

forward to summer jobs on the farm, where life lessons and a few dollars can be learned and earned along the way.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of few places better than an Indiana farm where a young person can truly learn the values of personal responsibility and hard work. And if America's farms are to continue to feed this nation and world, we must encourage young men and women to participate in farming and ranching. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, America's Family Farmers have built the most productive agriculture sector in the world and this abundance helps feed not only our nation, but also the world.

Family farms are truly based on the family where each generation trains the succeeding generation.

Last year the Department of Labor tried to inject itself into the family farm by proposing onerous new regulations that would have basically denied family farmers the ability to train the next generation of farmers.

Some would have you believe that the Labor Department was just looking out for children, but does anyone truly believe that a bureaucrat in Washington cares more about a family's children than their parents, or aunts and uncles, or their grandparents?

Faced with overwhelming opposition earlier to this overreach the Department of Labor withdrew the proposed regulations and went back to the drawing board. The legislation we are considering today would stop these regulations in their tracks and keep the bureaucrats from getting between family farmers and their children.

I urge my colleagues to support the heritage of the family farm and join me in passing this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4157, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Labor from reissuing or issuing a rule substantially similar to a certain proposed rule under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 relating to child labor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONGRESSIONAL REPLACEMENT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S ENERGY-RESTRICTING AND JOB-LIMITING OFFSHORE DRILLING PLAN

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 bill, H.R. 6082.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 738 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. 6082.

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

□ 1643

##### 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. 6082) to officially replace, within the 60-day Congressional review period under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, President Obama's Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program (2012-2017) with a congressional plan that will conduct additional oil and natural gas lease sales to promote offshore energy development, job creation, and increased domestic energy production to ensure a more secure energy future in the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. DOLD in the chair.

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

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, under the shadow of the Supreme Court's ruling on ObamaCare, the Obama administration on June 28 quietly announced the President's proposed final offshore drilling plan for 2012-2017.

Despite claims of their being proud of their energy record, the Obama administration deliberately chose to announce their plan on a day when it would get buried in the ObamaCare news coverage. This shows that even this administration is not proud of their plan that would place 85 percent of America's offshore areas off-limits to energy production.

Under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Leasing Act, when any President proposes a new 5-year offshore drilling plan, it must be submitted to Congress for a mandatory 60-day review before it can become final and take effect. That 60-day clock is now ticking. It's now Congress' responsibility to take action and to reject President Obama's no-new-drilling, no-new-jobs plan and to replace it with a robust, responsible plan to safely develop our offshore energy resources.

According to analysis conducted by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Office, the President has proposed fewer leases in his plan than any President since this process began—that goes back to President Jimmy

Carter, so it's even worse than President Carter.

President Obama's proposal doesn't open up one new area for leasing and energy production. It would set our Nation's energy production back to the days before 2008 when two moratoria that prohibited drilling of a vast majority of American offshore areas were in place. Both moratoria were lifted after the summer of 2008 due to the outrage of the American people over the cost of \$4-per-gallon gasoline, and they demanded that the Federal Government take action. President Obama proposes to effectively reimpose that moratoria.

From nearly the day he took the oath of office, this President has put the brakes on new American energy production and job creation. In the first weeks of this administration, the Interior Department took a nearly complete new offshore lease plan and put it on hold for 6 months, and then they tossed out that draft plan entirely and started over. It took them over 3½ years to get a new proposed plan in place. And along the way, they delayed and canceled multiple lease sales.

For example, President Obama canceled the Virginia lease sale scheduled for 2011 last year and now refuses to include Virginia in his 2012-2017 plan. He is responsible for closing an entire new area of drilling and cheating the Commonwealth out of thousands of jobs and another industry. If President Obama has his way, Virginia will be left out in the cold in until 2017 at the earliest.

The bill being considered today, H.R. 6082, is entitled the Congressional Replacement of President Obama's Energy-Restricting and Job-Limiting Offshore Drilling Plan. In stark contrast to President Obama's plan, this bill represents a drill-smart plan that includes 29 lease sales and focuses energy production in specific areas containing America's greatest known oil and natural gas resources. What a novel idea: go to where the resources are.

The bill would replace the lease sales scheduled in the President's proposed plan and safely open new areas that were previously under moratoria—such as the Mid-Atlantic, southern Pacific, and the Arctic. It does this while ensuring that necessary and required environmental reviews are conducted.

The congressional replacement plan would generate \$600 million in additional revenue and create tens of thousands of new American jobs.

Tomorrow there will be a direct up-or-down vote on the President's proposed plan when we consider, under suspension, H.R. 6168. There will also, obviously, be a direct up-or-down vote on this legislation. So Members can decide if the President's plan meets the standards expected by the American people or if we should replace it with a real plan that creates jobs and grows our economy.

The House has taken action to replace the President's proposed plan,

and I call on the Senate to do the same. If the Senate does nothing and lets the 60-day clock run out, that is an endorsement of the President's plan. It is an endorsement of the plan that re-imposes the drilling moratoria, creates no new jobs and no new energy.

I believe that we can do better than this proposed plan, and our Nation deserves better. By passing this bill, we are standing up for American energy and American jobs and moving our country forward.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to welcome everyone back to yet another episode of the GOP Wheel of Giveaway game show here. Every week on the floor of the House of Representatives, the majority picks an industry to benefit from giveaways of our public lands.

□ 1650

One month ago, the Republican majority voted to turn over nearly all of our onshore public lands to the oil and gas industry in just a few short years.

Two weeks ago, the majority voted to eviscerate proper environmental review for massive gold and silver and uranium mines on public lands to benefit the mining industry. And here we are on the House floor once again debating a Republican bill from the Natural Resources Committee intended to hand out even more industry giveaways.

Well, it actually gets hard to keep track of which industry is getting the GOP giveaway each week, so let's consult our chart—the GOP Wheel of Giveaways—so that we can make sure that everyone at home can follow along to see whether it will be the oil, the gas, the mining, or the timber industries that will be the big winner in the giveaway of our public lands this week.

Of course, we all know that it won't be the solar or the wind industries benefiting from the Republicans because in the Republican "oil above all" game, if you land on renewable energy, you lose a turn. So which industry is getting the giveaway this week? We are back on the "even more oil" on the House floor today, even more oil giveaways.

H.R. 6082 would place drill rigs right off our beaches in southern California, off our beaches in Maine, in New Hampshire, in Massachusetts, in Rhode Island, in Connecticut, in New York, in New Jersey—just put the drills right out there, right off the Maryland coast. And by the way, there will be millions of people, of course, out on those beaches saying get those oil rigs off the beaches, off the places where people go and have a good time during the summer, where the fishing industry is.

My amendment will say, and by the way, if you do find any oil and gas out there, at least let's keep the oil and gas here in the United States. Let's not run

the risk of spoiling the natural resources of our country—the beaches, the fishing areas—finding natural gas and then ship it to other countries; at least let's keep it here. And the Republicans are going to oppose keeping the natural gas that they would find off these beaches in California and Maine and Massachusetts and New Jersey and send it to other countries.

This is truly the "even more oil" Republican Party. Whatever ExxonMobile wants, whatever Shell wants, whatever BP wants, we'll do it, even if we know millions of people will just be protesting right from the very beginning—and by the way, without passing one of the reforms from the BP spill commission to make sure that the drilling occurs in a safe fashion.

They still, in 2 years, have yet to bring out one single safety reform that would implement safeguards to protect against the repetition of what happened in the Gulf of Mexico. So the natural gas that's found can go overseas. It will be done in a risky fashion because they refuse to learn the lessons of BP in the Gulf of Mexico, and they've included no new safety measures. That's what ExxonMobil wants, that's what BP wants, so it's out here on the House floor to be voted upon, by the way, over the vigorous objection of this Democrat and Democrats all across the country.

This Congress, the Republican majority, has reported 11 drilling bills out of the Natural Resources Committee. Those 11 bills have been combined and brought to the House floor and this is now the sixth massive passage of giveaways to Big Oil that we have considered. Two of those bills were largely similar to the legislation we are considering today to dramatically expand offshore drilling without putting any new safety measures in place.

All of the previous drilling bills have suffered from the same fate. They were all far too extreme to pass the Senate and not a single one of them has been signed into law. Well, let me let everyone in on a little secret: this bill is also not becoming law. Like the bills before it, it can't pass the Senate, and the administration has already said that the President would veto this bill.

But that reality hasn't stopped the Republican House from passing giveaways to the oil and gas industry over and over again. The reason they keep passing them is the same reason when you go to a movie and you see previews of coming attractions. What they're saying here is we're passing, that is, Republicans are passing, all of this legislation for the oil companies to drill off our beaches for the big oil companies. And if just somehow or other Mitt Romney becomes President and the Republicans take over the Senate, this will become the law of the Nation. So they see this as a preview of coming attractions, and they want the public to know that that will happen.

They want to run this year on this premise, and I think that's great. It's a

very honest way of dealing with something that will horrify people who live all along the coastlines in these States that would run the risk of having damage done to their beaches.

When you include all of the bills that have been reported by all of the committees altogether, this Republican House has already cast 139 votes—139 votes—on the House floor this Congress to benefit the oil and gas industry.

We are going to pass 90 hours of debate on the floor on oil and gas legislation this Congress just today. What a streak. When most people think of the great records of American history, they might think of Joe DiMaggio's 56-game hitting streak, or Cal Ripkin's 2,362 consecutive games, or maybe Wilt Chamberlain scoring 100 points in a basketball game, or Ted Williams hitting .406 in 1941.

But when all is said and done, the record of this Republican Congress voting to benefit Big Oil might be just as untouchable a record. With already 139 votes and nearly 90 hours of debate on these giveaways to the oil industry on the House floor, this is a once-in-a-generation performance by this Republican Congress. It may stand as a record that can never be broken by any other Congress in terms of the number of giveaways to the oil and gas industry.

Whether it's voting 33 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act, or voting again and again for more and more drilling, under the GOP, this isn't the House of Representatives, it's the House of Repetition. President Truman dubbed the 80th Congress the "do nothing" Congress. Well, this is apparently the "do the same thing over and over and over again" Congress.

The Republican majority has already cast 139 votes to aid the oil and gas industry. How many votes have they cast to benefit the wind and the solar industry? Ah, there's a good question. Well, the answer is zero—139 for oil and gas, zero for the wind and solar industry. Is that all you really need to know about what's going on here in Congress?

Can you imagine the millennials out there listening to this debate saying zero for wind and solar? Zero for the future? Zero for making our country more of the clean energy leader of the world, of reducing greenhouse gases, of creating jobs in these industries? Zero for wind and solar?

The wind tax breaks, by the way, are expiring this year. Do not expect that to come out on the House floor as a vote that the Republicans say we must extend. But tax breaks for oil companies, extra drilling privileges off our beaches for the oil and gas companies? Oh, yeah, plenty of votes for that.

While we have been spending 90 hours debating legislation to help Big Oil, recently the majority wouldn't even allow a debate on the floor on an amendment to create a renewable electricity standard for our Nation because the Republican energy policy isn't "all of the above." It is "oil above all." And

that's what we're going to be debating for the rest of the day out here on the House floor—sad to say for the future of renewable energy for our country.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Before I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, I'll yield myself 30 seconds to simply point out to my good friend from Massachusetts that in response to his answer on how many bills this House has addressed on renewables, the gentleman said zero, and that is incorrect.

□ 1700

There have been multiple bills and parts of bills dealing with the process of putting wind and solar in place, specifically on public lands, so I just wanted to correct the gentleman in that regard.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today is very simple. Republicans are taking a proactive step to secure a more stable energy future for our country.

Just last week, the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service published a report confirming what you can see on this chart, that President Obama's plan for offshore drilling offers the lowest number of lease sales in the history of our Outer Continental Shelf program.

There, on the left, my left, "15" is the number you see in red. Going back to 1980, when President Jimmy Carter was in office, he had 36 lease sales in his proposed 5-year plan. And you can see intervening 5-year plans since 1980 until today.

This is the fewest ever. Even this number is generous, because we're operating under the assumption that the administration will actually follow through on doing all of these 15 lease sales. This is not a sure bet, when you consider that since the President was elected, he has cancelled more lease sales than he has held.

Let me repeat that. This President, in 3½ years, has cancelled more lease sales than have been held.

Now, the administration proposes a new leasing plan that offers for sale the fewest leasing sales ever and locks away 85 percent of our Outer Continental Shelf from any development.

Why would the President propose the fewest number of lease sales ever? Is it because we've solved our dependency on foreign oil? No. We import 5 million barrels a day.

Is it because we've developed all of our domestic resources so there's nothing left to develop? No. The President's plan leaves tens of billions of barrels of oil off limits and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas untapped, unused, and unavailable for the American consumer.

The President says over and over that he supports U.S. energy development, then we see that, at every oppor-

tunity, he makes the choice to prevent efficient energy development from happening.

We must do more for the American people in generating more energy for lower prices and lessen our dependence on foreign oil. This bill does exactly that.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill. Vote for American energy and American jobs. Let's replace the President's do nothing plan with a plan that moves America forward.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I would like to address a point that the chairman made as he attempted to correct Mr. MARKEY and said that there have been a number of wind energy bills considered. I think we would gladly count those votes in the column of gutting the national environmental protection act, but wind, no. The wind industry did not support any of those bills that he was talking about or amendments. They are not wind legislation. They are environmental spoilage legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this Republican bill would allow drilling off the coast of every State in the east coast, from Maine to South Carolina, and off of California and in Bristol Bay, off of Alaska, which is, I might add, one of our Nation's most important salmon fisheries. By reviving long dead lease sales in these fishery areas, they would be reviving sales that the Bush administration issued just 4 days before they left office.

Now, it's interesting that tomorrow we will consider Republican legislation on this floor that is intended to prohibit midnight regulations, yet, today, we have a midnight drilling lease sale. They are, in effect, trying to reinstate the Bush administration's midnight offshore leasing plan. So I just want my colleagues on the other side to know that tomorrow, when we are talking about midnight regulations, that they were actually talking about it a day in advance.

The other side has also made the point that the administration's offshore drilling plan would reinstate a moratorium. Quite the opposite. Mr. Chairman, the Obama administration's offshore drilling plan already, now, makes more than 75 percent of our oil and gas resources available for drilling. They are not doing what the Republicans are saying they are doing.

Two months ago, industry analysts were projecting that, by the end of this year, we would have 50 percent more floating rigs operating in the gulf than before the BP spill. It turns out they were wrong. Not by the end of this year. It's already happened. We have about 50 percent more rigs operating in the gulf today. We have more rigs operating in the United States than in the rest of the world combined.

And they're saying the President is trying to kill the oil industry.

H.R. 6082 ignores the fact that President Obama's all-of-the-above energy strategy has successfully reduced our dependence on foreign oil from 57 percent in the last year of the Bush administration to only 45 percent today. It ignores the fact that our oil production is at an 18-year high.

It does raise the question of why we have this legislation in front of us at all if not to maybe embarrass the President. But, no, the President will not be embarrassed by the facts, and I hope we will deal with the facts here.

This legislation is unnecessary and unwise—unnecessary because the drilling is taking place, and unwise because the other side wants to strike all of the environmental protections that, rather than weakened, should be strengthened.

Later we will be considering an amendment that I will offer to strike the language from the underlying bill that requires the Department of the Interior to conduct a single multisale environmental impact statement for all new areas opened for drilling.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, I said a moment ago that this legislation talks about drilling from Maine to South Carolina, off California and in Alaska. And they propose to say a single environmental impact statement will deal with that? Well, that's like the environmental impact statement that applied to the BP drilling in the gulf that talked about walruses. Yes, because they were using the same environmental impact statement that they had used in Alaska previously.

No, the protection of the environment requires a little more attention than that. Congress has a responsibility to the American people to ensure that offshore oil and gas drilling is occurring in a safe and environmentally responsible manner.

Also, later, we will be considering an amendment that I will offer that has to do with the royalties that will be collected—or should be collected—from offshore drilling.

The Big Five oil companies made a record profit of \$137 billion last year. In the first quarter of this year, they continued to capitalize on the pain of Americans at the pump, raking in \$368 million in profits per day. And this legislation that is brought to the floor by the Republicans here wants to allow them to drill in many places without paying any royalties, without paying a fee to the taxpayers for the oil that the taxpayers own.

□ 1710

Right now, more than 25 percent of all oil produced offshore on Federal lands is produced without paying a penny of royalty. That should be changed.

My constituents—and I think the constituents of any Member of this House—would say it's only fair that these oil companies pay for what they use.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, a member of the Natural Resources Committee and a subcommittee chairman, Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I want to thank the committee chairman for allowing me to speak.

First, I would like to agree with the gentleman from New Jersey. He is absolutely correct that oil production has increased in recent years and that our dependence on oil has actually decreased over the same period of time.

But why? Because of the private sector.

The private sector industry has been out there and has been drilling in new areas like North Dakota and in my own home State of Louisiana. It's the private sector that's driving this. It's producing more oil than we ever have, and there is much more that we can have.

On the other hand, on public lands, which have been under the control of the President, we have seen a reduction of 15 percent. So there is no way in the world we could give our President, President Obama, credit for that unless, of course, we said, Well, indeed, the private sector didn't build it—he did. But I really don't think that's the case.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of H.R. 6082.

What we are seeing in President Obama's lease plan is a study in contrasts. When demand for energy was up and prices were spiking in 2008, the Bush administration opened more areas for drilling. That's just common-sense economics. Here we are 4 years later with high energy prices again, and this President's solution is to propose a plan that opens no new areas of drilling.

The Obama administration pounced on the BP spill 2 years ago to ratchet down our Nation's ability to drill for oil, and then it dragged its feet in issuing new drilling permits. All the while, taxpayer dollars were being thrown at failed wind and solar energy projects like Solyndra and many others too numerous to name today.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MARCHANT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. FLEMING. This legislation is smart policy and is a return to common sense. Our country needs energy, and it needs jobs. The President's plan doesn't help, but H.R. 6082 does. It will open areas for drilling that never should have been closed off, and that will lead to more jobs and more cost-effective energy for Americans.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, in 1969, many in America encountered the phrase "oil spill" for the first time. Off the coast of Santa Barbara, California, there was what has now become the granddaddy of oil spills.

Currently representing that area and those beaches is our good colleague. I

yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, here we are, voting once again to mandate new offshore drilling in areas where it simply isn't wanted. And just like before, this proposal simply ignores the facts, the facts stated by my colleague from New Jersey: the fact that we already make more than 75 percent of the offshore oil and gas resources available for drilling; the fact that domestic oil production is at an 18-year high; and the fact that we have more rigs that are drilling in the United States than in the rest of the world combined.

Instead of addressing the real issues in offshore drilling, like the need to adopt the safety recommendations of the nonpartisan oil spill commission, this bill seeks to compound the problems by mandating new drilling all over the place.

H.R. 6082 also cavalierly dismisses the legitimate concerns raised by the people most affected by this mandated new drilling idea—my constituents. After nearly 100 years of drilling off my coastline, Californians have spoken loud and clear: we've had enough. In fact, a 2010 proposal to allow slant drilling from the shores of a coastal town in my district was opposed by 70 percent—that's right, 70 percent—of the voters.

To protect communities now at risk under this bill, I offered an amendment that would have stopped the mandated new lease sales off southern California—off my district—but the majority refused to allow a debate on this amendment. In addition, this new mandated drilling would happen on platforms that have been in the Santa Barbara Channel since the Everly Brothers were topping the music charts over 50 years ago. It's not a good idea to use these old rigs for expanded drilling—20 of them—including platform A, as my colleague referenced, which was the very culprit of the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill.

I offered an amendment to require the Interior Department to certify these platforms were actually capable of handling new drilling before it could start; but thanks to the Rules Committee, we won't be debating that issue either.

What is also true is that the Pentagon doesn't support new drilling off its base on the central coast. The Pentagon told ExxonMobil that the company's proposed drilling plan at Vandenberg Air Force Base would "present a wide range of significant operational constraints." That's why I offered an amendment to protect the national space launch mission at Vandenberg Air Force Base; but again, the House won't be able to debate that issue, and the concerns of the Air Force are left unaddressed.

Mr. Chairman, it's clear that H.R. 6082 is not a well-thought out proposal. It's another heavy-handed, know-it-all

approach from Washington, D.C.—rubber-stamping destructive drilling, cutting out environmental reviews, limiting public input. That might be good policy for oil companies; but it's bad policy for my constituents, and it's bad energy policy for our Nation. I urge my colleagues to oppose this reckless offshore drilling bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another member of the Natural Resources Committee and a subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. As I listened to my colleague from Santa Barbara, I was reflecting on the fact that, during that same period, I represented the same area of Santa Barbara. I was in the State senate for 8 years. So I would remind the gentlelady that less than 4 years ago the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors passed a resolution asking for more offshore development of the Santa Barbara area, so dependent is the region's economy on that enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, that speaks volumes, I think, about where the American people stand today as well.

America's energy crisis is not because of any shortage of American energy. Our Nation is blessed with vast reserves of petroleum, natural gas, coal, hydroelectricity, and uranium that dwarf those of any other nation, and they should make us the most prosperous and energy-independent Nation in the world.

The real energy crisis is here in Washington—some would say right here in this Chamber—where our government, in thrall to the green left, continues to thwart the development of American resources.

We have seen this policy time and time again as the President has blocked the Keystone pipeline, waged war on coal, and thwarted offshore exploration and development, which is a problem that this bill now addresses. To add hypocrisy to injury, while blocking American petroleum development, many of these politicians exhort the Saudis and Brazilians to increase their production.

Enough is enough. Our Nation is at a crossroads. We can choose either a future of government-created energy shortages or a future of jobs, prosperity and abundance produced by American enterprise. That is the issue before us today, and that is one of the issues that will be before the American people in November.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is a new member of the committee, but who is one of the most energetic and informed members of the committee and passionate about preserving a healthful environment.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, here we go again.

It isn't enough that the Obama administration's offshore drilling plan

makes more than 75 percent of our oil and natural gas resources available for drilling; but the majority is not going to be happy until we have turned over every square foot of our public lands and our coastline to the oil and gas companies.

H.R. 6082 abandons any pretense to the support of states' rights by mandating lease sales for the east coast and southern California—the coastlines of States that are on record as opposing oil and gas drilling along their coasts.

□ 1720

Too bad New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. If your citizens want to prioritize the tourism, recreation, and fishing industries, Big Oil wants to move in, and H.R. 6028 gives them the authority to do so. H.R. 6082 requires no public comment or consultation with the States. Apparently, those steps, steps followed by the administration in putting together their plan, are too time consuming. Besides, they may result in opposition to this ill-conceived drilling plan.

On the same day that the United States Chemical Safety Board has released its report on the Deepwater Horizon accident with the finding that safety lessons were not learned from the 2005 refinery accident, we're moving a bill that does nothing to improve the safety of offshore drilling for either the people who work on these rigs or for the many citizens and businesses whose coastal access, enjoyment, or livelihood would be lost if there were an oil spill.

Thankfully, this bill will go no further than this House, at least in this Congress. If it passed the other body, the President has already issued a veto threat. Why are we doing this? One can only speculate.

I'm disappointed that the Rules Committee did not make my amendment in order. It would have required oil and gas companies that are awarded leases to disclose their Federal campaign donations to candidates and super PACs.

We are in real danger of losing our democracy. Free speech should not cost millions of dollars, and corporations are not people. Sunshine is the best antidote to this particular brand of poison. The public should know who is funding issue ads and other campaign-focused activities, especially when those funds come from corporations that profit from public resources.

The Supreme Court's decision in the Citizens United case unleashed a tidal wave of anonymous campaign donations. There are now over 600 super PACs poised to spend at least the \$221 million that they have collected so far to dominate the airwaves with advertisements of the political viewpoints of corporations and wealthy individuals. According to a Bloomberg news article published earlier this year, Americans for Prosperity, an organization backed by oil interests, paid over \$12 million for ads attacking the Obama administration's green energy policies.

The public has a right to know how profits made through exploitation of public resources of our land and our coastlines are being used to influence elections. My amendment would have provided the public with some of that information.

H.R. 6082 will not make us energy independent. It will not make us more energy efficient. It will not lower fuel prices. Energy efficiency and investment in our new energy resources are the real way to kick our oil habit.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 6082.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, before the gentleman begins, may I ask the time remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 17¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to another member of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I give thanks to the Natural Resources Committee for their hard work on this issue.

As my good friend, JEFF LANDRY, the Congressman from Louisiana reminds us, drilling equals jobs. And Republicans have a plan for job creation in America, and it begins not with a government takeover of our health care industry like the Democrats thought would create jobs. It begins with America pursuing energy independence, utilizing the resources that we are blessed with in this country, primarily right now in the offshore areas. We do this by expanding the areas of our Outer Continental Shelf that are included in our Nation's plan for exploration over the next 5 years. It seems simple to the average American, and that's what frustrates them so much, that we would refuse to at least explore our reserves and meet our energy needs in this country.

With a 9.4 percent unemployment rate in South Carolina, South Carolina understands that drilling equals jobs. Jobs we want, and that is why the Palmetto State offshore area is included in this bill.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this American Jobs and Energy initiative by passing H.R. 6082.

Mr. HOLT. At this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who, on the Appropriations Committee and Interior Appropriations, is a champion for the environment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend from New Jersey for yielding to me.

I have a few facts that we need to put on the table here:

One, this bill isn't going anywhere. It's not going to be accepted by the Senate, let alone be enacted by the President;

Secondly, we could create more jobs and a more sustainable future if we dropped the subsidies for oil and gas and we redirected them into wind and solar power;

Thirdly, this will have no impact upon the world oil price.

The fact is that we have a good deal of experience that shows that no matter how much production comes out of the United States, it, at best, has a negligible impact upon what consumers pay at the gas pump. Let me introduce some numbers to that effect to prove the point.

We currently consume about 18.8 million barrels of oil a day, and we produce about 5.4 million. Despite the concerted efforts of former oilmen President Bush and Vice President Cheney and a Congress that embraced the "drill, baby, drill" mantra, total oil production actually dropped from 2.118 billion barrels in 2001, when President Bush and Vice President Cheney came into office, to 1.812 billion barrels in 2008, when they left office. Under the friendliest, most pro-oil administration, U.S. production declined, despite technological advances in drilling and despite the lifting of previously restricted areas to drilling on land and at sea.

Ironically, oil production today, under the Obama administration, is higher than at any time during the last 14 years. I'll mention that once again. Oil production today is higher, under the Obama administration, than at any time during the last 14 years.

Onshore, oil companies hold leases on more than 73 million acres of the public's land; offshore, more than 37 million acres of the Outer Continental Shelf have been offered for lease since 2012.

More of the public's lands and waters are available and have been leased for drilling than at any previous time in U.S. history. It's worth repeating. More of the public's lands and waters are available today and have been leased for drilling than at any previous time in U.S. history.

As of June 1 of this year, there were 1,980 rotary drilling rigs operating on U.S. lands and waters, more than all other countries combined.

But all this activity has had no impact on prices. The fact is we have 36 years of data to show that it will have no impact on the price of oil.

Why are we doing this? That's the real question that needs to be answered. The Associated Press undertook a statistical analysis of 36 years of monthly, inflation-adjusted gasoline prices and U.S. domestic oil production. The study found that there was no statistical correlation between how much oil comes out of U.S. wells and the price at the pump.

U.S. oil production this past spring has been steady, yet the price of regular gasoline has fluctuated by more than 50 cents a gallon over a three month period.

The price spike this past spring can no more be attributed to President Obama and

the false claim that he is failing to drill more than he can be credited with the recent drop in the gasoline prices.

This bill moves us in exactly the opposite direction of what the bipartisan National Oil Spill Commission recommended: that current environmental reviews be more thorough and that oil spill response plans cover all contingencies.

It did not call for an arbitrary mandate to open all areas offshore on an unrealistic timetable, and it did not recommend drilling applicants be granted fast track approval.

This bill dismisses the work of the commission and pretends the trauma we all experienced in 2010, watching day-after-day and month-after-month, as more than 200 million gallons of oil spilled into the Gulf didn't happen.

It pretends the suffering and economic losses thousands of residents and local Gulf businesses experienced didn't happen.

This bill returns to the lax regulatory climate that existed before the disaster. It should be defeated.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

It was just last month that the administration announced its proposed final lease plan for developing the U.S. offshore energy resources for the next 5 years, 2012-2017. There was a lot of anticipation about this. We thought that finally the administration would hear the calls that have come from this House saying we need to increase our American energy supply and we need to create jobs, but we were disappointed. Our calls for relief obviously fell on deaf ears.

Instead of opening up 98 percent of the U.S. offshore, which is currently unleased for energy exploration, the President's plan will make the situation worse by closing 85 percent of our offshore areas to energy production. I think that's significant.

You have to ask the question: What do you really want? If you want energy independence, open it up. Let's explore for these sources.

□ 1730

To put that into context, I think what we need to do is look at this President's plan and compare it to previous Presidents. And, Mr. Chairman, what we find is that this President's plan offers fewer offshore drilling leases than former President Jimmy Carter had offered. The President's plan also ignores the economic struggles that are facing our country, and it really does not move us toward energy independence.

What it does do is it moves us a step backwards. We are heading in the wrong direction on this issue, and it imposes a drilling moratorium that had been lifted in 2008, a moratorium that the gulf coast still has not recovered from. And I think that we need to look at that and consider those jobs in our coastal regions.

In stark contrast to the President's plan, H.R. 6082 proposes a drill smart job creation plan that expands offshore drilling and opens new areas containing the most oil and natural gas resources. I encourage my colleagues to support this plan.

Mr. HOLT. May I inquire of the time remaining, Mr. Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4 minutes. The gentleman from Washington has 14 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6082 which I believe is a commonsense approach to energy production and jobs in south Louisiana and for our Nation.

I continue to be disappointed. The President states we must have "an all-of-the-above strategy for the 21st century that develops every source of American-made energy," but at the same time, he fails to understand the need to develop resources now for future energy production.

South Louisiana has tens of thousands of jobs in the oil and gas industry. This administration's hostility to responsible, safe American energy production—by closing 85 percent—85 percent—of our offshore areas to energy production and issuing burdensome and duplicative regulations stalls our languishing economy and hurts job growth.

I rise in support of H.R. 6082 because it's a rational and responsible plan. Not only will this bill generate a robust drilling plan, creating thousands of new jobs, helping to lower the price at the pump, improve American energy security, and strengthen our national and economic security, but it requires separate environmental reviews for each specific lease sale. This is good policy.

Passage of this legislation sends a crystal clear message to the administration: a do-nothing energy plan is simply unacceptable.

I look over at my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I would urge the President as well to take a look at that plaque up there near the ceiling above the Speaker's Chair—read it—from Daniel Webster. It says, "Let us develop the resources of our land."

Passage of this bill gets us on to a good start of developing the resources of our land, which include good, high-paying American jobs.

Mr. HOLT. I would now like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) who represents one of the areas that would be affected by offshore drilling, should this go forward.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

I don't have a lot of time to watch television these days. But I think most

of us have seen on television a commercial comes up time and time again. It's a commercial with beautiful coastal scenes in it, telling people, Come to Louisiana, Come to Mississippi, Come to Florida, Come to the coast. And I looked at that. And I said, That's great marketing. At the end of the commercial, I was surprised to see it was sponsored by BP. Now why was that sponsored by BP? It was sponsored by BP because of *Deepwater Horizon* and the damage that that did.

And this bill is just another attempt at giving Big Oil a handout, putting oil companies and their profits above both the American taxpayers and American treasures.

Now my district includes the south shore of Massachusetts, the Cape, the islands of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket and the south coast. We're a maritime community, one that respects the ocean and one that has prospered from its resources.

This bill would threaten our shores, our marine life, and the industries that rely upon them by opening up the waters of the east coast from Maine to South Carolina for quote-unquote "required oil and gases."

Now I ask my colleagues, is this necessary? Why put hundreds of miles of ocean waters and the livelihoods of our fishing and tourism industries at risk when our Nation's oil imports are already down to their lowest level in nearly two decades, and production is up?

Now in the spirit of compromise, I would like to offer a suggestion that will help the oil companies increase their profits. And that would be this: Let's defeat this bill, and the oil companies won't have to spend all that money paying for TV commercials to lure people to areas that are our Nation's treasures because they've been damaged.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from a coastal State, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 6082, the Congressional Replacement of President Obama's Energy-Restricting and Job-Limiting Offshore Drilling Plan.

The President's lease plan for offshore energy resources is unacceptable. It would close 85 percent of our offshore areas to energy production and recovery. Just like the Keystone pipeline, this is just another example of an administration beholden to a radical environmental agenda.

We must be about safely and responsibly recovering American energy. We have available energy under our feet and off our shores. This plan does that by expanding offshore drilling into new areas, areas that contain the most oil and natural gas resources.

Our economy is still struggling. People are still looking for work. And this bill would generate \$600 million in government revenue and at the same time,

put tens of thousands of Americans back to work.

It's time that we choose jobs and energy security over left-wing ideology.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I am the final speaker on our side. If the gentleman from Washington State is ready to conclude debate, so are we in the minority.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would tell my friend from Massachusetts, I have one other request for time and then myself to close.

Mr. MARKEY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today on behalf of the people of Virginia's Fifth District. As I visit with central and southside Virginians across my district, they all echo the same sentiment: The burdens caused by high fuel prices in this stalled economy are negatively impacting their lives.

This issue particularly resonates in the Commonwealth because just last month, the administration announced that its 5-year energy plan will exclude resources off of the coast of Virginia. This announcement comes as a shock to the people that I represent. At a time when the Fifth District is suffering from 3 years of high unemployment, now the administration has said it will put thousands more Virginia jobs on hold. It also shocks us because it shows just how out of touch Washington is when it comes to the devastation that high fuel prices are causing at home.

Energy prices may have subsided for now, but now is the time to act. I am proud to support this legislation which replaces the administration's unreasonable and irresponsible energy policy. I believe that this legislation will bring jobs to Virginia, help keep fuel prices low, and move our country forward to spur economic growth in central and southside Virginia.

□ 1740

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

This is a very simple debate to understand. The Republicans want to authorize drilling for oil and gas off of the coastlines of southern California, Maine and New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, New York, Maryland, and New Jersey. Those States do not want that. They long ago decided the risks were too great for their beaches and for their fishing industries. They do not want it.

But it also is in the context of this Republican aversion, this Republican opposition to wind and solar and other renewables receiving the same attention as oil and natural gas does. And the important thing about wind and solar is that they would be domestically produced 100 percent. The same is

true, by the way, you would think, for natural gas. Let's just say they find some off the coast of Massachusetts or off the coast of New Jersey; that would be great. But what the Republicans refuse to agree to is that that natural gas, after we've drilled off of our beaches, cannot be exported to other countries. And the reason that's important is we could use that natural gas and substitute it for the oil that we import from the Persian Gulf, but they won't agree to do that.

So the one thing that definitely has to be produced here is wind and solar because it has to be domestic. Natural gas, though, you can put it in a ship and you can send it around the world. You can freeze it like liquefied natural gas. And they won't agree not to do that as part of this package of running the risk of fouling the beaches of the east coast and the west coast.

There is just something fundamentally wrong with this; nothing for wind and solar, everything for the oil industry, including their discretion to then take the oil and gas that's discovered off our beaches and selling it overseas.

So this is just wrong on so many levels in terms of what we should be doing to protect our own country, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 9¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say why we are here today. We are here today because the President submitted his plan. It was late. His 5-year plan is supposed to go through a 60-day review here in the Congress. We are here to offer an alternative to that plan because that plan locks up 85 percent of the potential resources in this country. We offer this plan because we have heard loud and clear from the American people that it is in our best interest to be less dependent on foreign energy. And in the process of creating American energy, we obviously create American jobs. That, to me, is a win/win situation.

Now, let me respond to some of the arguments that have been made on the other side, and I want to point out specifically the bills.

The charge was made that the Republican-led House has not taken up any bills dealing with renewable energy. In fact, the observation was that there were no bills. In fact, there have been several bills, and there are three bills that have passed the House. Now, some of my friends on the other side of the aisle may not like it, but the fact is that they've passed.

The first one is H.R. 4402. It passed on a bipartisan basis in July. H.R. 3408, it too passed on a bipartisan basis in February. And H.R. 4480, it too passed on a bipartisan basis in June. So Republicans have repeatedly said that we are

in favor of an all-of-the-above energy plan, and this, of course, confirms that belief.

Now, I want to make an observation to part of the debate here that we are giving away something. I'm trying to think of an analogy on how to describe that, and the best I can come up with is if one has an asset, the Federal Government has an asset of having control over the Outer Continental Shelf, and somebody wants to use that asset where there may be some opportunity to grow the economy or create jobs, or what have you, that seems to me to be a positive step rather than a giveaway.

In fact, I think about the private landowners in North Dakota or maybe the State of North Dakota, because the same people, Big Oil, that are being beat up here on the floor here in debate went to North Dakota. They talked to the State and they talked to the private landowners. They said, You may have some assets that we would like to see if maybe there is some energy development available, very similar to what's available on the Outer Continental Shelf. So they made an agreement, I'll pay you, the landowner, some money if you let me look. And if there is something there, I'll pay you with what comes out of the ground.

Now, this is exactly the same process we're going through here, except we're dealing with the Outer Continental Shelf. Now, who is the beneficiary of that? Well, the beneficiary, in part, obviously, is the Federal Government because they get money for the leases and they'll get royalty payments. And I might point out, by the way, Mr. Chairman, the second largest source of income to the Federal Government after the income tax comes from leases and royalties. So there clearly is a benefit to the American people in that regard.

So when this is characterized as a giveaway when supposedly what is being given away is paid for, it does not, in my mind, pass the straight-face test.

Lastly, we hear the arguments, specifically from my good friend from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) saying this bill is going nowhere in the other body. Well, I would remind my good friend that the two Senators from his home State of Virginia are Democrats, and they are in support of drilling off the coast of Virginia, which, of course, this bill embodies. So if maybe they could whisper into the majority leader's ear and get some action on it, then this bill, indeed, could move through the Senate, as I suspect it will move through the House, on a bipartisan basis in the same light.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I think this bill is a very good bill. I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112–29. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 6082

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 “Congressional Replacement of President Obama’s Energy-Restricting and Job-Limiting Offshore Drilling Plan”.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) OCS PLANNING AREA.—Any reference to an “OCS Planning Area” means such Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area as specified by the Department of the Interior as of January 1, 2012.

(2) PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM (2012–2017).—The term “Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program (2012–2017)” means such plan as transmitted to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate on June 28, 2012.

**SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT TO IMPLEMENT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM (2012–2017).**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall implement the Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program (2012–2017) in accordance with the schedule for conducting oil and gas lease sales set forth in such proposed program, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), and otherwise applicable law.

(b) MODIFIED AND ADDITIONAL LEASE SALES.—Notwithstanding the schedule of lease sales in the Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program (2012–2017), the Secretary shall conduct under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) oil and gas lease sales in OCS Planning Areas as specified in the following table, in the year specified in the table for each lease sale:

| Lease Sale No. | OCS Planning Area                                  | Year |
|----------------|--|------|
| 229            | Western Gulf of Mexico                             | 2012 |
| 230            | Mid-Atlantic                                       | 2013 |
| 225            | Eastern Gulf of Mexico                             | 2013 |
| 227            | Central Gulf of Mexico                             | 2013 |
| 249            | Southern California (existing infrastructure sale) | 2013 |
| 233            | Western Gulf of Mexico                             | 2013 |
| 244            | Cook Inlet   | 2013 |
| 212            | Chukchi Sea  | 2013 |
| 228            | Southern California                                | 2014 |
| 230            | Mid-Atlantic                                       | 2014 |
| 231            | Central Gulf of Mexico                             | 2014 |
| 238            | Western Gulf of Mexico                             | 2014 |
| 242            | Beaufort Sea                                       | 2014 |
| 221            | Chukchi Sea  | 2014 |
| 245            | Mid-Atlantic                                       | 2015 |
| 232            | North Atlantic                                     | 2015 |
| 234            | Eastern Gulf of Mexico                             | 2015 |
| 235            | Central Gulf of Mexico                             | 2015 |
| 246            | Western Gulf of Mexico                             | 2015 |
| 237            | Chukchi Sea  | 2016 |
| 239            | North Aleutian Basin                               | 2016 |
| 248            | Western Gulf of Mexico                             | 2016 |
| 241            | Central Gulf of Mexico                             | 2016 |
| 226            | Eastern Gulf of Mexico                             | 2016 |
| 217            | Beaufort Sea                                       | 2016 |
| 243            | Southern California                                | 2017 |
| 250            | Mid-Atlantic                                       | 2017 |
| 247            | Central Gulf of Mexico                             | 2017 |
| 255            | South Atlantic-South Carolina                      | 2015 |

(c) LEASE SALES DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subsection (b)—

(1) lease sale numbers 229, 227, 233, 244, 225, 231, 238, 235, 242, 246, 226, 241, 237, 248, and 247 are such sales proposed in, and shall be conducted in accordance with, the Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program (2012–2017), except each such lease sale shall be conducted in the year specified for such sale in the table in subsection (b);

(2) lease sale numbers 220, 212, 228, 230, 221, 245, 232, 234, 239, 217, and 243 are such sales proposed in, and shall be conducted in accordance with, the Draft Proposed Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing Program for 2010–2015 as published in Federal Register on January 21, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 12), except each such lease sale shall be conducted in the year specified for such sale in the table in subsection (b); and

(3) lease sale numbers 249 and 250 shall be conducted—

(A) for lease tracts in the Southern California OCS Planning Area and Mid-Atlantic OCS Planning Area, respectively, as determined by and at the discretion of the Secretary, subject to subparagraph (C);

(B) in the year specified for each such lease sale in the table in subsection (b); and

(C) in accordance with the other provisions of this Act.

**SEC. 4. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE LEASE SALE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In lease sale 249 under section 3, the Secretary shall offer for sale leases of tracts in the Santa Maria and Santa Barbara/Ventura Basins of the Southern California OCS Planning Area as soon as practicable, but not later than December 31, 2013.

(b) USE OF EXISTING STRUCTURES OR ONSHORE-BASED DRILLING.—The Secretary of the Interior shall include in leases offered for sale under lease sale 249 such terms and conditions as are necessary to require that development and production may occur only from offshore infrastructure in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act or from onshore-based drilling.

**SEC. 5. NATIONAL DEFENSE.**

(a) NATIONAL DEFENSE AREAS.—This Act shall in no way affect the existing authority of the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, to designate national defense areas on the outer Continental Shelf pursuant to section 12(d) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1341(d)).

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONFLICTS WITH MILITARY OPERATIONS.—No person may engage in any exploration, development, or production of oil or natural gas on the Outer Continental Shelf under a lease issued under this Act that would conflict with any military operation, as determined in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior on Mutual Concerns on the Outer Continental Shelf signed July 20, 1983, and any revision or replacement for that agreement that is agreed to by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior after that date but before the date of issuance of the lease under which such exploration, development, or production is conducted.

**SEC. 6. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of this Act and in order to conduct lease sales in accordance with the lease sale schedule established by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a multisale environmental impact statement under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) for all lease sales required under this Act that are not included in the Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program (2012–2017).

(b) ACTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED.—Notwithstanding section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332), in such statement—

(1) the Secretary is not required to identify nonleasing alternative courses of action or to analyze the environmental effects of such alternative courses of action; and

(2) the Secretary shall only—

(A) identify a preferred action for leasing and not more than one alternative leasing proposal; and

(B) analyze the environmental effects and potential mitigation measures for such preferred action and such alternative leasing proposal.

**SEC. 7. EASTERN GULF OF MEXICO NOT INCLUDED.**

Nothing in this Act affects restrictions on oil and gas leasing under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (title I of division C of Public Law 109–432; 43 U.S.C. 1331 note).

**SEC. 8. LEASE SALE OFF THE COAST OF SOUTH CAROLINA.**

In determining the areas off the coast of South Carolina to be made available for leasing under this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) consult with the Governor and legislature of the State of South Carolina; and

(2) focus on areas considered to have the most geologically promising energy resources.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 112–616. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 112–616.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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, beginning at line 11, strike “PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM (2012–2017)” and insert “PROPOSED FINAL OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL & GAS LEASING PROGRAM (2012–2017)”.

Page 1, line 14, strike “plan” and insert “program”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 738, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will just take a few seconds here.

This amendment is very simple. It makes two small technical corrections to the way the plan is referred to in the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.



I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

The minority has no objection to the amendment by the gentleman, and we urge support of it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of 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 Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1750

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 112-616.

Mr. HOLT. 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:

Beginning at page 5, line 22, strike section 6.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 738, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is simple:

“On page 5, line 22, strike section 6.”

This amendment strikes language from the bill that requires the Interior Department to conduct a single multisale environmental impact statement for all of the new areas that would be opened under this bill.

Now, it's not going to happen. We are not going to see this into law. I'm sure this bill is not going anywhere. But if it were, it would be an environmental disaster.

The notion that one environmental analysis would be sufficient for lease sales in the Atlantic, in the Pacific, and Bristol Bay in Alaska is simply absurd. These are very different environments. The steps that would be taken to prepare for drilling would be different in each one. The steps that would be taken during drilling would be different in each one. The steps that would be taken to prepare against an accident would be different in each one, and the steps for a cleanup would be different in each one. In fact, it would be hard to imagine three environments that could be more different. Even along the Atlantic coast from South Carolina to Massachusetts there are differences.

Congress has a responsibility to the American people to ensure that offshore drilling for gas and oil is occurring in a safe and environmentally responsible manner. It's been over 2 years since the worst environmental oil disaster in American history, the BP oil spill, and Congress has yet to enact a single legislative reform.

This committee, instead of doing a bill that—seems to be motivated to try to embarrass the President, I guess, based on a false premise that the President is interfering with the oil industry. They should actually be trying to put in place corrections that have been pointed out that are needed following the knowledge we've learned from the BP oil spill. The independent BP Spill Commission gave Congress a grade of “D” for a legislative response.

Now, the Republican majority has said they wanted to wait until all the facts were in before taking action to respond to the gulf spill. Well, the time has come. We've heard from the independent BP Spill Commission, Mr. Chairman; we've heard from the government's joint investigative team, Mr. Chairman; and those reports reached similar conclusions: The BP disaster was preventable, not inevitable. Those reports concluded that corners were cut, bad decisions were made, and stronger safety standards could have helped, in fact, could have prevented the disaster.

In fact, just today, the United States Chemical Safety Board issued its first report on the BP oil spill disaster and found that, when BP looked at offshore operations, it “focused on financial risks, not process safety risks.”

So that's what we should be doing here today. We should be strengthening the safety, the public health, and the environmental protections instead of saying we're going to drill everywhere and water down the environmental protections.

Here we are considering the 11th drilling bill over the last 18 months. The Republican majority is, once again, seeking to open up vast, vast swaths of America's coastlines to drilling without proper environmental review.

Mandating a single environmental impact analysis for the variety of lease sales included under this legislation is simply insufficient. Truncating environmental review will make drilling less safe, not more safe.

Let me be clear: The authors of H.R. 6082 apparently believe that the Atlantic, the Pacific, and Bristol Bay are similar enough to warrant a single environmental assessment.

An oil spill off the east coast would endanger 200,000 jobs and \$12 billion associated with just New Jersey's fishing and tourism industries—and that's not counting the indirect effects as this money flows through our local economies.

Bristol Bay and the North Aleutian Basin form the heart of one of the most productive salmon fisheries on the planet, contributing more than \$5 billion every year to our economy, yet the underlying bill opens up these areas to drilling under a truncated environmental review.

My amendment simply strikes the language from the bill that requires a single multisale environmental impact statement and would go a long way toward protecting the environment.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The amendment prioritizes bureaucracy over responsibly increasing energy production and job creation. This amendment would strike the section of the bill requiring that an environmental impact statement be conducted prior to any leasing in lease sale areas.

The gentleman takes issue with the manner in which the environmental impact statement is required to be conducted. However, what he fails to mention is that the administration is required to do yet another environmental review prior to each lease sale and additional reviews on each lease block as a part of the leasing process, and then each exploration plan has additional environmental work. So, in effect, all of the areas in the underlying bill will be studied and then restudied for the effect that any activity will have on the environment.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but all of these lease sales will still be subject to the many different laws that still impact the offshore leasing process, such as the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Fishing Enhancement Act, to name a few.

The truth of the matter is that this bill doesn't harm the environment. It goes an extra mile in requiring a multiple-sale EIS on all of the lease areas, while also ensuring that leasing does occur, although that leasing is still subject to all the environmental protection laws that are on the books.

Support for offshore energy development does not mean that you cannot also respect the range of different environmental needs based on lease area.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody in the country does not want to drill safely and responsibly. I know I certainly don't, and I know Members on my side of the aisle don't. So I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman has yielded back his time. I will yield back my time and urge a “no” vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 112-616.

Ms. RICHARDSON. 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 7, strike line 3 and insert the following:

**SEC. 8. LEASE SALES OFF THE COASTS OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND CALIFORNIA.**

Page 7, line 5, after "lina" insert "and the coast of California".

Page 7, line 8, strike "the State of South Carolina" and insert "each such State".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 738, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, my staff and I have had the opportunity earlier today to discuss this amendment with Chairman HASTINGS, Ranking Member MARKEY and their staffs, so I'll be brief.

□ 1800

The Richardson amendment improves the bill by amending section 8 to explicitly require the Secretary of the Interior to consult the California Governor and the State legislature before leasing any areas off the coast of California. My amendment codifies in the bill existing law, practice, and custom.

In short, the Richardson amendment extends to California the same consideration that the bill's drafters afforded the State of South Carolina. The State of California has within its borders more than two-thirds of the Nation's Pacific coastline, a far greater percentage than South Carolina has with respect to the Atlantic coastline.

California's coastline is an international treasure, and our State's residents should have input on drilling off our shores. Offshore drilling along the California coastline should thoroughly consider impacts to tourism, fisheries, coastal recreation, and of course the economy and its benefits. That is why it's reasonable and necessary that the people of California, through their chief elected officials, be consulted by the Secretary of the Interior on the subject of offshore drilling off the California coast.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to acknowledge the leadership and expertise and willingness of Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member MARKEY for working with me on the Richardson amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. And I want to congratulate her on her

amendment because I think this is a responsible approach that we are trying to take.

One of the reasons why California is so important, I think as the gentlelady knows, is that there are geologists that say that there are over 1.5 million potential barrels of oil off the shore. That should be important to Californians because not too long ago you were producing 50 percent of your oil production, now it's down to 38 percent. What we say, obviously, in this legislation is that it should be done from platforms on land.

So I thank the gentlelady for her amendment. I think it's a responsible approach, and I think it adds to this legislation. And I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, again, I just want to conclude with saying that I both acknowledge and appreciate the leadership by both Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member MARKEY; look forward to working with them on this and many other issues; and I'm grateful for their willingness to consider the rightfulness of this amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part C of House Report 112-616.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . REQUIREMENT TO OFFER GAS FOR SALE ONLY IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Secretary of the Interior shall require that all gas produced under a lease issued under this Act shall be offered for sale only in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 738, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very, very simple. It ensures that the natural gas produced under the leases issued under this legislation is sold in America. We're talking about the public lands of the United States, the taxpayer-owned lands of the United States. These are the American people's lands off of Massachusetts, off of New York, off of New Jersey, off of California that are being leased under this bill. The very least we should be able to tell the American people is that they are actually going to see a benefit

from any oil or gas produced from these lands.

We should be able to tell Americans that we are keeping the natural gas produced on their public lands here in America to keep prices low for Americans here in the United States, and we're going to find ways of putting that natural gas into trucks, into buses, into cars so that we can stop importing oil from dangerous parts of the world.

We should be able to tell Americans that we're keeping the natural gas here so that we can create more American jobs in manufacturing plastics, fertilizer, chemicals, and steel; and that we tell those countries in the Middle East we don't need your oil any more than we need your sand because we have natural gas here in America. That's all that my amendment would do, send a strong signal to the OPEC nations.

Current law does not allow for the exportation of our crude oil, and it shouldn't allow for the exportation of our natural gas either. My amendment would ensure that no waivers can be granted, no permits can be issued to export natural gas produced from the public land of the United States to other countries when we're still importing oil from OPEC. How much sense does that make that we find natural gas and start to sell it to other countries, even as OPEC continues to tip us upside down and shake money out of our pockets at the pump?

So I'm going to reserve the balance of my time at this point and continue my argument in a few minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I'm very happy to see that the gentleman understands that America needs oil and natural gas. That was a very good statement on his part. We would prefer to see more domestic production of this necessary commodity rather than importing it from foreign countries. I think we're making progress in that regard, Mr. Chairman.

The good news is this is already law, what the gentleman is trying to address. Title 43, chapter 29, section 1534 of the U.S. Code specifically prevents the export of both oil or gas produced from the Outer Continental Shelf unless the President finds that it is, one, in the national interest; two, will not increase our reliance on natural gas; and, three, that it is in accordance with the Export Administration Act, which puts further regulations on exports.

Now, the House has said repeatedly that increased energy production on Federal lands is in the national interest. So I suppose the gentleman could say there is some wiggle room there.

But, nevertheless, this amendment had failed in committee last week, it has failed on the House floor on many occasions because of this protection that's already in law. So I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Department of Energy right now has applications from 15 companies to export 28 percent of our current natural gas consumption in the United States.

Let me be very clear: exporting our natural gas will increase American energy prices. No economist or energy analyst disagrees. Why would we find natural gas here and then start selling it around the world? It would increase the price here. In fact, exporting far less than what is currently being proposed could send domestic natural gas prices skyrocketing by 54 percent.

Let me just let everyone out there know right now, we are the Saudi Arabia of natural gas. We are, right now, the lowest natural gas price in the world. In the United States, it's only \$2.40, \$2.50 in Mcf. In Japan, in Korea, in China, it's seven times higher. In Europe, it's four times higher. So if you're a manufacturer, if you're a company thinking about moving your trucking or your bus fleet to natural gas as opposed to oil and you're in these other countries, it's difficult for you to do it.

It's time for the United States to figure out how to do this. We have this incredible bonanza. Now they're proposing to drill off the coastline of Massachusetts, off New York, off southern California to find more natural gas. And what are they saying? Let's export it. Well, you're going to export the cheapest natural gas in the world.

Do you know what T. Boone Pickens says about this? "If we do it, if we export natural gas, we're truly going to go down as America's dumbest generation. It's bad public policy to export natural gas."

□ 1810

This is T. Boone Pickens. This is ED MARKEY. This is a coalition that spans the entire spectrum of political thought, but we do agree on this one thing. Why would we take our most precious natural resource and sell it to other countries, when it gives us a massive competitive advantage?

So I'm going to reserve the balance of my time to conclude debate, but this is a nonsensical policy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time, and I understand I have the right to close, so I will reserve my time.

Mr. MARKEY. How much time is remaining on either side, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 15 seconds.

Mr. MARKEY. Fifteen seconds.

We drill for natural gas off of our beaches, our pristine beaches and we find it, we take the risk, those States

take their risk, that natural gas should stay here in America. ExxonMobil shouldn't be able to pack it up and sell it to China, sell it to South America. That natural gas should stay here in America if it's found off of our beaches. That's what the Markey amendment calls for.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that this law has been on the books since 1940. Now, in 1940, there was a whole lot of unrest in the world just prior to the Second World War, and in the wisdom, apparently, of the Congress of that time, they said that energy production from the Outer Continental Shelf, which I might add, was probably not as robust as it is today, there are only certain conditions that you would export what comes off. And as I listed those things before, I think they're important.

That law was a good law then. It's a good law now. This amendment adds absolutely nothing to that whatsoever.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part C of House Report 112-616.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

**SEC. . SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.**

The Secretary of the Interior shall require that drilling operations conducted under each lease issued under this Act meet requirements for—

(1) third-party certification of safety systems related to well control, such as blowout preventers;

(2) performance of blowout preventers, including quantitative risk assessment standards, subsea testing, and secondary activation methods;

(3) independent third-party certification of well casing and cementing programs and procedures;

(4) mandatory safety and environmental management systems by operators on the outer Continental Shelf (as that term is used in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act); and

(5) procedures and technologies to be used during drilling operations to minimize the

risk of ignition and explosion of hydrocarbons.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 738, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, the independent blue ribbon BP Spill Commission—and this is their comprehensive compendium of what went wrong and what needs to be done in order to correct what went wrong in the Gulf of Mexico, the worst environmental disaster in the history of our country—concluded that there were systemic problems that occurred in the entire industry.

The Commission recommended sweeping reforms to improve the safety of offshore drilling. Yet, this Congress has still not enacted a single legislative reform and, as a result, the BP Spill Commission recently gave Congress a D, this Republican Congress, on its legislative response, and only refrained from handing out an F because it said it didn't want to insult the institution.

My amendment would simply ensure that we put into the statute specific minimal safety requirements for blow-out preventers, cementing, and the casing of offshore wells. My amendment would ensure that if we are going to expand drilling off of States like Massachusetts and New York and New Jersey and Maryland and California, that we put additional safety requirements on the books to ensure that a Romney administration or any other future administration cannot simply roll back the Interior Department reforms.

We don't want a Louisiana mess off of the coast of Massachusetts, off of the coast of southern California. We want the safety reforms that the BP Spill Commission recommended be put in place so there is no recurrence.

The Republicans are saying they want to drill off of the coast of these States that don't want the drilling. The least that they should do is build in the safety reforms.

And just today, the Chemical Safety Board released its report on the disaster. The Chemical Safety Board reached many of the same conclusions as the BP Spill Commission. The government's joint investigative team and the National Academy of Engineering said that this disaster was not inevitable, that it was preventable.

This majority has said they wanted to wait until all the facts were in before taking action on safety legislation. Well, the time has now come. We now have two blue ribbon reports, each reaching the same conclusions. It is long past time for the Congress to take the lessons of the BP spill and turn them into laws, so that we never have a disaster like this again.

I'm afraid of what the majority is contemplating here, which is authorizing the drilling off the coasts of the

East and the West in our country without building in the safety reforms. If ever there is a recipe for disaster, ruining the fishing, ruining the tourism business for these States that don't want the drilling in the first place because their economies are not based upon the same premise as the Louisiana and Texas economy, then this is that recipe. This is what we're voting on here today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let's be very frank about this. This amendment won't increase safety, but it will add red tape to the leasing process and open new avenues for lawsuits to interfere with the process of creating American energy and creating American jobs.

The types of safety measures identified in the amendment are already in place, and they are already enforceable. On multiple occasions, the Obama administration has testified that offshore drilling operations are being conducted safely.

With this amendment, the minority continues to try to divert attention away from the real issue of increasing energy production, American energy production, creating jobs, American jobs, lowering energy costs, and improving our national security, all doing that because, potentially, we lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

So it seems that my friends on the other side of the aisle simply do not want to face the fact that this bill says we can move forward with a robust and responsible program of oil and gas development, while, at the same time, ensuring that increased safety measures are undertaken. These are not, nor should they be mutually exclusive goals.

Right now, we have two choices before us. Tomorrow, when we vote on this, and the suspension that will be before us, we can choose to endorse the President's energy plan to hold 15 sales in five areas in the OCS, or we can support this bill before us, which will have nearly double, 29 sales, in over double the areas, 11 areas.

Both options will ensure that the drilling is done safely. Both options will ensure that our environment is protected. But only one option follows through on the promise made to the American people when the moratoria was lifted.

The American people clearly want our Nation to harness our energy resources. But the President's energy plan takes 85 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf and makes it off-limits.

This amendment, I should add, has failed when it was offered on this floor last February, and it also failed when it was offered in committee last week.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1820

Mr. MARKEY. May I ask the Chair to recapitulate the exact time that the majority and minority still have remaining for this debate?

The Acting CHAIR. There are 1½ minutes for the gentleman from Massachusetts, and there are 2½ minutes for the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MARKEY. Does the gentleman have any other speakers?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman is prepared to yield back, I will do the same.

Mr. MARKEY. I am prepared to give my convincing concluding presentation to the House floor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am the last speaker on my side, so you do what you have to do, and I will respond accordingly.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

I yield myself my remaining time.

Again, just for the record, Republicans can say this as much as they want, but I have to repeat:

(1) When President Obama was sworn in, 57 percent of our oil was imported. Today, only 45 percent of our oil is imported—congratulations, President Obama—no matter how many times the Republicans want to cover that over.

(2) Seventy-five percent of all of the oil and gas reserves offshore have been made available by the Obama administration for drilling.

(3) We in the United States are at an 18-year high in drilling.

Now, the Republicans have a problem with this because the 18-year high in drilling, the reduction from 57 percent of imports down to 45 percent of imports and the fact that 75 percent of all areas off the shores of our country are open for drilling run totally contrary to everything that they believe—to everything that they want America to believe, it is better to be said—because if the American people actually believed the truth, which is that Obama has reduced our imported oil from 57 percent down to 45 percent, reduced our dependence upon imported oil and increased our drilling to the highest point in 18 years, then their whole narrative just goes right down the drain. They have to keep getting up as though Bush were the right guy, but he did nothing.

All we're saying is, if you are so desperate to actually license all of this new drilling off of the beaches of our States, at least build in the safety precautions, which is what the Markey amendment calls for, which will prevent another mess like the BP Horizon catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Okay. Let's say it again: The gentleman's remarks would imply that, be-

cause there is increased oil production in this country, it's due to the actions of this administration.

Nothing, Mr. Chairman, could be further from the truth, because it takes a while to go through the process of leasing and developing potential resources before you drill, and even then you don't know until you drill.

All of that process started prior to this administration's taking office. It happened in the Bush administration, and as a matter of fact, it happened in the Clinton administration. That's where the increased production, in large part, came from. Even that isn't entirely true, because the increased production of American oil is really coming from State and private lands, not from Federal lands. In fact, over the last 2 years, Federal lands production has been down under this administration. It is principally because of North Dakota and West Texas that we are finding more production of American energy.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, I think that's good—but why should we ignore the potential resources that we have on Federal lands and not allow that to produce our American energy?

This amendment really does not help that process. All it does is add red tape to the process, so I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part C of House Report 112-616.

Mr. HOLT. 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. \_\_\_\_ . ELIGIBILITY FOR LEASES.**

(a) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall not offer any lease pursuant to this Act to a person described in paragraph (2) unless the person has renegotiated each covered lease with respect to which the person is a lessee, to modify the payment responsibilities of the person to require the payment of royalties if the price of oil and natural gas is greater than or equal to the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

(2) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person referred to in paragraph (1) is a person that—

(A) is a lessee that—

(i) holds a covered lease on the date on which the Secretary considers the issuance of the lease under this Act; or

(ii) was issued a covered lease before the date of enactment of this Act, but transferred the covered lease to another person or entity (including a subsidiary or affiliate of the lessee) after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) any other person that has any direct or indirect interest in, or that derives any benefit from, a covered lease.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED LEASE.—The term “covered lease” means a lease for oil or gas production in the Gulf of Mexico that is—

(A) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) issued by the Department of the Interior under section 304 of the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (43 U.S.C. 1337 note; Public Law 104-58); and

(C) not subject to limitations on royalty relief based on market price that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

(2) LESSEE.—The term “lessee” includes any person or other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is in or under common control with, a lessee.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 738, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. If the majority Republicans continue to push their “oil above all” agenda, then we House Democrats will persist in our attempts to make offshore drilling safe—safe for the workers and safe for the environment—and to make sure that the American taxpayers are getting their fair share of return on the use of their natural resources.

The Big Five oil companies made a record profit of \$137 billion last year. In the first quarter of this year, they continued to capitalize on the pain that Americans feel at the pump, raking in \$368 million in profits per day. But did the Americans see increased profits from selling their oil as it was pumped from public lands offshore? No. As a result of a legal quirk in the 1995 law, oil companies are not paying any royalties to the American people on leases issued between 1996 and 2000—none, zero.

In recent years, the amount of free oil these companies have been pumping has gone through the roof as more of these faulty leases have gone into production. In fact, right now, more than 25 percent of all oil produced offshore on Federal lands is produced royalty-free, and these oil companies are getting a complete windfall on 25 percent of all the oil produced offshore in the United States. They don't pay the American people one penny for their drilling regardless of their huge profits. It's just unjust.

According to the Interior Department, American taxpayers stand to lose about \$9.5 billion over the next 10 years from this big giveaway to oil

companies. Yes, it's a giveaway. The Government Accountability Office projects that all this free drilling will cost us as much as \$53 billion over the life of the leases. My amendment would recover these revenues that rightly belong to the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is yet another attempt to legislate a decision that was made during the Clinton administration. The constant attempt to renegotiate contracts that were signed, sealed, and delivered under the Clinton administration is in violation of contract law. That should be very, very basic, it would seem to me, if, indeed, we are a Nation of laws.

The U.S. Supreme Court found that the Interior Department did not have the authority to go back and insert price thresholds on these leases. The Department lost this issue in district court, in the appellate court, and they lost it in the Supreme Court. If this amendment were to pass, the issue would most certainly be challenged in court where, undoubtedly, the Department would again lose after having spent taxpayer dollars to defend the indefensible.

Ultimately, this amendment seeks to force U.S. companies to break a contract negotiated under government law. Now, some would say it's a bad contract. Maybe it was. I'm not going to second-guess what the Clinton administration did—but, in fact, they signed that contract law. This amendment has repeatedly failed on the House floor, and I hope it fails again. I urge its opposition.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. My amendment would offer oil companies a choice. They could choose either to continue to produce royalty-free oil in the gulf and not get new leases or they could pay their fair share and proceed with this willy-nilly drilling that would be allowed under this law, under this legislation. My amendment does not break contracts. It simply would not force companies to give up their leases. It would impose a condition on future leases. As the Congressional Research Service has stated:

As a general matter, the United States has broad discretion in setting the qualifications of those with whom it contracts.

These oil companies are the most profitable companies in the history of the world, yet they receive more than \$4 billion a year in taxpayer subsidies. On top of that, they get to drill for free on all of these public lands. Because of a quirk in the 1995 law, which came about because that Republican Congress was not eager to make oil compa-

nies pay, we shouldn't continue to give them a free ride.

If my colleagues on the other side are serious about paying down the deficit and realistically financing necessary investments in this Nation, then there is no excuse for not supporting this amendment to recover about \$1 billion a year—actually, somewhat more than that probably—that is rightfully owed to the American people.

□ 1830

It's time to end this taxpayer rip-off once and for all.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

If the intent of this amendment, as the gentleman says, is just to say that companies aren't forced to, but could renegotiate their contracts, I would say they could do that right now. Anybody that enters into a contract is free—if both parties want to—to renegotiate a contract. Nothing prevents them from doing so. But to have the heavy hand of government say in the future that “if you don't do this,” I think that is really the wrong way to go. That's the last thing that we need, is saying a condition of leasing or doing business with the government is that you have to retroactively go back and change a contract. That would have a chilling effect, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I don't know why the Clinton administration signed these contracts. Who knows? But to add this, where do you stop then? Where do you stop with all of the Federal contracts that could be not only in energy production, but anything else? This is a very bad amendment. It's a very bad precedent, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part C of House Report 112-616.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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. \_\_\_\_ LEASES MUST REQUIRE ESTIMATIONS OF PRODUCTION AND EFFECT ON PRICES.**

The Secretary of the Interior shall require under each lease issued under this Act that

each application for a permit to drill a well includes detailed estimations of—

(1) the amount of oil and gas that is expected—

(A) to be found in the area where the well is drilled, in the case of an exploration well; or

(B) to be produced by the well, in the case of a production well; and

(2) the amount by which crude oil prices and consumer prices would be reduced as a result of oil and gas found or produced by the well, and by when the reductions would occur.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 738, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, Republicans justify these irresponsible bills by claiming that more drilling will help reduce the cost of gasoline and fuel for the average American. Yet opening up even more of our country's shores to drilling will do little to help Americans at the gas pump. In reality, the United States is already producing more oil per day than it ever has. There are more drilling rigs in the United States than the rest of the world combined.

The drilling plan issued by President Obama that this bill amends already makes three-quarters of our offshore oil and gas resources open to drilling. Yet 70 percent of the offshore areas that are leased are currently not even active. That's 55 million acres under lease not active.

The price of oil and gas is set on a global level, primarily by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, OPEC. At maximum output, the United States holds only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves, not nearly enough to significantly impact the price per barrel, which is set on a global scale. According to the Energy Information Agency, even tripling our current offshore drilling capabilities by the year 2030 would lower gasoline prices only 5 cents per gallon more than if we continued at our current levels.

Gas prices are set on the world market on the basis of many geopolitical factors. For example, when the world thought Israel might attack Iran in February, gas prices went up 10 percent in 2 months to reach a 9-month high over fear that fuel supply lines would be disrupted. Though production in our country has actually increased every year since 2005, crude oil hit a record \$147 per barrel over the same time period, demonstrating that there is little correlation between drilling levels in the United States and the price of oil.

What drives the price of oil more than any other factor is the large non-stop worldwide demand for oil. The only way we can reduce gasoline prices is to reduce our country's disproportionate demand for fossil fuels by increasing our energy efficiency, improving the fuel mileage of our cars, and developing renewable energy resources.

Federal policies should focus on these kinds of demand-reducing improvements, not on increasing the land available for drilling. I make it very clear over and over again that I'll be the last person standing off the shores of Florida if we continue down the path of wanting to drill in that area.

Mr. Chairman, with all this in mind, my amendment requires applicants for drilling or exploration to explain in detail to what extent and by when any oil is found on the leased property will that decrease the price of oil for the American consumer.

More drilling will put our businesses, as well as our environment and our health, at an increased risk. Since we know that there's no correlation between gas prices and U.S. drilling, this bill is really nothing more than a giveaway, and I know my good friend from Washington will say that it is not. He perceives it as not a giveaway. I do. I think that it's nothing more than a giveaway to the oil and gas companies. My goodness, gracious, have we not given them enough?

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the House rules.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. In deference to my good friend from Florida, I really believe that this is a political amendment that would simply require companies seeking to drill offshore to estimate the impact that increased oil and gas production would have on gasoline prices. This bill is about increasing American domestic energy production. It's about reducing our dependence on foreign oil. It's about creating American jobs and creating American energy.

Simply put, requiring producers to estimate the impact that each and every well has on global markets is nothing more than a bureaucratic paperwork nightmare that would be put on those that would want to go and drill offshore and a delaying tactic by those that are opposed to offshore development. I don't think this is a good amendment. As I said in deference to my good friend from Florida, I really believe that this is a political amendment.

With that, I urge rejection of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chair, do I have any time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chair, I am going to use my 30 seconds as I

hope to yield to my good friend from Washington for a question. Perhaps I can get it in.

Do you dispute, Representative HASTINGS, that we now have 55 million acres under lease, 70 percent of it is not being utilized and, in the final analysis, that all of what we wanted to drill, that it would amount to more than 2 percent of the world's output?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding and say that if you run out of time, I will claim the time.

First, I do not deny that, except the figures that you're using aren't quite accurate; I will say that in the sense that the 2 percent you're talking about is known reserves.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

□ 1840

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The 2 percent figure that you are using is the known reserves. The potential resources that we have are much, much greater than that. And really, when you are looking at potential future energy production in this country, you look at the potential resources, not the known reserves. There's a big, big difference. Two percent is reserve.

So I will acknowledge that while we have 2 percent right now, our potential resources are much, much larger.

And I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. But in the Gulf of Mexico, which holds the largest volume of undiscovered technically recoverable resources, 32 million acres are under lease. However, only approximately 10 million acres have approved exploration or development plans, and only 6.4 million of these acres are in production. Leased areas in the Gulf of Mexico that are not producing or are not subject to pending or approved exploration and development plan are estimated to contain 17.9 billion barrels of UTRR oil and 49.7 trillion cubic feet.

So I will make the argument again to my dear friend that if we're talking about doing everything that you called for—and I know it's most sincerely—if we do that, we are not talking about reducing the price of gas but by a nickel. So show me the plan to get us to energy independence by drilling.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, what the gentleman is talking about is lease sales. Somebody has made an investment. They do not know if that area has any oil or natural gas. They don't know. They will go through all the studies. They'll spend millions, and sometimes billions, of dollars finding out if there is something there. Then, if they think there is, they will drill, costing that much more.

Now, I might add, with these lease sales, there is a set time. The Federal

Government gets money from these lease sales. Why would somebody give the money to the Federal Government if they didn't think there was something there? And, by the way, many times these leases come up empty and the company walks away and the only revenue goes to the Federal Government.

But let me speak to one other area of the amendment, because what the gentleman is really saying with this amendment is he is asking somebody that produces a crude product to estimate the price of a finished product. That's like telling an apple grower in my part of the country that, if he or she is to sell apples overseas, what's the price of applesauce going to be down the line? Now, it doesn't make any sense to do that. Now, whether the gentleman purposely did that or not, I don't know. But in any case, I don't believe that the amendment ought to be adopted for other reasons, but certainly for that one.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS  
OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part C of House Report 112-616.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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. \_\_\_\_ . LEASES MUST REQUIRE ESTIMATIONS  
OF PRODUCTION AND RESULTING  
CLIMATE CHANGE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall require under each lease issued under this Act that each application for a permit to drill a well includes detailed estimations of—

(1) the amount of oil and gas that is expected—

(A) to be found in the area where the well is drilled, in the case of an exploration well; or

(B) to be produced by the well, in the case of a production well; and

(2) climate change that will result from consumption of oil and gas found pursuant to the lease.

(b) CLIMATE CHANGE DEFINED.—In this section the term "climate change" means change of climate that is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and that is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 738, the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to say, in the last exchange that I had with my good friend, that I deeply appreciate his yielding some of his time to me, and I'm glad that he didn't compare apples to oranges. I thought that's what he was going to do, but he went down the applesauce route.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues continue, in my opinion, to cling to an antiquated 19th century energy policy while the rest of the world has moved into the 21st century. Just because the majority Members of Congress refuse to acknowledge that human activity contributes to climate change does not make it true. Climate change is not an abstract or difficult scientific principle to grasp. The effects are all around us. Our country is currently experiencing its worst drought since the Dust Bowl in the year of my birth, 1936.

Just last week, sudden violent storms rocked the east coast—they were referred to as microbursts—knocking out power for thousands and killing a number of people. Furthermore, record heat waves are having serious repercussions on crop yields.

We must pursue responsible, sustainable energy policies both for the legacy that we will leave our children and also to make certain the United States is at the forefront of an emerging green economy.

My amendment will not let oil companies shield themselves in ignorance any longer. It requires in each permit application an analysis and estimate of the impact on global climate change of the consumption of the fossil fuels discovered.

While the oil and gas found under each individual lease may not have a huge impact, there is no question that the aggregate fossil fuel consumption contributes to global climate change.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment in order to force my friends, the House Republicans, and big oil companies to acknowledge the reality that the international community is preparing for.

Interestingly, Mr. Chairman, when I was president of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's Parliamentary Assembly—its headquarters is in Denmark—I went to Denmark during that 2-year period of time, close to 30 times over the course of the years that I've been here. When I fly into Denmark, just coming from the side of Sweden, I see the windmills tilting that have been tilting for 16 years. And Denmark's city, Copenhagen, is the beneficiary of much of that production. They're headed toward the future. We're living in the past.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In many respects, Mr. Chairman, we just had this debate. And again, with deference to my good friend from Florida, I think this is another political amendment because what it will do is require companies seeking to drill offshore to estimate the potential impact produced by oil and natural gas production, what impact that would have on climate change. Not only that, you would have to do it on a well-by-well basis.

Mr. Chairman, in all honesty, some sort of requirement like that would simply dry up anybody wanting to drill offshore or utilize our resources offshore. Now, if that's what the gentleman wants, then okay, that's a good concession; but, if not, it simply does not make any sense.

But from a practical standpoint—and I think this is very important, Mr. Chairman—if the issue—and there is some debate about this, no question. But if the issue of producing oil and natural gas will affect the climate, and we, as a country, probably have the most stringent environmental laws on our air quality and water quality, why would we put this extra burden on us when it wouldn't happen in other parts of the world?

But the net effect of this, if it were to become law, would be to drive everybody from America.

So the net effect, if the issue—now, if the issue is really to protect the environment and protect the air, why would you drive it to areas that have less stringent environmental laws? Yet that would be the practical effect if this amendment were to become law.

Like I said, we've been over this before. It puts extraordinary burdens on individual wells and individual producers. And as I mentioned, in deference to my friend, I think it is a political amendment.

I urge rejection, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1850

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in the words of the celebrated movie that these words came from, I'm shocked, just shocked that this is a political amendment. And I'm equally shocked that this bill is political. This is the 143rd time that we're talking about oil drilling. And somewhere along the line, I'm lost. I thought politics was what we do. That's what I do. That's what people sent me here to do. That's what you do, my good friend, is politics. That's what it's about.

The difference is where we separate ourselves is whether we're talking about the politics of the future, where there are opportunities for us to do the things to bring us to energy independence, or whether or not we are going to cling to fossil fuels until we just can't find any place else to drill.

My major opposition to oil drilling offshore has been demonstrably shown when the Deep Horizon accident occurred. There have been other accidents. You want to drill in the tundra; there have been accidents where oil was spilled in that area. And daily in Ft. Lauderdale, I see ships sitting offshore, and I find that occasionally tar and things that come from them wind up on the beaches.

We make \$60 billion a year in Florida on those resources. I heard you earlier, my colleague, argue about North Dakota. I don't want to be in North Dakota in the wintertime, and I'm glad if they are about their business doing what they want to do; but I know a lot of North Dakota people, when they finish with the drilling up there, are going to come to Florida for our beaches, and that's what I'm about trying to preserve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Well, I, too, am shocked; but I'm glad we got that out of the way. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, this bill is a bill that addresses American energy and American jobs and, therefore, has a positive effect—potential positive effect—on our economy.

This amendment adds nothing to that. As a matter of fact, I think it's an impediment to this bill becoming law if it were to be adopted. And if I could think of some sorts of things to say regarding oranges, I would say it; but I'm totally at a loss. So I will simply say that this amendment does not deserve support, I urge its rejection, 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. HASTINGS).

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HANNA) having assumed the chair, Mr. MARCHANT, 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. 6082) to officially replace, within the 60-day Congressional review period under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, President Obama's Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program (2012–2017) with a congressional plan that will conduct additional oil and natural gas lease sales to promote offshore en-

ergy development, job creation, and increased domestic energy production to ensure a more secure energy future in the United States, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### HOUSE PLANS VOTE ON PRESIDENT'S ENERGY PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we have had an extensive debate today on the floor centered around American energy and American jobs. It is interesting in how this discussion has unfolded over time. Many times we on this side of the aisle are accused of repeating over and over and over different issues, and I suppose to a certain extent that is true. But one of the reasons why this effort is done on a regular basis is because the genius of our Founding Fathers was such that they created a government where there was a division of powers, and we all know that, the three branches of government. But the genius of our Founding Fathers was even greater than that in the fact that they created the legislative branch, and they divided that power. They divided that power between the House and the Senate.

What that simply means, Mr. Speaker, is that before any legislation can pass, any law that's put on anybody in this country has to pass both Houses of the Congress. Now, I recognize I'm a Member of the people's House. There has been no Member of this House in the history of our country that was not elected to this House.

On the other hand, the Senate is a different body, as we well know. The Senate is made up of only two Members from each of the States regardless of population. Because we come from different constituencies, one a smaller constituency within a State, another from a whole State like the Senate is, you are bound to have different ideas as you approach legislation. But again, the genius of our Founding Fathers was to say, okay, before anything can become law, both Houses have to act on that legislation, and it has to pass both the House and the Senate without a comma being different. Therein, of course, lies the challenge.

So we have been accused here many times of passing the same type of legislation, at least on the same issue, and passing it over to the other body. But what we have found, unfortunately, in this Congress is that the other body has simply not acted on a lot of pieces of legislation. Now, I'm not saying they should pick up, although it would be nice if they took everything that we passed and say it is a wonderful idea, pass it over there, and send it to the President. Well, they don't do that.

But one of the functions that they could do and they haven't done is pass

legislation, albeit different than what we have. And then, of course, we have a mechanism to work out the difference. But in many respects, Mr. Speaker, not even that has happened. In other words, they haven't passed legislation where they may have a disagreement with us that we can work out the differences. So that leads to a lot of frustration, obviously, on our side of the rotunda; but we feel it is important as the Republican majority to continue to make the case in what we believe in.

I might mention also that the House is controlled in the majority by the Republicans; and, of course, the Democrats control the Senate. So there is a difference. So that's why we continue to send legislation over to the Senate, and we hold out hope that maybe one time they will take up legislation, maybe on the same issue, and we can go to conference and work out whatever differences. So that's why we continue to bring this legislation to the floor. I look forward to a time when the Senate will, in fact, act.

Now, let me talk then about this piece of legislation that we had on the floor today and why it was brought to the floor and how the process is going to unfold tomorrow. As I mentioned in my opening remarks on debate, the President, any President, by the way, is required to submit a 5-year energy plan on the Outer Continental Shelf, the OCS, and submit it for a 60-day review by Congress.

□ 1900

That clock started ticking in June last. So we felt it was important because I, for one, and a number of my colleagues on the House Natural Resources Committee, in fact, throughout this Congress, felt that the President's plan was inadequate and that there ought to be an alternative to that plan. Thus, we had a markup several weeks ago on the plan that we had before us today. We are debating it tonight now. We've gone through the debate, we've had the amendment process, and we will vote on this bill tomorrow.

But what is missing in all of this equation was simply that there is no effort to defend the President's plan. As a matter of fact, in the debate that I had heard from the other side, rarely did I hear anybody say that the President's energy plan was a good plan. So, tomorrow, there will be on suspension legislation that I reluctantly will offer that is essentially the President's energy plan. We'll have a vote, and tomorrow the House will have an opportunity to say "yes" to this job-creating bill that we had on the floor today or the President's plan. There will be a distinct choice that Members of this body will have an opportunity to vote on.

I certainly hope that they'll support this job-creating plan, American-energy-creating plan that we debated today, and I hope that they will reject President Obama's plan.