government’s responsibility to help prevent similar tragedies in the future, but, instead, I want to use this moment to recognize the extraordinary life that all three of these women brought into this world.

I had the opportunity to sit down with Dr. Pat Davis, who lost his wife, one of his daughters, and his sister-in-law on that day. Today, Dr. Davis is committed to ensuring that no one else experiences the same kind of loss that he has. He has called for action from local, State, and Federal officials to prevent future bluff collapses, and we stand together in these efforts. He is truly an inspiration.

Please take a moment to think of Julie, Annie, and Elizabeth. May they rest in peace.

COMMEMORATING THE 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACKS

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of those who lost their lives on 9/11/2001.

Eighteen years ago, the lives of innocent men, women, and children were senselessly taken at the hands of Islamic terrorists under the command of Osama bin Laden. Before day’s end, nearly 3,000 civilians, firefighters, law enforcement officers, and servicemembers would perish in the World Trade Center, on United Flight 93 in Pennsylvania, and in the Pentagon.

Though another year has passed, the pain remains for the families who lost a loved one that fateful day. I pray for all of those people who have lost someone today and pray for them tomorrow, and I pray for those in harm’s way who continue to serve across the globe to ensure that we can live safely in the greatest country in the world: the United States of America.

Never forget, and may God bless America.

In God we trust.

GUN VIOLENCE

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Texas is home to many gun owners.

Growing up, my family owned guns for hunting. It was part of how we fed our family. Thus, I don’t want to infringe on Second Amendment rights of Americans.

I do, however, want to stop the killing of innocent lives because someone was at risk to themselves or others who bought or accessed a firearm. Too many loopholes allow people to purchase, procure, or access a firearm.

Too many Texans have already died in mass shootings—so this is very personal to me—most recently, of course, in west Texas.

The House has already passed two bills that would prevent mass shootings. Last night, three more bills were marked up and will be ready for a floor vote.

Senate Republicans must allow a vote on gun control legislation. I am tired of people being killed because they won’t act. I end by asking them, Mr. Speaker: What will you do to save lives? What are you afraid of?

COMMEMORATING THE 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACKS

(Mr. MEUSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, we all remember where we were on September 11, 2001. I, myself, drove my daughter, Caroline, to school on my way to work. She was in the third grade. Driving over the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania on my way to work, I recall thinking what a beautiful day it was.

I watched with coworkers soon after that the horror of the planes hitting the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. A few days later, I was asked to come to Ground Zero to help.

I will never forget the hospitals were all prepared for injured in Manhattan, but there were no injured, or very few. I will never forget the families and the communities that showed resilience and hope. I will never forget the crowds of people cheering the first responders as they traveled toward Ground Zero.

I now have a flag hanging in my office with 2,977 names of those who perished that day. Two of those names were my friends.

September 11, now known as Patriot Day, brought us together and unified our Nation in defiance of terrorism and evil. Let us continue to come together and never forget that we are all Americans and that we, here, represent the greatest country on Earth.

RECOGNIZING ARTS IN EDUCATION WEEK

(Ms. PINGREE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Arts in Education Week.

As children return to school from their summer vacations, I am reminded that true education must go beyond language arts and math. It must include daily access to creative subjects like dance, poetry, visual arts, and theater.

Ninety-three percent of Americans agree: The arts are a vital part of a well-rounded education, and when schools make the investment, we see ripple effects across students' lives. A student involved in the arts is four times more likely to be recognized for academic achievement; they are three times more likely to win an award for school attendance and are elected to class office more than three times as often as their peers.

We must do more to ensure every child can regularly access arts education. In the most recent appropriations bill passed by this Chamber, we included a \$6 million increase to support Arts in Education at the Department of Education.

I am proud to work with lawmakers on both sides of the aisle to support this program and will push to preserve a strong increase in any final spending bill.

LET'S PUT PARTISAN POLITICS ASIDE

(Mr. BANKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 12 months since we reached a new trade agreement with Mexico and Canada. Both Mexico and Canada promptly ratified the agreement, but the House majority party refuses to let us vote on it.

While it is a multinational agreement, the benefits will be felt greatly in my home State of Indiana. Forty-seven percent of Indiana's exports go to Mexico and Canada, generating \$18 billion in revenue for the Hoosier State. American workers need this. Hoosier workers need this.

Speaker PELOSI, please, let's put partisan politics aside and do what is best for Indiana, for our country, and for all of North America. It is time to find the

courage to bring this trade deal to the floor for a vote.

□ 1215

REMEMBERING 9/11

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the events of September 11, 2001, and the courage of the first responders who ran into danger are forever etched in our minds and our hearts. Nearly 3,000 people were killed, thousands more were injured, and for many who were at Ground Zero, their pain and suffering endure.

This year we finally made the 9/11 Victim's Compensation Fund permanent so that we can always take care of our first responders, volunteers, and their families. We learned many lessons on that day. Lessons in sacrifice, sorrow, and bravery, as well as lessons in national security preparedness and foreign policy.

As we pause today to remember the victims and all those who were impacted by the attacks, let us also remember the lessons and maintain constant vigilance in our shared national commitment to never forget.

AMERICA WILL NEVER FORGET 9/11

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

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, never forget. In 2001 on 9/11, 2,977 peaceful people were murdered by 19 jihadi terrorists who were recruited by, plotted with, and were directed by al-Qaida to commit evil acts of war against the United States of America.

America is the greatest Nation to ever exist. We must never waiver in our resolve to defend our way of life. As the world tragically learned on 9/11, terrorists should never be ignored or given sanctuary to plan, prepare, or launch their evil acts. As Scripture says, there is a time for war. Following 9/11 was such a time.

Sadly, America's focus has long since expanded from finding and eliminating terrorists and those who give them sanctuary. Great nations don't fight endless wars. If we are truly to make America great again, we must be laser focused. America does not negotiate with terrorists or those who give them sanctuary. There is no substitute for victory.

WHEN WILL AMERICANS LEARN

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1941, H.R. 1146, and H.R. 205, three bills which will prevent oil

and gas leasing on our Outer Continental Shelf, in Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and near Florida's Gulf Coast.

In 1969, America suffered a disastrous oil spill off Santa Barbara. Two decades later, Exxon Valdez devastated Prince William Sound. In 2010, Deepwater Horizon ravaged the Gulf of Mexico.

When will we learn? How much more of our coastline will have to be ruined? How many more local economies will be shattered? How many more lives will be lost?

Republican and Democratic officials oppose the administration's expanded drilling plans. They know the health, environmental, and economic costs of oil spills and that those accidents occur thousands of times each year. There is no reason to take such risks, especially when we have cleaner, safer ways of producing the energy we need.

I applaud Representatives CUNNINGHAM, HUFFMAN, and ROONEY for offering this legislation to protect our planet and in the spirit of Pennsylvania's Constitution, which guarantees the people the right to clean air, clean water, and the preservation of our natural aesthetic.

I urge Members to support these bills. And I, too, say God bless America this day and all days.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL OPIOID AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Opioid Awareness Week. My home State of Kentucky has been one of the hardest hit by our Nation's ongoing opioid crisis. Sadly, over 1,300 Kentuckians died of a drug overdose in 2018.

I have been proud to work with my colleagues on the House Energy and Commerce Committee to combat the ongoing nationwide opioid epidemic. Next month we will honor the 1-year anniversary of the SUPPORT Act being signed into law. This landmark legislation is already helping communities prevent the rampant spread of opioid abuse, but more work needs to be done.

Last month I visited the Customs and Border Patrol international mail facility located at JFK Airport in New York. There I saw firsthand the dangers of illicit fentanyl coming through our borders. Fentanyl is a synthetic opioid that can be so potent it can kill anyone that comes in contact with it, including our law enforcement officers. I will continue to work with President Trump and my colleagues to stop fentanyl from coming to our country and help stop this epidemic from harming our communities.

REMEMBERING 9/11

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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

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

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

RECOGNIZING OFFICER KAREN BROWN

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

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

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

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

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CICILLINE) laid before the House the

following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 11, 2019, at 10:53 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1881.

That the Senate passed S. 2035.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

COASTAL AND MARINE ECONOMIES PROTECTION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1224

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1941) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior including in any leasing program certain planning areas, and for other purposes, with Mr. CUELLAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1230

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I am sorry. That is pure hypocrisy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I strongly urge passage of this legislation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1315

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

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

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

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

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

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

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

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

The Administration opposes H.R. 205, the Protecting and Securing Florida's Coastline Act of 2019, H.R. 1146, the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act, and H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act. These bills would undermine the Administration's commitment to a prosperous American economy supported by the responsible use of the Nation's abundant natural resources. Development of our resources enhances our energy security and energy dominance, and produces high-paying American jobs; provides increased revenue to the Treasury, States, tribes, and local communities; and is a critical source of conservation funding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEPTEMBER 5, 2019.

U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

SEPTEMBER 9, 2019.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

TERRY O'SULLIVAN,
General President.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

thank all the speakers for coming before us.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1330

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

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

H.R. 1941

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act".

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

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

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

SEC. 3. INSPECTION FEE COLLECTION.

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

"(g) INSPECTION FEES.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

"(A) shall be credited as offsetting collections;

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

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

"(D) shall remain available until expended.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

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

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

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, is in order except those printed in part F of House Report 116-200. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

California leads the Nation?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1345

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

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

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 5. RISK TO NATIONAL SECURITY.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1400

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 2. PUBLICATION OF INSPECTION RESULTS.

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

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

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

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

“(1) Any reports produced under this subsection.

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

“(A) The facility that was inspected.

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

“(C) The amount of the payment.”.

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 1415

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that allows the section 2 moratorium in this bill to go into effect when the Department of the Interior, in consultation with the Department of Labor, certifies that the offshore energy moratorium in the bill will not kill a substantial number of minority and women jobs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1430

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CASITOR 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 coload, for coloaded 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' progrowth 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 anti-environment, 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 from 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) | Hartzler | 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 |
| Buchson | 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 |
| Fox (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 F. | Castro (TX) |
| Aguilar | Brindisi | Chu, Judy |
| Allred | Brown (MD) | Cicilline |
| Amash | Brownley (CA) | Cisneros |
| Axne | Buchanan | Clark (MA) |
| Barragán | Bustos | Clarke (NY) |
| Bass | Butterfield | Clay |
| Beatty | Carbajal | Cleaver |
| Bera | Cárdenas | Cohen |
| Beyer | Carson (IN) | Connolly |
| Bilirakis | Cartwright | Cooper |
| Bishop (GA) | Case | Correa |
| Blumenauer | Casten (IL) | Costa |
| Blunt Rochester | Castor (FL) | Courtney |
| Bonamici | | Cox (CA) |

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

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1633

Messrs. HASTINGS, CISNEROS, PASCARELL, Mses. 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 yeas 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
Aguiar	Cooper	Gabbard
Allred	Correa	Gaetz
Axne	Costa	Gallagher
Barragán	Courtney	Gallego
Bass	Cox (CA)	Garamendi
Beatty	Craig	García (IL)
Bera	Crist	Golden
Beyer	Crow	Gomez
Bilirakis	Cummings	Gonzalez (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Cunningham	Gottheimer
Blumenauer	Davis (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	Houlihan
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	Españillat	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	Norcross	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)	Pascrell	Stanton
Larson (CT)	Payne	Stefanik
Lawson (FL)	Perlmutter	Steube
Lee (CA)	Peters	Stevens
Lee (NV)	Phillips	Suozi
Levin (CA)	Pingree	Swalwell (CA)
Levin (MI)	Pocan	Takano
Lewis	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Lieu, Ted	Posey	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski	Pressley	Titus
Loeb	Price (NC)	Tlaib
Loeb	Quigley	Tonko
Lofgren	Raskin	Torres (CA)
Lowenthal	Rice (NY)	Torres Small
Lowe	Richmond	(NM)
Lujan	Rooney (FL)	Trahan
Luria	Rose (NY)	Trone
Lynch	Rouda	Underwood
Malinowski	Roybal-Allard	Ruiz
Maloney,	Carolyn B.	Van Drew
Maloney, Sean	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Mast	Mast	Veasey
Matsui	Matsui	Velázquez
McAdams	McAdams	Visclosky
McBath	McBath	Waltz
McCollum	McCollum	Wasserman
McGovern	McGovern	Schultz
McHenry	McHenry	Waters
McNerney	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Meeks	Meeks	Webster (FL)
Meng	Meng	Welch
Moore	Moore	Wexton
Morelle	Morelle	Wild
Moulton	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Mucarsel-Powell	Mucarsel-Powell	Yarmuth
Murphy	Murphy	

NAYS—180

Aderholt	Fleischmann	Lesko
Allen	Fletcher	Long
Amash	Flores	Loudermilk
Amodei	Portenberry	Lucas
Armstrong	Foxx (NC)	Luetkemeyer
Arrington	Fulcher	Marchant
Babin	García (TX)	Marshall
Bacon	Gianforte	Massie
Baird	Gibbs	McCarthy
Balderson	Gohmert	McCaul
Banks	Gonzalez (OH)	McClintock
Barr	Gooden	McKinley
Bergman	Gossar	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
Bucshon	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
Cellular	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	Young
Tipton	Weber (TX)	Zeldin
Turner	Wenstrup	

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.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes 272, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

AYES—161

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

NOES—272

Adams	Butterfield	Crow
Aguilar	Carbajal	Cuellar
Allred	Cárdenas	Cummings
Amash	Carson (IN)	Cunningham
Armstrong	Cartwright	Davids (KS)
Axne	Case	Davis (CA)
Bacon	Casten (IL)	Davis, Danny K.
Barr	Castor (FL)	Dean
Barragán	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Bass	Chu, Judy	DeGette
Beatty	Cicilline	DeLauro
Bera	Cisneros	DelBene
Beyer	Clark (MA)	Delgado
Bilirakis	Clarke (NY)	Demings
Bishop (GA)	Clay	DeSaulnier
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Deutch
Blunt Rochester	Cohen	Dingell
Bonamici	Connolly	Doggett
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cooper	Doyle, Michael F.
Brindisi	Correa	Duffy
Brown (MD)	Costa	Duffey
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Engel
Buchanan	Cox (CA)	Escobar
Bustos	Craig	Eshoo
	Crist	Españolat

Evans	Lieu, Ted	Rutherford
Ferguson	Lipinski	Ryan
Finkenauer	Loeb	Sablán
Fitzpatrick	Loeb	San Nicolas
Fletcher	Loftgren	Sánchez
Foster	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Frankel	Lowe	Scanlon
Fudge	Lujan	Schakowsky
Gabard	Luria	Schiff
Gaetz	Lynch	Schneider
Gallagher	Malinowski	Schrader
Gallego	Maloney,	Schrier
Garamendi	Carolyn B.	Scott (VA)
García (IL)	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David
García (TX)	Mast	Sensenbrenner
Golden	Matsui	Serrano
Gomez	McAdams	Sewell (AL)
Gonzalez (TX)	McBath	Shalala
Gotthelmer	McCollum	Sherman
Green, Al (TX)	McGovern	Sherrill
Grijalva	McHenry	Sires
Guest	McNerney	Slotkin
Haaland	Meeks	Smith (NJ)
Harder (CA)	Meng	Smith (WA)
Hastings	Moore	Soto
Hayes	Morelle	Spanberger
Heck	Moulton	Speier
Higgins (LA)	Mucarsel-Powell	Stanton
Higgins (NY)	Murphy	Stefanik
Hill (AR)	Nader	Steil
Hill (CA)	Napolitano	Steube
Himes	Neal	Stevens
Hollingsworth	Neguse	Suozzi
Horn, Kendra S.	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)
Horsford	Norton	Takano
Houlihan	O'Halleran	Thompson (CA)
Hoyer	Ocasio-Cortez	Thompson (MS)
Huffman	Omar	Timmons
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Titus
Jayapal	Palmer	Tlaib
Jeffries	Panetta	Tonko
Johnson (GA)	Pappas	Torres (CA)
Johnson (LA)	Pascarell	Torres Small
Johnson (SD)	Payne	(NM)
Johnson (TX)	Perlmutter	Trahan
Kaptur	Peters	Trone
Katko	Peterson	Underwood
Keating	Phillips	Upton
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Van Drew
Kennedy	Plaskett	Vargas
Khanna	Pocan	Veasey
Kildee	Porter	Vela
Kilmer	Pressley	Velázquez
Kim	Price (NC)	Viscosky
Kind	Quigley	Walden
King (NY)	Raskin	Walt
Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)	Wasserman
Krishnamoorthi	Rice (SC)	Schultz
Kuster (NH)	Richmond	Waters
Lamb	Roby	Watson Coleman
Langevin	Rodgers (WA)	Welch
Larsen (WA)	Rooney (FL)	Wexton
Larson (CT)	Rose (NY)	Wild
Lawson (FL)	Rouda	Williams
Lee (CA)	Rouzer	Wilson (FL)
Lee (NV)	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth
Levin (CA)	Ruiz	
Levin (MI)	Ruppersberger	
Lewis	Rush	

NOT VOTING—5

Abraham	Lawrence	Radewagen
Clyburn	McEachin	

□ 1654

Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. PRESSLEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 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.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 252, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

AYES—179

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

NOES—252

Adams	Bustos	Costa
Aguilar	Butterfield	Courtney
Allred	Carbajal	Cox (CA)
Amash	Cárdenas	Craig
Axne	Carson (IN)	Crist
Barragán	Cartwright	Crow
Bass	Case	Cuellar
Beatty	Casten (IL)	Cummings
Bera	Castor (FL)	Cunningham
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Davids (KS)
Bilirakis	Chu, Judy	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Cicilline	Davis, Danny K.
Blumenauer	Cisneros	Dean
Blunt Rochester	Clark (MA)	DeFazio
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	DeGette
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clay	DeLauro
Brindisi	Cleaver	DelBene
Brown (MD)	Cohen	Delgado
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Demings
Buchanan	Cooper	DeSaulnier
	Correa	Deutch

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

NOT VOTING—7

Abraham	Lawrence	Radewagen
Clyburn	McEachin	
Foster	Norton	

□ 1703

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Georgia). There being no further amendments under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 548, he reported the bill, as amended by that res-

olution, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Graves of Louisiana moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1941, to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 2 of this Act shall take effect on the date the President certifies that the enactment of this Act will not increase the national average price of gasoline.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, we sat here for hours talking about the objectives of legislation to impose a moratorium on offshore energy production. I have heard the advocates for the legislation talk about the objectives of protecting our environment and preventing energy spills of oil. I have heard advocates talk about the objective of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. I have heard objectives discussed regarding creating jobs, perhaps green jobs, and ensuring that we have economic activity here in the United States.

Madam Speaker, I share those objectives. This bill doesn't do it. So let's go one by one and address the various objectives and address the facts associated with them.

Number one: Madam Speaker, when we stop producing energy domestically, we don't stop using energy. We don't change the form of energy. What happens is, as statistics prove, as the Department of the Interior officials have reported to the Natural Resources Committee, we increase our dependence upon imports from other countries.

When you import energy, they have lower environmental standards. You release greater greenhouse gas emissions, and by putting it on a ship, you

have a greater chance of spilling the energy. The safest thing you can do is produce it domestically and put it in a pipe.

Secondly, Madam Speaker, you have heard the discussion about ruining coastal habitat. You have heard the discussion about ruining coastal communities.

Madam Speaker, when you look at the statistics, in 2017, California produced about 209 million pounds of seafood; the State of Florida, about 111 million pounds; the State of South Carolina, about 10.5 million pounds. Louisiana, which has four times more energy production in the offshore than all other States combined, we produced 90 times that of South Carolina, or 900 million pounds of seafood, valued at more than \$360 million.

In addition, these funds go toward—the revenue sharing under offshore energy production goes to the resilience of your coastal ecosystem and the resiliency of your communities.

Madam Speaker, I shudder to think down the road, if we stop offshore energy production, what happens when a hurricane comes in and devastates communities, because we put a moratorium in place preventing the availability of revenues to protect those very communities.

In regard to the emissions, the United States has reduced greenhouse gas emissions more than the next 12 countries combined. We have done it without mandates, without requirements—more than the next 12 countries combined.

A BOEM report says emissions could increase in the absence of a new OCS leasing program. Madam Speaker, that was a report under the Obama administration. This bill does just that. It prevents additional leasings in new areas.

Case in point, when the State of California tried to impose their renewable energy portfolio, they have increased their dependence upon oil from Saudi Arabia. In New England, they have imported natural gas from Russia. These policies don't make sense as evidence has proven.

In regard to creating jobs, when President Obama was in office in 2011, one-half of this Nation's trade deficit, one-half, was attributable to us importing oil from other countries. Those countries do not have the safety record, the safety regime we have in the United States.

I join the Laborers' International Union of North America's president in believing that this bill is purely for political purposes. The union members working in the energy sector are being targeted. Instead of working to enact real job-creating infrastructure legislation, union members see their jobs, once again, being denigrated and belittled. Energy development can coexist with environmental stewardship.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, this motion to recommit is about gasoline prices. A run-up in world oil prices is effectively a tax on every American family's discretionary budget, except that the

money goes to the OPEC cartel rather than the U.S. Treasury.

Let me say that again. A run-up in world oil prices effectively attacks every American family's discretionary budget, except that the money goes to the OPEC cartel rather than the U.S. Treasury. Those aren't my words. Those are the words of Senators CANTWELL, MENENDEZ, MARKEY, and SCHUMER.

This amendment ensures that this legislation does not result in a disproportionate impact on the poor by raising gasoline prices and energy access to Americans across the board; of course, again, disproportionately impacting those of low income.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise to protect our environment. And as a former ocean engineer, I rise on behalf of the Lowcountry in the First Congressional District of South Carolina.

This motion to recommit wants to cede more power to our President, but I believe in the Constitution, and I believe in separate but equal branches of government like our Founding Fathers intended.

We, as Members of this institution, have an obligation to not only respond to current events, but also to anticipate future problems and work to prevent them. You don't wait for a bridge to break to fix its foundation, and you don't wait for the hurricane to hit before boarding up your windows, and you don't wait for an oil spill to realize that offshore drilling is just not worth jeopardizing our booming tourism industry.

As my father used to say, the juice just ain't worth the squeeze.

This bill ensures that no new lease sales are made along the Atlantic and the Pacific. We are not looking to reverse existing sales, just prevent new ones.

So why does this matter? Because public opinion matters, and because our friends and our neighbors have expressed their opposition to offshore drilling along our coasts.

There are certain things that go beyond politics, issues that touch each and every one of us personally, things that transcend partisan lines.

In South Carolina, we have strong bipartisan opposition to offshore drilling. It doesn't matter what party you belong to. We all enjoy the same beaches, the same sunset, and the same coastal economy, like South Carolina's, which is worth over \$22 billion. That is at risk. Whatever limited economic benefit may be gained from oil drilling is both fiscally and morally irresponsible.

I want to remind the folks of the remarkable track record Republicans

once had for environmental conservation. The National Environmental Policy Act and two Clean Air Acts were both signed by Republicans. A Republican created the Environmental Protection Agency.

By voting against this bill, Republicans promote pollution; they put profits over people; and they erase the legacy of environmental conservation that Republicans before them worked so hard to build.

I want to remind my colleagues, if they are a true conservative, if they are a real conservative, then be an environmental conservative, too.

This idea that offshore drilling is necessary for the country to achieve energy independence is just a red herring. As President Trump pointed out earlier this year during his State of the Union speech, the United States is now the number one producer of oil and natural gas in the world.

Yes, USA, USA, USA.

President Trump said that, for the first time in 65 years, we are a net exporter of energy. We have managed to make all this energy progress, and all that progress has been made without drilling in the Atlantic and Pacific.

We are sending 3 million barrels of oil overseas every single day. We do not need to put oil rigs in the Atlantic Ocean at all.

Why would we damage our beaches, our God-given natural resources, just to export more oil to other countries? Why would we do that?

To answer that question, we must first answer a more basic question: Who did you come here to serve?

When we see Old Glory, we pledge our allegiance to the flag and to the Nation, not to a party and not to a President.

This is not a partisan question, so let us not give a partisan answer. Let's defeat this motion to recommit and pass H.R. 1941.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 233, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—194

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

NAYS—233

Adams	Chu, Judy	Demings
Aguilar	Cicilline	DeSaulnier
Allred	Cisneros	Deutch
Amash	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Axne	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Barragán	Clay	Doyle, Michael
Bass	Cleaver	F.
Beatty	Cohen	Engel
Bera	Connolly	Escobar
Beyer	Cooper	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Espallat
Blumenauer	Costa	Evans
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Pinkenauer
Bonamici	Cox (CA)	Fletcher
Boyle, Brendan	Craig	Foster
F.	Crist	Frankel
Brindisi	Crow	Fudge
Brown (MD)	Cuellar	Gabbard
Brownley (CA)	Cummings	Gaetz
Bustos	Cunningham	Gallego
Butterfield	Davids (KS)	Garamendi
Carbajal	Davis (CA)	García (IL)
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny K.	García (TX)
Carson (IN)	Dean	Golden
Cartwright	DeFazio	Gomez
Case	DeGette	Gonzalez (TX)
Casten (IL)	DeLauro	Gottheimer
Castor (FL)	DelBene	Green, Al (TX)
Castro (TX)	Delgado	Grijalva

Haaland	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky	Dean	Krishnamoorthi	Rooney (FL)	King (IA)	Olson	Stefanik
Hastings	Matsui	Schiff	DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Rose (NY)	Kinzinger	Palazzo	Steil
Hayes	McAdams	Schneider	DeGette	Lamb	Rouda	Kustoff (TN)	Palmer	Steube
Heck	McBath	Schrader	DeLauro	Langevin	Roybal-Allard	LaHood	Pence	Stewart
Higgins (NY)	McCollum	Schrier	DeBene	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz	LaMalfa	Perry	Stivers
Hill (CA)	McGovern	Scott (VA)	Delgado	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger	Lamborn	Peterson	Taylor
Himes	McNerney	Scott, David	Demings	Lawson (FL)	Rush	Latta	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Horn, Kendra S.	Meeks	Serrano	DeSaulnier	Lee (CA)	Rutherford	Lesko	Ratcliffe	Thornberry
Horsford	Meng	Sewell (AL)	Deutch	Lee (NV)	Ryan	Long	Reed	Timmons
Houlihan	Moore	Shalala	Dingell	Levin (CA)	Sánchez	Loudermilk	Reschenthaler	Tipton
Hoyer	Morelle	Sherman	Doggett	Levin (MI)	Sarbanes	Lucas	Rice (SC)	Turner
Huffman	Moulton	Sherrill	Doyle, Michael	Lewis	Scanlon	Luetkemeyer	Riggleman	Upton
Jackson Lee	Mucarsel-Powell	Sires	F.	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky	Marchant	Roby	Wagner
Jayapal	Murphy	Slotkin	Engel	Lipinski	Schiff	Marshall	Rodgers (WA)	Walberg
Jeffries	Nadler	Smith (WA)	Escobar	Loeb sack	Schneider	Massie	Roe, David P.	Walden
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Soto	Eshoo	Lofgren	Schrader	McCarthy	Rogers (AL)	Walker
Johnson (TX)	Neal	Spanberger	Españolat	Lowey	Schrier	McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
Kaptur	Neguse	Speier	Evans	Lujan	Scott (VA)	McClintock	Rose, John W.	Watkins
Keating	Norcross	Stanton	Finkenauer	Luria	Scott, David	McHenry	Rouzer	Weber (TX)
Kelly (IL)	O'Halleran	Stevens	Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Serrano	McKinley	Roy	Webster (FL)
Kennedy	Ocasio-Cortez	Foster	Frankel	Malinowski	Sewell (AL)	Meadows	Scalise	Wenstrup
Khanna	Omar	Suozi	Swalwell (CA)	Fudge	Shalala	Meuser	Schweikert	Westerman
Kildee	Pallone	Takano	Gabbard	Gomez	Sherman	Miller	Scott, Austin	Williams
Kilmer	Panetta	Thompson (CA)	Gaetz	Gottheimer	Sherrill	Mitchell	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Kim	Pappas	Thompson (MS)	Gallego	Green, Al (TX)	Sires	Moolenaar	Shimkus	Wittman
Kind	Pascrell	Titus	Garamendi	Grijalva	Mast	Mooney (WV)	Simpson	Womack
Kirkpatrick	Payne	Tlaib	Garcia (IL)	Haaland	Matsui	Mullin	Smith (MO)	Woodall
Krishnamoorthi	Perlmutter	Tonko	Golden	Harder (CA)	McAdams	Newhouse	Smucker	Wright
Kuster (NH)	Peters	Torres (CA)	Gomez	Hastings	McBath	Norman	Spano	Yoho
Lamb	Peterson	Torres Small (NM)	Green, Al (TX)	Hayes	McCollum	Nunes	Stauber	Young
Langevin	Phillips	Underwood	Grijaiva	Heck	McGovern			
Larsen (WA)	Pingree	Van Drew	Haaaland	Herrera Beutler	McNerney			
Larson (CT)	Pocan	Vargas	Porter	Higgins (NY)	Meeke			
Lawson (FL)	Porter	Veasey	Trone	Hill (CA)	Meng			
Lee (CA)	Pressley	Vela	Trone	Himes	Moore			
Lee (NV)	Price (NC)	Velázquez	Underwood	Hollingsworth	Morelle			
Levin (CA)	Quigley	Visclosky	Van Drew	Horn, Kendra S.	Moulton			
Levin (MI)	Raskin	Wasserman	Vargaz	Horsford	Mucarsel-Powell			
Lewis	Rice (NY)	Waters	Veasey	Houlihan	Murphy			
Lieu, Ted	Richmond	Watson Coleman	Vela	Hoyer	Nadler			
Lipinski	Rooney (FL)	Welch	Velázquez	Huffman	Napolitano			
Loeb sack	Rose (NY)	Wexton	Visclosky	Jackson Lee	Neal			
Lofgren	Rouda	Wild	Wasserman	Jayapal	Neguse			
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)	Schultz	Jeffries	Norcross			
Lowey	Ruiz	Yarmuth	Waters	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran			
Lujan	Ruiz		Watson Coleman	Johnson (TX)	Trane			
Lujan	Ruppersberger		Welch	Kaptur	Underwood			
Luria	Rush		Wexton	Keating	Van Drew			
Lynch	Rush		Wild	Kelly (IL)	Vargas			
Malinowski	Ryan		Wilson (FL)	Kennedy	Veasey			
Maloney,	Sánchez		Yarmuth	Khanna	Vela			
Carolyn B.	Sarbanes			Kildee	Velázquez			
	Scanlon			Kilmer	Visclosky			
				Kim	Waltz			
				Kind	Wasserman			
				King (NY)	Schultz			
				Kirkpatrick	Waters			
					Watson Coleman			
					Welch			
					Wexton			
					Wild			
					Wilson (FL)			
					Yarmuth			
					Zeldin			

NOT VOTING—5

Abraham Lawrence Smith (NJ)
Clyburn McEachin

□ 1724

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. LAMBORN. Madam 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 238, nays 189, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

YEAS—238

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

Johnson (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Johnson (TX)
Kaptur	Keating	Kelly (IL)
Kennedy	Pocan	Porter
Khanna	Porter	Pressley
Kildee	Price (NC)	Quigley
Kilmer	Price (NC)	Quigley
Kim	Quigley	Raskin
Kind	Raskin	Rice (NY)
King (NY)	Rice (NY)	Richmond
Kirkpatrick	Richmond	

NAYS—189

Aderholt	Cole	Gooden
Allen	Collins (GA)	Gosar
Amash	Collins (NY)	Granger
Amodei	Comer	Graves (GA)
Armstrong	Conaway	Graves (LA)
Arrington	Cook	Graves (MO)
Babin	Crawford	Green (TN)
Bacon	Crenshaw	Griffith
Baird	Cuellar	Grothman
Balderson	Curtis	Guest
Banks	Davidson (OH)	Guthrie
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Hagedorn
Bergman	DesJarlais	Harris
Biggs	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Duffy	Hern, Kevin
Bishop (UT)	Duncan	Hice (GA)
Bost	Dunn	Higgins (LA)
Brady	Emmer	Hill (AR)
Brooks (AL)	Estes	Holding
Brooks (IN)	Ferguson	Hudson
Buck	Fleischmann	Huizenga
Bucshon	Fletcher	Hunter
Budd	Flores	Hurd (TX)
Burchett	Fortenberry	Johnson (LA)
Burgess	Foxx (NC)	Johnson (OH)
Byrne	Fulcher	Johnson (SD)
Calvert	Gallagher	Jordan
Carter (GA)	Garcia (TX)	Joyce (OH)
Carter (TX)	Gianforte	Joyce (PA)
Chabot	Gibbs	Katko
Cheney	Gohmert	Keller
Cline	Gonzalez (OH)	Kelly (MS)
Cloud	Gonzalez (TX)	Kelly (PA)

NOT VOTING—5

Abraham Lawrence Smith (NE)
Clyburn McEachin

□ 1735

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

U.S. WELOVEU FOUNDATION

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I take a moment and praise the work of the International WeLoveU Foundation, which I am proud to say is located in Oradell, New Jersey.

The organization and supporters are dedicated to improving the lives and conditions of people across the globe. They focus on the belief that we are all human beings, and when we help each other out, we bring out the best in all of us.

Last July, I attended one of their events, a walkathon in Jersey City's Liberty State Park. They raised \$50,000 to support disaster relief in Mozambique. Basically, the country was hit by two hurricanes in 2 months that devastated towns, farms, and homes.

Most people did not even know it happened, so I was impressed to see 2,500 people donate their time and effort to help people thousands of miles away. But that is what the WeLoveU Foundation does and continues to do:

help those less fortunate during times of crisis.

I am proud to support the work that they do and hope to praise more organizations like them in the future.

IN HONOR OF CORPORAL JAMES COLQUITT AS VETERAN OF THE MONTH

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a Knoxville, Tennessee, native, Corporal James Colquitt, an American hero and United States Marine.

Corporal Colquitt joined the United States Marine Corps at the age of 17. On March 15, 1944, he boarded a train and was sent to Marine Corps Recruit Depot San Diego for recruit training.

Corporal Colquitt served as a rifleman with I Company, 23rd Marines, 4th Marine Division. From February 19 to March 2, 1945, he participated in combat action against the Japanese during the Battle of Iwo Jima, one of the bloodiest battles of the entire Pacific War.

Corporal Colquitt received a Purple Heart for wounds received during combat operations on March 2, 1945. He was promoted to the rank of corporal and was honorably discharged from Marine Barracks in Washington, D.C., on April 26, 1946.

Corporal Colquitt is one of thousands of great men and women who honorably served our country during World War II. After defending our values and freedoms, these brave soldiers returned home, raised families, strengthened communities, and continued the growth of America.

It is my honor to recognize James Colquitt as the Tennessee Second Congressional District's September 2019 Veteran of the Month and to thank him for his service to our country.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACKS

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the September 11 attacks, and especially those who lost their lives on that day, including people from my own home State in Rhode Island.

I was 8 months into my first term in Congress when our Nation's course was inexorably altered that blue Tuesday morning. Over the last 18 years, as an inaugural member of the Committee on Homeland Security and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services with oversight over our Special Operations Forces, I devoted myself to ensuring our country is safe.

I know that we have made progress, important progress, and we worked to

eliminate terrorist enclaves around the world. We strengthened our security at home so that we are no longer a soft target. We, of course, paid dearly for these gains through the sacrifice of our servicemembers and the tax dollars of our citizens.

However, we still have a long way to go. This summer, Congress, of course, finally enacted, permanently, to protect 9/11 first responders. It is certainly long overdue.

We must also now fulfill our commitments to our veterans returning home from the Global War on Terror. We must protect our country against new and emerging threats, including in the cyber domain. And each year, we must renew our pledge to "never forget."

IN HONOR OF MELINDA "MINDY" GENE PICCOTTI

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H.R. 4279, to name the post office in Laceyville, Wyoming County, Pennsylvania, after Melinda "Mindy" Gene Piccotti.

A native of Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District, Mindy was an Air Force veteran who knew the struggles combat veterans and wounded soldiers face when returning home from duty.

Starting in 2009, at the age of 60, Mindy highlighted her commitment to our Nation's Armed Forces by creating Hunts for Healing, based out of Laceyville.

Mindy founded Hunts for Healing to help wounded soldiers returning from military operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other combat areas transition back into civilian life by allowing them to experience the joys of hunting, including social interaction and camaraderie.

With the assistance of volunteer guides and funded entirely by private donations, Hunts for Healing helps veterans in need of physical, spiritual, and emotional support.

For the impact of her life and for her continued legacy in the veterans' community, I urge Members to support H.R. 4279 and name the post office in Laceyville, Pennsylvania, for Melinda "Mindy" Gene Piccotti.

□ 1745

WETLANDS INSTITUTE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, the Wetlands Institute in Stone Harbor, south Jersey, recently celebrated its 50th anniversary.

For half a century, the Wetlands Institute has been providing south Jersey and its community with programs that

work toward conserving our wetlands and our coastal systems.

This institute was founded on the belief that those living in coastal communities should be educated about how to keep themselves and their environments protected, and they have been fulfilling that goal for the last 50 years.

Our oceans and our coasts are changing, and places like the Wetlands Institute are vital in teaching us how to protect the wildlife affected by these changes.

I thank all those who work at the institute for all they have done for the past 50 years. They are teaching the scientists and the environmentalists of the future, and I know they will continue to enhance our community and all of our communities into the future.

New Jersey, south Jersey, and the United States of America is proud of them. They have always been on the cutting edge, and I know they will continue to be.

RECOGNIZING JAKOB ZERNICK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable young man, Jakob Zernick, from Cambria County, Pennsylvania.

Jakob is a 13-year-old with a green thumb who started his own nonprofit called Seedz 4 Needz.

Jakob grows celery, Brussels sprouts, potatoes, and more to support the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, where he has been receiving treatment for Crohn's disease for the last 5 years.

Jakob sells his produce at a vegetable stand outside his home in Ebensburg and uses the money to purchase toys, games, books, and more items to gift to children who are patients at the hospital.

According to Jakob, he is projected to raise \$10,000 this year to benefit the Children's Hospital. His efforts have been recognized by the community, and Jakob's neighbors have been incredibly supportive, offering their own donations as well.

Most notably, Saint Francis University of Loretto, Pennsylvania, donated a \$1,000 check to Seedz 4 Needz to help Jakob continue his mission.

I am proud of the work that Jakob has done, and I look forward to seeing Seedz 4 Needz grow.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DIET EMAN

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a very special hero who risked her life to care for others and left a remarkable legacy.

Diet Eman was a longtime west Michigan resident who was born and

raised in the Netherlands. At 20 years old, she found herself in the middle of the crisis that had overtaken Europe during World War II.

Recognizing the injustices against the Jewish people in Holland, Diet and her fiancée, Hein Sietsma, formed the Dutch resistance group called “Help Elkander in Nood,” which means “helping each other in need.”

Throughout the course of the war, Diet organized shelters and provided assistance to Jews in need, reported on German troop movements, and helped downed Allied pilots.

Eventually, she was actually captured by the Germans and spent 3 months in a concentration camp. However, her spirit and will could not be broken, and she outsmarted her interrogators, bluffed her captors into releasing her, and quickly returned to her work within the resistance movement.

Diet was personally recognized by President Eisenhower for her contributions, as well as by Dutch King Willem-Alexander, who deemed her a national hero for her courage and sacrifice.

Meeting her in person last year was a very special memory for me and my entire family. Diet never wavered in taking a stand for what is noble and lived a life full of bravery, compassion, and purpose.

Through her efforts, Diet helped change the world and make it a better place.

May her memory be eternal.

COMMEMORATING THE 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF 9/11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to observe the 18th anniversary of the September 11 attacks on our Nation.

I want to thank the Congressional Progressive Caucus chairs, Representatives Jayapal and Pocan, and the Special Order conveners, Representatives Porter and Tlaib, for inviting us to use this time to commemorate this solemn anniversary of the 9/11 attacks.

I am deeply grateful to my colleagues who have supported the recovery over the years and, most recently, for the overwhelming support with a vote of 402–12 to fund and make permanent the Victim Compensation Fund.

On Tuesday, September 11, 2001, at 8:46 a.m., the first tower of the World Trade Center was struck. At 9:03, the second tower was struck. At 9:37, the Pentagon was hit. And, at 10:03, the fourth plane crashed in Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the name of every person who perished in that attack.

Gordon M. Aamoth, Jr.
Edelmiro Abad

Marie Rose Abad
Andrew Anthony Abate
Vincent Paul Abate
Laurence Christopher Abel
Alona Abraham
William F. Abrahamson
Richard Anthony Aceto
Heinrich Bernhard Ackermann
Paul Acquaviva
Christian Adams
Donald LaRoy Adams
Patrick Adams
Shannon Lewis Adams
Stephen George Adams
Ignatius Udo Adanga
Christy A. Addamo
Terence Edward Adderley, Jr.
Sophia B. Addo
Lee Adler
Daniel Thomas Afflitto
Emmanuel Akwasi Afuakwah
Alok Agarwal
Mukul Kumar Agarwala
Joseph Agnello
David Scott Agnes
Joao Alberto da Fonseca Aguiar, Jr.
Brian G. Ahearn
Jeremiah Joseph Ahern
Joanne Marie Ahladiotis
Shabbir Ahmed
Terrance Andre Aiken
Godwin O. Ajala
Trudi M. Alagero
Andrew Alameno
Margaret Ann Alario
Gary M. Albero
Jon Leslie Albert
Peter Craig Alderman
Jacquelyn Delaine Aldridge-Frederick
David D. Alger
Ernest Alikakos
Edward L. Allegretto
Eric Allen
Joseph Ryan Allen
Richard Dennis Allen
Richard L. Allen
Christopher E. Allingham
Anna S. W. Allison
Janet Marie Alonso
Anthony Alvarado
Antonio Javier Alvarez
Victoria Alvarez-Brito
Telmo E. Alvear
Cesar Amoranto Alviar
Tariq Amanullah
Angelo Amaranto
James M. Amato
Joseph Amatuccio
Paul W. Ambrose
Christopher Charles Amoroso
Craig Scott Amundson
Kazuhiro Anai
Calixto Anaya, Jr.
Joseph P. Anchundia
Kermit Charles Anderson
Yvette Constance Anderson
John Jack Andraecchio
Michael Rourke Andrews
Jean Ann Andrucki
Siew-Nya Ang
Joseph Angelini, Sr.
Joseph John Angelini, Jr.
David Lawrence Angell
Mary Lynn Edwards Angell
Laura Angilletta
Doreen J. Angrisani
Lorraine Antigua
Seima David Aoyama

Peter Paul Apollo
Faustino Apostol, Jr.
Frank Thomas Aquilino
Patrick Michael Aranyos
David Gregory Arce
Michael George Arczynski
Louis Arena
Barbara Jean Arestegui
Adam P. Arias
Michael J. Armstrong
Jack Charles Aron
Joshua Todd Aron
Richard Avery Aronow
Myra Joy Aronson
Japhet Jesse Aryee
Carl Francis Asaro
Michael A. Asciak
Michael Edward Asher
Janice Marie Ashley
Thomas J. Ashton
Manuel O. Asitimbay
Gregg A. Atlas
Gerald Thomas Atwood
James Audiffred
Louis F. Aversano, Jr.
Ezra Aviles
Sandy Ayala
Arlene T. Babakitis
Eustace R. Bacchus
John J. Badagliacca
Jane Ellen Baeszler
Robert J. Baierwalter
Andrew J. Bailey
Brett T. Bailey
Garnet Ace Bailey
Tatyana Bakalinskaya
Michael S. Baksh
Sharon M. Balkcom
Michael Andrew Bane
Katherine Bantiss
Gerard Baptiste
Walter Baran
Gerard A. Barbara
Paul Vincent Barbaro
James William Barbella
Victor Daniel Barbosa
Christine Johnna Barbuto
Colleen Ann Barkow
David Michael Barkway
Matthew Barnes
Melissa Rose Barnes
Sheila Patricia Barnes
Evan Jay Baron
Renee Barrett-Arjune
Arthur Thaddeus Barry
Diane G. Barry
Maurice Vincent Barry
Scott D. Bart
Carlton W. Bartels
Guy Barzvi
Inna B. Basina
Alysia Christine Burton Basmajian
Kenneth William Basnicki
Steven Joseph Bates
Paul James Battaglia
W. David Bauer
Ivhan Luis Carpio Bautista
Marlyn Capito Bautista
Mark Lawrence Bavis
Jasper Baxter
Lorraine G. Bay
Michele Beale
Todd M. Beamer
Paul Frederick Beatini
Jane S. Beatty
Alan Anthony Beaven
Lawrence Ira Beck
Manette Marie Beckles

Carl John Bedigian
 Michael Ernest Beekman
 Maria A. Behr
 Max J. Beilke
 Yelena Belilovskiy
 Nina Patrice Bell
 Debbie S. Bellows
 Stephen Elliot Belson
 Paul M. Benedetti
 Denise Lenore Benedetto
 Bryan Craig Bennett
 Eric L. Bennett
 Oliver Bennett
 Margaret L. Benson
 Dominick J. Berardi
 James Patrick Berger
 Steven Howard Berger
 John P. Bergin
 Alvin Bergsohn
 Daniel David Bergstein
 Graham Andrew Berkeley
 Michael J. Berkeley
 Donna M. Bernaerts
 David W. Bernard
 William H. Bernstein
 David M. Berray
 David Shelby Berry
 Joseph John Berry
 William Reed Bethke
 Yeneneh Betru
 Timothy D. Betterly
 Carolyn Mayer Beug
 Edward Frank Beyea
 Paul Michael Beyer
 Anil Tahilram Bharvaney
 Bella J. Bhukhan
 Shimmy D. Biegeleisen
 Peter Alexander Biefeld
 William G. Biggart
 Brian Eugene Bilcher
 Mark Bingham
 Carl Vincent Bini
 Gary Eugene Bird
 Joshua David Birnbaum
 George John Bishop
 Kris Romeo Bishundat
 Jeffrey Donald Bittner
 Albert Balewa Blackman, Jr.
 Christopher Joseph Blackwell
 Carrie Rosetta Blagburn
 Susan Leigh Blair
 Harry Blanding, Jr.
 Janice Lee Blaney
 Craig Michael Blass
 Rita Blau
 Richard Middleton Blood, Jr.
 Michael Andrew Boccardi
 John Paul Bocchi
 Michael L. Bocchino
 Susan M. Bochino
 Deora Frances Bodley
 Bruce Douglas Boehm
 Mary Catherine Murphy Boffa
 Nicholas Andrew Bogdan
 Darren Christopher Bohan
 Lawrence Francis Boisseau
 Vincent M. Boland, Jr.
 Touri Hamzavi Bolourchi
 Alan Bondarenko
 Andre Bonheur, Jr.
 Colin Arthur Bonnett
 Frank J. Bonomo
 Yvonne Lucia Bonomo
 Sean Booker, Sr.
 Kelly Ann Booms
 Canfield D. Boone
 Mary Jane Booth
 Sherry Ann Bordeaux
 Krystine Bordenabe
 Jerry J. Borg
 Martin Michael Boryczewski
 Richard Edward Bosco
 Klaus Bothe
 Carol Marie Bouchard
 J. Howard Boulton
 Francisco Eligio Bourdier
 Thomas Harold Bowden, Jr.
 Donna M. Bowen
 Kimberly S. Bowers
 Veronique Nicole Bowers
 Larry Bowman
 Shawn Edward Bowman, Jr.
 Kevin L. Bowser
 Gary R. Box
 Gennady Boyarsky
 Pamela Boyce
 Allen P. Boyle
 Michael Boyle
 Alfred J. Braca
 Sandra Conaty Brace
 Kevin Hugh Bracken
 Sandy Waugh Bradshaw
 David Brian Brady
 Alexander Braginsky
 Nicholas W. Brandemarti
 Daniel Raymond Brandhorst
 David Reed Gamboa Brandhorst
 Michelle Renee Bratton
 Patrice Braut
 Lydia Estelle Bravo
 Ronald Michael Breitweiser
 Edward A. Brennan III
 Frank H. Brennan
 Michael E. Brennan
 Peter Brennan
 Thomas More Brennan
 Daniel J. Brethel
 Gary Lee Bright
 Jonathan Eric Briley
 Mark A. Brisman
 Paul Gary Bristow
 Marion R. Britton
 Mark Francis Broderick
 Herman Charles Broghammer
 Keith A. Broomfield
 Bernard C. Brown II
 Janice Juloise Brown
 Lloyd Stanford Brown
 Patrick John Brown
 Bettina B. Browne-Radburn
 Mark Bruce
 Richard George Bruehert
 Andrew Brunn
 Vincent Edward Brunton
 Ronald Bucca
 Brandon J. Buchanan
 Greg J. Buck
 Dennis Buckley
 Nancy Clare Bueche
 Patrick Joseph Buhse
 John Edward Bulaga, Jr.
 Stephen Bruce Bunin
 Christopher L. Burford
 Matthew J. Burke
 Thomas Daniel Burke
 William Francis Burke, Jr.
 Charles F. Burlingame III
 Thomas E. Burnett, Jr.
 Donald J. Burns
 Kathleen Anne Burns
 Keith James Burns
 John Patrick Burnside
 Irina Buslo
 Milton G. Bustillo
 Thomas M. Butler
 Patrick Dennis Byrne
 Timothy G. Byrne
 Daniel M. Caballero
 Jesus Neptali Cabezas
 Lillian Caceres
 Brian Joseph Cachia
 Steven Dennis Cafiero, Jr.
 Richard Michael Caggiano
 Cecile Marella Caguicla
 John Brett Cahill
 Michael John Cahill
 Scott Walter Cahill
 Thomas Joseph Cahill
 George C. Cain
 Salvatore B. Calabro
 Joseph M. Calandrillo
 Philip V. Calcagno
 Edward Calderon
 Jose O. CalderoOlmedo
 Kenneth Marcus Caldwell
 Dominick E. Calia
 Felix Bobby Calixte
 Francis Joseph Callahan
 Liam Callahan
 Suzanne M. Calley
 Gino Luigi Calvi
 Roko Camaj
 Michael F. Cammarata
 David Otey Campbell
 Geoffrey Thomas Campbell
 Robert Arthur Campbell
 Sandra Patricia Campbell
 Sean Thomas Canavan
 John A. Candela
 Vincent A. Cangelosi
 Stephen J. Cangialosi
 Lisa Bella Cannava
 Brian Cannizzaro
 Michael R. Canty
 Louis Anthony Caporicci
 Jonathan Neff Cappello
 James Christopher Cappers
 Richard Michael Caproni
 Jose Manuel Cardona
 Dennis M. Carey, Sr.
 Edward Carlino
 Michael Scott Carlo
 David G. Carlone
 Rosemarie C. Carlson
 Mark Stephen Carney
 Joyce Ann Carpeneto
 Jeremy Caz Carrington
 Michael T. Carroll
 Peter J. Carroll
 James Joseph Carson, Jr.
 Christoffer Mikael Carstanjen
 Angelene C. Carter
 James Marcel Cartier
 Sharon Ann Carver
 Vivian Casalduc
 John Francis Casazza
 Paul Regan Cascio
 Neilie Anne Heffernan Casey
 William Joseph Cashman
 Thomas Anthony Casoria
 William Otto Caspar
 Alejandro Castaño
 Arcelia Castillo
 Leonard M. Castrianno
 Jose Ramon Castro
 William E. Caswell
 Richard G. Catarelli
 Christopher Sean Caton
 Robert John Caulfield
 Mary Teresa Caulfield
 Judson Cavalier
 Michael Joseph Cawley
 Jason David Cayne
 Juan Armando Ceballos

Marcia G. Cecil-Carter
 Jason Michael Cefalu
 Thomas Joseph Celic
 Ana Mercedes Centeno
 Joni Cesta
 John J. Chada
 Jeffrey Marc Chairnoff
 Swarna Chalasani
 William A. Chalcoff
 Eli Chalouh
 Charles Lawrence Chan
 Mandy Chang
 Rosa Maria Chapa
 Mark Lawrence Charette
 David M. Charlebois
 Gregorio Manuel Chavez
 Pedro Francisco Checo
 Douglas MacMillan Cherry
 Stephen Patrick Cherry
 Vernon Paul Cherry
 Nestor Julio Chevalier, Jr.
 Swede Joseph Chevalier
 Alexander H. Chiang
 Dorothy J. Chiarchiaro
 Luis Alfonso Chimbo
 Robert Chin
 Eddie Wing-Wai Ching
 Nicholas Paul Chiofalo
 John G. Chipura
 Peter A. Chirchirillo
 Catherine Ellen Chirls
 Kyung Hee Casey Cho
 Abul K. Chowdhury
 Mohammad Salahuddin Chowdhury
 Kirsten Lail Christophe
 Pamela Chu
 Steven Paul Chucknick
 Wai Ching Chung
 Christopher Ciafardini
 Alex F. Ciccone
 Frances Ann Cilente
 Elaine Cillo
 Patricia Ann Cimaroli Massari and her un-
 born child
 Edna Cintron
 Nestor Andre Cintron III
 Robert D. Cirri, Sr.
 Juan Pablo Cisneros
 Benjamin Keefe Clark
 Eugene Clark
 Gregory Alan Clark
 Mannie Leroy Clark
 Sara M. Clark
 Thomas R. Clark
 Christopher Robert Clarke
 Donna Marie Clarke
 Michael J. Clarke
 Suria Rachel Emma Clarke
 Kevin Francis Cleary
 James D. Cleere
 Geoffrey W. Cloud
 Susan Marie Clyne
 Steven Coakley
 Jeffrey Alan Coale
 Patricia A. Cody
 Daniel Michael Coffey
 Jason Matthew Coffey
 Florence G. Cohen
 Kevin S. Cohen
 Anthony Joseph Coladonato
 Mark Joseph Colaio
 Stephen J. Colaio
 Christopher Michael Colasanti
 Kevin Nathaniel Colbert
 Michel P. Colbert
 Keith E. Coleman
 Scott Thomas Coleman
 Tarel Coleman

Liam Joseph Colhoun
 Robert D. Colin
 Robert J. Coll
 Jean Marie Collin
 John Michael Collins
 Michael L. Collins
 Thomas Joseph Collins
 Joseph Kent Collison
 Jeffrey Dwayne Collman
 Patricia Malia Colodner
 Linda M. Colon
 Sol E. Colon
 Ronald Edward Comer
 Jaime Concepcion
 Albert Conde
 Denease Conley
 Susan P. Conlon
 Margaret Mary Conner
 Cynthia Marie Lise Connolly
 John E. Connolly, Jr.
 James Lee Connor
 Jonathan M. Connors
 Kevin Patrick Connors
 Kevin F. Conroy
 Brenda E. Conway
 Dennis Michael Cook
 Helen D. Cook
 Jeffrey W. Coombs
 John A. Cooper
 Julian T. Cooper
 Joseph John Coppo, Jr.
 Gerard J. Coppola
 Joseph Albert Corbett
 John J. Corcoran III
 Alejandro Cordero
 Robert Joseph Cordice
 Ruben D. Correa
 Danny A. Correa-Gutierrez
 Georgine Rose Corrigan
 James J. Corrigan, Ret.
 Carlos CortéRodriguez
 Kevin Michael Cosgrove
 Dolores Marie Costa
 Digna Alexandra Costanza
 Charles Gregory Costello, Jr.
 Michael S. Costello
 Asia S. Cottom
 Conrod Kofi Cottoy, Sr.
 Martin John Coughlan
 John G. Coughlin
 Timothy J. Coughlin
 James E. Cove
 Andre Colin Cox
 Frederick John Cox
 James Raymond Coyle
 Michele Coyle-Eulau
 Christopher Seton Cramer
 Eric A. Cranford
 Denise Elizabeth Crant
 James Leslie Crawford, Jr.
 Robert James Crawford
 Tara Kathleen Creamer
 Joanne Mary Cregan
 Lucia Crifasi
 John A. Crisci
 Daniel Hal Crisman
 Dennis A. Cross
 Kevin R. Crotty
 Thomas G. Crotty
 John R. Crowe
 Welles Remy Crowther
 Robert L. Cruikshank
 John Robert Cruz
 Grace Alegre Cua
 Kenneth John Cubas
 Francisco Cruz Cubero
 Thelma Cuccinello
 Richard Joseph Cudina

Neil James Cudmore
 Thomas Patrick Cullen III
 Joan Cullinan
 Joyce Rose Cummings
 Brian Thomas Cummins
 Michael Joseph Cunningham
 Robert Curatolo
 Laurence Damian Curia
 Paul Dario Curioli
 Patrick Joseph Currivan
 Beverly L. Curry
 Andrew Peter Charles Curry Green
 Michael Sean Curtin
 Patricia Cushing
 Gavin Cushny
 Caleb Arron Dack
 Carlos S. da Costa
 Jason M. Dahl
 Brian Paul Dale
 John D'Allara
 Vincent Gerard D'Amadeo
 Thomas A. Damaskinos
 Jack L. D'Ambrosi, Jr.
 Jeannine Damiani-Jones
 Manuel João DaMota
 Patrick W. Danahy
 Mary D'Antonio
 Vincent G. Danz
 Dwight Donald Darcy
 Elizabeth Ann Darling
 Annette Andrea Dataram
 Edward A. D'Atri
 Michael D. D'Auria
 Lawrence Davidson
 Michael Allen Davidson
 Scott Matthew Davidson
 Titus Davidson
 Niurka Davila
 Ada M. Davis
 Clinton Davis, Sr.
 Wayne Terrial Davis
 Anthony Richard Dawson
 Calvin Dawson
 Edward James Day
 William Thomas Dean
 Robert J. DeAngelis, Jr.
 Thomas Patrick DeAngelis
 Dorothy Alma de Araujo
 Ana Gloria Pocasangre Debarrera
 Tara E. Debek
 James D. Debeuneure
 Anna M. DeBin
 James V. DeBlase, Jr.
 Jayceryll Malabuyoc de Chavez
 Paul DeCola
 Gerald F. DeConto
 Simon Marash Dedvukaj
 Jason Christopher DeFazio
 David A. DeFeo
 Jennifer De Jesus
 Monique Effie DeJesus
 Nereida De Jesus
 Emy De La Peña
 Donald Arthur Delapenha
 Azucena Maria de la Torre
 Vito Joseph DeLeo
 Danielle Anne Delie
 Joseph A. Della Pietra
 Andrea DellaBella
 Palmina DelliGatti
 Colleen Ann Deloughery
 Joseph DeLuca
 Manuel Del Valle, Jr.
 Francis Albert De Martini
 Anthony Demas
 Martin N. DeMeo
 Francis Deming
 Carol Keyes Demitz

Kevin Dennis
 Thomas Francis Dennis, Sr.
 Jean C. DePalma
 Jose Nicolas De Pena
 Robert John Deraney
 Michael DeRienzo
 David Paul DeRubbio
 Jemal Legesse DeSantis
 Christian Louis DeSimone
 Edward DeSimone III
 Andrew J. Desperito
 Michael Jude D'Esposito
 Cindy Ann Deuel
 Melanie Louise de Vere
 Jerry DeVito
 Robert P. Devitt, Jr.
 Dennis Lawrence Devlin
 Gerard P. Dewan
 Sulemanali Kassamali Dhanani
 Michael Louis DiAgostino
 Matthew Diaz
 Nancy Diaz
 Obdulio Ruiz Diaz
 Michael A. Diaz-Piedra III
 Judith Berquis Diaz-Sierra
 Patricia Florence Di Chiaro
 Rodney Dickens
 Jerry D. Dickerson
 Joseph Dermot Dickey, Jr.
 Lawrence Patrick Dickinson
 Michael D. Diehl
 John Difato
 Vincent Francis DiFazio
 Carl Anthony DiFranco
 Donald Joseph DiFranco
 Eddie A. Dillard
 Debra Ann Di Martino
 David DiMeglio
 Stephen Patrick Dimino
 William John Dimmling
 Christopher More Dincuff
 Jeffrey Mark Dingle
 Rena Sam Dinnoo
 Anthony Dionisio
 George DiPasquale
 Joseph Di Pilato
 Douglas Frank DiStefano
 Donald Americo DiTullio
 Ramzi A. Doany
 Johnnie Doctor, Jr.
 John Joseph Doherty
 Melissa Cándida Doi
 Brendan Dolan
 Robert E. Dolan, Jr.
 Neil Matthew Dollard
 James Domanico
 Benilda Pascua Domingo
 Alberto Dominguez
 Carlos Dominguez
 Jerome Mark Patrick Dominguez
 Kevin W. Donnelly
 Jacqueline Donovan
 William H. Donovan
 Stephen Scott Dorf
 Thomas Dowd
 Kevin Christopher Dowdell
 Mary Yolanda Dowling
 Raymond Matthew Downey, Sr.
 Frank Joseph Doyle
 Joseph Michael Doyle
 Randall L. Drake
 Patrick Joseph Driscoll
 Stephen Patrick Driscoll
 Charles A. Droz III
 Mirna A. Duarte
 Luke A. Dudek
 Christopher Michael Duffy
 Gerard J. Duffy
 Michael Joseph Duffy
 Thomas W. Duffy
 Antoinette Duger
 Jackie Sayegh Duggan
 Sareve Dukat
 Patrick Dunn
 Felicia Gail DunJones
 Christopher Joseph Dunne
 Richard Anthony Dunstan
 Patrick Thomas Dwyer
 Joseph Anthony Eacobacci
 John Bruce Eagleson
 Edward T. Earhart
 Robert Douglas Eaton
 Dean Phillip Eberling
 Margaret Ruth Echtermann
 Paul Robert Eckna
 Constantine Economos
 Barbara G. Edwards
 Dennis Michael Edwards
 Michael Hardy Edwards
 Christine Egan
 Lisa Erin Egan
 Martin J. Egan, Jr.
 Michael Egan
 Samantha Martin Egan
 Carole Eggert
 Lisa Caren Ehrlich
 John Ernst Eichler
 Eric Adam Eisenberg
 Daphne Ferlinda Elder
 Michael J. Elferis
 Mark Joseph Ellis
 Valerie Silver Ellis
 Albert Alfy William Elmarry
 Robert R. Elseth
 Edgar Hendricks Emery, Jr.
 Doris Suk-Yuen Eng
 Christopher Epps
 Ulf Ramm Ericson
 Erwin L. Erker
 William John Erwin
 Sarah Ali Escarcega
 Jose Espinal
 Fanny Espinoza
 Billy Scoop Esposito
 Bridget Ann Esposito
 Francis Esposito
 Michael A. Esposito
 Ruben Esquillin, Jr.
 Sadie Ette
 Barbara G. Etzold
 Eric Brian Evans
 Robert Edward Evans
 Meredith Emily June Ewart
 Catherine K. Fagan
 Patricia Mary Fagan
 Ivan Kyrillos FairbankBarbosa
 Keith George Fairben
 Sandra Fajardo-Smith
 Charles S. Falkenberg
 Dana Falkenberg
 Zoe Falkenberg
 Jamie L. Fallon
 William F. Fallon
 William Lawrence Fallon, Jr.
 Anthony J. Fallone, Jr.
 Dolores Brigitte Fanelli
 Robert John Fangman
 John Joseph Fanning
 Kathleen Anne Faragher
 Thomas James Farino
 Nancy C. Doloszycki Farley
 Paige Marie Farley-Hackel
 Elizabeth Ann Farmer
 Douglas Jon Farnum
 John Gerard Farrell
 John W. Farrell
 Terrence Patrick Farrell
 Joseph D. Farrelly
 Thomas Patrick Farrelly
 Syed Abdul Fatha
 Christopher Edward Faughnan
 Wendy R. Faulkner
 Shannon Marie Fava
 Bernard D. Favuzza
 Robert Fazio, Jr.
 Ronald Carl Fazio, Sr.
 William M. Feehan
 Francis Jude Feely
 Garth Erin Feeney
 Sean Bernard Fegan
 Lee S. Fehling
 Peter Adam Feidelberg
 Alan D. Feinberg
 Rosa Maria Feliciano
 Edward P. Felt
 Edward Thomas Fergus, Jr.
 George J. Ferguson III
 J. Joseph Ferguson
 Henry Fernandez
 Judy Hazel Santillan Fernandez
 Julio Fernandez
 Elisa Giselle Ferraina
 Anne Marie Sallerin Ferreira
 Robert John Ferris
 David Francis Ferrugio
 Louis V. Fersini, Jr.
 Michael David Ferugio
 Bradley James Fetchet
 Jennifer Louise Fialko
 Kristen Nicole Fiedel
 Amelia V. Fields
 Samuel Fields
 Alexander Milan Filipov
 Michael Bradley Finnegan
 Timothy J. Finnerty
 Michael C. Fiore
 Stephen J. Fiorelli
 Paul M. Fiori
 John B. Fiorito
 John R. Fischer
 Andrew Fisher
 Bennett Lawson Fisher
 Gerald P. Fisher
 John Roger Fisher
 Thomas J. Fisher
 Lucy A. Fishman
 Ryan D. Fitzgerald
 Thomas James Fitzpatrick
 Richard P. Fitzsimons
 Salvatore Fiumefreddo
 Darlene E. Flagg
 Wilson F. Flagg
 Christina Donovan Flannery
 Eileen Flecha
 Andre G. Fletcher
 Carl M. Flickinger
 Matthew M. Flocco
 John Joseph Florio
 Joseph Walkden Flounders
 Carol Ann Flyzik
 David Fodor
 Michael N. Fodor
 Stephen Mark Fogel
 Thomas J. Foley
 Jane C. Folger
 David J. Fontana
 Chih Min Foo
 Delrose E. Forbes Cheatham
 Godwin Forde
 Donald A. Foreman
 Christopher Hugh Forsythe
 Claudia Alicia Foster
 Noel John Foster
 Sandra N. Foster

Ana Fosteris
 Robert Joseph Foti
 Jeffrey Fox
 Virginia Elizabeth Fox
 Pauline Francis
 Virgin Lucy Francis
 Gary Jay Frank
 Morton H. Frank
 Peter Christopher Frank
 Colleen L. Fraser
 Richard K. Fraser
 Kevin J. Frawley
 Clyde Frazier, Jr.
 Lillian Inez Frederick
 Andrew Fredericks
 Tamitha Freeman
 Brett Owen Freiman
 Peter L. Freund
 Arlene Eva Fried
 Alan W. Friedlander
 Andrew Keith Friedman
 Paul J. Friedman
 Gregg J. Froehner
 Lisa Anne Frost
 Peter Christian Fry
 Clement A. Fumando
 Steven Elliot Furman
 Paul James Furmato
 Karleton Douglas Beye Fyfe
 G Fredric Neal Gabler
 Richard Peter Gabriel
 Richard S. Gabrielle
 James Andrew Gadiel
 Pamela Lee Gaff
 Ervin Vincent Gailliard
 Deanna Lynn Galante and her unborn child
 Grace Catherine Galante
 Anthony Edward Gallagher
 Daniel James Gallagher
 John Patrick Gallagher
 Lourdes J. Galletti
 Cono E. Gallo
 Vincent Gallucci
 Thomas E. Galvin
 Giovanna Galletta Gambale
 Thomas Gambino, Jr.
 Giann F. Gamboa
 Ronald L. Gamboa
 Peter James Ganci, Jr.
 Michael Gann
 Charles William Garbarini
 Andrew Sonny Garcia
 Cesar R. Garcia
 David Garcia
 Jorge Luis Morron Garcia
 Juan Garcia
 Marilyn Del Carmen Garcia
 Christopher Samuel Gardner
 Douglas Benjamin Gardner
 Harvey Joseph Gardner III
 Jeffrey Brian Gardner
 Thomas A. Gardner
 William Arthur Gardner
 Frank Garfi
 Rocco Nino Gargano
 James M. Gartenberg
 Matthew David Garvey
 Bruce Gary
 Boyd Alan Gatton
 Donald Richard Gavagan, Jr.
 Peter Alan Gay
 Terence D. Gazzani
 Gary Paul Geidel
 Paul Hamilton Geier
 Julie M. Geis
 Peter Gerard Gelinas
 Steven Paul Geller
 Howard G. Gelling, Jr.
 Peter Victor Genco, Jr.
 Steven Gregory Genovese
 Alayne Gentul
 Linda M. George
 Edward F. Geraghty
 Suzanne Geraty
 Ralph Gerhardt
 Robert Gerlich
 Denis P. Germain
 Marina Romanovna Gertsberg
 Susan M. Getzendanner
 Lawrence D. Getzfred
 James G. Geyer
 Cortez Ghee
 Joseph M. Giaccone
 Vincent Francis Giammona
 Debra Lynn Gibbon
 James Andrew Giberson
 Brenda C. Gibson
 Craig Neil Gibson
 Ronnie E. Gies
 Andrew Clive Gilbert
 Timothy Paul Gilbert
 Paul Stuart Gilbey
 Paul John Gill
 Mark Y. Gilles
 Evan Hunter Gillette
 Ronald Lawrence Gilligan
 Rodney C. Gillis
 Laura Gilly
 John F. Ginley
 Donna Marie Giordano
 Jeffrey John Giordano
 John Giordano
 Steven A. Giorgetti
 Martin Giovinazzo
 Kum-Kum Girolamo
 Salvatore Gitto
 Cynthia Giugliano
 Mon Gjonbalaj
 Dianne Gladstone
 Keith Alexander Glascoe
 Thomas Irwin Glasser
 Edmund Glazer
 Harry Glenn
 Barry H. Glick
 Jeremy Logan Glick
 Steven Glick
 John T. Gnazzo
 William Robert Godshalk
 Michael Gogliormella
 Brian F. Goldberg
 Jeffrey G. Goldflam
 Michelle Goldstein
 Monica Goldstein
 Steven Ian Goldstein
 Ronald F. Golinski
 Andrew H. Golkin
 Dennis James Gomes
 Enrique Antonio Gomez
 Jose Bienvenido Gomez
 Manuel Gomez, Jr.
 Wilder Alfredo Gomez
 Jenine Nicole Gonzalez
 Mauricio Gonzalez
 Rosa J. Gonzalez
 Lynn Catherine Goodchild
 Calvin Joseph Gooding
 Peter Morgan Goodrich
 Harry Goody
 Kiran Kumar Reddy Gopu
 Catherine C. Gorayeb
 Lisa Fenn Gordenstein
 Kerene Gordon
 Sebastian Gorki
 Kieran Joseph Gorman
 Thomas Edward Gorman
 Michael Edward Gould
 O. Kristin Osterholm White Gould
 Douglas Alan Gowell
 Yuji Goya
 Jon Richard Grabowski
 Christopher Michael Grady
 Edwin J. Graf III
 David Martin Graifman
 Gilbert Franco Granados
 Lauren Catuzzi Grandcolas and her unborn child
 Elvira Granitto
 Winston Arthur Grant
 Christopher S. Gray
 Ian J. Gray
 James Michael Gray
 Tara McCloud Gray
 John M. Grazioso
 Timothy George Grazioso
 Derrick Auther Green
 Wade B. Green
 Wanda Anita Green
 Elaine Myra Greenberg
 Donald Freeman Greene
 Gayle R. Greene
 James Arthur Greenleaf, Jr.
 Eileen Marsha Greenstein
 Elizabeth Martin Gregg
 Denise Marie Gregory
 Donald H. Gregory
 Florence Moran Gregory
 Pedro Grehan
 John Michael Griffin
 Tawanna Sherry Griffin
 Joan Donna Griffith
 Warren Grifka
 Ramon B. Grijalvo
 Joseph F. Grillo
 David Joseph Grimm
 Francis Edward Grogan
 Linda Gronlund
 Kenneth George Grouzalis
 Joseph Grzelak
 Matthew James Grzymalski
 Robert Joseph Gschaar
 Liming Gu
 Richard J. Guadagno
 Jose A. Guadalupe
 Cindy Yan Zhu Guan
 Geoffrey E. Guja
 Joseph P. Gullickson
 Babita Girjamatie Guman
 Douglas Brian Gurian
 Janet Ruth Gustafson
 Philip T. Guza
 Barbara Guzzardo
 Peter Mark Gyulavary
 Gary Robert Haag
 Andrea Lyn Haberman
 Barbara Mary Habib
 Philip Haentzler
 Nezam A. Hafiz
 Karen Elizabeth Hagerty
 Steven Michael Hagis
 Mary Lou Hague
 David Halderman
 Maile Rachel Hale
 Diane Hale-McKinzy
 Richard B. Hall
 Stanley R. Hall
 Vaswald George Hall
 Robert J. Halligan
 Vincent Gerard Halloran
 Carolyn B. Halmon
 James Douglas Halvorson
 Mohammad Salman Hamdani
 Felicia Hamilton
 Robert W. Hamilton
 Carl Max Hammond, Jr.

Frederic K. Han
 Christopher James Hanley
 Sean S. Hanley
 Valerie Joan Hanna
 Thomas Paul Hannafin
 Kevin James Hannaford, Sr.
 Michael Lawrence Hannan
 Dana Rey Hannon
 Christine Lee Hanson
 Peter Burton Hanson
 Sue Kim Hanson
 Vassilios G. Haramis
 James A. Haran
 Gerald Francis Hardacre
 Jeffrey Pike Hardy
 T.J. Hargrave
 Daniel Edward Harlin
 Frances Haros
 Harvey L. Harrell
 Stephen G. Harrell
 Melissa HarringtonHughes
 Aisha Ann Harris
 Stewart D. Harris
 John Patrick Hart
 Eric Hartono
 John Clinton Hartz
 Emeric Harvey
 Peter Paul Hashem
 Thomas Theodore Haskell, Jr.
 Timothy Shawn Haskell
 Joseph John Hasson III
 Leonard W. Hatton, Jr.
 Terence S. Hatton
 Michael Helmut Haub
 Timothy Aaron Haviland
 Donald G. Havlish, Jr.
 Anthony Maurice Hawkins
 Nobuhiro Hayatsu
 James Edward Hayden
 Robert Jay Hayes
 Philip T. Hayes, Ret.
 W. Ward Haynes
 Scott Jordan Hazelcorn
 Michael K. Healey
 Roberta B. Heber
 Charles Francis Xavier Heeran
 John F. Heffernan
 Michele M. Heidenberger
 Sheila M.S. Hein
 H. Joseph Heller, Jr.
 JoAnn L. Heltibridle
 Ronald John Hemenway
 Mark F. Hemschoot
 Ronnie Lee Henderson
 Brian Hennessey
 Edward R. Hennessy, Jr.
 Michelle Marie Henrique
 Joseph Patrick Henry
 William L. Henry, Jr.
 Catherina Henry-Robinson
 John Christopher Henwood
 Robert Allan Hepburn
 Mary Herencia
 Lindsay C. Herkness III
 Harvey Robert Hermer
 Norberto Hernandez
 Raul Hernandez
 Gary Herold
 Jeffrey Alan Hersch
 Thomas J. Hetzel
 Leon Bernard
 Heyward MC Sundance
 Brian Christopher Hickey
 Enemencio Dario
 Hidalgo Cedeño
 Timothy Brian Higgins
 Robert D.W. Higley II
 Todd Russell Hill
 Clara Victorine Hinds
 Neal O. Hinds
 Mark Hindy
 Katsuyuki Hirai
 Heather Malia Ho
 Tara Yvette Hobbs
 Thomas Anderson Hobbs
 James J. Hobin
 Robert Wayne Hobson III
 DaJuan Hodges
 Ronald G. Hoerner
 Patrick A. Hoey
 John A. Hofer
 Marcia Hoffman
 Stephen Gerard Hoffman
 Frederick Joseph Hoffmann
 Michele L. Hoffmann
 Judith Florence Hofmiller
 Wallace Cole Hogan, Jr.
 Thomas Warren Hohlweck, Jr.
 Jonathan R. Hohmann
 Cora Hidalgo Holland
 John Holland
 Joseph F. Holland
 Jimmie I. Holley
 Elizabeth Holmes
 Thomas P. Holohan
 Herbert Wilson Homer
 LeRoy W. Homer, Jr.
 Bradley V. Hoorn
 James P. Hopper
 Montgomery McCullough Hord
 Michael Joseph Horn
 Matthew Douglas Horning
 Robert L. Horohoe, Jr.
 Michael Robert Horrocks
 Aaron Horwitz
 Charles J. Houston
 Uhuru G. Houston
 Angela M. Houtz
 George Gerard Howard
 Brady Kay Howell
 Michael C. Howell
 Steven Leon Howell
 Jennifer L. Howley and her unborn child
 Milagros Hromada
 Marian R. Hrycak
 Stephen Huczko, Jr.
 Kris Robert Hughes
 Paul Rexford Hughes
 Robert T. Hughes, Jr.
 Thomas F. Hughes, Jr.
 Timothy Robert Hughes
 Susan Huie
 Lamar Demetrius Hulse
 John Nicholas Humber, Jr.
 William Christopher Hunt
 Kathleen Anne Hunt-Casey
 Joseph Gerard Hunter
 Peggie M. Hurt
 Robert R. Hussa
 Stephen N. Hyland, Jr.
 Robert J. Hymel
 Thomas Edward Hynes
 Walter G. Hynes
 Joseph Anthony Ianelli
 Zuhtu Ibis
 Jonathan Lee Ielpi
 Michael Patrick Iken
 Daniel Ilkanayev
 Frederick J. III, Jr.
 Abraham Nethanel Ilowitz
 Anthony P. Infante, Jr.
 Louis S. Inghilterra
 Christopher Noble Ingrassia
 Paul Innella
 Stephanie Veronica Irby
 Douglas Jason Irgang
 Kristin Irvine-Ryan
 Todd Antione Isaac
 Erik Hans Isbrandtsen
 Taizo Ishikawa
 Waleed Joseph Iskandar
 Aram Iskenderian, Jr.
 John F. Iskyan
 Kazushige Ito
 Aleksandr Valeryevich Ivantsov
 Lacey Bernard Ivory
 Virginia May Jablonski
 Bryan C. Jack
 Brooke Alexandra Jackman
 Aaron Jeremy Jacobs
 Ariel Louis Jacobs
 Jason Kyle Jacobs
 Michael G. Jacobs
 Steven A. Jacobson
 Steven D. Jacoby
 Ricknauth Jaggernauth
 Jake Denis Jagoda
 Yudhvir S. Jain
 Maria Jakubiak
 Robert Adrien Jalbert
 Ernest James
 Gricelda E. James
 Mark Steven Jardim
 Amy Nicole Jarret
 Muhammadou Jawara
 Francois JeaPierre
 Maxima JeaPierre
 Paul Edward Jeffers
 John Charles Jenkins
 Joseph Jenkins, Jr.
 Alan Keith Jensen
 Prem Nath Jerath
 Farah Jeudy
 Hweidar Jian
 Eliezer Jimenez, Jr.
 Luis Jimenez, Jr.
 Charles Gregory John
 Nicholas John
 Dennis M. Johnson
 LaShawna Johnson
 Scott Michael Johnson
 William R. Johnston
 Allison Horstmann Jones
 Arthur Joseph Jones III
 Brian Leander Jones
 Charles Edward Jones
 Christopher D. Jones
 Donald T. Jones II
 Donald W. Jones
 Judith Lawter Jones
 Linda Jones
 Mary S. Jones
 Andrew Brian Jordan, Sr.
 Robert Thomas Jordan
 Albert Gunnis Joseph
 Ingeborg Joseph
 Karl Henry Joseph
 Stephen Joseph
 Jane Eileen Josiah
 Anthony Jovic
 Angel L. Juarbe, Jr.
 Karen Sue Juday
 Ann C. Judge
 Mychal F. Judge
 Paul William Jurgens
 Thomas Edward Jurgens
 Shashikiran LakshmiKantha Kadaba
 Gavkharoy Kamardinova
 Shari Kandell
 Howard Lee Kane
 Jennifer Lynn Kane
 Vincent D. Kane
 Joon Koo Kang
 Sheldon Robert Kanter

Deborah H. Kaplan
 Robin Lynne Kaplan
 Alvin Peter Kappelmann, Jr.
 Charles H. Karczewski
 William A. Karnes
 Douglas Gene Karpiloff
 Charles L. Kasper
 Andrew K. Kates
 John A. Katsimatides
 Robert Michael Kaulfers
 Don Jerome Kauth, Jr.
 Hideya Kawauchi
 Edward T. Keane
 Richard M. Keane
 Lisa Yvonne Kearney-Griffin
 Karol Ann Keasler
 Barbara A. Keating
 Paul Hanlon Keating
 Leo Russell Keene III
 Brenda Kegler
 Chandler Raymond Keller
 Joseph John Keller
 Peter R. Kellerman
 Joseph P. Kellett
 Frederick H. Kelley III
 James Joseph Kelly
 Joseph A. Kelly
 Maurice P. Kelly
 Richard John Kelly, Jr.
 Thomas Michael Kelly
 Thomas Richard Kelly
 Thomas W. Kelly
 Timothy Colin Kelly
 William Hill Kelly, Jr.
 Robert Clinton Kennedy
 Thomas J. Kennedy
 Yvonne E. Kennedy
 John Richard Keohane
 Ralph Francis Kershaw
 Ronald T. Kerwin
 Howard L. Kestenbaum
 Douglas D. Ketcham
 Ruth Ellen Kettler
 Boris Khalif
 Norma Cruz Khan
 Sarah Khan
 Taimour Firaz Khan
 Rajesh Khandelwal
 SeiLai Khoo
 Michael Vernon Kiefer
 Satoshi Kikuchihara
 Andrew Jay-Hoon Kim
 Lawrence Don Kim
 Mary Jo Kimelman
 Heinrich Kimmig
 Karen Ann Kincaid
 Amy R. King
 Andrew M. King
 Lucille Teresa King
 Robert King, Jr.
 Lisa King-Johnson
 Brian K. Kinney
 Takashi Kinoshita
 Chris Michael Kirby
 Howard Barry Kirschbaum
 Glenn Davis Kirwin
 Helen Crossin Kittle and her unborn child
 Richard Joseph Klares
 Peter Anton Klein
 Alan David Kleinberg
 Karen Joyce Klitzman
 Ronald Philip Kloepfer
 Eugueni Kniazev
 Andrew James Knox
 Thomas Patrick Knox
 Rebecca Lee Koborie
 Deborah A. Kobus
 Gary Edward Koecheler
 Frank J. Koestner
 Ryan Kohart
 Vanessa Lynn Przybylo Kolpak
 Irina Kolpakova
 Suzanne Rose Kondratenko
 Abdoulaye Koné
 Bon Seok Koo
 Dorota Kopiczko
 Scott Michael Kopytko
 Bojan George Kostic
 Danielle Kousoulis
 David P. Kovalcin
 John J. Kren
 William Edward Krukowski
 Lyudmila Ksido
 Toshiya Kuge
 Shekhar Kumar
 Kenneth Bruce Kumpel
 Frederick Kuo, Jr.
 Patricia A. Kuras
 Nauka Kushitani
 Thomas Joseph Kuveikis
 Victor Kwarkye
 Raymond Kui Fai Kwok
 Angela Reed Kyte
 Andrew La Corte
 Carol Ann La Plante
 Jeffrey G. La Touche
 Kathryn L. LaBorie
 Amarnauth Lachman
 Ganesh K. Ladkat
 James Patrick Ladley
 Joseph A. Lafalce
 Jeanette Louise Lafond-Menichino
 David James LaForge
 Michael Patrick LaForte
 Alan Charles LaFrance
 Juan Mendez Lafuente
 Neil Kwong-Wah Lai
 Vincent Anthony Laieta
 William David Lake
 Franco Lalama
 Chow Kwan Lam
 Michael S. Lamana
 Stephen LaMantia
 Amy Hope Lamonsoff
 Robert T. Lane
 Brendan Mark Lang
 Rosanne P. Lang
 Vanessa Lang Langer and her unborn child
 Mary Lou Langley
 Peter J. Langone
 Thomas Michael Langone
 Michele Bernadette Lanza
 Ruth Sheila Lapin
 Ingeborg A.D. Lariby
 Robin Blair Larkey
 Judith Camilla Larocque
 Christopher Randall Larrabee
 Hamidou S. Larry
 Scott Larsen
 John Adam Larson
 Natalie Janis Lasden
 Gary Edward Lasko
 Nicholas Craig Lassman
 Paul Laszczynski
 Charles A. Laurencin
 Stephen James Lauria
 Maria LaVache
 Denis Francis Lavelle
 Jeannine Mary LaVerde
 Anna A. Laverty
 Steven Lawn
 Robert A. Lawrence, Jr.
 Nathaniel Lawson
 David W. Laychak
 Eugen Gabriel Lazar
 James Patrick Leahy
 Joseph Gerard Leavey
 Neil J. Leavy
 Robert G. LeBlanc
 Leon Lebor
 Kenneth Charles Ledee
 Alan J. Lederman
 Elena F. Ledesma
 Alexis Leduc
 Daniel John Lee
 David S. Lee
 Dong Chul Lee
 Gary H. Lee
 Hyun Joon Lee
 Juanita Lee
 Kathryn Blair Lee
 Linda C. Lee
 Lorraine Mary Greene Lee
 Myoung Woo Lee
 Richard Y.C. Lee
 Stuart Soo-Jin Lee
 Yang Der Lee
 Stephen Paul Lefkowitz
 Adriana Legro
 Edward Joseph Lehman
 Eric Lehrfeld
 David R. Leistman
 David Prudencio Lemagne
 Joseph Anthony Lenihan
 John Joseph Lennon, Jr.
 John Robinson Lenoir
 Jorge Luis León, Sr.
 Matthew G. Leonard
 Michael Lepore
 Charles A. Lesperance
 Jeff LeVeen
 John Dennis Levi
 Alisha Caren Levin
 Neil David Levin
 Robert Levine
 Robert Michael Levine
 Shai Levinhar
 Daniel M. Lewin
 Adam Jay Lewis
 Jennifer Lewis
 Kenneth E. Lewis
 Margaret Susan Lewis
 Ye Wei Liang
 Orasri Liangthanasarn
 Daniel F. Libretti
 Ralph Michael Licciardi
 Edward Lichtschein
 Samantha L. LightbourAllen
 Steven Barry Lillianthal
 Carlos R. Lillo
 Craig Damian Lilore
 Arnold Arboleda Lim
 Darya Lin
 Wei Rong Lin
 Nickie L. Lindo
 Thomas V. Linehan, Jr.
 Robert Thomas Linnane
 Alan Patrick Linton, Jr.
 Diane Theresa Lipari
 Kenneth P. Lira Arévalo
 Francisco Alberto Liriano
 Lorraine Lisi
 Paul Lisson
 Vincent M. Litto
 Ming-Hao Liu
 Nancy Liz
 Harold Lizcano
 Martin Lizzul
 George A. Llanes
 Elizabeth C. Logler
 Catherine Lisa Loguidice
 Jérôme Robert Lohez
 Michael William Lomax
 Stephen V. Long

Laura Maria Longing
 Salvatore P. Lopes
 Daniel Lopez
 George Lopez
 Luis Manuel Lopez
 Maclovio Lopez, Jr.
 Manuel L. Lopez
 Joseph Lostrangio
 Chet Dek Louie
 Stuart Seid Louis
 Joseph Lovero
 Sara Elizabeth Low
 Jenny Seu Kueng Low Wong
 Michael W. Lowe
 Garry W. Lozier
 John P. Lozowsky
 Charles Peter Lucania
 Edward Hobbs Luckett
 Mark Gavin Ludvigsen
 Lee Charles Ludwig
 Sean Thomas Lugano
 Daniel Lugo
 Marie Lukas
 William Lum, Jr.
 Michael P. Lunden
 Christopher E. Lunder
 Anthony Luparello
 Gary Frederick Lutnick
 Linda Anne Luzzicone
 Alexander Lygin
 CeeCee Lyles
 Farrell Peter Lynch
 James Francis Lynch
 James T. Lynch, Jr.
 Louise A. Lynch
 Michael Cameron Lynch
 Michael Francis Lynch
 Richard D. Lynch, Jr.
 Robert Henry Lynch, Jr.
 Sean P. Lynch
 Sean Patrick Lynch
 Terence M. Lynch
 Michael J. Lyons
 Monica Anne Lyons
 Nehamon Lyons IV
 Patrick John Lyons
 M Robert Francis Mace
 Marianne MacFarlane
 Jan Maciejewski
 Susan A. Mackay
 Catherine Fairfax MacRae
 Richard Blaine Madden
 Simon Maddison
 Noell C. Maerz
 Jennieann Maffeo
 Joseph Maffeo
 Jay Robert Magazine
 Brian Magee
 Charles W. Magee
 Joseph V. Maggitti
 Ronald Magnuson
 Daniel L. Maher
 Thomas A. Mahon
 William J. Mahoney
 Joseph Daniel Maio
 Linda C. Mair-Grayling
 Takashi Makimoto
 Abdu Ali Malahi
 Debora I. Maldonado
 Myrna T. Maldonado-Agosto
 Alfred Russell Maler
 Gregory James Malone
 Edward Francis Maloney III
 Joseph E. Maloney
 Gene Edward Maloy
 Christian H. Maltby
 Francisco Miguel Mancini
 Joseph Mangano
 Sara Elizabeth Manley
 Debra M. Mannetta
 Marion Victoria Manning
 Terence John Manning
 James Maounis
 Alfred Gilles Padre Joseph
 Marchand
 Joseph Ross Marchbanks, Jr.
 Laura A. Marchese
 Hilda Marcin
 Peter Edward Mardikian
 Edward Joseph Mardovich
 Charles Joseph Margiotta
 Louis Neil Mariani
 Kenneth Joseph Marino
 Lester V. Marino
 Vita Marino
 Kevin D. Marlo
 Jose Juan Marrero
 John Daniel Marshall
 Shelley A. Marshall
 James Martello
 Michael A. Marti
 Karen Ann Martin
 Peter C. Martin
 Teresa M. Martin
 William J. Martin, Jr.
 Brian E. Martineau
 Betsy Martinez
 Edward J. Martinez
 Jose Angel Martinez, Jr.
 Robert Gabriel Martinez
 Waleska Martinez
 Lizie D. Martinez-Calderon
 Paul Richard Martini
 Anne Marie Martino-Cramer
 Joseph A. Mascali
 Bernard Mascarenhas
 Stephen Frank Masi
 Ada L. MasoAcker
 Nicholas George Massa
 Michael Massaroli
 Phillip William Mastrandrea, Jr.
 Rudy Mastrocinque
 Joseph Mathai
 Charles William Mathers
 William A. Mathesen
 Marcello Matricciano
 Margaret Elaine Mattic
 Dean E. Mattson
 Robert D. Mattson
 Walter A. Matuza, Jr.
 Timothy J. Maude
 Jill Maurer-Campbell
 Charles A. Mauro, Jr.
 Charles J. Mauro
 Dorothy Mauro
 Nancy T. Mauro
 Robert J. Maxwell
 Renée A. May and her unborn child
 Tyrone May
 Keithroy Marcellus Maynard
 Robert J. Mayo
 Kathy N. Mazza
 Edward Mazzella, Jr.
 Jennifer Lynn Mazzotta
 Kaaria Mbaya
 James Joseph McAlary, Jr.
 Brian Gerard McAleese
 Patricia Ann McAneney
 Colin R. McArthur
 John Kevin McAvoy
 Kenneth M. McBrayer
 Brendan F. McCabe
 Michael McCabe
 Thomas Joseph McCann
 Justin McCarthy
 Kevin M. McCarthy
 Michael Desmond McCarthy
 Robert G. McCarthy
 Stanley McCaskill
 Katie Marie McCloskey
 Juliana Valentine McCourt
 Ruth Magdaline McCourt
 Charles Austin McCrann
 Tonyell F. McDay
 Matthew T. McDermott
 Joseph P. McDonald
 Brian Grady McDonnell
 Michael P. McDonnell
 John F. McDowell, Jr.
 Eamon J. McEaney
 John Thomas McElean, Jr.
 Daniel Francis McGinley
 Mark Ryan McGinly
 William E. McGinn
 Thomas Henry McGinnis
 Michael Gregory McGinty
 Ann Walsh McGovern
 Scott Martin McGovern
 William J. McGovern
 Stacey Sennas McGowan
 Francis Noel McGuinn
 Thomas F. McGuinness, Jr.
 Patrick J. McGuire
 Thomas M. McHale
 Keith David McHeffey
 Ann M. McHugh
 Denis J. McHugh III
 Dennis P. McHugh
 Michael Edward McHugh, Jr.
 Robert G. McIlvaine
 Donald James McIntyre
 Stephanie Marie McKenna
 Molly L. McKenzie
 Barry J. McKeon
 Evelyn C. McKinnedy
 Darryl Leron McKinney
 George Patrick McLaughlin, Jr.
 Robert C. McLaughlin, Jr.
 Gavin McMahan
 Robert D. McMahan
 Edmund M. McNally
 Daniel Walker McNeal
 Walter Arthur McNeil
 Christine Sheila McNulty
 Sean Peter McNulty
 Robert William McPadden
 Terence A. McShane
 Timothy Patrick McSweeney
 Martin E. McWilliams
 Rocco A. Medaglia
 Abigail Medina
 Ana Iris Medina
 Damian Meehan
 William J. Meehan, Jr.
 Alok Kumar Mehta
 Raymond Meisenheimer
 Manuel Emilio Mejia
 Eskedar Melaku
 Antonio Melendez
 Mary P. Melendez
 Christopher D. Mello
 Yelena Melnichenko
 Stuart Todd Meltzer
 Diarelia Jovanah Mena
 Dora Marie Menchaca
 Charles R. Mendez
 Lizette Mendoza
 Shevonne Olicia Mentis
 Wolfgang Peter Menzel
 Steve John Mercado
 Wesley Mercer
 Ralph Joseph Mercurio
 Alan Harvey Merdinger
 George L. Merino

Yamel Josefina Merino
 George Merkouris
 Deborah Merrick
 Raymond Joseph Metz III
 Jill Ann Metzler
 David Robert Meyer
 Nurul H. Miah
 William Edward Micciulli
 Martin Paul Michelstein
 Patricia E. Mickleby
 Ronald D. Milam
 Peter Teague Milano
 Gregory Milanowycz
 Lukasz Tomasz Milewski
 Sharon Christina Millan
 Corey Peter Miller
 Craig J. Miller
 Douglas C. Miller
 Henry Alfred Miller, Jr.
 Joel Miller
 Michael Matthew Miller
 Nicole Carol Miller
 Philip D. Miller
 Robert Alan Miller
 Robert Cromwell Miller, Jr.
 Benny Millman
 Charles M. Mills, Jr.
 Ronald Keith Milstein
 Robert J. Minara
 William George Minardi
 Louis Joseph Minervino
 Thomas Mingione
 Wilbert Miraille
 Domenick N. Mircovich
 Rajesh Arjan Mirpuri
 Joseph D. Mistrulli
 Susan J. Miskowicz
 Paul Thomas Mitchell
 Richard P. Miuccio
 Jeffrey Peter Mladenik
 Frank V. Moccia, Sr.
 Louis Joseph Modafferi
 Boyie Mohammed
 Dennis Mojica
 Manuel D. Mojica, Jr.
 Kleber Rolando Molina
 Manuel De Jesus Molina
 Carl Molinaro
 Justin John Molisani, Jr.
 Brian Patrick Monaghan
 Franklyn Monahan
 John Gerard Monahan
 Kristen Leigh Montanaro
 Craig Montano
 Michael G. Montesi
 Carlos Alberto Montoya
 Antonio De Jesus Montoya Valdes
 Cheryl Ann Monyak
 Thomas Carlo Moody
 Sharon Moore
 Krishna V. Moorthy
 Laura Lee Defazio Morabito
 Abner Morales
 Carlos Manuel Morales
 Paula E. Morales
 Sonia Mercedes Morales Puopolo
 Gerard P. Moran, Jr.
 John Christopher Moran
 John Michael Moran
 Kathleen Moran
 Lindsay Stapleton Morehouse
 George William Morell
 Steven P. Morello
 Vincent S. Morello
 Yvette Nicole Moreno
 Dorothy Morgan
 Richard J. Morgan
 Nancy Morgenstern

Sanae Mori
 Blanca Robertina Morocho Morocho
 Leonel Geronimo Morocho Morocho
 Dennis Gerard Moroney
 Lynne Irene Morris
 Odessa V. Morris
 Seth Allan Morris
 Steve Morris
 Christopher Martel Morrison
 Ferdinand V. Morrone
 William David Moskal
 Brian A. Moss
 Marco Motroni
 Cynthia MotuWilson
 Iouri A. Mouchinski
 Jude Joseph Moussa
 Peter Moutos
 Damion O'Neil Mowatt
 Teddington H. Moy
 Christopher Michael Mozzillo
 Stephen Vincent Mulderry
 Richard T. Muldowney, Jr.
 Michael D. Mullan
 Dennis Michael Mulligan
 Peter James Mulligan
 Michael Joseph Mullin
 James Donald Munhall
 Nancy Muñiz
 Francisco Heladio Munoz
 Carlos Mario Muñoz
 Theresa Munson
 Robert Michael Murach
 Cesar Augusto Murillo
 Marc A. Murolo
 Brian Joseph Murphy
 Charles Anthony Murphy
 Christopher W. Murphy
 Edward Charles Murphy
 James F. Murphy IV
 James Thomas Murphy
 Kevin James Murphy
 Patrick Jude Murphy
 Patrick Sean Murphy
 Raymond E. Murphy
 Robert Eddie Murphy, Jr.
 John Joseph Murray
 John Joseph Murray
 Susan D. Murray
 Valerie Victoria Murray
 Richard Todd Myhre
 Louis J. Nacke II
 Robert B. Nagel
 Mildred Rose Naiman
 Takuya Nakamura
 Alexander John Robert Napier
 Frank Joseph Naples III
 John Philip Napolitano
 Catherine Ann Nardella
 Mario Nardone, Jr.
 Manika K. Narula
 Shawn M. Nassaney
 Narender Nath
 Karen Susan Navarro
 Joseph M. Navas
 Francis Joseph Nazario
 Glenroy I. Neblett
 Rayman Marcus Neblett
 Jerome O. Nedd
 Laurence F. Nedell
 Luke G. Nee
 Pete Negron
 Laurie Ann Neira
 Ann N. Nelson
 David William Nelson
 Ginger Risco Nelson
 James A. Nelson
 Michele Ann Nelson
 Peter Allen Nelson

Oscar Francis Nesbitt
 Gerard Terence Nevins
 Renee Tetreault Newell
 Christopher C. Newton
 Christopher NewtoCarter
 Nancy Yuen Ngo
 Khang Ngoc Nguyen
 Jody Tepedino Nichilo
 Kathleen Ann Nicosia
 Martin Stewart Niederer
 Alfonse Joseph Niedermeyer
 Frank John Niestadt, Jr.
 Gloria Nieves
 Juan Nieves, Jr.
 Troy Edward Nilsen
 Paul Nibley
 John Ballantine Niven
 Katherine McGarry Noack
 Curtis Terrance Noel
 Michael A. Noeth
 Daniel R. Nolan
 Robert Walter Noonan
 Jacqueline June Norton
 Robert Grant Norton
 Daniela Rosalia Notaro
 Brian Christopher Novotny
 Soichi Numata
 Brian Nunez
 Jose Nunez
 Jeffrey Roger Nussbaum
 Dennis Patrick O'Bergh
 James P. O'Brien, Jr.
 Michael P. O'Brien
 Scott J. O'Brien
 Timothy Michael O'Brien
 Daniel O'Callaghan
 Dennis James O'Connor, Jr.
 Diana J. O'Connor
 Keith Kevin O'Connor
 Richard J. O'Connor
 Amy O'Doherty
 Marni Pont O'Doherty
 James Andrew O'Grady
 Thomas G. O'Hagan
 Patrick J. O'Keefe
 William O'Keefe
 Gerald Thomas O'Leary
 Matthew Timothy O'Mahony
 John P. O'Neill
 Peter J. O'Neill, Jr.
 Sean Gordon Corbett O'Neill
 Kevin M. O'Rourke
 Patrick J. O'Shea
 Robert William O'Shea
 Timothy Franklin O'Sullivan
 James A. Oakley
 Douglas E. Oelschlager
 Takashi Ogawa
 Albert Ogletree
 Philip Paul Ognibene
 John A. Ogonowski
 Joseph J. Ogren
 Samuel Otice
 Gerald Michael Olcott
 Christine Anne Olender
 Linda Mary Oliva
 Edward K. Oliver
 Leah Elizabeth Oliver
 Eric Taube Olsen
 Jeffrey James Olsen
 Barbara K. Olson
 Maureen Lyons Olson
 Steven John Olson
 Toshihiro Onda
 Seamus L. Oneal
 Betty Ann Ong
 Michael C. Opperman
 Christopher T. Orgielewicz

Margaret Quinn Orloske
 Virginia Anne Ormiston
 Ruben S. Ornedo
 Ronald Orsini
 Peter Keith Ortale
 Juan Ortega-Campos
 Jane Marie Orth
 Alexander Ortiz
 David Ortiz
 Emilio Pete Ortiz
 Pablo Ortiz
 Paul Ortiz, Jr.
 Sonia Ortiz
 Masaru Ose
 Elsy Carolina Osorio Oliva
 James R. Ostrowski
 Jason Douglas Oswald
 Michael John Otten
 Isidro D. Ottenwalder
 Michael Chung Ou
 Todd Joseph Ouida
 Jesus Ovalles
 Peter J. Owens, Jr.
 Adianes Oyola
 Angel M. Pabon, Jr.
 Israel Pabon, Jr.
 Roland Pacheco
 Michael Benjamin Packer
 Diana B. Padro
 Deepa Pakkala
 Jeffrey Matthew Palazzo
 Thomas Palazzo
 Richard A. Palazzolo
 Orio Joseph Palmer
 Frank Anthony Palombo
 Alan N. Palumbo
 Christopher Matthew Panatier
 Dominique Lisa Pandolfo
 Jonas Martin Panik
 Paul J. Pansini
 John M. Paolillo
 Edward Joseph Papa
 Salvatore T. Papasso
 James Nicholas Pappageorge
 Marie Pappalardo
 Vinod Kumar Parakat
 Vijayashanker Paramsothy
 Nitin Ramesh Parandkar
 Hardai Parbhu
 James Wendell Parham
 Debra Marie Paris
 George Paris
 Gye Hyong Park
 Philip Lacey Parker
 Michael Elaine Parkes
 Robert E. Parks, Jr.
 Hashmukh C. Parmar
 Robert Parro
 Diane Marie Parsons
 Leobardo Lopez Pascual
 Michael J. Pascuma, Jr.
 Jerrold Hughes Paskins
 Horace Robert Passananti
 Suzanne H. Passaro
 Avnish Ramanbhai Patel
 Dipti Patel
 Manish Patel
 Steven Bennett Paterson
 James Matthew Patrick
 Manuel D. Patrocino
 Bernard E. Patterson
 Clifford L. Patterson, Jr.
 Cira Marie Patti
 Robert E. Pattison
 James Robert Paul
 Patrice Paz
 Victor Hugo Paz
 Stacey Lynn Peak
 Richard Allen Pearlman
 Durrell V. Pearsall, Jr.
 Thomas Nicholas Pecorelli
 Thomas Pedicini
 Todd Douglas Pelino
 Mike Adrian Pelletier
 Anthony G. Peluso
 Angel R. Pena
 Robert Penninger
 Richard Al Penny
 Salvatore F. Pepe
 Carl Allen B. Peralta
 Robert David Peraza
 Jon A. Perconti, Jr.
 Alejo Perez
 Angel Perez, Jr.
 Angela Susan Perez
 Anthony Perez
 Ivan Antonio Perez
 Nancy E. Perez
 Berry Berenson Perkins
 Joseph John Perroncino
 Edward J. Perrotta
 Emelda H. Perry
 Glenn C. Perry, Sr.
 John William Perry
 Franklin Allan Pershep
 Danny Pesce
 Michael John Pescherine
 Davin N. Peterson
 Donald Arthur Peterson
 Jean Hoadley Peterson
 William Russell Peterson
 Mark James Petrocelli
 Philip Scott Petti
 Glen Kerrin Pettit
 Dominick A. Pezzulo
 Kaleen Elizabeth Pezzuti
 Kevin J. Pfeifer
 Tu-Anh Pham
 Kenneth John Phelan, Sr.
 Sneha Anne Philip
 Eugenia McCann Piantieri
 Ludwig John Picarro
 Matthew Picerno
 Joseph O. Pick
 Christopher J. Pickford
 Dennis J. Pierce
 Bernard Pietronico
 Nicholas P. Pietrunti
 Theodoros Pigis
 Susan Elizabeth Pinto
 Joseph Piskadlo
 Christopher Todd Pitman
 Joshua Michael Piver
 Robert R. Ploger III
 Zandra F. Ploger
 Joseph Plumitallo
 John M. Pocher
 William Howard Pohlmann
 Laurence Michael Polatsch
 Thomas H. Polhemus
 Steve Pollicino
 Susan M. Pollio
 Darin H. Pontell
 Joshua Iosua Poptean
 Giovanna Porras
 Anthony Portillo
 James Edward Potorti
 Daphne Pouletsos
 Richard N. Poulos
 Stephen Emanuel Poulos
 Brandon Jerome Powell
 Scott Alan Powell
 Shawn Edward Powell
 Antonio Dorsey Pratt
 Gregory M. Preziose
 Wanda Ivelisse Prince
 Vincent A. Princiotta
 Kevin M. Prior
 Everett Martin Proctor III
 Carrie Beth Progen
 David Lee Pruum
 Richard A. Prunty
 John Foster Puckett
 Robert David Pugliese
 Edward F. Pullis
 Patricia Ann Puma
 Jack D. PUNCHES
 Hemanth Kumar Puttur
 Joseph J. Pycior, Jr.
 Edward R. Pykon
 Christopher Quackenbush
 Lars Peter Qualben
 Lincoln Quappé
 Beth Ann Quigley
 Patrick J. Quigley IV
 Michael T. Quilty
 James Francis Quinn
 Ricardo J. Quinn
 Carol Millicent Rabalais
 Christopher Peter Anthony
 Racaniello
 Leonard J. Ragaglia
 Eugene J. Raggio
 Laura Marie Ragonese-Snik
 Michael Paul Ragusa
 Peter Frank Raimondi
 Harry A. Raines
 Lisa J. Raines
 Ehtesham Raja
 Valsa Raju
 Edward J. Rall
 Lukas Rambousek
 Maria Ramirez
 Harry Ramos
 Vishnoo Ramsaroop
 Deborah A. Ramsaur
 Lorenzo E. Ramzey
 Alfred Todd Rancke
 Adam David Rand
 Jonathan C. Randall
 Shreyas S. Ranganath
 Anne T. Ransom
 Faina Rapoport
 Rhonda Sue Rasmussen
 Robert A. Rasmussen
 Amenias Rasool
 R. Mark Rasweiler
 Marsha D. Ratchford
 David Alan James Rathkey
 William Ralph Raub
 Gerard F. Rauzi
 Alexey Razuvaev
 Gregory Reda
 Sarah Anne Redheffer
 Michele Marie Reed
 Judith Ann Reese
 Donald J. Regan
 Robert M. Regan
 Thomas Michael Regan
 Christian Michael Otto Regenhard
 Howard Reich
 Gregg Reidy
 James Brian Reilly
 Kevin O. Reilly
 Timothy E. Reilly
 Joseph Reina, Jr.
 Thomas Barnes Reinig
 Frank Bennett Reisman
 Joshua Scott Reiss
 Karen Renda
 John Armand Reo
 Richard Cyril Rescorla
 John Thomas Resta
 Sylvia San Pio Resta and her unborn child

Martha M. Reszke
 David E. Retik
 Todd H. Reuben
 Luis Clodoaldo Revilla Mier
 Eduvigis Reyes, Jr.
 Bruce Albert Reynolds
 John Frederick Rhodes
 Francis Saverio Riccardelli
 Rudolph N. Riccio
 Ann Marie Riccoboni
 David Harlow Rice
 Eileen Mary Rice
 Kenneth Frederick Rice III
 CeCelia E. Richard
 Vernon Allan Richard
 Claude Daniel Richards
 Gregory David Richards
 Michael Richards
 Venesha Orintia Richards
 Jimmy Riches
 Alan Jay Richman
 John M. Rigo
 Frederick Charles Rimmele III
 Rose Mary Riso
 Moises N. Rivas
 Joseph R. Rivelli, Jr.
 Carmen Alicia Rivera
 Isaias Rivera
 Juan William Rivera
 Linda Ivelisse Rivera
 David E. Rivers
 Joseph R. Riveroso
 Paul V. Rizza
 John Frank Rizzo
 Stephen Louis Roach
 Joseph Roberto
 Leo Arthur Roberts
 Michael E. Roberts
 Michael Edward Roberts
 Donald Walter Robertson, Jr.
 Jeffrey Robinson
 Michell Lee Jean Robotham
 Donald Arthur Robson
 Antonio A. Rocha
 Raymond James Rocha
 Laura Rockefeller
 John Michael Rodak
 Antonio José Rodrigues
 Anthony Rodriguez
 Carmen Milagros Rodriguez
 Gregory E. Rodriguez
 Marsha A. Rodriguez
 Mayra Valdes Rodriguez
 Richard Rodriguez
 David Bartolo Rodriguez-Vargas
 Matthew Rogan
 Jean Destrehan Rogér
 Karlie Rogers
 Scott William Rohner
 Keith Michael Roma
 Joseph M. Romagnolo
 Efrain Romero, Sr.
 Elvin Romero
 James A. Romito
 Sean Paul Rooney
 Eric Thomas Ropiteau
 Aida Rosario
 Angela Rosario
 Mark H. Rosen
 Brooke David Rosenbaum
 Linda Rosenbaum
 Sheryl Lynn Rosenbaum
 Lloyd Daniel Rosenberg
 Mark Louis Rosenberg
 Andrew Ira Rosenblum
 Joshua M. Rosenblum
 Joshua Alan Rosenthal
 Richard David Rosenthal
 Philip Martin Rosenzweig
 Daniel Rosetti
 Richard Barry Ross
 Norman S. Rossinow
 Nicholas P. Rossomando
 Michael Craig Rothberg
 Donna Marie Rothenberg
 Mark David Rothenberg
 James Michael Roux
 Nicholas Charles Alexander Rowe
 Edward V. Rowenhorst
 Judy Rowlett
 Timothy Alan Roy, Sr.
 Paul G. Ruback
 Ronald J. Ruben
 Joanne Rubino
 David M. Ruddle
 Bart Joseph Ruggiere
 Susan A. Ruggiero
 Adam Keith Ruhalter
 Gilbert Ruiz
 Robert E. Russell
 Stephen P. Russell
 Steven Harris Russin
 Michael Thomas Russo, Sr.
 Wayne Alan Russo
 William R. Ruth
 Edward Ryan
 John Joseph Ryan
 Jonathan Stephan Ryan
 Matthew L. Ryan
 Tatiana Ryjova
 Christina Sunga Ryook
 Thierry Saada
 Jason Elazar Sabbag
 Thomas E. Sabella
 Scott H. Saber
 Charles E. Sabin, Sr.
 Joseph Francis Sacerdote
 Jessica Leigh Sachs
 Francis John Sadocha
 Jude Elias Safi
 Brock Joel Safronoff
 Edward Saiya
 John Patrick Salamone
 Marjorie C. Salamone
 Hernando Rafael Salas
 Juan G. Salas
 Esmerlin Antonio Salcedo
 John Pepe Salerno
 Rahma Salie and her unborn child
 Richard L. Salinardi, Jr.
 Wayne John Saloman
 Nolbert Salomon
 Catherine Patricia Salter
 Frank G. Salvaterra
 Paul Richard Salvio
 Samuel Robert Salvo, Jr.
 Carlos Alberto Samaniego
 John P. Sammartino
 James Kenneth Samuel, Jr.
 Michael San Phillip
 Hugo M. Sanay
 Alva Cynthia Jeffries Sanchez
 Jacquelyn Patrice Sanchez
 Jesus Sanchez
 Raymond Sanchez
 Eric M. Sand
 Stacey Leigh Sanders
 Herman S. Sandler
 Jim Sands, Jr.
 Ayleen J. Santiago
 Kirsten Reese Santiago
 Maria Theresa Concepcion Santillan
 Susan Gayle Santo
 Christopher A. Santora
 John August Santore
 Mario L. Santoro
 Rafael Humberto Santos
 Rufino C.F. Santos III
 Victor J. Saracini
 Kalyan K. Sarkar
 Chapelle Renee Stewart Sarker
 Paul F. Sarle
 Deepika Kumar Sattaluri
 Gregory Thomas Saucedo
 Susan M. Sauer
 Anthony Savas
 Vladimir Savinkin
 John Michael Sbarbaro
 David M. Scales
 Robert Louis Scandole
 Michelle Scarpitta
 Dennis Scauso
 John Albert Schardt
 John G. Scharf
 Fred C. Scheffold, Jr.
 Angela Susan Scheinberg
 Scott Mitchell Schertzer
 Sean Schielke
 Steven Francis Schlag
 Robert A. Schlegel
 Jon Schlissel
 Karen Helene Schmidt
 Ian Schneider
 Thomas G. Schoales
 Marisa Dinardo Schorpp
 Frank G. Schott, Jr.
 Gerard Patrick Schrang
 Jeffrey H. Schreier
 John T. Schroeder
 Susan Lee Schuler
 Edward W. Schunk
 Mark Evan Schurmeier
 John Burkhart Schwartz
 Mark Schwartz
 Adriane Victoria Scibetta
 Raphael Scorca
 Janice M. Scott
 Randolph Scott
 Christopher Jay Scudder
 Arthur Warren Scullin
 Michael H. Seaman
 Margaret M. Seeliger
 Anthony Segarra
 Carlos Segarra
 Jason M. Sekzer
 Matthew Carmen Sellitto
 Michael L. Selves
 Howard Selwyn
 Larry John Senko
 Arturo Angelo Sereno
 Frankie Serrano
 Marian H. Serva
 Alena Sesinova
 Adele Christine Sessa
 Sita Nermalla Sewnarine
 Karen Lynn Seymour
 Davis Grier Sezna, Jr.
 Thomas Joseph Sgroi
 Jayesh Shantilal Shah
 Khalid M. Shahid
 Mohammed Shajahan
 Gary Shamay
 Earl Richard Shanahan
 Dan F. Shanower
 Neil G. Shastri
 Kathryn Anne Shatzoff
 Barbara A. Shaw
 Jeffrey James Shaw
 Robert John Shay, Jr.
 Daniel James Shea
 Joseph Patrick Shea
 Kathleen Shearer
 Robert M. Shearer

Linda June Sheehan
 Hagay Shefi
 Antionette M. Sherman
 John Anthony Sherry
 Atsushi Shiratori
 Thomas Joseph Shubert
 Mark Shulman
 See Wong Shum
 Allan Abraham Shwartzstein
 Clarin Shellie Siegel-Schwartz
 Johanna Sigmund
 Dianne T. Signer and her unborn child
 Gregory Sikorsky
 Stephen Gerard Siller
 David Silver
 Craig A. Silverstein
 Nasima H. Simjee
 Bruce Edward Simmons
 Diane M. Simmons
 Donald D. Simmons
 George W. Simmons
 Arthur Simon
 Kenneth Alan Simon
 Michael J. Simon
 Paul Joseph Simon
 Marianne Liquori Simone
 Barry Simowitz
 Jane Louise Simpkin
 Jeff Lyal Simpson
 Cheryle D. Sincok
 Khamladaï Khami Singh
 Roshan Ramesh Singh
 Thomas E. Sinton III
 Peter A. Siracuse
 Muriel F. Siskopoulos
 Joseph Michael Sisolak
 John P. Skala
 Francis Joseph Skidmore, Jr.
 Toyena Corliss Skinner
 Paul Albert Skrzypek
 Christopher Paul Slattery
 Vincent Robert Slavin
 Robert F. Sliwak
 Paul Kenneth Sloan
 Stanley S. Smagala, Jr.
 Wendy L. Small
 Gregg H. Smallwood
 Catherine T. Smith
 Daniel Laurence Smith
 Gary F. Smith
 George Eric Smith
 Heather Lee Smith
 James Gregory Smith
 Jeffrey R. Smith
 Joyce Patricia Smith
 Karl T. Smith, Sr.
 Kevin Joseph Smith
 Leon Smith, Jr.
 Moira Ann Smith
 Rosemary A. Smith
 Bonnie Shihadeh Smithwick
 Rochelle Monique Snell
 Christine Ann Snyder
 Dianne Bullis Snyder
 Leonard J. Snyder, Jr.
 Astrid Elizabeth Sohan
 Sushil S. Solanki
 Rubén Solares
 Naomi Leah Solomon
 Daniel W. Song
 Mari-Rae Sopper
 Michael Charles Sorresse
 Fabian Soto
 Timothy Patrick Soulas
 Gregory Thomas Spagnoletti
 Donald F. Spampinato, Jr.
 Thomas Sparacio
 John Anthony Spataro
 Robert W. Spear, Jr.
 Robert Speisman
 Maynard S. Spence, Jr.
 George Edward Spencer III
 Robert Andrew Spencer
 Mary Rubina Sperando
 Frank Spinelli
 William E. Spitz
 Joseph Patrick Spor, Jr.
 Klaus Johannes Sprockamp
 Saranya Srinuan
 Fitzroy St. Rose
 Michael F. Stabile
 Lawrence T. Stack
 Timothy M. Stackpole
 Richard James Stadelberger
 Eric Adam Stahlman
 Gregory Stajk
 Alexandru Liviu Stan
 Corina Stan
 Mary Domenica Stanley
 Anthony Starita
 Jeffrey Stark
 Derek James Statkevicius
 Patricia J. Statz
 Craig William Staub
 William V. Steckman
 Eric Thomas Steen
 William R. Steiner
 Alexander Robbins Steinman
 Edna L. Stephens
 Andrew Stergiopoulos
 Andrew J. Stern
 Norma Lang Steuerle
 Martha Jane Stevens
 Michael James Stewart
 Richard H. Stewart, Jr.
 Sanford M. Stoller
 Douglas Joel Stone
 Lonny Jay Stone
 Jimmy Nevill Storey
 Timothy Stout
 Thomas Strada
 James J. Straine, Jr.
 Edward W. Straub
 George J. Strauch, Jr.
 Edward Thomas Strauss
 Steven R. Strauss
 Larry L. Strickland
 Steven F. Strobert
 Walwyn Wellington Stuart, Jr.
 Benjamin Suarez
 David Scott Suarez
 Ramon Suarez
 Dino Xavier Suarez Ramirez
 Yoichi Sumiyama Sugiyama
 William Christopher Sugra
 Daniel Thomas Suhr
 David Marc Sullins
 Christopher P. Sullivan
 Patrick Sullivan
 Thomas G. Sullivan
 Hilario Soriano Sumaya, Jr.
 James Joseph Suozzo
 Colleen M. Supinski
 Robert Sutcliffe
 Seline Sutter
 Claudia Suzette Sutton
 John Francis Swaine
 Kristine M. Swearson
 Brian David Sweeney
 Brian Edward Sweeney
 Madeline Amy Sweeney
 Kenneth J. Swenson
 Thomas F. Swift
 Derek Ogilvie Sword
 Kevin Thomas Szocik
 Gina Szejnberg
 Norbert P. Szurkowski
 Harry Taback
 Joann C. Tabeek
 Norma C. Taddei
 Michael Taddonio
 Keiichiro Takahashi
 Keiji Takahashi
 Phyllis Gail Talbot
 Robert R. Talhami
 John Talignani
 Sean Patrick Tallon
 Paul Talty
 Maurita Tam
 Rachel Tamares
 Hector Rogan Tamayo
 Michael Andrew Tamuccio
 Kenichiro Tanaka
 Rhondelle Cherie Tankard
 Michael Anthony Tanner
 Dennis Gerard Taormina, Jr.
 Kenneth Joseph Tarantino
 Allan Tarasiewicz
 Michael C. Tarrou
 Ronald Tartaro
 Deborah Tavolarella
 Darryl Anthony Taylor
 Donnie Brooks Taylor
 Hilda E. Taylor
 Kip P. Taylor
 Leonard E. Taylor
 Loris Ceylon Taylor
 Michael Morgan Taylor
 Sandra C. Taylor
 Sandra Dawn Teague
 Karl W. Teepe
 Paul A. Tegtmeier
 Yeshavant Moreshwar Tembe
 Anthony Tempesta
 Dorothy Pearl Temple
 Stanley L. Temple
 David Gustaf Peter Tengelin
 Brian John Terrenzi
 Lisa Marie Terry
 Goumatie Thackurdeen
 Harshad Sham Thatte
 Michael Theodoridis
 Thomas F. Theurkauf, Jr.
 Lesley Anne Thomas
 Brian Thomas Thompson
 Clive Ian Thompson
 Glenn Thompson
 Nigel Bruce Thompson
 Perry A. Thompson
 Vanavah Alexei Thompson
 William H. Thompson
 Eric Raymond Thorpe
 Nichola Angela Thorpe
 Tamara C. Thurman
 Sal Edward Tieri, Jr.
 John Patrick Tierney
 Mary Ellen Tiesi
 William Randolph Tieste
 Kenneth Tietjen
 Stephen Edward Tighe
 Scott Charles Timmes
 Michael E. Tinley
 Jennifer M. Tino
 Robert Frank Tipaldi
 John James Tipping II
 David Tirado
 Hector Luis Tirado, Jr.
 Michelle Lee Titolo
 Alicia Nicole Titus
 John J. Tobin
 Richard J. Todisco
 Otis V. Tolbert
 Vladimir Tomasevic
 Stephen Kevin Tompsett

Thomas Tong
 Doris Torres
 Luis Eduardo Torres
 Amy Elizabeth Toyen
 Christopher Michael Traina
 Daniel Patrick Trant
 Abdoul Karim Traore
 Glenn J. Travers, Sr.
 Walter Philip Travers
 Felicia Yvette Traylor-Bass
 James Anthony Trentini
 Mary Barbara Trentini
 Lisa L. Tretotola
 Karamo Baba Trerra
 Michael Angel Trinidad
 Francis Joseph Trombino
 Gregory James Trost
 Willie Q. Troy
 William P. Tselepis, Jr.
 Zhanetta Valentinovna Tsoy
 Michael Patrick Tucker
 Lance Richard Tumulty
 Ching Ping Tung
 Simon James Turner
 Donald Joseph Tuzio
 Robert T. Twomey
 Jennifer Lynn Tzemis
 John G. Ueltzhoeffler
 Tyler Victor Ugolyn
 Michael A. Uliano
 Jonathan J. Uman
 Anil Shivhari Umakar
 Allen V. Upton
 Diane Marie Urban
 John Damien Vaccacio
 Bradley Hodges Vadas
 William Valcarcel
 Felix Antonio Vale
 Ivan Vale
 Benito Valentin
 Santos Valentin, Jr.
 Carlton Francis Valvo II
 Pendyala Vamsikrishna
 Erica H. Van Acker
 Kenneth W. Van Auken
 R. Bruce Van Hine
 Daniel M. Van Laere
 Edward Raymond Vanacore
 Jon Charles Vandevander
 Frederick T. Varacchi
 Gopalakrishnan Varadhan
 David Vargas
 Scott C. Vasel
 Azael Ismael Vasquez
 Ronald J. Vauk
 Arcangel Vazquez
 Santos Vazquez
 Peter Vega
 Sankara Sastry Velamuri
 Jorge Velazquez
 Lawrence G. Veling
 Anthony Mark Ventura
 David Vera
 Loretta Ann Vero
 Christopher James Vialonga
 Matthew Gilbert Vianna
 Robert Anthony Vicario
 Celeste Torres Victoria
 Joanna Vidal
 John T. Vignano II
 Joseph Vincent Vignano
 Frank J. Vignola, Jr.
 Joseph Barry Vilardo
 Claribel Villalobos Hernandez
 Sergio Gabriel Villanueva
 Chantal Vincelli
 Melissa Renée Vincent
 Francine Ann Virgilio
 Lawrence Virgilio
 Joseph Gerard Visciano
 Joshua S. Vitale
 Maria Percoco Vola
 Lynette D. Vosges
 Garo H. Voskerjian
 Alfred Anton Vukosa
 Gregory Kamal Bruno Wachtler
 Karen J. Wagner
 Mary Alice Wahlstrom
 Honor Elizabeth Wainio
 Gabriela Silvina Waisman
 Wendy Alice Rosario Wakeford
 Courtney Wainsworth Walcott
 Victor Wald
 Kenneth E. Waldie
 Benjamin James Walker
 Glen Wall
 Mitchel Scott Wallace
 Peter Guyder Wallace
 Robert Francis Wallace
 Roy Michael Wallace
 Jeanmarie Wallendorf
 Matthew Blake Wallens
 Meta L. Waller
 John Wallace, Jr.
 Barbara P. Walsh
 Jim Walsh
 Jeffrey P. Walz
 Ching Wang
 Weibin Wang
 Michael Warchola
 Stephen Gordon Ward
 Timothy Ray Ward
 James A. Waring
 Brian G. Warner
 Derrick Christopher Washington
 Charles Waters
 James Thomas Waters, Jr.
 Patrick J. Waters
 Kenneth Thomas Watson
 Michael Henry Wayne
 Todd Christopher Weaver
 Walter Edward Weaver
 Nathaniel Webb
 Dinah Webster
 William Michael Weems
 Joanne Flora Weil
 Michael T. Weinberg
 Steven Weinberg
 Scott Jeffrey Weingard
 Steven George Weinstein
 Simon Weiser
 David M. Weiss
 David Thomas Weiss
 Chin Sun Pak Wells
 Vincent Michael Wells
 Deborah Jacobs Welsh
 Timothy Matthew Welty
 Christian Hans Rudolf Wemmers
 Ssu-Hui Wen
 John Joseph Wenckus
 Oleh D. Wengerchuk
 Peter M. West
 Whitfield West, Jr.
 Meredith Lynn Whalen
 Eugene Michael Whelan
 Adam S. White
 Edward James White III
 James Patrick White
 John Sylvester White
 Kenneth Wilburn White, Jr.
 Leonard Anthony White
 Malissa Y. White
 Maudlyn A. White
 Sandra L. White
 Wayne White
 Leanne Marie Whiteside
 Mark P. Whitford
 Leslie A. Whittington
 Michael T. Wholey
 Mary Lenz Wieman
 Jeffrey David Wiener
 William J. Wik
 Alison Marie Wildman
 Glenn E. Wilkinson
 Ernest M. Willcher
 John Charles Willett
 Brian Patrick Williams
 Candace Lee Williams
 Crossley Richard Williams, Jr.
 David J. Williams
 David Lucian Williams
 Debbie L. Williams
 Dwayne Williams
 Kevin Michael Williams
 Louie Anthony Williams
 Louis Calvin Williams III
 John P. Williamson
 Donna Ann Wilson
 William Eben Wilson
 David Harold Winton
 Glenn J. Winuk
 Thomas Francis Wise
 Alan L. Wisniewski
 Frank Paul Wisniewski
 David Wiswall
 Sigrid Charlotte Wiswe
 Michael R. Wittenstein
 Christopher W. Wodenshek
 Martin Phillips Wohlforth
 Katherine Susan Wolf
 Jennifer Yen Wong
 Siucheung Steve Wong
 Yin Ping Wong
 Yuk Ping Wong
 Brent James Woodall
 James John Woods
 Marvin Roger Woods
 Patrick J. Woods
 Richard Herron Woodwell
 David Terence Wooley
 John Bentley Works
 Martin Michael Wortley
 Rodney James Wotton
 William Wren, Ret.
 John W. Wright, Jr.
 Neil Robin Wright
 Sandra Lee Wright
 Jupiter Yambem
 John D. Yamnicky, Sr.
 Suresh Yanamadala
 Vicki Yancey
 Shuyin Yang
 Matthew David Yarnell
 Myrna Yaskulka
 Shakila Yasmin
 Olabisi Shadie Layeni Yee
 Kevin W. Yokum
 Edward P. York
 Kevin Patrick York
 Raymond R. York
 Suzanne Martha Youmans
 Barrington Leroy Young, Jr.
 Donald McArthur Young
 Edmond G. Young, Jr.
 Jacqueline Young
 Lisa L. Young
 Elkin Yuen
 Joseph C. Zaccoli
 Adel Agayby Zakhary
 Arkady Zaltsman
 Edwin J. Zambrana, Jr.
 Robert Alan Zampieri
 Mark Zangrilli
 Christopher R. Zarba, Jr.

Ira Zaslow
 Kenneth Albert Zelman
 Abraham J. Zelmanowitz
 Martin Morales Zempoaltecatl
 Zhe Zeng
 Marc Scott Zeplin
 Jie Yao Justin Zhao
 Yuguang Zheng
 Ivelin Ziminski
 Michael Joseph Zinzi
 Charles Alan Zion
 Julie Lynne Zipper
 Salvatore J. Zisa
 Prokopios Paul Zois
 Joseph J. Zuccala
 Andrew Steven Zucker
 Igor Zukelman

That brilliant, blue-skied September day became one of the darkest mornings in our history when 2,997 innocent people were struck and killed just for going about their daily lives. They were murdered for being Americans.

Thousands more were injured, and, in the years since, tens of thousands more became ill, disabled, or died from exposure to the toxic soup that hung in the air and covered the crash sites.

Since that heartbreaking day, we have come together as a Nation on each anniversary to remember the lives that were taken from us and to honor and thank those first responders who were there for us when we needed them most. Their heroic actions in those first chaotic hours and in the weeks and months to follow showed us that, even in our darkest hours, there can be light.

The dark attack became one of the greatest rescue efforts in history. In a time of sorrow, we drew strength from friends and found comfort in the kindness of strangers. We were inspired to persevere by the resolve and courage of thousands who rushed to the scene to help.

In Congress, we were united and determined. It was on that day that we first pledged to never forget. We vowed to honor those we lost and to always be there for those first responders and survivors who had suffered and continue to suffer from devastating diseases caused by the toxins at the crash site.

It is to honor that pledge, and in recognition of those who still suffer every day from the effects of 9/11, that many of us worked over the years—Congressmen NADLER, KING, and many others, along with hundreds of advocates and colleagues—in a bipartisan effort to ensure first responders and survivors have the healthcare and compensation they so justly deserve.

We are proud that, as of this past July, both the World Trade Center Health Program and the Victim Compensation Fund are effectively permanent.

As the longtime sponsor and author, along with JERRY NADLER and PETER KING, of this legislation in the House, seeing these bills pass was my proudest moment in Congress.

Despite the darkness of those hours, “Never Forget” also calls us to remem-

ber that we were united at that time as one Nation and we were there for one another.

Even today, we can find comfort and inspiration in remembering the way all New Yorkers, all Americans, came together in the aftermath of the attack.

Let us remember the good that we can accomplish together when we focus on what unites us, when we let our shared dreams and highest values pull us together rather than divide us.

After all that I witnessed on that long-ago September day, I was proud beyond words to be a New Yorker and an American.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to recognize my good friend and colleague from the great State of New York, JERRY NADLER, who has worked many long days in response to rebuilding after 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY for yielding and for all her work over the years on this issue.

It is hard to believe it has been 18 years. Like many New Yorkers, 9/11 seems both long ago and immediate, a memory and something I live with every day.

I was in Washington that morning and immediately rushed back to New York by train. I saw the smoking wreckage in Lower Manhattan from the train window and expected chaos in the city, but, when I exited Penn Station that evening, I was struck by the silence.

It was like a scene from out of the movie “On the Beach.” The city seemed empty. No cars, no people, no vehicles, no buses, nothing on the streets—just the strange odor that hung in the air.

Knowing the terror and confusion happening just 40 blocks south, the silence was eerie.

But, as we recall the fear and grief of September 11, we cannot forget the courage we saw that morning and in the days, weeks, and months following the attack: the firefighters who ran into those buildings, the police officers who searched for survivors, the co-workers who carried each other down endless stairs, the strangers on the street who guided each other to safety, the construction workers who spent months clearing debris.

The legacy of 9/11 is not just one of tragedy and grief; it is one of courage, self-sacrifice, and community; it is one of the American people, through Congress, appropriating \$20 billion to help New York begin to recover from the terrorist attack.

But history would not be complete if we did not acknowledge that the Federal Government exacerbated the massive environmental disaster caused by the collapse of the World Trade Center by insisting, contrary to ample evidence, that the air in Lower Manhattan and Brooklyn was safe to breathe.

Thousands of responders, from all over the country, worked on the World

Trade Center site with minimal or no protective equipment.

The Federal Government did not step in to conduct the necessary comprehensive cleanup of the schools, offices, and residences in Lower Manhattan. Instead, students were sent back to schools caught in a dust cloud before the ventilation systems were cleaned. Residents and office workers were sent back to buildings covered in asbestos.

I joined a few environmental groups in trying to warn people that they could not believe the assurances of EPA administrator Christine Todd Whitman and Mayor Giuliani that the air was not safe to breathe, that people should not return to school or to work without respiratory protection and until a proper cleanup was done.

Eventually, we forced the government to acknowledge those lies and to provide healthcare and resources for those clearly made sick by their exposure to those toxins.

As subcommittee chair, I held the first hearings to hold the EPA and former EPA administrator Whitman accountable for putting hundreds of thousands at risk. Those hearings were held in 2007.

Working with Congresswoman MALONEY, Congressman KING, and my colleagues in New York and New Jersey, we finally got Congress to come together in 2010 to pass the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act, to establish a national health program, and to reopen the Victim Compensation Fund to provide support to sick responders and survivors.

In 2015, as these programs were about to expire, we made the Health Program permanent, but reauthorized the VCF for only 5 years.

This year, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I was incredibly proud and moved to hold a hearing on the need for additional time and money for the VCF.

We heard heartbreaking testimony from sick responders and survivors: a firefighter, an FBI agent, a former high school student, the widow of a construction worker, and the late Detective Luis Alvarez, who passed away from a 9/11-related cancer just weeks after testifying.

The very next day, the committee unanimously passed the bill to make the fund permanent, to restore any cuts to past awards, and to ensure the Victim Compensation Fund had all the necessary funding going forward.

That bill passed the full House and Senate and went straight to the President's desk, where it was signed into law.

Creating the Health Program and the Victim Compensation Fund and making those programs permanent count among the proudest moments of my time as a Member of Congress. Through these programs, we are finally living up to the challenge Abraham Lincoln laid before us in his second inaugural address, that we must care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan.

□ 1800

We will never forget 9/11. We will never forget those who perished on that day from the terrorist attacks, and we will never abandon those who battled that day and still bear the scars.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY for hosting this Special Order hour with me and for being such a champion for the survivors and responders over the years.

I thank each of our colleagues who come to the floor this evening to remember those we lost and thank all of our colleagues who joined us in voting for and renewing the 9/11 healthcare act.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), another champion for this cause.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and New Yorker, my colleague, CAROLYN MALONEY, for organizing this evening so that we can all remember.

Eighteen years have passed since the September 11 terrorist attacks, but the memory of this unimaginable tragedy, unspeakable terror, and profound grief remains.

When tragedy struck, men and women streamed from the Twin Towers and the Pentagon as first responders ran in and risked their lives. Volunteers sifted through debris for days and weeks, hoping for miracles.

Between those horrific attacks and the crash of Flight 93 in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, we lost nearly 3,000 family members, friends, and neighbors. We promised to never forget those whose lives were cut short.

The pain that we all feel from the loss of our relatives, friends, and neighbors will never heal, but every day we must channel that pain into remembrance and service. By participating in this day of service, we help build a stronger, more unified community to honor the victims' memories.

We are also called to care for those who remain with us but suffer as a result of their bravery that day. In July, the Senate followed the House's lead and passed the permanent renewal of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund, which was enacted on July 29, 2019. The long-overdue action provides financial security and care for first responders and survivors who are ill from exposure to a mix of burning chemicals and debris.

On this and every anniversary of the September 11 attacks, we are reminded of our common purpose and solemn responsibilities: to care for the survivors and first responders, to give our law enforcement the resources to prevent and respond to attacks, and, last but not least, to hold the victims and heroes of September 11 and their families forever in our hearts.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

On 9/11, I got in a car and started to driving to New York. There were barricades up that said: "New York in crisis. You cannot pass." It was the only time I ever had to use my congressional ID.

I got through, and all you could see were first responders pouring in from New Jersey to help. They were a critical part of not only rebuilding in New York, but passing the important legislation.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman, Representative MALONEY, for all her dedication, and I thank her for naming me to share a few remarks.

I am a new Representative from Pennsylvania, neighbor to New Jersey, but I spend an awful lot of time in New Jersey, and our whole area was affected.

Eighteen years ago, planes crashed into the Twin Towers, the Pentagon, and a Pennsylvania field near Shanksville. September 11 slammed into our national consciousness and has reverberated ever since.

We lost family, friends, neighbors, coworkers—losses that are immeasurable. We might have lost more, but on that day, our first responders rushed toward danger, rescued survivors, and then spent months cleaning up the wreckage.

That blend of sorrow and courage was on display again in June, when first responders encouraged Congress to reauthorize the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund.

Detective Luis Alvarez told me: "I'm doing okay, but there are others out there who aren't doing okay." Before Detective Alvarez died a few weeks later, he said: "The government has to act like first responders . . . put politics aside and let's get this bill done."

Ultimately, we did so—through the might and strength of CAROLYN MALONEY, I might add—naming our bill for him, Luis Alvarez, and other heroes.

In the spirit of Detective Alvarez, let us continue to do so, working together with decency and respect. That is how we will honor those we lost; that is how we will honor those we continue to lose; and that is how we will honor all of those who continue to grieve.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

9/11 was a total bipartisan effort. I have never seen this Congress so united and determined, working together, particularly in the New York delegation.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for yielding and for hosting this Special Order hour.

Really, much of Congresswoman MALONEY's career here and legacy of service in the House of Representatives, while focused passionately on a lot of other issues that are very important, certainly is one that is filled with much success in advocating on behalf of the New York community and for first responders all across America for important priorities post-9/11. So I

thank her for all of her leadership, because a lot of that benefits my constituents as well on the East End, but, really, for all of us as Americans.

As we are here right now, all across New York, across my district, across our country, people are gathering, men and women who remember exactly where they were and how they felt, what they saw, what they heard, and also, kids who weren't even born yet, learning for the first time those stories of what was experienced on September 11, 2001.

We often talk about our Nation's Greatest Generation. I was at Army Reserve duty this past weekend, and I was talking to one officer who said that his life—not just his military career, but his life—is broken up into two parts: There was the part of his life until September 11, 2001, and the part of his life after September 11, 2001.

It is a challenge for that generation serving post-9/11 to try to fill the shoes of our Nation's Greatest Generation, those who have served in World War II, Korea, Vietnam, peacetime, wartime, many great Americans through generations.

It is so important for us to honor and remember the victims of September 11, 2001, to honor and remember those with courage who ran up while other people were running down, who ran toward danger, ignoring orders to go in the opposite direction at the ultimate risk of their own life.

And also, it is important for us to honor all of the men and women who have served in our Nation's military. Think of that man or that woman that next morning who had a successful career, a stable family, and they went to their local recruiter's office to sign up to serve and, ultimately, gave their life in that cause. There has been so much sacrifice since 9/11.

As we gather together on this 18th anniversary here in the House Chamber, this morning starting with a moment of silence and a singing of "God Bless America," when we say "never forget," we have to ensure that every single day that we are honoring the legacy of all those lives cut short too soon, that we are paying tribute to those first responders with an enormous amount of courage, and that we are honoring those men and women who still serve to this day, those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice, our Gold Star families, our Blue Star families, past, present, and future.

As that lieutenant colonel told me this past weekend, for him, where he separated his life into service before 9/11 and service after, life before 9/11 and life after, know that right now we have men and women who are overseas who were 1 year old or 2 years old and their entire life have only known the post-9/11 reality, and yet they want nothing else but service.

So I think this 18th anniversary is not just about what happened on that day and the days and the weeks and the months that followed, but it is also about where we are today.

Finally, I would say this: While we talk about the lives that were lost that day, there is an important lesson with the justice that was served to follow, for anyone who seeks to break down this country, to tear apart what binds us together as Americans, the ultimate justice will be delivered to them abroad, because America is strong.

New Yorkers are strong, but as Americans, we will come together; we will unite; we will fight to protect our freedoms and our liberties. And it is not about Republican or Democrat, conservative or liberal; it is about us as Members of this body and as Americans outside of this body to unite for a cause so much greater than ourselves, the greatest Nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank Mrs. MALONEY for her leadership through the years to ensure that, in so many ways, our first responders, families, victims are all being fought for successfully in the Halls of this great Chamber, and all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have assisted Mrs. MALONEY in her important efforts. I thank the gentlewoman for hosting today's Special Order hour.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), a great partner in our efforts to rebuild after 9/11.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY and Chairman NADLER for hosting this bipartisan Special Order hour this evening to remember the attacks on September 11, 2001.

I thank the gentlewoman so much for all she does for our first responders and for our country. We are all very grateful.

More than 700 New Jersey residents were among the nearly 3,000 Americans killed at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and on the four planes that morning. The attacks were not only a declaration of war on the American people, but also on our fundamental ideals of freedom and liberty.

On 9/11, we lost more than 400 firefighters, police, EMTs, and other first responders who all ran in to help, true patriots putting others ahead of themselves.

And since that tragic morning, 2,000 first responders who were there at the pile in the days, weeks, and months following have died from illnesses from their exposure to toxic dust and debris.

Earlier this year, I was proud to stand right here on the House floor alongside my colleagues in the New York and New Jersey delegations, led by Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. KING and Chairman NADLER, calling for the permanent authorization of the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund, which, through the tireless advocacy efforts of their fellow first responders and survivors will provide our sick and dying 9/11 first responders and their families with the support they need and deserve.

Just as we stood together then—not as Democrats or Republicans, but as

Americans—after those attacks 18 years ago, we must continue to do so today and come together as a country for our children, for our first responders, for our brave men and women in Active Duty, and for our veterans.

I think our country has had enough of the fighting. I think people want us to come together as one. They want us to work together, govern together, and solve problems together under the flag.

Today, we are able to step back, to think and reflect and pray for all the lives we lost that day and all those we have lost since. We honor their legacies by coming together as a nation here in the greatest country in the world and continuing to work to build a more perfect Union.

As we remember those we lost and our veterans and our active service-members and all of our first responders who continue to protect us, may God bless all those we lost that day as well as their families, those we have lost since, and may God bless those who bravely protect us here at home and abroad every day. And may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELGADO), an outstanding new Member of Congress, a great addition to the New York delegation.

Mr. DELGADO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of nearly 3,000 Americans who were killed in the September 11 terrorist attacks on our homeland.

Eighteen years ago today, vile acts of terror were committed in New York, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. In the moments following these tragedies, as thousands of people streamed out of the towers for safety, thousands of first responders ran into harm's way to save lives. These first responders came from all across the State of New York, including my district, the 19th Congressional District.

Today is a solemn day of quiet remembrance. We bow our heads as a nation in a moment of silence, as we cannot carry the weight of these memories of loved ones alone. The pain is too hard for one family to bear, for one city to bear alone, for one State to bear alone.

□ 1815

Today I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and from every corner of the country to never forget—to never forget the lives we lost, to never forget the sacrifices made of our men and women in uniform, and know that we will stand with you and your families in the years ahead.

May we also never forget the national unity we all felt in the days, weeks, and months following 9/11 where all that mattered was putting country first. God bless America.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NORMA TORRES), a great leader here in Congress.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representatives MALONEY and NADLER for organizing this Special Order to mark a day that is engraved in the memory of every American, September 11, 2001.

Eighteen years later we honor the lives of the fallen, the firefighters and the law enforcement officers who ran towards danger when everyone else was running away from it. And we recognize the 911 dispatchers who were working around the clock behind the scenes to organize emergency response across our Nation.

I was working at the LAPD 911 center that morning. It was all hands on deck, and I didn't know when I would be able to go home. My first assignment that day was to assemble two mobile field force units and send them out to protect places of worship, water treatment plants, cell phone towers, and anything that could be considered a target.

I had no idea what would come next. None of us did. But like every first responder working that day, 911 dispatchers had to cast their own fears aside. They had jobs to do. They had to protect and secure their communities, just like firefighters and police officers. And they had to be the calm reassuring voice on the other side of the line for every person who dialed 911, for every resident who was fearing the worst, for every child who was calling to ask should I go to school or stay home. We received calls from all over the world at our 911 center that day.

So as we pause today to remember that tragic, dark day, let us not forget the unsung heroes, the 911 dispatchers who are always heard and never seen.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressional Progressive Caucus for allowing us to use their time on the floor with this Special Order remembering our losses, our strength, remembering 9/11.

9/11 was a transformational event. I never meet anyone from another country or any State in America that they do not tell me about their feelings about 9/11. I remember when I drove home that day and my daughter was home sick, and she said—and it still is one of the best descriptions of what happened—she said, "I feel like Alice in Wonderland. I have gone through the looking glass and nothing will ever be the same again." And it is true about our country.

We reordered our priorities and made Homeland Security our number one priority. We wrote many bills to make this country safer and stronger, and we worked together that day and every day. We remember the lives that were taken from us and in the years that have followed the lives that have been lost because of sickness, and we are reminded of the strength and resiliency of our great Nation and what we can achieve when we band together.

I want to thank all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for joining me in this Special Order and for all of

their help and support and ideas, leadership, and guidance to help rebuild this Nation and make it stronger after 9/11.

We will never forget.

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

REMEMBERING 9/11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MALONEY for telling the story. You know, it is not just New Yorkers, I can't imagine there is an American who doesn't remember exactly where they were in that horrific moment. And it's a moment yet where those of us in the West and all over the country ached to see what happened to your community.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and all of my colleagues for all of the support and the effort to rebuild and make this country stronger. We literally rewrote the whole intelligence system and defense system of the Nation and took really massive steps to restructure our government and our country to be able to respond and protect our citizens. It was a unified, determined effort.

I thank all of my colleagues for all of their help for New York and for all of their help for the Pentagon and Shanksville, and, mostly, for being part of an effort to rebuild and make this country stronger to be able to prevent future attacks.

I thank Members so much for their kind words. My constituents in my city deeply appreciate it.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MALONEY. We always have to be careful when we are friends not to go around calling each other by our first names.

But I was not here at the time of 9/11, I did not come for another decade. And yet today, even with the young people we have in our office that were just children, I mean young children, and you can still feel that sort of somber tone. It is a powerful example and something that is devastating. And we can come together. I desperately wish there were more opportunities where we remember, not the horror, but the fact that there was unity. And how do we deal in a world right now where so much of our politics is toxic and in not allowing that broken sort of political system to ever sort of be more powerful than those moments where we must come together and both heal, deal with the heartbreak and then also make sure it never ever happens again.

So my reason for being on the floor this evening is I wanted to spend a mo-

ment and just touch on 9/11 and how that just affects so many of us. I am told now in Arizona we have 30 or 40 of those first responders or others who were affected who are receiving their healthcare in our community. I know of only one or two Arizonans, I believe, who lost their lives, so we always sort of pull back to our communities and personalize it.

THE MATH DOESN'T WORK

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, just before we got back there was a jobs report, and I know that it is going to be a little geeky, but I wanted to go walk through some of those underlying numbers that lay in there. And it's actually good news, the fact that there are really terrific things happening in our economy.

But I still want to put it in context: I have been coming to this microphone for quite a while now to say, What is the biggest issue we as a society have?

If you think of my little girl that is going to turn 4 next month, what is the biggest impairment to her economic future? And we are going to walk through some of the math, but we are going to also walk through some of the solutions, because it turns out it is demographics.

We always put up this slide to basically sort of point out that the days of yesteryear, where Members would get behind these microphones and say, Well, if we just raise the tax on this population, or if we just do this entitlement reform over here, or we just do premium support over here that the fact of the matter is that 30 years from now, if you remove Social Security and Medicare from the budget, this country is 20-some-trillion dollars cash positive. If you pull Social Security and Medicare back into the math, we are \$100 trillion upside down. Mathematically, we just can't get there.

And so, if we actually care about keeping our promises to those, you know, the 10,300 Americans that turn 65 every single day and start to move into their benefits, we really need to get serious, because we are already in a time—we don't tell the public this because it is hard. We are not honest, I believe, with ourselves, but there is already things Congress would desperately like to be doing, our constituents would desperately like us to do that we are not doing because of the squeeze-out factor that is already happening because of our demographics.

There is this thing called baby boomers. I am one of them. And the math to keep our promises basically takes away the resources that would be doing other things. And they are promises, we have to keep them.

So how do you create the economic vitality, the labor force and all those other things? And we are going to spend a little bit of time on labor force today.

So just some points of reference. Every 5 years just the growth of Social Security and Medicare healthcare entitlements, just the growth portion

equals the entire Defense Department. So if you came into the office and said, "DAVID, tomorrow my solution for being able to keep our promises in Medicare is let's just get rid of the Pentagon," you only covered the growth portion of the spending for Social Security and Medicare healthcare entitlements for 5 years. So then every 10 years, two full Pentagons is just the growth. Ninety-one percent of the spending increases that are basically slated for the next 10 years are solely the growth in Social Security and Medicare.

Understand, it is math. It is not Republican or Democrat. And we have lunacy around here. We have done this on the floor before, where we walk through some of the solutions that are thrown out that are completely make-believe. Well, if we just raised taxes on the rich and do this, if we just raised this number, and you understand, the math doesn't work. You are going to have to do something that is really hard for a broken political system. And we are going to have to do something that is big, complex, and actually holistic.

So one of the reasons we put this board up almost every time we are behind this microphone is trying to say, We actually sort of have come up with about five pillars, everything from, you know, one pillar being tax policy, trade policy, regulatory policy to maximize economic velocity, incentives to be in the labor force to maximize that, because labor force participation is crucial.

Let's explain. After tax reform, the modelers kept coming back and saying, We believe the headwinds for the economic growth are going to be what they call capital stock, savings. Will the country have cash in its banks and those things?

Well, we have already blown the wheels off or the charts off or however you want to say it in everything from repatriated cash coming back into the country which has been substantially greater than we have ever expected. Foreign investments. But also, Americans have been saving substantially more of the tax reform savings to them than we actually modelled.

But it was labor force. And we are going to come back to that because there is actually some really interesting, good news, but we have got to get our heads around it, but the two headwinds were labor force and capital stock.

□ 1830

We have proven capital stock is working in our favor, and all of a sudden, we got a jobs report that looks like the labor force. This violates all the smart people and the demographers who never thought that, at this point in our demographic cycle, we would be hitting these numbers.

Another thing we talk about is, how do we have population stability? Immigration, family formation. Our birth

rates, now we are at functionally negative population growth if we look at domestic birth rates. That is a real problem. If we are going to redesign immigration, can we move to a talent-based immigration system so it maximizes economic velocity?

Once again, you see a theme here. We must grow like crazy.

Other things: Can we put incentives into our earned entitlement programs? When you earn your Social Security, you earn your Medicare, could we build some incentives in there saying, if you are healthy and feel of sharp mind, or if you want to be an entrepreneur, what can we do as incentives to stay in the labor force, to continue that, because we need you?

We have done some time on the floor where we have walked through things that are happening in countries like Japan, where they are desperately trying to get populations to stay or come back into the labor force just for economic survival.

The one we have had the most fun with behind this microphone—and the next slide will make some sense, and then we will go on to the labor force issues—is that I believe we are in a time when technology may be one of the things that saves us. We have done time on this floor where we have walked through amazing technology that is about to do stunningly great things for the environment.

We now have a couple of big experimental power plants that are working outside of Houston where they are burning coal and natural gas with no smokestack. They are collecting every bit of the CO₂.

We have proven that technology works. Now we have had a breakthrough on being able to carbon mine the air. We have learned how to do a couple things. There is a type of genetic engineering in certain food stocks so your cow doesn't produce as much methane. Remember, twice as much comes out of the mouth as—a bit of trivia.

It turns out, instead of just regulating and controlling and crushing the very economic growth we must have to be able to keep our social entitlement promises, let's embrace technology.

There is technology that is about to be a disruption in healthcare costs. Our problem is that we have to legalize it.

Are you prepared to allow technology to write you a prescription if we can demonstrate that the algorithms and the sensors and those things are incredibly accurate? Are we prepared to work out some financing mechanisms for these new biological drugs that are about to cure diseases that are crushing to both individuals and families but also to the economics of healthcare?

Remember, 5 percent of our brothers and sisters who have chronic conditions are the majority of our healthcare expenditures.

Where is the excitement and optimism that there are a number of these horrible, horrible afflictions that are about to be cured?

I have been up here and brought the charts and those things about diseases like hemophilia. The fact is that we believe we are heading to a single-shot cure. The 8,600—I believe that is the accurate number—of our brothers and sisters who suffer hemophilia, which is a horribly expensive disease, can be cured, but the drug is also really expensive. For instance, are we prepared to think through how we finance cures, a drug that stabilizes ALS but is going to be really expensive?

What happens when I can use technology on one end to keep us healthy and technology on the other end to cure?

This has to be a radically different way to think about how we are going to crush the price of healthcare than the insanity, the mathematical insanity, that seems to be part of our public discourse right now of, "Well, let's just nationalize healthcare," because that removes no costs. If you lay it out and look at the underlying math, it doesn't save anything. It is just, once again, playing the game of shifting.

Shifting things, like the debate we have had for the last 10 years between Republicans and Democrats on who gets subsidized, who has to pay, who should pay, and who gets subsidized, it is absurdity.

We now need to do those things that reduce the price or cure our brothers and sisters who have these afflictions.

As we are walking through the math, and we went back and double-vetted this a couple of hours ago, and we talked about this before, if you look at the next 30 years and remove Social Security and Medicare, our country is \$23.1 trillion cash positive. If you take Social Security, Medicare, and their associated interest costs on the borrowing, we are over \$100 trillion negative.

If you look carefully, it is not Social Security. Social Security is a big deal, but two-thirds-plus of it is Medicare.

We need to have a fixation on what we do as a society to crack the cost of healthcare. That is why we are working on a piece of legislation in our office to allow technology to be truly—think about a Blockbuster video moment.

How many of us went to Blockbuster video last weekend? I know it is a silly example, but it is a good one because didn't it feel like, overnight, we used to go get those little silver disks, and now we go home and hit a button?

We, as a society, engage in technology disruption all the time.

The problem with healthcare, similar to what we have in education, is that we have so much government intrusion in it, so much government regulation, so much trying to keep people safe. The ability to have technology innovation that crashes the price—we have all seen some of the new wearables and some of the things you can blow into that look like they are going to diagnose everything from several types of cancer to being able to tell if you have

the flu. The algorithms associated with that, if we can demonstrate they are highly accurate, what should they be allowed to do?

That disruption is coming, but what do we do about this? We know what is driving the debt and what is going to drive us off the rails.

Could I beg of us, as policymakers, to fixate on the revolution that changes this cost curve? Instead, we will do absolutely ridiculous—my father used to refer to it as the shiny object theory. It is, you could have something that is incredibly important in your life, but if I can come up with a shiny object over here and wave it around and, in this case, get the press and others and maybe talk radio and maybe the cable news, we will talk about the shiny object. We will go run over and worry about that and deal with that, even though this over here is the thing that is so critical to the survival of our society.

Let's talk about where we are having some success right now.

It was only a couple years ago—I remember it was the Joint Economic Committee—we were sitting down with some demographers and researchers. We were talking about the aging of America and how labor force participation was going to crash. Because of that, we were going to see a real headwind in our ability to grow as a society, as an economy.

Without growth, we are not going to have the revenues. We are not going to have all those pillars that we talked about in the beginning moving forward.

Last Friday, we got the unemployment numbers. Underneath it, there is that thing called the U6 data where you start to dive into it and understand what is really going on.

As we get ready to walk through these really positive things, I need everybody to work with me on a concept. How do we have a society—and let me grab my little notes here—that, all of a sudden, we have 163.4 million Americans working? We are now back above 63 percent labor force participation. We are back up to, like, 63.2, which those very researchers in that meeting a couple of years ago said by now we would be maybe as low as in the high 50s, that the available labor was going to crash.

You start to understand that there is a miracle happening in our society because, to quote some of the folks recently, workers came out of the woodwork this last month and have been entering the labor force.

The best way I can describe this is, remember a few years ago when we used to come behind these microphones and talk about the real unemployment data: Hey, I know they are saying we are only at 6 percent unemployment, but if you add in all those people who are not looking for work, discouraged workers, if I can use a pop-culture term from the 1980s, worn-out workers, the unemployment rate was 14, 16, 18 percent of the society.

We have data that, last month, when they do the real unemployment calculation, it is the lowest it has been in modern times. We are back at 7 percent and ticking lower. The official unemployment rate stayed at 3.7.

Work with me here. The official unemployment rate doesn't change, but we know we had a few hundred thousand new entries into the labor force. A big chunk of that was not being calculated in unemployment numbers because they weren't even looking. Something happened in society where, all of a sudden, folks who were underemployed, who had not been looking, all of a sudden came back.

This is really, really important. I know it is geeky, but the math is absolutely critical.

The other thing that was happening was, if you dug into that unemployment report on Friday, if you take the last 3 months, all of a sudden, wages and productivity have started to spike. If you analyze the last 3 months, all of a sudden, wages are moving at about a 4.2 percent increase in a time with very low inflation.

We all remember our econ classes. What are the two things that make an employer pay you more money? It was really simple. It was productivity and inflation.

What happens if we are in a world where there is very little inflation and, all of a sudden, we are paying people more? It turns out maybe we have to add a little labor force squeeze, a society with more jobs than available workers. All of a sudden, we get the spike of productivity we see in the last 3 months. These are good things.

We have talked behind these microphones for years now about how working men and women aren't getting ahead, that the actual real wages have stayed flat for a couple of decades, except for substantially this last year. We really should figure out what are we doing right and continue to do more of it.

Look, it is math. Is it Republican math or Democratic math? It is math, but something is working in our society where they are coming back into the labor force.

Look, why isn't there joy in this place? Has our partisanship become so dark that something that would be a conversation of joy, a 3.3 percent unemployment rate for adult women—this is close to the 1953 rate, and in 1953, it was a dramatically smaller population that was looking.

How about a 5.5 percent African American unemployment rate, a record low? Where's the joy? A 4.2 percent Hispanic American unemployment rate has now tied the all-time record low. A 3.3 percent unemployment rate for adult women, near the lowest rate since 1953. A 2.8 percent Asian American unemployment rate, almost touching up against the record low.

If you want to take prime age, which there is a whole reason we calculate that for productivity numbers, a 76.3

percent labor force participation, the highest rate since February 2002, and an 80 percent prime age, 25 to 54, employment rate for the first time since 2008.

There are other numbers in here.

□ 1845

You would actually think for a moment there would be some level of joy of something is working in our society, where the very people we walk around here claiming that we are fighting for and that we care about is working. We just need to figure out what is working and do more of it.

U.S. household income finally matches the 1999 peak, while the poverty rate is at its lowest since 2001.

How many of you actually saw that discussed over this weekend and over the last couple of days?

It is working. For the first time, most new working age hires in the U.S. are people of color. It is working.

When I get up behind this mike and I keep trying to say we have these five pillars that we need all of these cylinders to be clicking to be able to grow the economy so we can generate the revenues, so we actually have a fighting chance to keep our promises, that labor force participation one is working right now.

Doesn't this body understand how powerful this is?

They will be out tomorrow, and it is always dangerous to guess, but last month you saw the reality of what we call receipts, tax receipts. Tax receipts so far this year are functionally 3.1 percent higher. They have grown. They are the highest in U.S. history. And if you actually use even what they call inflation adjusted dollars, it is the second highest in history.

So the misinformation campaign saying, well, tax reform didn't—no, tax reform is working. The revenue receipts are up.

If we could actually get some decent data on understanding social needs, Social Security and disability, we know the numbers have fallen. TANF needs have fallen. Many of these are no longer needing the U.S. Government subsidies, our taxpayer dollars, because they are working again.

Where is the joy? Yet why is the spending functionally up about 6½ percent?

Well, a big portion of that was displaced on what we call discretionary, but a big portion of that growth is demographics. We don't do a particularly honest job of showing in a chart saying, look, this is on autopilot.

Every day, 10,300 Americans turn 65, they move into benefits, and we have set aside not nearly enough resources to cover that. As a matter of fact, the Medicare part A portion of the trust fund is gone in a couple of years.

So as we walk through this—and this chart is almost impossible to read and understand, but the trendline of African American women, of Hispanics, of White workers, of African American

men, of Hispanics and others coming back into the labor force is a miracle. It is a demonstration of our five-pillar proposal of how we grow, how we deal with those healthcare costs that are the driver of the crushing debt that is coming down upon us not tomorrow, but today.

One of the pillars is actually working right now. We have demonstrated that sort of holistic theory that, when you get tax policy right, regulatory policy right—could you imagine, when we finally get ourselves and some of the trade issues all cleaned up, where we can go economically?

But it is a demonstration that, economically, this affects what is happening over here on people's ability to have the honor of work.

Mr. Speaker, I just desperately wish, when we have our debates—I know we are always going to have those moments where we have to do the shiny object because that is great politics, but the demographics and over \$100 trillion of debt being handed to my little girl over the next three decades is a level of cruelty.

And it is not Republican or Democrat, it is math, could we ever get our heads around the fact of doing those things that remove that cruelty and make the next three decades for my little girl, for all of us, one of the most amazing portions of American history.

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

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, throughout our district work period, I visited farms, ranches, manufacturing plants, and small businesses where people all said the same thing: It is time to pass the USMCA now. Farmers, ranchers, and workers in Kansas understand how important this monumental trade deal is, and they want it done now.

On November 30, 2018, the United States, Mexico, and Canada signed a monumental free and fair trade agreement for our countries. Since then, Mexico has made significant labor reforms and adopted the USMCA, while Canada is not far behind.

Unfortunately, here at home, the USMCA is stuck in purgatory. Congress failed to bring the USMCA to a vote over the summer, while some of

my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to slow walk and delay a vote to ratify the USMCA.

While my colleagues may want to deny, or at least delay, any victory for President Trump, the only people hurt by delaying the USMCA are hard-working American farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and families.

Currently, more than 12 million American jobs depend on trade with Canada and Mexico. As is the case for 45 other States, Canada and Mexico are Kansas' top two trading partners, worth \$4.9 billion every year, while supporting 110,000 jobs in my State alone. This impact underscores just how important the USMCA is for our country.

According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, the USMCA will create 176,000 new jobs and increase U.S. GDP by \$68 billion. Exports to USMCA partners will grow by \$33.3 billion, and imports from the USMCA partners will grow by \$31.5 billion.

Overall, the update to NAFTA will create jobs, boost wages, and open up new markets for American agriculture and manufacturing. It also sets unprecedented standards for areas like intellectual property, small businesses, and the environment.

This is a significant improvement over NAFTA, which was actually beneficial to my district in Kansas, especially for our farmers, ranchers, and aerospace manufacturers. However, the 25-year-old NAFTA agreement was outdated and badly in need of reform and modernization.

Consider that, when NAFTA was first negotiated in 1992, Motorola cell phones were carried around in a bag, and just one in five households had a home computer. Even fewer than that could connect to a dial-up internet in order to access the world wide web, which had just been unveiled in 1991.

Clearly, a lot has changed in the last 25 years, and our laws and trade deals should change as well.

As Representative of the Air Capital of the World and the breadbasket of America, I know that USMCA is critical for manufacturers, farmers, and ranchers throughout Kansas and our country. That is why I am proud to serve today on the whip team, led by Whip STEVE SCALISE, to help get the USMCA finalized in Congress.

Earlier today, our team met with Ambassador Lighthizer to receive an update on negotiations, and I want to take a moment to again thank him and the entire administration for the work they did to draft the USMCA. Now it is time for Congress to do its part to secure this free and fair trade deal that farmers, ranchers, workers, and families in the heartland and throughout the country deserve.

As a fierce advocate for free and fair trade, I believe a trade agreement with Canada and Mexico is crucial for Kansas and our country. However, President Trump is right to insist that trade deals both be fair and free.

Free trade allows us to export our quality agriculture and manufactured goods around the globe, while fair trade enables us to do so at a fair price without intellectual property infringement. The USMCA accomplishes both of these goals.

I have several Members here with me tonight who also want to talk. I want to talk some more about some of the other benefits that are out there from the USMCA, but right now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), my friend and colleague.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman for bringing this issue to light and for holding this Special Order, and, of course, my colleagues who are with me here today.

All of us who are probably older than the age of 25 have watched, probably in every State in the Union, certainly in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, every little town that you drove through in the State that I am privileged to represent, every little town had some small business, or maybe two or three: a shoe factory, a dress factory. One of the little towns south of us had a cigar factory or two.

Over the course of my adult lifetime, those little factories, those small employers in every single town have left. The reason they left is multiple, but one of them is because the trade deals that were signed by previous administrations encouraged them to leave. They encouraged our competitors to take them over, and we closed up shop. We lost those jobs. Our folks in America had to go find work elsewhere and get retraining elsewhere.

It has been 25 years since NAFTA was enacted. Twenty-five years is a long time. Things were different 25 years ago. There wasn't e-commerce. We weren't all thinking about a globalized economy.

Now these antiquated laws that we are living under are holding back our American economy. If we would just pass the USMCA—it is in the hands of the Speaker right now. If we would just pass it, 176,000 new jobs, \$68 billion in growth to our economy.

Instead of being worried about trading with China and being concerned with what China is going to do, we could trade with people we really agree with who are right on the other side of our border: Canada and Mexico. Wouldn't that be wonderful?

We need to modernize our laws, and that starts by allowing the USMCA to go through. That framework should be considered today. We need free and fair trade. We don't have that right now.

We must pass the USMCA to bolster quality, family-sustaining jobs in America, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and other States around our country.

The USMCA is a win for the American worker. It is great to help out our neighbors around the globe, but our responsibility first is right here at home in our States, like the State of Penn-

sylvania where I am privileged to come from.

The USMCA is a great start and a strategic win. Today I am calling on House leadership to allow for the consideration of the USMCA without any further delay. Let the chips fall where they may. Put it on the floor, and let's see what happens. I suspect it will pass, which means the will of the people will be done and we can get to work working more with our allies and our friends and doing better for Americans.

Quite honestly, while China is waiting to make a trade deal, one of the reasons they are waiting is because this Congress won't approve one in the USMCA. They are saying: Why should we come negotiate with America when their Congress won't approve what we negotiate?

We need to show them that we will approve it; we do stand with the American people and the American worker. We need a better deal with China, too, and it starts with the USMCA.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me the time and for bringing this issue to the forefront.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. PERRY said a lot of things that are really valid there and important to us.

I have several other Members who want to talk about how important things are. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON), my friend and colleague.

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this body's consideration of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or the USMCA, which has the support of both of our neighboring nations; the majority of our Nation's Governors, including Ohio's Governor Mike DeWine; more than 600 trade group organizations across the Nation; our current administration; a significant number of my colleagues both in the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate; and myself.

The USMCA will support tens of millions of jobs across the United States. In my home State of Ohio, more than 428,000 jobs are supported by trade with Canada and Mexico.

The livelihood of my constituents is directly impacted by the success of trade with our neighboring nations. Last year, nearly \$28 billion worth of goods and services were exported from my home State of Ohio to Canada and Mexico.

□ 1900

These exports consist of iron, steel, motor vehicle parts, and machinery, much of which come from my district in central Ohio.

Ohio is also the 12th largest agricultural exporting State. USMCA will make important improvements to secure greater market access for our farmers and will ensure the fair treatment of Ohio's agriculture products in the marketplace.

With \$28 billion in economic value and 428,000 Ohio jobs on the line, we simply cannot afford for the USMCA to fail. It is time to pass USMCA now.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Representative BALDERSON's efforts and involvement in this.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my colleague.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding.

I also rise today to speak urging consideration of USMCA.

Mr. Speaker, I have been an elected official for a while, and even when I first began this job in the 1990s, I would get complaints from people as to why we couldn't do something about NAFTA.

After four Presidents, we watched NAFTA be approved and watched jobs leave America. We finally have a President who is willing to do something about it. As mentioned before, this agreement is important for Wisconsin manufacturers and manufacturers all over the country. Wisconsin, of all of the States, has the second highest percent of our workforce involved in manufacturing, and that is why when I get home, I hear about the importance of this agreement so much.

But as important as it is to manufacturing, the major reason why I wish so much this would be brought to the floor is when I go back home, I hear so much from my agriculture sector. This is important for your corn farmer, but it is even more important for your dairy farmer. Dairy is in the worst position it has been, I think, since I was in law school in the 1980s, and I was a law clerk for someone who had a primarily dairy clientele. It was so tough watching what these guys and gals went through in dairy in the 1980s.

Now, due to low prices, we are back to where we again and again watch dairy farmers wondering whether they are going to be able to hang on for another week, another month without going under. And here we have this agreement, which has been sitting here waiting to be voted on, and we are not allowed to come in here and vote on it.

I beg people. I realize that there may be some things you don't like about President Trump, but he has negotiated a very important agreement here, a very important agreement for manufacturers, a very important agreement for the agriculture sector, especially dairy.

Please, do not let this agreement wait any more. Do not drive more people out of business just for partisan reasons. This is such a good agreement. It is so rare that we get a big improvement around here.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's time and participation in this very important topic tonight.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), my friend.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Kansas who represents my wife's family.

Hopefully, I won't take a couple of minutes, but there were a couple of things as we were doing some economic numbers before.

The modeling right now says if USMCA passes, it is another half a point on GDP growth. In a \$21 trillion economy, that is real money, but it is also hundreds and hundreds of thousands of jobs.

But there is even another complexity that I am going to ask for folks to think about. Think of the issues we have, particularly with China. So many of us would love to have a healthy relationship with China, but we don't believe they are playing by the WTO rules. They are breaking the rules.

So we are seeing a world right now where lots of manufacturers are thinking about moving parts of their supply chain. Wouldn't it be an amazing thing that we do our job here, we get this trade agreement passed, and those components, those issues, parts of those supply chains are back here in North America? Our ability to say our continent, our trading block, our ability to not only have robust economies for ourselves, but these labor provisions.

And this is the last thing I really wanted to hit on. The gentleman and I are on the whip team for passing this. We have had a number of visits with our brothers and sisters on the left. With a lot of them, I will get this: Well, David, I am concerned about the enforcement of the new labor standards that the Mexican Government has passed.

Remember, their legislature has passed this. Their President has signed it. There are dramatic changes in their labor rules. I will bring them a copy and say: But you don't understand, it is not the 1940s and 1950s anymore. You don't send in a team of union representatives to go inspect one of the 70,000-some facilities and inspect and then write up a report saying we don't think you are—in today's world, we have that thing called the internet.

The law the Mexican Congress passed actually has provisions in there for privacy and secrecy and the ability to use technology that if you believe your labor rights are being abused in a Mexican factory, you can actually document it. You can actually put it on a blog and those things.

So how do we drag our brothers and sisters from the left to actually walk away from the excuse of the labor improvement enforcement, and get them to understand that it is not the 1950s anymore; that now we are going to use technology and the ability to have these new labor standards in Mexico which can be enforced on a very large scale using technology?

This is incredibly important to our economic growth, and our entire regions. Let's get this done.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his comments. The gentleman pointed out so much about how important it is to get that economic growth so that we have got the value in the economy and how much effort that Mexico has made, already changing the laws in their coun-

try to make sure that it is a much more viable process for them, and it is more productive for them as well.

Mr. Speaker, I come from Kansas, and specifically in my district, we have a lot of agriculture and a lot of issues there. And the USMCA is a great improvement for the agriculture area. It sets some unprecedented standards for agriculture, regulation, and biotechnology.

It maintains duty-free access for American farmers in Mexico, and provides new access for U.S. wheat, eggs, dairy, and poultry. In fact, the International Trade Commission estimates an additional \$277 million in increased dairy sales to our North American partners under USMCA. That is a 44 percent increase that will bring a much-needed lift to the U.S. dairy industry.

Another area is manufacturing. USMCA maintains a duty-free access for U.S. manufactured goods and removes some of the existing barriers for remanufactured goods, opening up a lot of new markets for American products.

It encourages U.S. manufacturing by requiring 75 percent of auto content to be produced in North America. The Office of the United States Trade Representative estimates that USMCA will add \$34 billion in automotive investment and create 76,000 new American jobs.

It also incentivizes higher wages, requiring 40 to 50 percent of auto content to be made by workers making at least \$16 an hour, helping to boost wages across many manufacturing sectors.

It requires Mexico to pass some sweeping labor reforms to improve standards there and create an even more even playing field for American labor. Mexico has already followed through and enacted these reforms which are already benefiting U.S. manufacturing.

Canada and Mexico buy more products manufactured in America than our next 10 trading partners. Exports of manufactured goods to Canada and Mexico account for more than 2 million jobs across our country.

As a representative of Wichita, I have seen firsthand how important it is that our manufacturers have access to global markets. Transportation equipment exports account for \$2.7 billion last year, and the growth in manufactured goods, exports from Kansas, grew 8.5 percent from 2010 to 2018.

In addition, Kansas aerospace exports to Canada and Mexico have increased by more than 20 percent over the last decade, helping grow the total value of manufactured goods exported from Kansas to Canada and Mexico to \$3.2 billion in 2018. These numbers underscore the importance of USMCA for American manufacturing.

I wanted to mention that I have got some other representatives here who also have a big impact and a lot of value to add to that. Right now I would like to call on my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Kansas yielding to me.

I stand before you today representing the outstanding people of Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District to call upon the Speaker to bring up and my colleagues to pass the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, otherwise known as USMCA.

Back in Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District during the August work month, I heard from our farmers our manufacturers, and energy producers, all of whom would benefit from the passage of the USMCA.

Their message to me was clear: We need to complete this trade deal so we can continue hiring, growing wages, and keep this economy rolling. The benefits of the USMCA to our agriculture community are critical.

Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District is home to over 10,500 farms, 98 percent of which are family farms. Moreover, our district is responsible for 18 percent of Pennsylvania's agricultural sales.

During August, I visited Brown Hill Farms in Tunkhannock. I met with dairy producers at an ag-dairy summit with USDA Secretary Sonny Perdue and my colleague, Congressman G.T. THOMPSON.

I also attended Penn State's AG Progress Days, Pennsylvania's largest outdoor agricultural exposition. At each visit, dairy producers said the same thing. The USMCA agreement would greatly benefit them by eliminating Canada's Class 7 milk, allowing American dairy farmers to once again sell milk ingredient products in Canada.

Canada and Mexico have taken steps to finalize this agreement. What is stopping the United States from doing the same? Right now, the agreement is sitting on Speaker PELOSI's desk.

Let's be clear. Failure to bring up the USMCA for a vote is a failure to stand up for American jobs, American workers, and American families.

That is a shame because one thing that Members of Congress share is that we want to do what is best for our districts and for our country. Our constituents sent us here to work on things that will actually help people. USMCA will do that by prioritizing American jobs, American goods, and American workers.

I thank Congressman ESTES for organizing tonight's Special Order on USMCA. Let's work on things that can actually help people. Let's work on things that can have a positive impact. Let's pass the USMCA.

Mr. Speaker, let's get this done.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's time and involvement in this.

I would also now like to call on a friend of mine and colleague from the great State of Indiana.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Kansas for allowing me to have the opportunity to speak on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my voice in support of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, better known as USMCA, which will expand markets for our farmers and manufacturers, while ensuring cheaper goods for Americans.

In Indiana, our economy thrives because we are one of the larger manufacturing States in the country, and an agricultural center for the Nation. We make the steel that towers above the Nation's largest cities in skyscrapers. We build the cars that drive along the Nation's highways and byways, and we grow the crops that feed the Nation's citizens and livestock.

We have built this economy, in part, through strong international relationships with countries as far away as Japan, and as close as Canada and Mexico. In fact, it is the partnerships with our closest neighbors to the north and south that are the strongest and most vital.

In 2018, Canada was the Hoosier State's most significant international export market, purchasing 34 percent of all of the exports, for a total of \$13 billion in products. The 72 Canadian companies which operate in Indiana employ over 15,600 citizens of our State.

Mexico follows as our second biggest export market, purchasing 13.8 percent of our exports, injecting \$5.5 billion into the Hoosier heartland. There are 2,000 manufacturing firms and 61,000 jobs in Indiana who rely on exports to these countries.

Beyond the strengthening of our export market, USMCA will also increase the percentage of cars that must be built in North America to 75 percent and require that 40 percent of the auto content be built by workers earning \$16 an hour or more.

This is both a boon for manufacturers in the State and the Hoosier workers that are the lifeblood of our economy.

□ 1915

This legislation also opens up Canadian markets to our U.S. turkey and dairy products and ensures that our agricultural producers have access to Mexico's markets tariff-free.

Right now, due to the international trade conditions like the current delay in this deal, Hoosier manufacturers are seeing their growth stymied. The Hoosier farmers are hurting as corn, soy, and pork markets have taken major hits in the past few years. The longer we wait, the worse it gets.

Nearly every day I hear from constituents who are anxious to get this trade deal passed so that we can keep our economy in high gear. Our farmers and manufacturers in the Fourth District need this deal for both the certainty and the prosperity it will provide.

USMCA will further expand prosperity and ensure that the strong economic growth we have seen in the past 3 years continues.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this: Allow us to vote.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE), who is my friend and colleague.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Florida, which I have the privilege of representing, relies on trade with Canada and Mexico to survive and thrive. From transportation equipment to machinery to agricultural products, in 2017 alone, Florida exported \$6.7 billion in goods to Canada and Mexico.

We are not alone. Canada was the leading market for United States goods exported, followed closely by Mexico in 2017. These allies account for 34 percent of U.S. exports and 35 percent of U.S. imports. They are our strategic partners and an important part of our successful economy here in the United States.

Continuing the long history of our successful trade relationship is essential to bringing the United States economy into the 21st century. That is why Congress should pass the USMCA. By implementing the USMCA, we would be creating 176,000 additional American jobs and continuing to grow our economy by over \$68 billion.

This agreement will protect American intellectual property, update our digital trade rules, enable data to be transferred cross-border, and expand markets for American agricultural products. USMCA maintains the successful duty-free access for American farmers in Mexico and opens the Canadian market up for the first time to American dairy, wheat, chicken, egg, and turkey products. American dairy producers alone would grow their access to up to 3.59 percent of the Canadian dairy market, and the dairy farmers in my district in the 17th District of Florida can use every little bit of an opportunity to sell their products.

Improving USMCA will ease the uncertainty facing Florida farmers and ranchers, allowing them to make new investments to grow operations.

This deal is a good deal for Florida and America, and it is time that the majority bring this important measure to the floor.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL). Representative ROGER MARSHALL is my fellow Kansan and colleague.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank so much the gentleman, my friend and fellow colleague from Kansas, for leading on this issue and giving me the opportunity to speak about it.

Certainly, times are very tough in agriculture, the toughest I have ever seen, the toughest, certainly, since the 1980s. The passage of USMCA, the NAFTA 2.0, is the single greatest thing

Congress could do for our farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and workers.

The President has delivered, and now it is time for Congress to deliver. Delaying the implementation of this program hurts agriculture across Kansas because the deal would enable Kansas producers to trade more commodities by opening the Canadian market up for American dairy, wheat, chicken, and eggs, some for the very first time.

Additionally, this agreement will grow our business with our very top two customers, Mexico and Canada, meaning thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars in increased exports for Kansans.

Finally, the unprecedented standards for agricultural biotechnology will support 21st-century innovations in agriculture and lay the groundwork for future agreements with other countries around the globe.

Some of the brightest thinkers in the world are in America, but these innovators have been robbed of billions of dollars over the previous decades due to intellectual property theft. USMCA can't be delayed any longer, as new protections for intellectual property will drive innovation and create even more jobs by strengthening protection of patents, trademarks, and secrets.

President Trump's USMCA also levels the playing field for workers in my State by expanding guarantees for the enforcement of labor protections across North America. Future economic growth and jobs for Kansas and America are increasingly dependent on expanding U.S. trade and investment opportunities in the global marketplace. President Trump has delivered this incredibly bipartisan deal, and it is long past time for Congress to bring it up for a vote to usher in a new era in American trade.

Mr. Speaker, it is now time for us to bring USMCA to the floor.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I thank all the Members who have joined us tonight.

As President Trump has often pointed out, many of our trade deals have not always created the best outcomes for American workers and products, but by approving the USMCA, we can take one giant step in overhauling one of the most fundamental trade deals with our closest neighbors. We can also create a great template for success, especially if we turn our focus to improving trade relations with China and other countries.

As we stated tonight, there is no time like the present to get started moving this process forward, making sure that every provision of the deal is enforceable so we can get the USMCA across the finish line. The cost of delay is too great for our farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, small businesses, entrepreneurs, and families.

Again, I thank my colleagues for joining me tonight, and I ask this body to pass the USMCA now.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, if innovation is the lifeblood of our nation's economy, then the Dallas-Fort Worth region might very well be considered our country's heart. World-class research hospitals and several leading pharmaceutical companies call DFW home, where they create life-saving treatments while keeping our local economy strong. Their continued success, however, depends on their access to international marketplaces, especially those in Canada and Mexico. That is why passing the United States Mexico Canada Agreement, or "USMCA," is so important.

One of the biggest concerns that I hear from innovators in my district is the protection of their intellectual property (IP) rights in the international marketplace. President Trump and Trade Ambassador Lighthizer have delivered on this issue by installing robust IP protections into this trade agreement with Canada and Mexico. The USMCA provisions that

strengthen patents, copyrights, trademarks, and trade secrets protections mean that innovators can spend less time worrying about protecting their IP rights and more time creating products and Texas jobs.

Not only will this job creation boost the American and Texan economies, but it will also benefit two of our country's strongest trading partners. In 2017, Texas alone exported \$127 billion in products to Canada and Mexico, with 72 percent of the materials imported by Texan manufacturers coming from those same countries. The Texas economy flourishes from its trade relationship with these countries, and in the end, trade with Mexico and Canada supports 948,900 jobs in our state.

Many Americans are already living in the strongest economy of their lifetimes, and the USMCA is critical to ensuring that our country's industries can continue to prosper and sell their goods freely and fairly across the globe. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage and ask that it be brought up for a vote as soon as possible.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2035. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to develop a strategic plan to expand eligibility for the PreCheck Program to individuals with Transportation Worker Identification Credentials or Hazardous Materials Endorsements; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 12, 2019, at 9 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 205, the Protecting and Securing Florida's Coastline Act of 2019, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 205 (RULES COMMITTEE PRINT 116-29)

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—													
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2019-2024	2019-2029	
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN THE DEFICIT														
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Effects	0	0	-45	-45	5	5	15	15	15	15	10	-80	-10	

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 1941 (RULES COMMITTEE PRINT 116-31)

By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2019- 2024	2019- 2029
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Effects	0	0	-45	-45	-20	-20	-15	-15	-15	-15	-20	-130	-210

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2037. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulations and Energy Efficiency, Office of Management, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inclusion of Early Stage Technology Demonstration in Authorized Technology Transfer Activities (RIN: 1991-AC14) received August 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2038. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Revision to Reference Methods Rule [EPA-R07-OAR-2019-0293; FRL-9998-39-Region 7] received August 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2039. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — C1-C4 Linear and Branched Chain Alkyl D-Glucitol Dianhydro Alkyl Ethers; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0201; FRL-9997-14] received August 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2040. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Technical Amendments to Revise Regional Office Address [FRL-9998-08-Region 6] received August 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2041. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Revision to Emission Data, Emission Fees and Process Information Rule [EPA-R07-OAR-2019-0300; FRL-9998-41-Region 7] received August 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2042. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lipochitooligosaccharide (LCO) MOR116; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0244; FRL-9997-94] received August 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2043. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dinotefuran; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0424; FRL-9994-82] received August 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2044. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Nevada; Revisions to Clark County Ozone Maintenance Plan [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0365; FRL-9998-83-Region 9] received August 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2045. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Ohio; Corrections [EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1092; MI-87-1; EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0121; FRL-9998-75-Region 5] received August 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2046. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Arkansas; Revisions to State Implementation Plan Permitting Programs [EPA-R06-OAR-2019-0301; FRL-9997-81-Region 6] received August 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2047. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Arizona; Maricopa County Air Quality Department [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0105; FRL-9998-76-Region 9] received August 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2048. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Poland, Transmittal No. 19-49, pursuant to section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2049. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on politically motivated boycotts of, divestment from, and sanctions against Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2050. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-113, "Close Relative Caregiver Subsidy Pilot Program Establishment Temporary Amendment Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2051. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-114, "Medical Marijuana Program Patient Employment Protection Temporary Amendment Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2052. A letter from the Director, Office of the White House Liaison, Department of

Education, transmitting a notification of a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2053. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office for Coastal Management, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Coastal Zone Management Act Program Change Procedures [Docket No.: 080416573-8999-03] (RIN: 0648-AW74) received August 19, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2054. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to Civil Penalty Amounts (RIN: 2105-AE80) received August 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2055. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0253; Product Identifier 2019-NM-006-AD; Amendment 39-19686; AD 2019-14-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2056. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0046; Product Identifier 2018-CE-040-AD; Amendment 39-19721; AD 2019-17-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2057. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0018; Product Identifier 2018-NM-116-AD; Amendment 39-19681; AD 2019-14-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2058. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0528; Product Identifier 2018-NE-24-AD; Amendment 39-19717; AD 2019-16-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2059. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0577; Product Identifier 2018-NM-119-AD; Amendment 39-19695; AD 2019-15-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2060. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0606; Product Identifier 2019-NM-120-AD; Amendment 39-19706; AD 2019-16-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2061. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0607; Product Identifier 2019-NM-135-AD; Amendment 39-19709; AD 2019-16-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2062. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0257; Product Identifier 2018-NM-175-AD; Amendment 39-19714; AD 2019-16-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2063. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0365; Product Identifier 2019-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-19718; AD 2019-16-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2064. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Marion, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0355; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AGL-15] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2065. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Threat Disqualification Update [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0656; Amendment Nos.: 3-2, 61-143, 63-42, and 65-59] (RIN: 2120-AL04) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2066. A letter from the Chief, Commercial and Trade Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological Material From Algeria [CBP Dec. 19-09] (RIN: 1515-AB48) received August 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110

Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2067. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Assessment of Fees [Docket No.: OCC-2018-0039] (RIN: 1557-AE58) received August 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2068. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Failure To Cash a Distribution Check From a Qualified Retirement Plan (Rev. Rul. 2019-19) received August 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3691. A bill to require the TSA to develop a plan to ensure that TSA material disseminated in major airports can be better understood by more people accessing such airports, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 335. A bill to require the Inter-Agency Task Force on Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia to develop a plan for reducing, mitigating, and controlling harmful algal blooms and hypoxia in South Florida, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-202, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Natural Resources discharged from further consideration, H.R. 335 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CONSENSUS CALENDAR

Under clause 7 of rule XV, the following motion was filed with the Clerk: Motion No. 7, September 11, 2019 by Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York on H.R. 1980.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. DEAN, Mr. LAMB, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4279. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 445 Main Street in Laceyville, Pennsylvania, as the "Melinda Gene Piccotti Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr.

GALLEGO, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SIREN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. TLALIB, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 4280. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself and Mr. LAMB):

H.R. 4281. A bill to amend chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to allow a veteran to receive a full year supply of contraceptive pills, transdermal patches, and vaginal rings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 4282. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to develop a training session and a counseling session in suicide prevention and lethal means tailored to veterans who served in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself and Mr. VISLOSKEY):

H.R. 4283. A bill to require Federal agencies with jurisdiction over broadband deployment to enter into an interagency agreement related to certain types of funding for broadband deployment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. BARR, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. COMER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 4284. A bill to permanently extend the exemption for the aging process of distilled spirits from the production period for purposes of capitalization of interest costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRINDISI (for himself and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 4285. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend and modify certain authorities and requirements relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 4286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to businesses for certain virtual training expenses related to elementary and secondary school students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX of California:

H.R. 4287. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide greater protection of proprietary information of other registered entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 4288. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish the Honorable Augustus F. Hawkins Centers of Excellence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. COLE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. COOK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 4289. A bill to require Federal law enforcement agencies to report on cases of

missing or murdered Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. BANKS):

H.R. 4290. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate a week as "Battle Buddy Check Week" for the purpose of outreach and education concerning peer wellness checks for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McEACHIN (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 4291. A bill to help reduce household energy burdens by expanding access to solar energy for low-income households, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 4292. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the authority of district courts to provide injunctive relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4293. A bill to establish the United States Commission on an Open Society with Security; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 4294. A bill to empower States to manage the development and production of oil and gas on available Federal land, to distribute revenues from oil and gas leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf to certain coastal States, to promote alternative energy development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. BARRAGÁN):

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution recognizing September 11, 2019, as a "National Day of Service and Remembrance"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution supporting the designation of the week of September 11 to September 17 as "Patriot Week"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. STEVENS (for herself, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr.

KILDEE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. BERGMAN):

H. Res. 552. A resolution calling on the Government of the Russian Federation to provide evidence of wrongdoing or to release United States citizen Paul Whelan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

131. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Mississippi, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 596, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

132. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 247, memorializing the Congress of the United States to facilitate and ensure implementation of the VA Maintaining Internal Systems and Strengthening Integrated Outside Networks Act of 2018 by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KELLER:

H.R. 4279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7—"The Congress shall have the Power to establish Post Offices and Post Roads." Page H65891

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 4280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 4281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 4282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 4283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 4284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BRINDISI:

H.R. 4285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, authorized by Congress' power to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 4286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COX of California:

H.R. 4287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLEGOS:

H.R. 4288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 4289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McEACHIN:

H.R. 4291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 4292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 9 states "The Congress shall have Power To . . . constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court . . ." And Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 states "The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof."

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 4294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 35: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 96: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 144: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 146: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 250: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 303: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 307: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 366: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 444: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 510: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Ms. LOFGREN.

- H.R. 569: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 575: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 585: Mr. POCAN and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 647: Mr. BACON, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BASS, and Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 649: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 674: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 727: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 728: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 737: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 744: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 820: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 822: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 832: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 838: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 912: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 940: Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 961: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 996: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1002: Mr. PETERS, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MAST.
H.R. 1008: Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1025: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 1049: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1098: Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 1139: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 1163: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 1173: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 1174: Mr. POCAN and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 1186: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 1221: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1236: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1272: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1309: Mr. McNERNEY and Ms. FRANKEL.
H.R. 1337: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 1342: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1354: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1400: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1497: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1498: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 1516: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 1527: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 1534: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. PRESSLEY.
H.R. 1554: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 1607: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 1661: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1670: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1671: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1682: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 1695: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1707: Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 1709: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 1737: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1749: Ms. PLASKETT and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 1761: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 1766: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1767: Ms. SHERILL.
H.R. 1773: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1776: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1799: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1814: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1865: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1869: Mr. WELCH and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 1873: Mr. BOST and Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 1901: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1933: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 1934: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1940: Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 1956: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1975: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 1978: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1980: Mr. KELLER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1987: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2014: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 2054: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2062: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 2096: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2117: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 2134: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2135: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2153: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2161: Mr. SPANO.
H.R. 2168: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 2178: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2184: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 2218: Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 2271: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2279: Mr. STEWART, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2315: Ms. PRESSLEY.
H.R. 2319: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BARR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STIVERS, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 2328: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 2339: Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2382: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 2408: Mr. EMMER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2415: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 2420: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 2426: Mrs. MURPHY and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 2428: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2435: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 2471: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2474: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 2477: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2482: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2486: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 2501: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 2504: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2577: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2594: Mr. WELCH and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 2597: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2616: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2645: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2680: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2681: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2708: Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2711: Mr. SIRES, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2739: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2742: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 2746: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 2747: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2752: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2795: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2800: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 2808: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2813: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2815: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2816: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2846: Mrs. MURPHY.
H.R. 2854: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2895: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2901: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2905: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2947: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2951: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2985: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BIGGS, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 2991: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2993: Mr. HUIZENGA and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 3036: Mr. COX of California, Ms. MENG, and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 3048: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COOK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3077: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 3114: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3116: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3125: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 3138: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 3145: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 3172: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3192: Ms. HILL of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3197: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 3219: Mrs. MURPHY and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 3220: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3260: Mr. ROSE of New York.
H.R. 3289: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3303: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3312: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 3332: Mr. MAST and Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 3350: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3356: Mr. RIGGLEMAN and Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 3362: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 3381: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 3396: Ms. PORTER, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. ROSE of New York.
H.R. 3402: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 3403: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 3415: Mr. KILDEE and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 3451: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 3463: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3473: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3495: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COLE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. MAST, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3497: Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. MCADAMS, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 3502: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BARR, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOODEN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 3529: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3545: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3555: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3559: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3593: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3598: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 3645: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3647: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3657: Mr. WALDEN and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 3665: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 3666: Mr. BACON and Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 3668: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 3712: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3735: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3742: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 3744: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3762: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 3798: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3808: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3820: Ms. WILD and Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 3828: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 3870: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 3882: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 3884: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3942: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. SEN-SENRENNER.

- H.R. 3954: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
 H.R. 3962: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 3973: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3981: Ms. PORTER.
 H.R. 4019: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
 H.R. 4032: Mr. STELL.
 H.R. 4056: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 4061: Mr. BALDERSON.
 H.R. 4077: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 4086: Mr. WELCH and Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 4096: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
 H.R. 4116: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 4150: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 4155: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 4187: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 4194: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 4206: Mr. TRONE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4207: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 4211: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 4219: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
- H.R. 4237: Mr. KATKO and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 4248: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 4249: Mr. POCAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 4255: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 4263: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 4270: Mr. SIRES, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 4272: Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ESPALLAT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 4277: Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H.J. Res. 38: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. PERRY.
 H. Con. Res. 27: Ms. SLOTKIN.
 H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H. Con. Res. 52: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
- H. Res. 49: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H. Res. 107: Mr. MAST.
 H. Res. 160: Mr. BAIRD.
 H. Res. 189: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MAST, and Mr. GALLAGHER.
 H. Res. 326: Mr. CASE, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. GABBARD.
 H. Res. 387: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. ALLRED.
 H. Res. 439: Mr. SPANO.
 H. Res. 475: Mr. CHABOT.
 H. Res. 513: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. PAPPAS.
 H. Res. 517: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MAST, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
 H. Res. 543: Ms. CLARKE of New York.