

Paulsen	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Payne	Rush	Thompson (PA)
Pearce	Ryan (OH)	Thornberry
Pelosi	Ryan (WI)	Tiberi
Perlmutter	Salmon	Tierney
Perry	Sánchez, Linda	Tipton
Peters (CA)	T.	Titus
Peters (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Tonko
Peterson	Sanford	Tsongas
Petri	Sarbanes	Turner
Pingree (ME)	Scalise	Upton
Pittenger	Schakowsky	Valadao
Pitts	Schiff	Van Hollen
Pocan	Schneider	Vargas
Poe (TX)	Schock	Veasey
Polis	Schrader	Vela
Pompeo	Schwartz	Velázquez
Posey	Schweikert	Visclosky
Price (GA)	Scott (VA)	Wagner
Price (NC)	Scott, Austin	Walberg
Quigley	Scott, David	Walden
Radel	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Rahall	Serrano	Walz
Rangel	Sessions	Wasserman
Reed	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Reichert	Shea-Porter	Waters
Renacci	Sherman	Watt
Ribble	Shimkus	Waxman
Rice (SC)	Shuster	Weber (TX)
Richmond	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Rigell	Sinema	Welch
Roby	Sires	Wenstrup
Roe (TN)	Slaughter	Westmoreland
Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Whitfield
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Williams
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (FL)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rokita	Southerland	Wittman
Rooney	Speler	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Stewart	Womack
Roskam	Stivers	Woodall
Ross	Stockman	Yarmuth
Rothfus	Stutzman	Yoder
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Yoho
Royce	Takano	Yoho
Ruiz	Terry	Young (AK)
Runyan	Thompson (CA)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Broun (GA)	Fincher	McMorris
Campbell	Lamborn	Rodgers
Connolly	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
Conyers	McCaull	Young (FL)

□ 1515

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

OFFSHORE ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2231.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274 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. 2231.

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

□ 1518

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. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARDNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) 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.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act.

Unlike the President's plan that we heard from this week, which is to impose new energy taxes and Federal red tape that will increase energy prices and cost American jobs, this Republican plan will expand access to our own U.S. energy resources in order to lower energy prices and increase American jobs.

□ 1520

Gas prices have nearly doubled since President Obama took office. The national average today remains above \$3.50 per gallon compared to the \$1.89 it was when he took office. We shouldn't have to accept potentially \$4-a-gallon gas prices, especially when we have the resources right here at home. Higher gas prices mean we are making tough budget choices. For small businesses, it may mean the difference between hiring more workers or having to let some go. For families, it may be the difference between replacing the worn-out household appliance or making due with makeshift repairs. This is why access to affordable energy is so vital.

For decades, most of our Nation's offshore areas were under a moratorium, preventing any offshore development. All of that, Mr. Chairman, changed in the summer of 2008 when outrageously high gas prices made our Nation's energy struggles a regular topic of conversation around the dinner table for American families. Later that year, Congress and then-President Bush lifted those moratoria with the hopes of fostering an era of increased energy production.

President Obama then came into office with a tremendous opportunity.

For the first time in more than a generation, he had the ability to open new offshore areas to oil and natural gas production. Sadly, instead, he went out of his way to shut down this opportunity by putting forth a new 5-year offshore leasing plan that locks up 85 percent of our offshore areas. The plan includes no new drilling, which results in no new American jobs. In fact, it includes the lowest number of lease sales ever offered in an offshore lease plan. Mr. Chairman, that's the worst record since President Jimmy Carter's.

We must do better. That's why we are here today to consider the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. This legislation puts us back on the right path: one that will open new areas to drilling, one that will create 1.2 million American jobs, one that will lower energy prices, and one that will generate \$1.5 billion in new revenue to the Federal Government. But it's not only energy jobs that will be created; it's associated industries like manufacturing, boating, transportation, and service industries like hotels and restaurants. They, too, will also benefit.

This legislation requires the administration to implement a new 5-year leasing plan that includes areas with the most oil and natural gas, such as the mid-Atlantic and Alaska and off southern California. It's not a “drill everywhere” plan but, rather, a “drill smart” plan that focuses on those areas where the greatest potential lies. It would also require specific lease sales to be held off the coasts of South Carolina and Virginia, the latter of which was originally scheduled to take place in 2011 but was cancelled by the Obama administration. There is bipartisan support in favor of the Virginia lease sale, but, again, this administration canceled it and punted any future sales until after 2017.

The bill also establishes a fair and equitable revenue sharing program with all coastal States that have drilling off their coasts, much like what the Gulf States currently enjoy. Revenue sharing will create new incentives for opening offshore areas to drilling. Again, more American energy production equates to more jobs and a stronger economy.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the bill includes reforms to further enhance the accountability, efficiency, safety, and ethical standards of offshore energy operations. These reforms will allow for the robust production of our Nation's offshore energy resources while ensuring that all activity is conducted with proper oversight.

Offshore energy production has steadily declined under this administration, and, frankly, Mr. Chairman, it's time to reverse that trend. H.R. 2231 will remove government barriers that are currently blocking access to our American energy resources. It will safely and responsibly unlock our energy and allow us to create over a million new American jobs. I urge my colleagues to support the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Here we are again. It's kind of a Groundhog Day moment for Congress. This bill, or individual parts of this bill, passed in the last Congress five times and never went anywhere in the Senate, and it will meet the same fate again.

Now, the premise here is that if we had mandatory offshore oil leasing in the more sensitive areas of the coast—remember, 75 percent of the known recoverable resources are available currently under lease. Currently, there are 5,484 leases on the Outer Continental Shelf that aren't producing. Those leases cover 30 million acres—85 percent of the total acreage currently under lease. We estimate there are 18 billion barrels of oil under these leases and 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. When I asked the gentleman from the American Petroleum Institute why they needed to put more acreage under lease when they're sitting on all of this, his answer was, Well, you know, these things take a long time.

If they take a long time, let's encourage them to develop what they've already leased, to go after these 18 billion barrels of oil and 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. When they're making progress there, then they might come back and petition for more, and we'll make a decision at that point given the needs of the country; but the premise that somehow by putting more leases out there—with no requirement for them to perform—the price of gas will drop is absolutely untrue. We all know that's untrue. The American consumers know it's untrue.

The principal reason that underlies the 50-cent-a-gallon, one-week run-up in May, which we're still paying, is refineries. Our refineries need to be cleaned and maintained and have periodic maintenance, and, oh, a couple of them have broken down. We have seen incredible consolidation in the refinery industry, and it's always the excuse for jacking up the price on Memorial Day and on the July Fourth weekend and sticking it to the American consumers. Last year, they claimed that all of the refineries were shut down. An investigative reporter went in and got the air pollution records—no. Actually, they were operating, and they were exporting gasoline from the United States to overseas and were claiming there was a shortage here.

Now, we're in a world market. There's not much we can do about that. So the world price is what we pay for oil and gas, and it's a manipulated market; it's a collusive market. If we really wanted to do something, Members on the other side would join me in getting the administration to file a complaint against OPEC for manipulating the markets and for violating the World Trade Organization. You would join in investigating these suspicious refinery shutdowns, which I've

asked the Obama administration Energy Task Force to do. You would also join us, instead of giving more latitude to speculators in the oil companies, in actually reining in the speculators. Hey, the head of ExxonMobil says, Don't blame me for high prices as 75 cents a gallon is due to excess speculation on Wall Street.

So there are some real things we could do that would bring relief very quickly to American families, but those are not giving the oil industry, which is sitting on 5,484 leases, covering 30 million acres and 18 billion barrels of oil and 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, more acreage to put under lease, particularly with mandatory leasing in sensitive areas.

That's what this bill would do. We've passed it before. Well, not "we." Collectively, the House has passed it before. I expect, as I said, we will see that happen again today, but nothing will happen with these bills in the United States Senate.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this legislation, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. While the U.S. is blessed with an abundance of energy resources, we are also saddled with an administration that is throwing up barriers to our energy security and economic prosperity.

This is why, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. It passed out of the subcommittee I chair on Energy and Mineral Resources.

The bill requires the President to implement a new 5-year plan that includes the areas offshore containing the greatest known oil and natural gas resources. This is a targeted approach that focuses on specific areas in which we know the most energy resources are located. The bill requires lease sales to be held off of Virginia, which were originally scheduled to take place in 2011, and South Carolina.

□ 1530

In both States, there is strong, bipartisan support from the public, the congressional delegations and the Governors for drilling off their coasts.

Finally, the bill implements important reforms to strengthen the safety, accountability and efficiency of the Federal Government's offshore agencies. It establishes a fair revenue-sharing program for all coastal States.

Both provisions would further encourage the safe, expanded production of offshore energy.

Mr. Chairman, high gas prices hurt all of us, and the impacts are felt every day. Families are forced to make tough decisions in their budgets, schools run fewer buses and the costs of businesses go up, forcing companies to hire fewer workers. But the concerns of America's

energy consumers, the Nation's small businesses and families have largely been ignored by this administration.

When President Obama took office, nearly all of the offshore areas were open to energy production. The administration had the tremendous opportunity for the first time in more than a generation to open new areas of the OCS for oil and gas drilling. Available to them for the first time since 1982 was the opportunity to access billions of barrels of oil that have been held closed under lock and key for decades.

Instead of jumping on the opportunity to increase our energy security, President Obama discarded a plan to develop these new areas, canceled lease sales and closed off 85 percent of our Outer Continental Shelf. This crushed the hopes and economic opportunity for the people in States like Virginia. In fact, the Obama plan put forward the lowest number of lease sales since the Jimmy Carter administration.

Nearly one year later, we are here again today to attempt to change the wrong course upon which this administration has set our Nation and our energy future. Recently, the Energy Information Administration issued their report for energy production on Federal lands for fiscal year 2012. It should be no surprise that the sale of crude on Federal lands decreased 5 percent in 2012, with an 8 percent decrease in Federal offshore volumes.

While this administration seems content with the status quo, this legislation is about making the right choices now to foster new access and new energy for the future. H.R. 2231 makes it clear that waiting until 2017, 5 more years, is too long for new energy production.

Increased American energy production is one of the best ways to create new American jobs, strengthen the economy and generate new revenue to help tackle the national debt. We cannot keep ignoring the vast resources potential of the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf. I applaud Chairman HASTINGS for his leadership on this issue, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the ranking member of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Oregon.

Each summer as Americans rush to our beaches for fun and relaxation, the majority of the Republicans here in the House rush forward with ill-conceived legislation to open up those same beaches and coastlines to unsafe drilling. Today we have a bill that has been accelerated through the legislative process and has been drafted in a way that limits the opportunity for Members representing coastal States to protect shorelines and coastal economies.

The bill we're considering would allow Big Oil to put drilling rigs off the Atlantic, Pacific and Alaskan coasts

without enacting key drilling safety reforms that we know should be there following the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster. This is bad policy through a bad process, all so this bill can enjoy the same fate that so many irresponsible drilling bills that the majority has rammed through have experienced.

They put these bills forward in apparent ignorance that a law requires passage by both houses and signature by the President. The administration was never given an opportunity to testify on this legislation, and now the President has suggested that he would veto this bill if it ever made it to his desk.

In committee markup, I offered an amendment to protect the Atlantic coastal communities, including my home State of New Jersey, which is strongly opposed to drilling off the Atlantic coast. The amendment was rejected on a party-line vote.

Need I remind my colleagues that about 70 million people live in Atlantic coastal regions. And according to NOAA data, Atlantic commercial fisheries were valued at \$1.8 billion in 2011, and the New Jersey Travel Industry Association says New Jersey's travel and tourism is worth about \$38 billion a year, supporting more than 500,000 jobs. All this depends on the pristine conditions of our beaches and shoreline.

But this isn't just about what New Jersey wants. Energy development of the OCS is a Federal issue. And as we learned during the debate on my amendment, any oil spill off the coast of, let's say, Virginia, will drift quickly to the coast of New Jersey and other northeastern States.

I submitted an amendment this week, but it was ruled not in order. The Rules Committee seems to think it's strange to want to collect fees—rent on drilling plots that belong to the public. Fees should be collected on all leases, producing or not. I think it's worth noting that according to the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, as of June of this year, there were more than 30 million acres of non-producing leases, five times more than the 5.6 million leased acres where oil production is currently occurring. Oil and gas doesn't need more acreage to drill on. They need to drill on the leases they currently hold.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOLT. In addition to these leases, we're considering this bill on the heels of the President's speech announcing his plan to reduce carbon pollution and to mitigate the threats of global climate change.

I realize the authors of this bill don't put much stock in what the President had to say the other day. But as elected representatives, we have a moral obligation to act. As the climate changes, there will be stronger superstorms,

worse floods, more withering droughts, more intense wildfires. The science is overwhelming, but many of my colleagues in Congress would prefer to deepen our dependence on fossil fuels.

We're considering this bill at the wrong time, in the wrong way, and it's the wrong bill. The crisis is not waning. The crisis of climate change is real. President Obama is doing all he can administratively while Congress fiddles. It is no coincidence that as Democrats work to address climate change, Republicans in the House recklessly pursue a "drill, baby, drill" agenda.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this is a jobs bill. It creates American jobs, producing American energy. So it's an energy security bill, as well. And there can be no national security without energy security. So this is a national security bill, as well.

Virginians get it, South Carolinians get it and Americans get it. The first domino is the jobs that are created on the offshore rigs. But if you ride on Highway 90 from Lafayette, Louisiana, down toward New Iberia and Houma, Louisiana, you're going to see on both sides of the road business after business after business that is supporting the offshore industries. These are pipe welders, pipefitters, mechanics and the service industry.

You know what? Those guys contribute to the Chamber of Commerce and the United Way, and they go to church, they tithe and they eat at the local restaurants. This is a true job creator, and the first domino is the domino of putting Americans to work offshore, and that's what this bill does by opening up more areas on the Outer Continental Shelf. And with the trickle down, all the other dominos fall that provide money to the economies that desperately need it in this country in all the offshore areas.

We want it in South Carolina. They want it in Virginia. And Americans want us to meet our energy needs with their own resources. That's why I urge the passage of this legislation, and I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 4 minutes to an outstanding new member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

□ 1540

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a messy conglomeration of retread ideas that wastes this Chamber's time. The various titles in this bill have been rejected by the Senate, by many of the affected States, and have a zero chance of being signed by the President.

Even when some of the ideas in this bill have merit, such as codifying the

reorganization of the former Minerals Management Service, or addressing the temporary nature of Interior's authority to collect inspection fees, these ideas are cobbled together with provisions that are a mess of "drill-baby-drill" slogan-over-substance dead ends. So I get it; this is a message bill.

Well, here's where I think the message is wrong: Americans have a right to weigh in on government actions in their backyard. This bill eliminates that opportunity by mandating lease sales and gagging the National Environmental Policy Act.

Americans should all be able to share in the value of their public lands. This bill, however, takes the sale of a public asset and sends much of the revenue to only a few States, instead of either paying down the deficit or spending it on programs of national benefit to all Americans.

Again, Americans should be told the truth about the nonexistent effect on gas prices of expanded U.S. drilling. As my colleague from Oregon explained so well, the price of crude is set in a global market, one where the countries with the greatest reserves have formed a cartel, which decreases supply to the world when we increase production in order for them to keep the prices propped up. So, unfortunately, we are actually not keeping gas prices down by increasing U.S. production.

I am also very disappointed that an amendment that I filed was not made in order. My amendment would have prevented the Interior Department from doing business with companies that did not have a formal policy preventing discrimination based upon sexual orientation and gender identity. This amendment would have required oil companies that are not in compliance to certify that they would only hire individuals based on merit and not sexual orientation or gender identity, and they would prevent other discriminations and harassments if they want to purchase oil or gas leases.

These policies are not unusual that I'm asking: 88 percent of Fortune 500 companies have formal nondiscrimination policies prohibiting harassment and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. In fact, all of the major integrated oil companies have sexual orientation nondiscrimination policies except one, ExxonMobil. In the past, ExxonMobil has explained that they're not in violation of State and local nondiscrimination laws because of the Federal Defense of Marriage Act, and that trumped local statutes. Well, that argument has been vitiated since the Supreme Court struck down DOMA as unconstitutional.

There is also extensive precedent of the Federal Government requiring contractors to have nondiscrimination policies based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. Our government dollars and resources should only be used when we are assured that the most qualified individuals are all equally considered.

Now is the time for ExxonMobil to respect the Constitution and enact a formal policy preventing discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. We Americans should not accept discrimination in any form.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. I applaud Chairman HASTINGS for his leadership on this bill that I believe will lower energy prices through the increased production of offshore resources.

This is not only a jobs bill but a path to energy independence and relief to the American consumer's pocketbook—a concept this administration claims they support, but fails to follow through with.

Just this week, the President directed EPA to put more regulations on the energy sector. These regulations will increase costs, which will be passed on to all American consumers and stifle domestic energy production, taking us further off the path to energy independence.

I know my constituents do not believe that this heavy-handed approach to regulations and increasing costs to millions of families across the country is the answer to our problem.

Oklahomans want leadership on energy policy, not hollow promises meant to appease a political party. I believe this bill is just one step of many that can be taken to get America to energy independence.

Mr. Chairman, I stand with my constituents who believe that this path to energy independence begins here at home. I encourage my fellow Members to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, just to inject a few facts into the debate, although we often ignore those around here: oil production from Federal lands is higher now than it was at the end of the Bush administration. We have produced 596 million barrels of oil from Federal lands last year, compared with 565 in 2008; and the Energy Information Administration found that oil production is higher on public lands offshore now than it was at the end of the Bush administration. We have produced 474 million barrels of oil last year, compared to 462 in 2008, but sometimes facts are inconvenient things.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), an esteemed member of the Ways and Means and Budget Committees.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for Chairman HASTINGS. He's a fair, civil individual. But this bill is off the charts. At least the last one that we voted on had some redeeming qualities—some redeeming qualities.

We know there's more oil been produced in the last 3½ years. The in-

crease is greater than the previous 20 years. So you're trying to target the administration, and the administration can speak for itself and defend itself, but this is not right. This is not right. This is not right.

So let's talk about this. I am opposed to this legislation. This bill would completely rewrite the administration's plan for offshore leasing in a reckless and irresponsible manner. For example, this bill would force the Secretary of the Interior to conduct lease sale 220, located off the shore of Virginia, 70 miles from the beaches of my home State of New Jersey.

Now, look, a lot of the folks that are going to vote for this bill voted against even helping those people in New Jersey respond to the Sandy storm. You know it, and I know it. And here we are on the floor perpetrating untruths about why this is needed now. Look, it's not the amount of land that we've set aside on water or on land for oil exploration and production. We've got plenty of oil coming out of the ground. We don't have any refineries, and this is the same debate we had 25 years ago. How dare anybody stand in this astute body and then claim we don't care if gas prices go up. The fact of the matter is this is an oil Congress and this is an oil economy, and you don't want to bring in—I want to talk about the special interests of the people who are hurting out there.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. I want to talk about the special interests—not oil companies—us. Let's talk about us and what we get out of this.

In fact, if I'm not mistaken, correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Chairman, the administration is committed to ensuring that American taxpayers receive a fair return from the sale of public resources, public land. As drafted, as this bill is before us right now, the revenue-sharing provisions of H.R. 2231 would ultimately reduce the net return to the taxpayers from development of Federal resources directed to be leased under this bill.

So, with summer upon us, tourism at the Jersey shore is one of our State's greatest economic drivers. These jobs that are committed, these jobs depend upon the responsible stewardship of our waters and coasts, and the legislation before us now puts those jobs at risk. For communities across the State still working to rebuild from Sandy, this is not a risk they are willing to take.

Instead of bending over backwards for Big Oil, we need to bend over and help as best we can the average citizen. I ask for a “no” vote on this.

□ 1550

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to my colleague from Virginia, I'd just point out that the CBO estimates that there will be revenue coming into the Federal

Government of approximately \$1.5 billion.

At this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, a bill that will create thousands of new jobs in Virginia while lowering the cost of energy for all Americans.

Last month I traveled throughout my district, visiting local communities to discuss the impact of high energy prices. At each stop the same message rang clear: the cost of energy continues to have a significant negative impact on our small businesses, our farmers and our families.

Not only do we see higher prices at the gas pump, but high fuel prices have triggered higher prices across the board. People are paying more for groceries and are witnessing their utility costs rise at a time when they can least afford it. There is no question Americans continue to suffer from Washington's failure to adopt a sensible energy policy.

The President's consistently failed to lead on this issue. The administration continues to restrict leasing permits for oil and gas exploration off the coast of the Commonwealth, preventing Virginians from utilizing our natural resources.

Reopening the lease sales off our coast enjoys broad bipartisan support in Virginia, yet Washington continues to insist that it knows best what is best for the Commonwealth.

At a time when too many people in my district and across the country are out of work, it is critical that we, in the House, do everything we can to encourage creation of new jobs and reduce the burden on our hardworking families, our farmers and our small businesses.

If adopted, this act will lead to the creation of over a million new American jobs. In addition, this legislation will lead to lower energy prices, economic growth and strengthened national security.

As the House continues to lead on creating a sensible domestic energy policy, it is my hope that the Senate and the President will join us.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation. And I thank Chairman HASTINGS for his leadership and his committee for its leadership on this important issue.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER), another esteemed member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this poorly conceived and deeply irresponsible legislation. This bill is a clear giveaway to oil companies that are already posting record profits, and it's a dramatic departure from the regionally-targeted offshore drilling strategy that has led to domestic oil production rising to an

all-time high. In fact, it's even possible that America will be the world's largest oil exporter within the next 7 years.

To most people, this would indicate that our current policies are working, but apparently, not to the supporters of this bill. Instead, they think taxpayers should give giant subsidies to Big Oil at the likely expense of the economically critical tourism and fishing industries in many States, including my own.

What we should be doing, 3 years after the awful BP spill in the Gulf, is passing legislation that would protect workers, coastal communities, and the environment from devastating spills. In the 3 years since that tragedy, Congress has yet to pass legislative reform to improve the safety of offshore drilling.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will vote down this unnecessary giveaway to oil companies and, instead, take up legislation to respond to the BP oil spill and protect our coastal communities and workers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), a leader in the House here on energy development.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Let me make this simple. We need 20 million barrels of oil each day. We need this for oil and natural gas to make plastics, fertilizer, for transportation, and other feedstock.

Almost 20 percent of our oil comes from OPEC. Our 10-year trade deficit with OPEC is over \$1 trillion. We can buy their oil or we develop our own. Ours or theirs.

OPEC money funds the Taliban, al Qaeda, and terrorism, and thousands of servicemen have been killed and tens of thousands have been wounded by them.

We have vast supplies, more than 86 billion barrels offshore. We can develop our own safely and responsibly, or we can rely on OPEC.

So the real question is this: Where do you want our men and women to work?

Do you want them to wear helmets or hard hats?

Do we want them carrying rifles or wrenches, driving tanks or trucks?

Do you want them to be protecting foreign wells and fighting terrorists paid off with OPEC oil money?

Or do we want our men and women working here in America for American energy?

In my work in the Navy, I have seen too many of our American servicemen and -women wounded. And so now the choice is simple. What do you choose?

I choose American energy.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'd just like to respond to the gentleman who preceded me.

The statistic he used was accurate in 2005, the 20 million barrels a day imported. And that was, of course, when George Bush was President of the United States with the Bush-Cheney

energy policy. And that was 57 percent, you know, of the oil we consumed.

Now, due to changes with fleet fuel economy standards and biofuels and other steps taken by the Obama administration, actually, our daily consumption is down to 18.5 million barrels. That's not bad. That's almost an 8 percent decrease in a mere 7 years, with the President only in office for 4½. And we are now only 36 percent dependent on foreign oil.

That trend continues, of course, as I spoke earlier, about the increase in production on Federal lands and Federal offshore lands between the Obama administration and the Bush administration. So actually, we are making significant progress with the new policies that are designed to create less oil dependence, as opposed to the Bush-Cheney energy policy, which was actually designed to increase our dependence on fossil fuels.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. For too long, our economy has remained stagnant and the unemployment rate high. And for too long, hard-working American families have been suffering the consequences. These tough economic times are, in part, a direct result of our current energy policies.

Over the past several years, the Obama administration has been leading this country in the wrong direction with regard to our domestic energy production by enacting a plan that keeps 85 percent of America's coastal areas off limits to energy exploration. These Federal barriers have cost Americans jobs, surrendered much-needed revenue streams that would benefit the States, and decreased access to drilling areas that would allow us to become less dependent on foreign oil.

This administration has consistently been hostile to affordable domestic energy. Just this week, a senior advisor to the President said:

The one thing the President really needs to do now is to begin the process of shutting down the conventional coal plants. A war on coal is exactly what's needed.

This should not come as a surprise, since President Obama also has said in the past, "Under my plan of a cap and trade system electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket."

So, Mr. Chairman, we must harness our resources, contrary to these statements, not close them off. This bill reforms our current policy by requiring the administration to submit a 5-year leasing plan by 2015 that contains new offshore areas with the greatest known oil and gas reserves. Some of these areas have been estimated at 2.5 billion

barrels of oil, or up to 7.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. There's simply no reason not to explore these areas with so much potential.

This legislation also establishes a fair revenue-sharing system among coastal States where energy resources are explored. Whether it's off the coast of California, along the Gulf of Mexico, or the coast of my home State of Virginia, each State will share a percentage of revenue from energy production off their shores.

This bill also ensures environmental protections remain a priority by reorganizing the Interior Department to include the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, charged with overseeing environmental safety.

Now, studies have indicated that energy production offshore, in my home State of Virginia, if this legislation is put into law, could create almost 2,000 new jobs in Virginia alone and produce 750 million barrels of oil and over 6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Mr. Chairman, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act will lower gas prices for working families. It will strengthen our national security, and help create up to a million new jobs across America in the long term. The people of this country deserve a government focused on restoring the faith in our economy, and this bill is a step in the right direction.

□ 1600

Again, I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for his hard work on this measure, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Does the gentleman have any additional speakers?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman is prepared to close, I am prepared to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The majority leader just put out some very impressive statistics on the possible potential off of the east and west coasts if we opened up these sensitive areas to mandatory leasing; but it's actually smaller than the known reserves under the leases the Federal Government has already let to oil companies, which they have thus far refused to develop: 5,484 leases, 30 million acres, 18 billion barrels of oil—his number was smaller than that—and 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. His number was smaller than that.

So it's the premise that by mandatory leasing of these sensitive areas we're going to somehow have some sort of a boon to production as opposed to somehow incentivizing these oil companies not to sit on these leases forever. We have offered legislation previously from our side to require development of leases within a certain period of time, with escalating costs over time, and with the potential of turning those back and letting them be released to companies that actually want to do the work.

People say, Well, these oil companies won't just sit on it. Yeah, they'll sit on it. It's worth more every day. And they don't pay hardly anything to sit on it. Does anybody think the price of oil is going to be cheaper 5 years from now than it is today? So if they sit on a Federal lease—and, oh, maybe we can get some more to sit on for the future—then that resource which they paid for in 1999 when oil was much cheaper is a phenomenally profitable resource.

So to say we must open up these sensitive areas now is disingenuous at best as opposed to incentivizing the industry to use those which are already leased and which have known resources that exceed the speculative resources under these in sensitive areas off California, off the east coast of the U.S., and in Bristol Bay, where there's a \$2 billion a year totally sustainable fishing industry. It's not worth those risks.

The majority leader went on to castigate the administration. I know that many people's speeches are written in advance by their staff and they may not have been listening to the earlier debate and some of the facts I put out, or whatever happened. As I pointed out, during the Bush administration we were importing 20 million barrels of oil a day. That was 2005. And that was 57 percent of our consumption. Under the new policies of the Obama administration, which have led to conservation, more fuel-efficient cars, and biofuels, we are importing only 18.5 million barrels a day. That is 36 percent.

So we have made progress, and we should continue down that path. To lease more fossil fuel resources offshore is not a particularly creative 21st century solution. It may be a grand mid-20th century solution, which was much reflected in the Bush-Cheney energy policy. Actually, at the time when it passed, I said it would have been embarrassing policy for the 1950s, and it was tragic for the 21st century in terms of the potential we have with conservation, alternate fuels, and other measures we can take.

To rush this bill forward—and it will be rushed forward—to die in the Senate is not going to lower the price at the pump for any American. Again, the majority leader referenced that. And I made a statement on that earlier.

We're experiencing, not an oil shortage, but an artificial refinery shortage in the United States of America, which is used as an excuse to jack up prices and stick it to the American driving public every year in May and June and July when our families want to go on vacation. It's stretching their wallets.

If we took steps against the collusive shutdown of refineries, if we took steps against the collusive behavior of OPEC and other countries through the World Trade Organization, and if we took steps to crack down on the speculation on Wall Street, which even the head of ExxonMobil says, Don't blame me for those sky-high prices; blame Wall Street—75 cents a gallon is due to the

Enron loophole created by a former Republican Congress to allow wild speculation in energy futures by Wall Street as opposed to producers and consumers coming together in a regular commodities market. So if we wanted to provide relief today, we'd crack down on speculation.

If we wanted to provide relief in the slightly longer term, we would deal with the issues of collusion and OPEC and refineries. And if we wanted to enhance the oil supply further, even though we're producing near-record amounts today here in the United States of America, we would encourage, incentivize, or disincentivize these oil companies who are sitting on these many, many billion barrels of oil, trillions of cubic feet of natural gas and refusing to develop their existing leases while pandering for more.

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 13 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been a very interesting debate and I think it's a good debate, because what's at stake here in the long-run, not only for today but maybe potentially for generations ahead, is the potential energy independence for our country. And I think that's a worthy thing to have a debate about on the floor of the House.

Let me address a few of the issues that were brought up by my friend on the other side of the aisle, and let me focus first on leases.

The argument on the other side leaves one to believe that leases are just given out to anybody that wants them and then they just sit on them. Nothing could be further from the truth. A lease is given out on a potential area where there may be oil or natural gas. Those leases cost money and have certain conditions of a time in which whoever buys the lease has to develop that lease, and that can range anywhere from 5 to 10 years, depending on the depth of the water.

So the fact of the matter is these lease sales cost whoever purchases the lease. Now if it costs, where does the money go? It comes to the Federal Government. This is a source of income for the Federal Government just on the lease sales.

Now, why would any business want to spend money and not try to get a return on it? Many times, these leases then are reverted back to the Federal Government. In fact, the average, depending where you are and the depth, can be as high as 20 percent. It can be as low as 10 percent. On average, it's around 15 percent. So these lease blocks come back to the Federal Government. And guess what. They can be relet again. In fact, in some cases, over 40 percent are relet. What does that

mean? That means the Federal Government gets another chance—and still without any energy production, I might add—just on the lease sales.

And then you have a truism, I suppose, and maybe not what is understood by a lot of people, but I've heard this over and over, that when you have a lease, you really don't know if there's oil there until you go through all the technology to find it. But the ultimate last step is to drill. And if you're lucky, then you'll get something that you can develop; but if not, all of that money is spent and you get no return back.

This is a fact from the standpoint of how leases work. Nobody is going to sit on leases unless they felt that there is a potential there. If not, the terms of the lease sale means it goes back to the Federal Government, and that is something that I think we need to probably understand more than we do now.

And then there's the issue of cartels. I think that was mentioned. I think history shows that whenever there is a cartel, I don't care what the commodity is, the very best way to beat the cartel is to outsupply the cartel. And that's precisely what this bill is about, and it's precisely because of the new technology that has been developed by the oil and gas industry to drill smart, which is what this bill does.

The potential resources offshore in this country are huge, enough so, that some people say we could be the premier supplier of crude in the next 20 years—and that includes comparing ourselves to the Middle East.

□ 1610

Now, it has also been stated that since this administration took office, oil and gas production is up. That's true, it is up; but it's not up on Federal lands. And this is precisely what this bill addresses, oil and gas leasing on Federal lands.

Most of that is on private lands and most of it, frankly, is in North Dakota and in west Texas. But if you look at what the results are of this administration as it relates to what their jurisdiction is—which of course is Federal lands and offshore—the Congressional Research Service, a part of Congress, has noted that the recent increase in U.S. oil and natural gas can be attributed to State and private lands, and not Federal. Now, that's what the CRS said, but I can go a step further.

There is a Federal agency within the Department of Energy, the Energy Information Agency. Now, this is an agency within the Obama administration, I might add, Mr. Chairman. They say that total Federal offshore production dropped 8 percent last year and natural gas dropped 19 percent last year. This is on Federal offshore. But it goes even further.

Since the President took office in 2009, Federal offshore production is down 12 percent and natural gas production is down 40 percent. Now, Mr.

Chairman, I'm going to repeat, this is information that comes from the Department of Energy, the Energy Information Agency. That is an agency within the Obama administration. So while we have increased oil and gas production in this country, it is, in fact, in spite of this administration, not because of.

The reason why this legislation is so important—again, it's not done for a day; it's done for future generations—it is in our best interests. A growing economy needs a certainty of energy. This bill provides a certainty of energy because we are drilling on Federal offshore areas.

And it has a national security aspect to it all, Mr. Chairman. You know, every day we hear news about the Middle East and the volatility in the Middle East, and yet we talk—OPEC is principally positioned in the Middle East, not wholly, but principally in the Middle East. Is it not in our best interest, therefore, when we know we have these resources, to utilize them from a national security standpoint?

Finally, of course, it's been said over and over—and it's so true—energy jobs are good jobs; they're good-paying jobs. Why don't we want to make sure that we can create more American jobs with American energy for national security purposes? Mr. Chairman, that's precisely what this legislation does, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2231, The Offshore Energy and Jobs Act and H.R. 1613, The Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act.

H.R. 2231 directs the Interior Department to develop a new five-year offshore leasing plan that makes available for oil and gas exploration and development at least 50% of the unleased coastal areas with the most potential for energy production, and it creates a nationwide revenue sharing system so coastal states will receive a share of the federal royalties. It also requires that drilling be allowed off the coasts of California, South Carolina and Virginia and statutorily reorganizes the Interior Department agencies that oversee offshore leasing and permitting, safety inspections and revenue collection.

While I do not agree with some of the environmental provisions in this bill, I support it because it is a message bill about the importance of accessing our offshore resources. While leasing and permitting has come back some since the Deepwater Horizon accident, it is not back to the level it was before the spill. Additionally with the President reneging on certain areas originally contained in his 2012–2017 Five Year Offshore Leasing Plan, our future access over the next decade is extremely limited. We need to open new offshore areas up for production instead of producing on the same lands we have for decades.

H.R. 1613 would approve the February 2012 agreement between the United States and Mexico concerning transboundary oil and gas reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico. It also provides guidelines that the administration must follow in implementing all future transboundary hydrocarbon agreements.

H.R. 1613 is different than H.R. 2231 in that it is not a message bill. It gives the State Department the authority it needs to move forward on an important negotiated agreement with Mexico so that our respective countries can jointly develop in the Gulf of Mexico. I am hopeful we can get this bill to the President's desk for his signature soon.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I oppose H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. By requiring offshore oil and gas drilling in the Atlantic Ocean, this bill threatens New Jersey's coastal environment, fishing, tourism and the associated jobs and economic activity. This bill is the same old failed attempt by the Republican majority to give away public resources to wealthy, multi-national corporations at the cost of American taxpayers and our environment.

In New Jersey, tourism is a top industry, and we rely on our beaches, fisheries and clean ocean to attract that tourism. In 2011, the commercial fishing industry in New Jersey generated \$6.6 billion in sales and contributed \$2.4 billion to gross state product, while supporting 44,000 jobs. At the same time, New Jersey's recreational fisheries generated \$1.7 billion in sales and contributed \$871 million to gross state product, while supporting 10,000 jobs.

I made an effort to give a voice to those Americans living on the Atlantic Coast who want to protect their livelihoods, who want to preserve a clean ocean and who want to ensure the health of marine life. I proposed an amendment to the bill which would have given the House of Representatives an opportunity to vote on whether we should force drilling in the Atlantic Ocean. However, my amendment was not allowed to even come to a full vote because of Republican opposition.

At a time when domestic energy production is booming under President Obama, this rushed expansion of unsafe drilling into environmentally sensitive areas is completely unwarranted. This legislation unnecessarily rewards wealthy, multi-national who are sitting on 30 million acres worth of approved leases, waiting to drill until prices are even higher.

Energy independence is a matter of smart economic progress and national security and the American people deserve real proposals that will move our country forward. The American people deserve better than this same old bill that is sure to go nowhere once again.

The 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 113–16. 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. 2231

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 "Offshore Energy and Jobs Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM REFORMS

Sec. 101. Outer Continental Shelf leasing program reforms.

Sec. 102. Domestic oil and natural gas production goal.

Sec. 103. Development and submittal of new 5-year oil and gas leasing program.

TITLE II—DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT TO CONDUCT NEW OCS SALES IN VIRGINIA, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND CALIFORNIA

Sec. 201. Requirement to conduct proposed oil and gas Lease Sale 220 on the Outer Continental Shelf offshore Virginia.

Sec. 202. South Carolina lease sale.

Sec. 203. Southern California existing infrastructure lease sale.

Sec. 204. Environmental impact statement requirement.

Sec. 205. National defense.

Sec. 206. Eastern Gulf of Mexico not included.

TITLE III—EQUITABLE SHARING OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES

Sec. 301. Disposition of Outer Continental Shelf revenues to coastal States.

TITLE IV—REORGANIZATION OF MINERALS MANAGEMENT AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Sec. 401. Establishment of Under Secretary for Energy, Lands, and Minerals and Assistant Secretary of Ocean Energy and Safety.

Sec. 402. Bureau of Ocean Energy.

Sec. 403. Ocean Energy Safety Service.

Sec. 404. Office of Natural Resources revenue.

Sec. 405. Ethics and drug testing.

Sec. 406. Abolishment of Minerals Management Service.

Sec. 407. Conforming amendments to Executive Schedule pay rates.

Sec. 408. Outer Continental Shelf Energy Safety Advisory Board.

Sec. 409. Outer Continental Shelf inspection fees.

TITLE V—UNITED STATES TERRITORIES

Sec. 501. Application of Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act with respect to territories of the United States.

TITLE I—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM REFORMS

SEC. 101. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM REFORMS.

Section 18(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5)(A) In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall make available for leasing and conduct lease sales including at least 50 percent of the available unleased acreage within each outer Continental Shelf planning area considered to have the largest undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas resources (on a total btu basis) based upon the most recent national geologic assessment of the outer Continental Shelf, with an emphasis on offering the most geologically prospective parts of the planning area.

"(B) The Secretary shall include in each proposed oil and gas leasing program under this section any State subdivision of an outer Continental Shelf planning area that the Governor of the State that represents that subdivision requests be made available for leasing. The Secretary may not remove such a subdivision from the program until publication of the final program.

"(C) In this paragraph the term 'available unleased acreage' means that portion of the outer Continental Shelf that is not under lease at the

time of a proposed lease sale, and that has not otherwise been made unavailable for leasing by law.

“(6)(A) In the 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the Secretary shall make available for leasing any outer Continental Shelf planning areas that—

“(i) are estimated to contain more than 2,500,000,000 barrels of oil; or

“(ii) are estimated to contain more than 7,500,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas.

“(B) To determine the planning areas described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use the document entitled ‘Minerals Management Service Assessment of Undiscovered Technically Recoverable Oil and Gas Resources of the Nation’s Outer Continental Shelf, 2006’.”.

SEC. 102. DOMESTIC OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION GOAL.

Section 18(b) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) DOMESTIC OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION GOAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In developing a 5-year oil and gas leasing program, and subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall determine a domestic strategic production goal for the development of oil and natural gas as a result of that program. Such goal shall be—

“(A) the best estimate of the possible increase in domestic production of oil and natural gas from the outer Continental Shelf;

“(B) focused on meeting domestic demand for oil and natural gas and reducing the dependence of the United States on foreign energy; and

“(C) focused on the production increases achieved by the leasing program at the end of the 15-year period beginning on the effective date of the program.

“(2) PROGRAM GOAL.—For purposes of the 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the production goal referred to in paragraph (1) shall be an increase by 2032 of—

“(A) no less than 3,000,000 barrels in the amount of oil produced per day; and

“(B) no less than 10,000,000,000 cubic feet in the amount of natural gas produced per day.

“(3) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall report annually, beginning at the end of the 5-year period for which the program applies, to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate on the progress of the program in meeting the production goal. The Secretary shall identify in the report projections for production and any problems with leasing, permitting, or production that will prevent meeting the goal.”.

SEC. 103. DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMITTAL OF NEW 5-YEAR OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) by not later than July 15, 2014, publish and submit to Congress a new proposed oil and gas leasing program under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) for the 5-year period beginning on such date and ending July 15, 2020; and

(2) by not later than July 15, 2015, approve a final oil and gas leasing program under such section for such period.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF ALL AREAS.—In preparing such program the Secretary shall include consideration of areas of the Continental Shelf off the coasts of all States (as such term is defined in section 2 of that Act, as amended by this Act), that are subject to leasing under this Act.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 18(d)(3) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(d)(3)) is amended by striking “or after eighteen months following the date of enactment of this section, whichever first occurs,”.

TITLE II—DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT TO CONDUCT NEW OCS SALES IN VIRGINIA, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND CALIFORNIA

SEC. 201. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 220 ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OFFSHORE VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the exclusion of Lease Sale 220 in the Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program 2012–2017, the Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 220 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO MAKE REPLACEMENT LEASE BLOCKS AVAILABLE.—For each lease block in a proposed lease sale under this section for which the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, under the Memorandum of Agreement referred to in section 205(b), issues a statement proposing deferral from a lease offering due to defense-related activities that are irreconcilable with mineral exploration and development, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall make available in the same lease sale one other lease block in the Virginia lease sale planning area that is acceptable for oil and gas exploration and production in order to mitigate conflict.

(c) BALANCING MILITARY AND ENERGY PRODUCTION GOALS.—In recognition that the Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program and the domestic energy resources produced therefrom are integral to national security, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense shall work jointly in implementing this section in order to ensure achievement of the following common goals:

(1) Preserving the ability of the Armed Forces of the United States to maintain an optimum state of readiness through their continued use of the Outer Continental Shelf.

(2) Allowing effective exploration, development, and production of our Nation’s oil, gas, and renewable energy resources.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LEASE SALE 220.—The term “Lease Sale 220” means such lease sale referred to in the Request for Comments on the Draft Proposed 5-Year Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing Program for 2010–2015 and Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Proposed 5-Year Program published January 21, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 3631).

(2) VIRGINIA LEASE SALE PLANNING AREA.—The term “Virginia lease sale planning area” means the area of the outer Continental Shelf (as that term is defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.)) that is bounded by—

(A) a northern boundary consisting of a straight line extending from the northernmost point of Virginia’s seaward boundary to the point on the seaward boundary of the United States exclusive economic zone located at 37 degrees 17 minutes 1 second North latitude, 71 degrees 5 minutes 16 seconds West longitude; and

(B) a southern boundary consisting of a straight line extending from the southernmost point of Virginia’s seaward boundary to the point on the seaward boundary of the United States exclusive economic zone located at 36 degrees 31 minutes 58 seconds North latitude, 71 degrees 30 minutes 1 second West longitude.

SEC. 202. SOUTH CAROLINA LEASE SALE.

Notwithstanding inclusion of the South Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area in the Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program 2012–2017, the Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a lease sale not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act for areas off the coast of South Carolina determined by the Secretary to have the most geo-

logically promising hydrocarbon resources and constituting not less than 25 percent of the leaseable area within the South Carolina offshore administrative boundaries depicted in the notice entitled “Federal Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Administrative Boundaries Extending from the Submerged Lands Act Boundary seaward to the Limit of the United States Outer Continental Shelf”, published January 3, 2006 (71 Fed. Reg. 127).

SEC. 203. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE LEASE SALE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior 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, 2014.

(b) USE OF EXISTING STRUCTURES OR ON-SHORE-BASED DRILLING.—The Secretary of the Interior shall include in leases offered for sale under this lease sale 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, extended-reach drilling.

SEC. 204. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of 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 title.

(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. 205. NATIONAL DEFENSE.

(a) NATIONAL DEFENSE AREAS.—This Act does not 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. 206. 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).

TITLE III—EQUITABLE SHARING OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES

SEC. 301. DISPOSITION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES TO COASTAL STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) is amended—

(1) in the existing text—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “All rentals,” and inserting the following:

“(C) DISPOSITION OF REVENUE UNDER OLD LEASES.—All rentals,”; and

(B) in subsection (c) (as designated by the amendment made by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph), by striking “for the period from June 5, 1950, to date, and thereafter” and inserting “in the period beginning June 5, 1950, and ending on the date of enactment of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act”;

(2) by adding after subsection (c) (as so designated) the following:

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COASTAL STATE.—The term ‘coastal State’ includes a territory of the United States.

“(2) NEW LEASING REVENUES.—The term ‘new leasing revenues’—

“(A) means amounts received by the United States as bonuses, rents, and royalties under leases for oil and gas, wind, tidal, or other energy exploration, development, and production on new areas of the outer Continental Shelf that are authorized to be made available for leasing as a result of enactment of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act and leasing under that Act; and

“(B) does not include amounts received by the United States under any lease of an area located in the boundaries of the Central Gulf of Mexico and Western Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas on the date of enactment of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, including a lease issued before, on, or after such date of enactment.”; and

(3) by inserting before subsection (c) (as so designated) the following:

“(a) PAYMENT OF NEW LEASING REVENUES TO COASTAL STATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), of the amount of new leasing revenues received by the United States each fiscal year, 37.5 percent shall be allocated and paid in accordance with subsection (b) to coastal States that are affected States with respect to the leases under which those revenues are received by the United States.

“(2) PHASE-IN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), paragraph (1) shall be applied—

“(i) with respect to new leasing revenues under leases awarded under the first leasing program under section 18(a) that takes effect after the date of enactment of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, by substituting ‘12.5 percent’ for ‘37.5 percent’; and

“(ii) with respect to new leasing revenues under leases awarded under the second leasing program under section 18(a) that takes effect after the date of enactment of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, by substituting ‘25 percent’ for ‘37.5 percent’.

“(B) EXEMPTED LEASE SALES.—This paragraph shall not apply with respect to any lease issued under title II of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act.

“(b) ALLOCATION OF PAYMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of new leasing revenues received by the United States with respect to a leased tract that are required to be paid to coastal States in accordance with this subsection each fiscal year shall be allocated among and paid to coastal States that are within 200 miles of the leased tract, in amounts that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each such State that is closest to the geographic center of the lease tract, as determined by the Secretary.

“(2) MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a coastal State under paragraph (1) each fiscal year with respect to a leased tract shall be—

“(A) in the case of a coastal State that is the nearest State to the geographic center of the leased tract, not less than 25 percent of the total amounts allocated with respect to the leased tract;

“(B) in the case of any other coastal State, not less than 10 percent, and not more than 15 percent, of the total amounts allocated with respect to the leased tract; and

“(C) in the case of a coastal State that is the only coastal State within 200 miles of a leased tract, 100 percent of the total amounts allocated with respect to the leased tract.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts allocated to a coastal State under this subsection—

“(A) shall be available to the coastal State without further appropriation;

“(B) shall remain available until expended;

“(C) shall be in addition to any other amounts available to the coastal State under this Act; and

“(D) shall be distributed in the fiscal year following receipt.

“(4) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a coastal State may use funds allocated and paid to it under this subsection for any purpose as determined by the laws of that State.

“(B) RESTRICTION ON USE FOR MATCHING.—Funds allocated and paid to a coastal State under this subsection may not be used as matching funds for any other Federal program.”.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—This section and the amendment made by this section shall not affect the application of section 105 of 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)), as in effect before the enactment of this Act, with respect to revenues received by the United States under oil and gas leases issued for tracts located in the Western and Central Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas, including such leases issued on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—REORGANIZATION OF MINERALS MANAGEMENT AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 401. ESTABLISHMENT OF UNDER SECRETARY FOR ENERGY, LANDS, AND MINERALS AND ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF OCEAN ENERGY AND SAFETY.

There shall be in the Department of the Interior—

(1) an Under Secretary for Energy, Lands, and Minerals, who shall—

(A) be appointed by the President, by and with the advise and consent of the Senate;

(B) report to the Secretary of the Interior or, if directed by the Secretary, to the Deputy Secretary of the Interior;

(C) be paid at the rate payable for level III of the Executive Schedule; and

(D) be responsible for—

(i) the safe and responsible development of our energy and mineral resources on Federal lands in appropriate accordance with United States energy demands; and

(ii) ensuring multiple-use missions of the Department of the Interior that promote the safe and sustained development of energy and minerals resources on public lands (as that term is defined in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

(2) an Assistant Secretary of Ocean Energy and Safety, who shall—

(A) be appointed by the President, by and with the advise and consent of the Senate;

(B) report to the Under Secretary for Energy, Lands, and Minerals;

(C) be paid at the rate payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule; and

(D) be responsible for ensuring safe and efficient development of energy and minerals on the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States; and

(3) an Assistant Secretary of Land and Minerals Management, who shall—

(A) be appointed by the President, by and with the advise and consent of the Senate;

(B) report to the Under Secretary for Energy, Lands, and Minerals;

(C) be paid at the rate payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule; and

(D) be responsible for ensuring safe and efficient development of energy and minerals on public lands and other Federal onshore lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including implementation of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) and the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.) and administration of the Office of Surface Mining.

SEC. 402. BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of the Interior a Bureau of Ocean Energy (referred to in this section as the “Bureau”), which shall—

(1) be headed by a Director of Ocean Energy (referred to in this section as the “Director”); and

(2) be administered under the direction of the Assistant Secretary of Ocean Energy and Safety.

(b) DIRECTOR.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Director shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The Director shall be compensated at the rate provided for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall carry out through the Bureau all functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary relating to the administration of a comprehensive program of offshore mineral and renewable energy resources management.

(2) SPECIFIC AUTHORITIES.—The Director shall promulgate and implement regulations—

(A) for the proper issuance of leases for the exploration, development, and production of nonrenewable and renewable energy and mineral resources on the Outer Continental Shelf;

(B) relating to resource identification, access, evaluation, and utilization;

(C) for development of leasing plans, lease sales, and issuance of leases for such resources; and

(D) regarding issuance of environmental impact statements related to leasing and post leasing activities including exploration, development, and production, and the use of third party contracting for necessary environmental analysis for the development of such resources.

(3) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not carry out through the Bureau any function, power, or duty that is—

(A) required by section 403 to be carried out through the Ocean Energy Safety Service; or

(B) required by section 404 to be carried out through the Office of Natural Resources Revenue.

(d) RESPONSIBILITIES OF LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES.—Nothing in this section shall affect the authorities of the Bureau of Land Management under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or of the Forest Service under the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-588).

SEC. 403. OCEAN ENERGY SAFETY SERVICE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of the Interior an Ocean Energy Safety Service (referred to in this section as the “Service”), which shall—

(1) be headed by a Director of Energy Safety (referred to in this section as the “Director”); and

(2) be administered under the direction of the Assistant Secretary of Ocean Energy and Safety.

(b) DIRECTOR.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Director shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The Director shall be compensated at the rate provided for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Interior shall carry out through the Service all functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary relating to the administration of safety and environmental enforcement activities related to offshore mineral and renewable energy resources on the Outer Continental Shelf pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) including the authority to develop, promulgate, and enforce regulations to ensure the safe and sound exploration, development, and production of mineral and renewable energy resources on the Outer Continental Shelf in a timely fashion.

(2) *SPECIFIC AUTHORITIES.*—The Director shall be responsible for all safety activities related to exploration and development of renewable and mineral resources on the Outer Continental Shelf, including—

(A) exploration, development, production, and ongoing inspections of infrastructure;

(B) the suspending or prohibiting, on a temporary basis, any operation or activity, including production under leases held on the Outer Continental Shelf, in accordance with section 5(a)(1) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1334(a)(1));

(C) cancelling any lease, permit, or right-of-way on the Outer Continental Shelf, in accordance with section 5(a)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1334(a)(2));

(D) compelling compliance with applicable Federal laws and regulations relating to worker safety and other matters;

(E) requiring comprehensive safety and environmental management programs for persons engaged in activities connected with the exploration, development, and production of mineral or renewable energy resources;

(F) developing and implementing regulations for Federal employees to carry out any inspection or investigation to ascertain compliance with applicable regulations, including health, safety, or environmental regulations;

(G) implementing the Offshore Technology Research and Risk Assessment Program under section 21 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1347);

(H) summoning witnesses and directing the production of evidence;

(I) levying fines and penalties and disqualifying operators;

(J) carrying out any safety, response, and removal preparedness functions; and

(K) the processing of permits, exploration plans, development plans.

(d) *EMPLOYEES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall ensure that the inspection force of the Bureau consists of qualified, trained employees who meet qualification requirements and adhere to the highest professional and ethical standards.

(2) *QUALIFICATIONS.*—The qualification requirements referred to in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be determined by the Secretary, subject to subparagraph (B); and

(B) shall include—

(i) three years of practical experience in oil and gas exploration, development, or production; or

(ii) a degree in an appropriate field of engineering from an accredited institution of higher learning.

(3) *ASSIGNMENT.*—In assigning oil and gas inspectors to the inspection and investigation of individual operations, the Secretary shall give due consideration to the extent possible to their previous experience in the particular type of oil and gas operation in which such inspections are to be made.

(4) *BACKGROUND CHECKS.*—The Director shall require that an individual to be hired as an inspection officer undergo an employment investigation (including a criminal history record check).

(5) *LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS.*—Individuals hired as inspectors must be able to read, speak, and write English well enough to—

(A) carry out written and oral instructions regarding the proper performance of inspection duties; and

(B) write inspection reports and statements and log entries in the English language.

(6) *VETERANS PREFERENCE.*—The Director shall provide a preference for the hiring of an individual as an inspection officer if the individual is a member or former member of the Armed Forces and is entitled, under statute, to retired, retirement, or retainer pay on account of service as a member of the Armed Forces.

(7) *ANNUAL PROFICIENCY REVIEW.*—

(A) *ANNUAL PROFICIENCY REVIEW.*—The Director shall provide that an annual evaluation of each individual assigned inspection duties is conducted and documented.

(B) *CONTINUATION OF EMPLOYMENT.*—An individual employed as an inspector may not continue to be employed in that capacity unless the evaluation demonstrates that the individual—

(i) continues to meet all qualifications and standards;

(ii) has a satisfactory record of performance and attention to duty based on the standards and requirements in the inspection program; and

(iii) demonstrates the current knowledge and skills necessary to courteously, vigilantly, and effectively perform inspection functions.

(8) *LIMITATION ON RIGHT TO STRIKE.*—Any individual that conducts permitting or inspections under this section may not participate in a strike, or assert the right to strike.

(9) *PERSONNEL AUTHORITY.*—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director may employ, appoint, discipline and terminate for cause, and fix the compensation, terms, and conditions of employment of Federal service for individuals as the employees of the Service in order to restore and maintain the trust of the people of the United States in the accountability of the management of our Nation's energy safety program.

(10) *TRAINING ACADEMY.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall establish and maintain a National Offshore Energy Safety Academy (referred to in this paragraph as the "Academy") as an agency of the Ocean Energy Safety Service.

(B) *FUNCTIONS OF ACADEMY.*—The Secretary, through the Academy, shall be responsible for—

(i) the initial and continued training of both newly hired and experienced offshore oil and gas inspectors in all aspects of health, safety, environmental, and operational inspections;

(ii) the training of technical support personnel of the Bureau;

(iii) any other training programs for offshore oil and gas inspectors, Bureau personnel, Department personnel, or other persons as the Secretary shall designate; and

(iv) certification of the successful completion of training programs for newly hired and experienced offshore oil and gas inspectors.

(C) *COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.*—

(i) *IN GENERAL.*—In performing functions under this paragraph, and subject to clause (ii), the Secretary may enter into cooperative educational and training agreements with educational institutions, related Federal academies, other Federal agencies, State governments, safety training firms, and oil and gas operators and related industries.

(ii) *TRAINING REQUIREMENT.*—Such training shall be conducted by the Academy in accordance with curriculum needs and assignment of instructional personnel established by the Secretary.

(11) *USE OF DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL.*—In performing functions under this subsection, the Secretary shall use, to the extent practicable, the facilities and personnel of the Department of the Interior. The Secretary may appoint or assign to the Academy such officers and employees as the Secretary considers necessary for the performance of the duties and functions of the Academy.

(12) *ADDITIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall work with appropriate educational institutions, operators, and representatives of oil and gas workers to develop and maintain adequate programs with educational institutions and oil and gas operators that are designed—

(i) to enable persons to qualify for positions in the administration of this Act; and

(ii) to provide for the continuing education of inspectors or other appropriate Department of the Interior personnel.

(B) *FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.*—The Secretary may provide financial and technical assistance to educational institutions in carrying out this paragraph.

(e) *LIMITATION.*—The Secretary shall not carry out through the Service any function, power, or duty that is—

(1) required by section 402 to be carried out through Bureau of Ocean Energy; or

(2) required by section 404 to be carried out through the Office of Natural Resources Revenue.

SEC. 404. OFFICE OF NATURAL RESOURCES REVENUE.

(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—There is established in the Department of the Interior an Office of Natural Resources Revenue (referred to in this section as the "Office") to be headed by a Director of Natural Resources Revenue (referred to in this section as the "Director").

(b) *APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Director shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) *COMPENSATION.*—The Director shall be compensated at the rate provided for Level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) *DUTIES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Interior shall carry out, through the Office, all functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary and relating to the administration of offshore royalty and revenue management functions.

(2) *SPECIFIC AUTHORITIES.*—The Secretary shall carry out, through the Office, all functions, powers, and duties previously assigned to the Minerals Management Service (including the authority to develop, promulgate, and enforce regulations) regarding offshore royalty and revenue collection; royalty and revenue distribution; auditing and compliance; investigation and enforcement of royalty and revenue regulations; and asset management for onshore and offshore activities.

(d) *LIMITATION.*—The Secretary shall not carry out through the Office any function, power, or duty that is—

(1) required by section 402 to be carried out through Bureau of Ocean Energy; or

(2) required by section 403 to be carried out through the Ocean Energy Safety Service.

SEC. 405. ETHICS AND DRUG TESTING.

(a) *CERTIFICATION.*—The Secretary of the Interior shall certify annually that all Department of the Interior officers and employees having regular, direct contact with lessees, contractors, concessionaires, and other businesses interested before the Government as a function of their official duties, or conducting investigations, issuing permits, or responsible for oversight of energy programs, are in full compliance with all Federal employee ethics laws and regulations under the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) and part 2635 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, and all guidance issued under subsection (c).

(b) *DRUG TESTING.*—The Secretary shall conduct a random drug testing program of all Department of the Interior personnel referred to in subsection (a).

(c) *GUIDANCE.*—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue supplementary ethics and drug testing guidance for the employees for which certification is required under subsection (a). The Secretary shall update the supplementary ethics

guidance not less than once every 3 years thereafter.

SEC. 406. ABOLISHMENT OF MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE.

(a) **ABOLISHMENT.**—The Minerals Management Service is abolished.

(b) **COMPLETED ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Completed administrative actions of the Minerals Management Service shall not be affected by the enactment of this Act, but shall continue in effect according to their terms until amended, modified, superseded, terminated, set aside, or revoked in accordance with law by an officer of the United States or a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(2) **COMPLETED ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION DEFINED.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term “completed administrative action” includes orders, determinations, memoranda of understanding, memoranda of agreements, rules, regulations, personnel actions, permits, agreements, grants, contracts, certificates, licenses, registrations, and privileges.

(c) **PENDING PROCEEDINGS.**—Subject to the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the officers of the Department of the Interior under this Act—

(1) pending proceedings in the Minerals Management Service, including notices of proposed rulemaking, and applications for licenses, permits, certificates, grants, and financial assistance, shall continue, notwithstanding the enactment of this Act or the vesting of functions of the Service in another agency, unless discontinued or modified under the same terms and conditions and to the same extent that such discontinuance or modification could have occurred if this Act had not been enacted; and

(2) orders issued in such proceedings, and appeals therefrom, and payments made pursuant to such orders, shall issue in the same manner and on the same terms as if this Act had not been enacted, and any such orders shall continue in effect until amended, modified, superseded, terminated, set aside, or revoked by an officer of the United States or a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(d) **PENDING CIVIL ACTIONS.**—Subject to the authority of the Secretary of the Interior or any officer of the Department of the Interior under this Act, pending civil actions shall continue notwithstanding the enactment of this Act, and in such civil actions, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered and enforced in the same manner and with the same effect as if such enactment had not occurred.

(e) **REFERENCES.**—References relating to the Minerals Management Service in statutes, Executive orders, rules, regulations, directives, or delegations of authority that precede the effective date of this Act are deemed to refer, as appropriate, to the Department, to its officers, employees, or agents, or to its corresponding organizational units or functions. Statutory reporting requirements that applied in relation to the Minerals Management Service immediately before the effective date of this Act shall continue to apply.

SEC. 407. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE PAY RATES.

(a) **UNDER SECRETARY FOR ENERGY, LANDS, AND MINERALS.**—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to “Under Secretaries of the Treasury (3).” the following:

“Under Secretary for Energy, Lands, and Minerals, Department of the Interior.”

(b) **ASSISTANT SECRETARIES.**—Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “Assistant Secretaries of the Interior (6).” and inserting the following:

“Assistant Secretaries, Department of the Interior (7).”

(c) **DIRECTORS.**—Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “Director, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.” and inserting the following new items:

“Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy, Department of the Interior.

“Director, Ocean Energy Safety Service, Department of the Interior.

“Director, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior.”

SEC. 408. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF ENERGY SAFETY ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall establish, under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, an Outer Continental Shelf Energy Safety Advisory Board (referred to in this section as the “Board”)—

(1) to provide the Secretary and the Directors established by this Act with independent scientific and technical advice on safe, responsible, and timely mineral and renewable energy exploration, development, and production activities; and

(2) to review operations of the National Offshore Energy Health and Safety Academy established under section 403(d), including submitting to the Secretary recommendations of curriculum to ensure training scientific and technical advancements.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **SIZE.**—The Board shall consist of not more than 11 members, who—

(A) shall be appointed by the Secretary based on their expertise in oil and gas drilling, well design, operations, well containment and oil spill response; and

(B) must have significant scientific, engineering, management, and other credentials and a history of working in the field related to safe energy exploration, development, and production activities.

(2) **CONSULTATION AND NOMINATIONS.**—The Secretary shall consult with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering to identify potential candidates for the Board and shall take nominations from the public.

(3) **TERM.**—The Secretary shall appoint Board members to staggered terms of not more than 4 years, and shall not appoint a member for more than 2 consecutive terms.

(4) **BALANCE.**—In appointing members to the Board, the Secretary shall ensure a balanced representation of industry and research interests.

(c) **CHAIR.**—The Secretary shall appoint the Chair for the Board from among its members.

(d) **MEETINGS.**—The Board shall meet not less than 3 times per year and shall host, at least once per year, a public forum to review and assess the overall energy safety performance of Outer Continental Shelf mineral and renewable energy resource activities.

(e) **OFFSHORE DRILLING SAFETY ASSESSMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**—As part of its duties under this section, the Board shall, by not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section and every 5 years thereafter, submit to the Secretary a report that—

(1) assesses offshore oil and gas well control technologies, practices, voluntary standards, and regulations in the United States and elsewhere; and

(2) as appropriate, recommends modifications to the regulations issued under this Act to ensure adequate protection of safety and the environment, including recommendations on how to reduce regulations and administrative actions that are duplicative or unnecessary.

(f) **REPORTS.**—Reports of the Board shall be submitted by the Board to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House or Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and made available to the public in electronically accessible form.

(g) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—Members of the Board, other than full-time employees of the Federal Government, while attending meeting of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary or the Director while serving away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, in-

cluding per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals in the Government serving without pay.

SEC. 409. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF INSPECTION FEES.

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

“(g) **INSPECTION FEES.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall collect from the operators of facilities subject to inspection under subsection (c) non-refundable fees for such inspections—

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

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

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

“(3) **AVAILABILITY OF FEES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, all amounts deposited in the Fund—

“(i) shall be credited as offsetting collections;

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

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

“(iv) shall remain available until expended.

“(B) **USE FOR FIELD OFFICES.**—Not less than 75 percent of amounts in the Fund may be appropriated for use only for the respective Department of the Interior field offices where the amounts were originally assessed as fees.

“(4) **INITIAL FEES.**—Fees shall be established under this subsection for the fiscal year in which this subsection takes effect and the subsequent 10 years, and shall not be raised without advise and consent of the Congress, except as determined by the Secretary to be appropriate as an adjustment equal to the percentage by which the Consumer Price Index for the month of June of the calendar year preceding the adjustment exceeds the Consumer Price Index for the month of June of the calendar year in which the claim was determined or last adjusted.

“(5) **ANNUAL FEES.**—Annual fees shall be collected under this subsection for facilities that are above the waterline, excluding drilling rigs, and are in place at the start of the fiscal year. Fees for fiscal year 2013 shall be—

“(A) \$10,500 for facilities with no wells, but with processing equipment or gathering lines;

“(B) \$17,000 for facilities with 1 to 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells; and

“(C) \$31,500 for facilities with more than 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells.

“(6) **FEES FOR DRILLING RIGS.**—Fees for drilling rigs shall be assessed under this subsection for all inspections completed in fiscal years 2013 through 2022. Fees for fiscal year 2013 shall be—

“(A) \$30,500 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of 1,000 feet or more; and

“(B) \$16,700 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of less than 1,000 feet.

“(7) **BILLING.**—The Secretary shall bill designated operators under paragraph (5) within 60 days after the date of the inspection, with payment required within 30 days of billing. The Secretary shall bill designated operators under paragraph (6) within 30 days of the end of the month in which the inspection occurred, with payment required within 30 days after billing.

“(8) *SUNSET*.—No fee may be collected under this subsection for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2022.

“(9) *ANNUAL REPORTS*.—

“(A) *IN GENERAL*.—Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 2013, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the operation of the Fund during the fiscal year.

“(B) *CONTENTS*.—Each report shall include, for the fiscal year covered by the report, the following:

“(i) A statement of the amounts deposited into the Fund.

“(ii) A description of the expenditures made from the Fund for the fiscal year, including the purpose of the expenditures and the additional hiring of personnel.

“(iii) A statement of the balance remaining in the Fund at the end of the fiscal year.

“(iv) An accounting of pace of permit approvals.

“(v) If fee increases are proposed after the initial 10-year period referred to in paragraph (5), a proper accounting of the potential adverse economic impacts such fee increases will have on offshore economic activity and overall production, conducted by the Secretary.

“(vi) Recommendations to increase the efficacy and efficiency of offshore inspections.

“(vii) Any corrective actions levied upon offshore inspectors as a result of any form of misconduct.”.

TITLE V—UNITED STATES TERRITORIES

SEC. 501. APPLICATION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT WITH RESPECT TO TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (a), by inserting after “control” the following: “or lying within the United States exclusive economic zone and the Continental Shelf adjacent to any territory of the United States”;

(2) in paragraph (p), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(3) in paragraph (q), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(r) The term ‘State’ includes each territory of the United States.”.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 113-131. 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. BRADY OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113-131.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 8, before the period insert “, and shall include and consider all such subdivisions in any environmental review conducted and statement prepared for such pro-

gram under section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2))”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, our Nation is in the middle of an exciting energy revolution, but we will never truly reach energy security as long as 85 percent of our offshore areas remain off limits to oil and gas manufacturers.

Chairman HASTINGS’ Offshore Energy and Jobs Act on the floor today will open more offshore areas to energy development and bring our Nation closer toward the bipartisan goal of energy independence. This is a great thing.

In particular, Chairman HASTINGS’ innovative bill allows State Governors to request that certain offshore areas be included in the 5-year leasing plan. This gives States more power to unlock offshore energy resources and the jobs and the affordable energy that go along with responsible offshore energy development.

I’m offering an amendment to strengthen that language based on my More Energy, More Jobs legislation recently introduced with my colleagues, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia and Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois. It will require the Interior Department to include all these areas requested by State Governors in the environmental review process for the leasing plan.

The National Environmental Policy Act requires all major Federal actions, including offshore leasing plans, to undergo an environmental review. For offshore leasing, this is an environmental impact statement. Typically, this is a 2-year process at least, and a first step for including any area in an offshore leasing plan. Without environmental impact statements, new areas can’t be leased for offshore drilling.

My amendment will bring more areas into consideration for offshore energy development and move them further along in the leasing process, regardless of whether they are included in the final leasing plan.

More importantly, it will make it easier for future Congresses to pass leasing plans like the underlying bill because more offshore areas will have gone through the necessary environmental review process.

I’d like to thank Chairman HASTINGS for working with me both on this amendment and including some of our ideas in the underlying bill. With this struggling economy and our Nation in the midst of an energy revolution, now is the time to act to unleash more American-made energy and more American jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the gentleman’s amendment adds to this legislation, and we support his amendment.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you, Chairman HASTINGS.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, at the end of the general debate we had some creative math and/or cherry-picking of years to make a point that is not accurate.

The point is that oil production from Federal lands today is higher than it was at the end of the Bush administration—596 million barrels compared to 565 in 2008.

Now, in the offshore, when you use a certain number of years, obviously there is some anomaly. The anomaly was the worst oil spill disaster in the history of the United States, which was the Macondo blowup in the gulf, which of course set back leasing activity and development in the gulf for a period of time. However, we have now adopted new regulations. We’re actually requiring blowup preventers that work and a few other sorts of things that the Obama administration has done to make the drilling safer.

Under this administration, there are now more floating rigs in the gulf than before the spill and during the Bush years; and we approved 112 Deepwater drilling permits last year—the most since 2005. Of course that drilling is being conducted more safely than it has in the past.

So, I mean, we’re going to be able to switch around, pick different years, and do all of these things, but these are aggregate, longer-term numbers as opposed to specifying a particular year—and particularly picking a year after the worst oil spill rig disaster in the history of the United States.

With that, Mr. Chairman, we do not object to the amendment by Mr. BRADY, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to respond to my good friend from Oregon’s statistics.

What I said is that the production is down from when the President took office. And that, of course, is true. The gentleman makes the argument that there was more production initially in the Obama administration than the Bush administration. I never argued with that. But there’s a reason for it. There were more lease sales during the Bush administration, and it takes a while to get these leases producing. They started producing at the first part of the Obama administration; and since then, they have gone down because of the actions of this administration.

So my statistics are correct, and I guess his statistics are correct; but it's not the whole story. The whole story is it takes a lot of time in order to bring a lease sale into production, and that's what the gentleman overlooked.

□ 1620

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

I am ready to close whenever the ranking member is.

Mr. DEFAZIO. As I pointed out earlier in the debate, yes, the chairman is correct, it does take time, and there are 5,484 leases, 30 million acres, mostly about 85 percent in the Gulf of Mexico, that have an estimated, according to the Energy Information Administration, 18 billion barrels of oil and 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that have not yet been developed.

In any case, I do not oppose the gentleman's amendment. He makes a small improvement in what we consider to be a bad bill by requiring that if States opt into leasing, that there will be a NEPA review. I'm glad that there is some recognition on the other side of the aisle on the value of NEPA reviews to protect our precious natural resources.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a commonsense amendment that helps us responsibly develop our traditional energy sources for more jobs, more revenue to help balance this budget, and more affordable energy for America.

I urge my colleagues' support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113-131.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 11, beginning at line 3, strike section 204.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, 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, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I am offering an amendment to H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. I want to thank my colleagues, Representatives GERRY CONNOLLY and JIM MORAN, for working with me to bring this amendment to the floor.

This amendment strikes section 204 of the underlying bill. Section 204 seeks to limit the ability to conduct a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement, EIS. Given our experience with devastating oil spills such as the BP spill, the Exxon Valdez, and a spill off the coast of Santa Barbara, we should be improving our review processes and strengthening safety requirements.

The combination of reduced resources and shortened timeframes that are mandated by the bill, as well as the expanse of area to be addressed, make the task of preparing a credible EIS difficult, if not impossible.

With these demanding schedules provided by section 204, what information is compelling Congress to seek such swift approval? Oil production, as has been said, is at a 20-year high and natural gas production is also at an all-time high. Furthermore, under President Obama's leadership, our dependence on foreign oil has fallen from 57 percent to 36 percent.

Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility to the American people to pass legislation that will serve them. Section 204 limits the environmental review to provide for less rigor than a typical review process, which can create huge environmental and economic risks.

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

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

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

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

I generally do not rise to vote or argue against a Hastings amendment, but in this case I feel I have to. It is the nature of who the author of the amendment is, perhaps, and I think the gentleman understands.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prioritizes bureaucracy over responsibly increasing energy production. The amendment, as the gentleman noted, would strike a section of the bill, but that bill, that section, requires an Environmental Impact Statement to be conducted prior to any leasing in any lease sale areas.

The gentleman takes issue in 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 part of the leasing process. Then each expiration plan has additional environmental work.

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 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, just to name a few.

The truth of the matter is that this bill doesn't harm the environment; it goes the extra mile in requiring a multi-sale EIS on all of the lease areas, while still ensuring that leasing does occur because of the certainty in the process.

Support for offshore energy does not mean that you cannot respect a wide range of different environmental needs based upon a lease area.

We want to drill safely and responsibly. I think that is embodied in the underlying bill. For that reason, I urge rejection of the Hastings amendment, the Hastings of Florida amendment.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, would you be kind enough to tell me how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the cosponsor of this amendment and good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, maybe Mr. HASTINGS of Washington would be more comfortable calling it the Hastings-Connolly amendment, so that a Virginia name might make him feel more comfortable.

Mr. Chairman, have we already forgotten the consequences of lax regulation? I know the gulf coast hasn't. For many Americans, the image of more than 200 million gallons of oil spilling into the gulf, an area of oil spill and oil slick that if superimposed in this region would have gone from my district in northern Virginia all the way to New York City. It threatened America's largest fishery, jeopardizing tourism, wreaking havoc with the region's entire economy.

Sadly, the magnitude of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill might have been mitigated had BP and Transocean simply been required to do what this amendment requires—to comply with the basic environmental standards established to prevent such disasters from happening in the first place. Yet here we are 3 years later, and this Congress still has not taken a single action to improve drilling safety because the House majority has blocked every attempt. Now they want to make matters worse by gutting NEPA protections.

I am pleased to join my colleague in offering a commonsense amendment to preserve NEPA protections, and at least some modicum of impartiality in this attempt to legislate the majority's motto of "drill, baby, drill" everywhere.

Considering that all other major projects, even transit projects, with clear environmental benefits must undergo an Environmental Impact Statement, it is absurd to exclude from analysis activities that have the potential to destroy entire economies and ecosystems. For example, why is it that northern Virginia's Rail to Dulles project, a public project I oversaw, had to go through an extensive full 2-year environmental review, yet a privately-owned oil rig in the gulf was exempted from that same process? It makes no sense.

The BP spill was preventable, Mr. Chairman. Unfortunately, gulf coast residents will pay that price for that poor decision to waive an environmental review for decades to come as we continue to clean up the worst environmental disaster in our Nation's history.

Let's not allow that to happen. Let's support this amendment.

□ 1630

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the impacts of a major oil spill off Florida's coast would be devastating to tourism, travel to nearby beaches, mangroves, and wildlife. This is a truncated process and wrong.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, what this bill does could have very serious consequences to Virginia's economy. By looking at multiple sales, you lose sight potentially of the harmful impact of individual parcels.

For example, drilling the close-in parcels could have a very adverse impact to the tourism industry in Virginia Beach. Other parcels would affect the absolutely essential shipping channels to Baltimore and Hampton Roads. Opening up other parts of Virginia's waters would have a very serious and consequential impact upon the ability of the Navy to use that area off Virginia's shores. Other parcels would have an adverse impact upon the fishing industry.

So what we are suggesting is to look specifically at these individual parcels. If you look at the entire broad scope of these sales, you're going to lose sight of some of the most serious adverse consequences.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Washington has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting debate just simply on this amendment because I would point out to my colleagues that there has been a lot of reference on the floor today about the Senate's doing something or not doing something. I would just remind my colleagues that their Senators, both of whom are Democrats, support drilling

off the Virginia coast. I've found out, too, that their candidate for Governor has switched his position now and that he, too, supports drilling off the coast of Virginia. So I can say here today, I think very honestly, that there is bipartisan support for drilling off the coast of Virginia.

Finally, I want to address the point that my good friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) made about no safety. I will just refer him to title IV in this legislation. If his concern is on not having safety and updating rules because of oil spills, then he should support this legislation, because title IV does that through the reorganization process.

So, Mr. Chairman, it hurts me to say vote "no" on a Hastings amendment, but I will in this case for the arguments that I made a moment ago. We simply don't need it because of all of the environmental reviews you have to go through on lease sales.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113-131.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 104. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the issuance of a lease under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) to any person designated for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to—

(1) the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability and Divestiture Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a), or the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.);

(2) Executive Order 13622 (July 30, 2012), Executive Order 13628 (October 9, 2012), or Executive Order 13645 (June 3, 2013);

(3) Executive Order 13224 (September 23, 2001) or Executive Order 13338 (May 11, 2004); or

(4) the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, this straightforward amendment ensures that the Interior Department will not allow leases under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to go to any person currently subject to sanctions by the U.S. Government under existing Federal laws. This amendment will ensure that no company can benefit from today's legislation if it helps prop up oppressive and destabilizing regimes, such as Iran or Syria.

With the threat from Iran continuing to grow, it is vital that Congress respond with prudent and effective action. We must continue to isolate Iran, promote stability in the Middle East, and protect Israel. Growing our own domestic energy resources is an important part of further isolating Iran. My amendment ensures that we do not inadvertently or indirectly support the Iranian regime while opening American sources of energy. Iran is an existential threat to our best ally in the region, Israel; and it is a state sponsor of terrorism in addition to Iran's relentless pursuit of nuclear weapons and the abuse it directs to its own citizens.

With regard to Syria, existing sanctions are already helping increase the pressure on President Assad's regime. Thanks to the sanctions, Syrian oil production has decreased as companies have cut ties with the government and exited the country. Despite this pressure, more action is needed. This amendment is a responsible next step to ensure that nothing in this bill will empower President Assad's continuing war against the Syrian people.

The United States should not be rewarding companies that are currently subject to sanctions by the U.S. Government. We must ensure that none of the profit derived from today's legislation will prop up nations that would harm our national security interests or those of our ally, Israel. Israel has a hard enough time surviving in a dangerous neighborhood without letting it get any worse.

With both the Iranian and Syrian regimes threatening our allies in the Middle East and with Iran's proxy, Hezbollah, now directly involved in the fighting in Syria, I believe that Congress must show its unity in the protection of our good friend Israel and with the people of Syria.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I think the gentleman's amendment adds a great deal to this legislation, and I support your amendment.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman for that and for his leadership on the entire bill.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this simple amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. At the beginning of the consideration of this bill, I talked about how this was a little bit of “Groundhog Day” because all or parts of this bill passed in the last Congress five times. Now the gentleman is kind of disproving my theory because, well, I guess, at the very end of the movie, they broke out of the “Groundhog Day” cycle’s being repetitive; but the gentleman is actually breaking us out of the cycle.

Actually, last year, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), a Democrat, offered this identical amendment for sanctions to one of the many offshore oil drilling bills passed by the Republicans in the last Congress. On that day, which was the 25th of July 2012—almost a year ago today—I would note, on an amendment that does exactly what this amendment does, which we think is extraordinarily meritorious, that every Republican voted no—N-O. That would, of course, include Mr. LAMBORN and the esteemed chairman, Mr. HASTINGS.

So I’m not sure what has changed in the last year. Perhaps they just opposed it the last time because a Democrat was offering it and because the principle and the danger posed by businesses operating in these countries which are hostile to the United States of America wasn’t worth dealing with when you could beat a Democratic amendment. I don’t know. Maybe there has been a new realization on the other side of the aisle of the dangers of Iran and Syria since that time. Again, I don’t know.

Not one Republican Member of the House voted in favor of this amendment 1 year ago despite the fact that the esteemed gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) offered it as a motion to recommit on a bill. It could be because Republicans lockstep oppose motions to recommit or Democratic amendments, even if they have merit, just to make some sort of a perverse point.

We support this amendment today, as Democrats did last year, and perhaps all of the Republicans will change their positions this year, and it will be a unanimous vote.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to receiving the vote of the ranking member. I suppose that means he is in favor of this amendment, so I appreciate and applaud that.

This is very similar to the amendment last year, though it is not identical as you stated. It is very similar, and this is an example that we can work together in a bipartisan way to commonly work together on good ideas. Motions to recommit, as I will remind you, do sometimes throw up a procedural roadblock that delay the progress of a bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1640

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding as I want to make this point.

Existing law already exists as it relates to sanctions with the countries we’re talking about, but I think it is very important, since we’re talking about a national commodity, that we reemphasize—and that’s really what the gentleman’s amendment does, it reemphasizes what is already on the books. I think that needs to be done, especially right now with the volatility that we see in the Middle East.

So I think the gentleman’s amendment, as I stated, makes a great deal of sense. I support it, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LAMBORN. As I reclaim my time, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The gentleman would have been accurate had the motion to recommit been worded “promptly,” but it was worded “forthwith,” so it would only have delayed the bill by a total of 10 minutes or 15 minutes, however long the next vote was set for. It would not have sent the bill back to committee, and it would not have disrupted the movement of the legislation. So that part of the statement is not accurate and not a good explanation for why the Republicans uniformly opposed this excellent policy last year, even if it is, as the chairman says, reemphasizing existing law.

We happen to think it’s a really great existing law, and we wanted to make that point last year. Your side didn’t. I’m glad that you’ve come around on looking at the companies that do business in Iran and Syria as serious threats to the United States and are going to essentially support the amendment that we offered last year, which you opposed.

That’s the best I can do, Mr. Chairman. Sometimes we change our minds around here. We haven’t. All the Democrats, I expect, will vote in favor of this amendment, as they did last time. Apparently now, most or all Republicans will vote. That is a privilege we have around here, to change our minds. I just wish they had opposed it on better grounds last time rather than saying, well, it would have delayed the bill by 15 minutes.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I do look forward and appreciate the gentleman across the aisle’s support of this amendment, and I thank him for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment. I urge everyone’s support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113-131.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title IV add the following:

SEC. 410. PROHIBITION ON ACTION BASED ON NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY DEVELOPED UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 13547.

(a) PROHIBITION.—The Bureau of Ocean Energy and the Ocean Energy Safety Service may not develop, propose, finalize, administer, or implement, any limitation on activities under their jurisdiction as a result of the coastal and marine spatial planning component of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547.

(b) REPORT ON EXPENDITURES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate identifying all Federal expenditures in fiscal years 2011, 2012, and 2013, by the Bureau of Ocean Energy and the Ocean Energy Safety Service and their predecessor agencies, by agency, account, and any pertinent subaccounts, for the development, administration, or implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning component of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547, including staff time, travel, and other related expenses.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple amendment. It basically says that it prohibits the offshore agencies of the Interior Department from imposing ocean zoning related to the Obama administration’s continued attempts to establish the National Ocean Policy under Executive Order 13547 without congressional authorization.

It also requires the administration to submit a report to Congress identifying expenditures for fiscal years 2011 through 2013 by the Bureau of Ocean Energy, the Ocean Energy Safety Service, and their predecessor agencies.

Just as a little background, Executive Order 13547 was signed in 2010, and it requires that various bureaucracies essentially zone the ocean and the sources thereof. This essentially means that a drop of rain that falls on your house could be subject to this overreaching policy because that drop of rain will ultimately wind up in the ocean.

There are concerns that have been raised recently that the National Ocean Policy may not only restrict ocean and inland activities, but it may also have a problem because it has not been given any specific appropriations by this Congress. We have had hearings on this in the Natural Resources Committee, and no agency has told us from which source they’re getting the funding for this initiative.

As you can see in chart 1, this light green area shows the area that's covered under ocean zoning. As you can see, that covers a lot more than the blue areas that represent the ocean. There are 26 States just in the Mississippi watershed that would be affected by this executive order.

If we go to chart 2, you can see that the executive order creates a huge new bureaucracy at a time when we're trying to make government smaller, more efficient, and less intrusive. There are 63 agencies involved, as we see on the next chart, in this effort to try to zone the oceans. This looks like more than a planning exercise at this point.

Let me say that you're going to hear from the other side something that says planning is good. Yeah, planning may be good. Planning with the intent to regulate or a backdoor regulation or backdoor rulemaking is not, because here is what the executive order states on its face. It says:

All executive departments, agencies, and offices that are members of the council and any other executive department, agency, or office whose actions affect the ocean, our coasts, and the Great Lakes shall, to the fullest extent consistent with applicable law . . . comply with council certified coastal and marine spatial plans.

That means all these folks are going to have something to say on how we move forward.

This is a very simple amendment, and it was so simple that we offered it as a limitation amendment for the FY13 CJS appropriations bill, and it passed on a bipartisan vote of 246-174.

Let me close by saying that we're not plowing new ground here. This has already been approved in the CJS appropriations bill from last year. This amendment does not stop any existing statute, any existing rule, or any existing regulation. For instance, you may hear that it stops the Rigs-to-Reefs program. That is totally false. It does not get in the way of any existing program.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLORES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

The gentleman knows that I have the same concerns he has on this executive order, and I think his amendment adds a great deal to this bill, and I support his amendment.

Mr. FLORES. Reclaiming my time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in adamant opposition.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. This amendment would prohibit the Department of the Interior offshore agencies from using voluntary and commonsense planning as part of the National Ocean Policy to inform decisions they make under existing laws.

It's interesting that the National Ocean Industries Association, which represents offshore energy developers of many kinds, yesterday noted:

This is a great example of the progress that can be made when industry and regulating agencies communicate with each other. It's gratifying to see government and an industry come together to cooperatively and responsibly address these complex and important environmental issues.

And the gentleman's amendment would bring that program to a halt, which obviously the industry actually seems to think is useful.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

I think the gentleman might be well intended with his thought of what this amendment does, but it's exactly the opposite of what the industry wants.

The gentleman is a relatively new Member to Congress and does not represent a coastal area in his district. But if he were here during the nineties and early 2000, the reason we have a National Ocean Policy is because Congress set up a commission to study the conflicts of the sea brought to us by users of the ocean. That was the petroleum industry. That was the fishing industry. They were in conflict.

We had one agency saying, You can drill for oil, and others were saying, No, those are protected fishing grounds. Crab pots were being swept up by seismic boats going out and looking for oil and other geological issues. We had the Navy not corresponding with buoys. We had just tons of conflicts all within our 200-mile ocean exclusive economic zone, and the industry begged for some kind of collaboration of getting together.

□ 1650

Congress put together a commission; and on that commission Lawrence Dickerson, who was Diamond Offshore, chairman of the International Association of Drilling Contractors and chairman of the National Ocean Industries Association, was appointed by President Bush to sit on that commission. The recommendations of that commission, a commission that Congress created, were to create a national ocean policy. Congress actually introduced bills. The bills were introduced by Republican Members. Congressman Jim Greenwood carried the bill. Others carried the bill. The Resources Committee would never even give them a hearing. Admiral Watkins was chair of the committee, who was first President Bush's Energy Secretary, and also former CNO. All of these Republicans were asking for a national ocean policy.

Now we have it, and the gentleman says let's ignore it, let's ignore it. Let's not allow it to even be involved.

This is a setback. If you want to absolutely have fast track in permitting, then do it under planning. That's the way we plan for our military with the quadrennial review. There isn't anything—health plans. Everything we do, transportation plans, you name it, it's around a big plan. We don't spend any money until the plan is in place.

Now we are in the process of having that plan, which the industry supports, and the gentleman wants to say, no, don't do anything, ignore it. You bring us back to conflicts at sea. You bring back regulatory fights. If you want to delay decisionmaking, then don't have a plan like we have.

This amendment destroys the ability to get the job done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The Chair would note that the gentleman does not have the right to close.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I am a newcomer to Congress, but the reason I'm a newcomer to Congress is because before I did this, I had 30 years of experience working offshore. So I have firsthand experience with this. Twenty years of that, it was as a sea level officer for different companies that operated offshore.

Congress studied this issue for 10 years, and took no action. What does that tell us? That means the intent of Congress is to have no statute or regulation to zone the oceans. So the gentleman's issue is a little off base here. And just to make sure we correct the statement about what NOIA said, here's what they're putting out today:

NOIA staunchly supports the good work that Congressman FLORES has done and continues to do to fight back this ill-conceived national ocean policy, and stands in strong support of the Flores amendment on the House floor today.

I want to remind everybody I have this list of folks that support this. This is the fishing industry, both commercial and recreational. It's agriculture. It's home builders. It's the energy industry. We're not trying to stop a niche problem.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my colleagues that the national ocean policy is the recommendation of a commission that we created, bipartisan commission, appointed by President Bush, to recommend how we might avoid the conflicts of sea. The national ocean policy is that, to have a policy so that when we do activities in the ocean, we know whether those activities are consistent with a policy.

I think the gentleman is completely wrong in thinking that disrupting that policy planning is going to get a faster and more equitable way of drilling for oil. I think he's totally wrong in that, and the administration would probably veto the bill if it's in there. I don't think that it is an amendment that's going to do good. I think it's going to do harm, and I would oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

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

Mr. FARR. I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY
MR. CASSIDY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5, as modified, printed in part B of House Report 113-131.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. ____ . AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED
OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.

Section 105(f)(1) of 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) shall be applied by substituting “2023, and shall not exceed \$999,999,999 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2055” for “2055”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, in 2006 Congress passed the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, or GOMESA. This legislation for the first time allowed States to share in revenues generated from offshore drilling. GOMESA provided 37.5 percent of revenue to the Gulf States, to begin in the year 2017, but arbitrarily placed a \$500 million cap on the collectively shared revenue.

Conversely, the Mineral Leasing Act requires the Federal Government to allocate 50 percent of the energy revenue generated on Federal lands to interior States in which the revenue is generated without an annual cap.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It simply moves offshore royalty sharing more in line with the benefit onshore interior States experience by moving the GOMESA cap from \$500 million to \$1 billion. This would begin 10 years from now. It's almost \$1 billion, just short of \$1 billion.

My amendment does not impact onshore producing States. If your State is receiving revenue sharing from onshore, my amendment does nothing to change that. It just moves Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, and Alabama a little bit closer to parity. You can look at this graph right here, and you can see that this graph shows that interior States are receiving 50 percent with no dollar cap. Gulf States, less a percentage and with a cap. And all other States have the same percent with no cap.

The House has previously passed a similar version of this amendment twice: once in the PIONEER Act and second on the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, both last year, overwhelmingly with bipartisan support. In fact, the House laid the groundwork for this with the landmark passage of the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act of 2006. This was the first offshore revenue-sharing bill to pass a congressional Chamber, and it did not include an arbitrary cap.

So I ask my colleagues, if you're worried about rising energy prices, I'd recommend a “yes” vote on this amendment. Thirty percent of the Nation's energy comes off the gulf coast. If you're interested in treating Gulf Coast States equally, the way we treat onshore drilling in Federal lands for inland States, I also recommend a “yes.” And if you're interested in the environment, let me just make the case here that by the Louisiana Constitution, 100 percent of the Federal tax revenue that comes from this will go to coastal restoration. That is important to us because every place you see red is a place where we will lose in Louisiana land over the next 50 years. And where you see red, I see families. I see families and businesses which will no longer exist unless we do something proactively to restore those lands.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to tell the gentleman that I support his amendment. I think it adds a great deal to this legislation, and I commend him for it.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his amendment. I think it is the right thing. I think the Gulf Coast States are treated unfairly with the cap. This raises the cap. It's the right thing.

I was talking with a gentleman from an ACC school—I know you're an LSU guy—but he was from Virginia Tech. He said, Go Hokies. I didn't like that, but he understands that Louisiana is treated unfairly when you compare to what is going on in Wyoming where they got a billion dollars last year in revenue.

My State of South Carolina is included in this bill, and they want the revenue-sharing as well. It is the right thing for the States that help produce America's energy. So I commend the gentleman. Let's raise that cap, and let's treat those Gulf Coast States fairly because they are the producers of American energy. And so I commend the gentleman.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition because I can't believe—I am kind of excited that you want to get more money—but I can't believe the Republicans are suggesting that the Treasury of the United States ought to be robbed of another \$11 billion that goes to deficit reduction so it can be spent on the Gulf States because in legislation we just passed we give the Gulf States something no other States get: we give them in law now \$150 billion over the next 60 years in revenue earmarked for the Gulf States. And what this amendment says is that's not enough; we want \$11 billion more. What gall.

□ 1700

Most of us, if we were doing this, would be accused of doing an earmark. And certainly you don't do earmarks anymore in the House of Representatives. So what is it that \$150 billion isn't enough for four States and you need, now, before you even have spent that money, to put into law another \$11 billion?

Could you answer that question?

Mr. CASSIDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. No, you have the time. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. FARR. I will yield to the gentleman for a question. Explain to me what is broken that needs \$11 billion more, right now, with the \$150 billion that you've already been given, or will be given.

Mr. CASSIDY. This is what is broken. This is our coastline, which is melting away. This is what increases our risk. We've lost a land mass equal to Rhode Island in Louisiana.

Now, the money that is received, our share will go to this, but it is not adequate to rebuild this coastline. And the other thing which is broken is—

Mr. FARR. You've lost the coastline why?

Mr. CASSIDY. Because we channeled the Mississippi in order to create navigational services for the rest of the inland nation. And so as you channel that Mississippi, the wetlands lost the nourishing sediment that comes to them.

Mr. FARR. And those are the States that have also instate waters and onshore and offshore drilling?

Mr. CASSIDY. Yes, we do have onshore and offshore drilling, absolutely.

Mr. FARR. Which are very lucrative revenues for the State.

Mr. CASSIDY. If we want to speak about lucrative revenue, all I ask is to have the same deal that every other State has. No, I don't even ask for the same deal that every other State has, because every other State, if they're interior, gets 50 percent of the revenue.

Other coastal States, for example, California, have no cap on the amount

of royalty sharing that they may have with the Federal Government. It is only in the gulf coast that there is a cap.

Now, if you want to have the same deal for our State that other States have, I would love to have the 50 percent that Wyoming has.

Mr. FARR. That's onshore, not offshore. We actually have caps with offshore, and we have banned further offshore drilling, both State and Federal waters.

Mr. CASSIDY. Well, if you decide to cut off your economic nose to spite your face, I can't help that.

Mr. FARR. The Republicans have been very big on deficit reduction and very much against earmarks. And now, with this amendment you're proposing it seems to fly in the face of the policy of your own party that you want to take out of the Treasury \$11 billion that could be applied to deficit reduction and give it to the Gulf States, which already have \$150 billion over the next—in revenue coming to you, earmarked for you. That is far more than California or other States.

Mr. CASSIDY. If I may say, I admire your verbal sleight-of-hand because never in the past has royalty sharing been considered earmarks. But if now we're going to start considering royalty sharing earmarks, heck, let's go back and look at every State. But that is, again, a verbal sleight-of-hand. That is not under the definition of an earmark, and I think the gentleman knows that.

Mr. FARR. Well, I'm on the Appropriations Committee, and if this were brought up in the Appropriations Committee, it certainly would be an earmark. And it is a process that should be in the appropriations process and not added to this bill, where you create an \$11 million earmark for four Gulf States.

Mr. CASSIDY. Assuming that the gentleman continues to yield to me, I would say, in that case, we need to go back to every State which has a better royalty sharing arrangement with the Federal Government than we and ask to reconsider that.

We're not even asking to have the 50 percent on the inland or the no cap on the other coastal States. We're just asking that you raise the cap and keep our revenue sharing royalty percent at the same lower level than it is on the inland. Now, I don't know why we're being singled out when those other States do so well.

Mr. FARR. Well, I think the chair of your committee, Mr. HASTINGS, who knows this, that only about 40 percent of the money that comes in for the Land and Water Conservation account, of the revenue that comes from the offshore drilling, only 40 percent of it is given back to the States for land and water conservation purposes. That other 60 amount just goes into the Treasury. That's where this money goes, and what you're doing is getting something that none of the other States have.

If we want to revise the percentage of money that goes into the Land and Water Conservation Fund, I'm all for that.

Mr. CASSIDY. So, when I spoke to someone from Wyoming today, she goes, Oh, you're only getting 37.5? Wyoming gets 48 percent.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman from Louisiana yield to me for 15 seconds?

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I just want to point out, the gentleman, my good friend from California, is talking about revenue loss.

I just want to make this point: the CBO says this legislation will create \$1.5 billion to the Federal Government.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CASSIDY. How much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) for yielding and for bringing this amendment. I think it's important to point out that this was an arbitrary cap that was put in place based on problems that were really created in the 1950s when initial revenue sharing was done.

For whatever reason, there are various reasons, one State was singled out to not be able to participate in revenue sharing. It just so happens to be the State that produced about 30 percent of the offshore oil and gas. All we're asking for is a little bit closer to fairness.

This amendment's a really important step in the right direction and continues the concept that we've always promoted: to allow States that do participate in producing American energy to also participate in the revenue that's produced to the Federal Treasury. It's an incentive to continue to encourage that kind of American energy exploration.

I support the amendment.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I'll just close by saying—and I'm not sure I understand the logic of my friend on the other side of the aisle—apparently, this is going to increase our Federal revenue by \$1.5 billion. But more importantly, it generates dollars for the State of Louisiana to preserve these, the homes of these families. This allows revenue that has been from our Outer Continental Shelf to come back to preserve this coastline, these families, and these businesses to remain in existence. And that's what this is really about, equity, increased revenue for the Federal Government, and families in Louisiana being able to preserve their existence.

I urge support for our amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113–131.

Mr. CASSIDY. 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:

TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. —. RULES REGARDING DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES UNDER GULF OF MEXICO ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2006.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue rules to provide more clarity, certainty, and stability to the revenue streams contemplated by the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note).

(b) CONTENTS.—The rules shall include clarification of the timing and methods of disbursements of funds under section 105(b)(2) of such Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply stipulates that no later than 60 days after the enactment of H.R. 2231, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue rules to provide clarity, certainty, and stability to the revenue streams we just discussed that were created by GOMESA of 2006.

This Federal law allows the State to use this money for the restoration of coastal areas and the mitigation of damage to natural resources. However, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, formerly MMS, has yet to issue the necessary rules and regulations.

In 2009, a letter signed by the Governors of Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas asked for these rules to be published and recommendations incorporated. It's now 2013, over 6 years since Congress passed in 2006, and the rules have still not been published. The lack of clarity in this phase 2 implementation of GOMESA impedes the ability of Gulf States and eligible coastal political subdivisions to conduct and achieve the planning efforts needed to maximize coastal protection.

It's long overdue for these rules to be published. The amendment is simple. It just directs it to do so. I move for approval of the amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think his amendment again adds a great deal to this legislation. I support the amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, we do not oppose this amendment at this time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113–131.

Mr. RIGELL. 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:

TITLE _____ MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. ____ SEISMIC TESTING IN THE ATLANTIC OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.

Not later than December 31, 2013, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management shall publish a record of decision on the Atlantic G&G Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Statement.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. RIGELL. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 2231, which requires the administration to complete its Atlantic Environmental Impact Statement by December 31 of this year, which will pave the way for us to calculate new estimates of the tremendous energy potential that's off our shores.

□ 1710

It's been 30 years since geological and geophysical studies, including seismic studies, have been conducted in Atlantic waters. Those studies used outdated technology, and our current estimates for the energy that is out there are surely inaccurate. And I believe they're low. For example, we collected five times more oil from the Gulf of Mexico than the government estimated to be there in 1983. The study also will allow us to move forward with a critical com-

ponent of renewable energy—and that's wind.

So for all those reasons, the administration must stay on track here and issue its long-awaited environmental impact statement—and do that on time. And that's what my amendment ensures happens. It should move forward with energy production and, most importantly, job creation, using the best science available.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I think the gentleman's amendment makes a great deal of sense. We've had discussions in our committee on the accuracy of the data.

The point is that this legislation says that one ought to drill where the resources are. And the gentleman's amendment, I think, goes a long way in that direction. I commend him for that and support it.

Mr. RIGELL. I thank the chairman for your leadership on this bill.

I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. I rise in support of the gentleman from Virginia's amendment that sets a deadline for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to complete an environmental review to allow offshore Atlantic seismic studies to go forward. I have joined 42 bipartisan House colleagues urging President Obama to move quickly to complete the environmental analysis.

Unfortunately, the Department of Interior is well over a year behind in completing its work. As you know, delays continue to prevent the creation of thousands of good-paying jobs and around \$19.5 billion in Federal, State, and local revenue.

I'm glad to join with Chairman HASTINGS in support of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. These measures are important for Virginia and this Nation, supporting domestic energy security, revenue sharing, and job creation. This is about jobs, energy independence, and just plain, old common sense. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and this important energy bill.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, March 21, 2013.

HON. BARACK OBAMA,
President of the United States of America,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge that your Administration act to diligently complete the long-delayed Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the conduct of a safe, environmentally protective seismic assessment of the oil and natural gas resources offshore the Atlantic outer continental shelf (OCS). The gathering of such information represents a critical step toward making science-based decisions with regard to any future commercial or recreational activities in the federal waters off our Atlantic coastline that could provide the nation much needed energy, economic, and environmental benefits.

It has been nearly two generations since seismic testing was last conducted along our

eastern seaboard. Since that time, technological advancements have rendered those previous findings nearly irrelevant. For example, while 2-D imaging was restricted by certain geological characteristics, today's 3-D and 4-D imaging techniques allow us to identify resources previously unknown to exist. By relying solely on outdated technology and information, we are blindly assessing offshore resource potential and making uninformed decisions without the benefit of sound science. To further illustrate this point, in 1987 the Minerals Management Service estimated that there were 9.57 billion barrels of oil within the Gulf of Mexico. In 2011, with more recent seismic data and exploration, they adjusted that estimate to 48.4 billion barrels of oil—roughly a 500% increase.

Contrary to the hyperbolic comments of many opposed to this simple information-gathering process, history tells us it can be done safely with great deference to our valuable ocean ecosystems. Industry employs a number of effective mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts to wildlife in the seismic survey areas such as ramping up the sound levels to allow animals to leave the area before the full survey begins and placing marine mammal observers onboard the survey vessel to shut down the survey if an animal is spotted in the vicinity. Industry has been performing seismic surveys around the world, including the Gulf of Mexico, for decades and there has never been a documented case where use of an air gun to perform a seismic survey has caused the death of an animal. Similarly, a report by the National Academy of Sciences' National Research Council stated that "No scientific studies have conclusively demonstrated a link between exposure to sound and adverse effects on a marine mammal population." It is past time to continue your Administration's efforts to safely accumulate this information using modern technology.

As you know, the Department of the Interior (DOI) held an initial scoping meeting on their EIS for Atlantic OCS seismic in April 2010. Previous to that in 2009, the FY 2010 House Interior Appropriations bill instructed DOI to indicate their expected timeline for completion of the EIS. DOI's response in February 2010 indicated a Final EIS being issued in April 2012. With nearly a full year having passed beyond this target date, we would urge the swift completion of this environmental analysis so that the many seismic permits already submitted to DOI may be properly considered, along with any future applications.

Finally, in order to ensure a viable market for Atlantic seismic data, we also urge your reconsideration of current policies prohibiting any new oil and gas leasing in the Atlantic OCS. Only the prospect of future leasing provides proper market incentive to make the significant investments needed to obtain this data.

We thank you for your consideration and hope to quickly move forward on Atlantic seismic testing to enable a science-based decision making process with regard to OCS access.

Sincerely,

Jeff Duncan; Doc Hastings; John Fleming; Steve Scalise; Joe Wilson; Morgan Griffith; Robert Wittman; Doug Lamborn; Rob Bishop; Tom Graves; Randy Forbes; Paul Broun.

Mick Mulvaney; Virginia Foxx; Robert Hurt; Tom Rooney; Frank Wolf; Richard Hudson; Trey Gowdy; Glenn Thompson; Tom Rice; Renee Ellmers; Scott Rigell; Bob Goodlatte; Mark Meadows; Robert Pittenger; Lynn Westmoreland; Bill Cassidy.

Cynthia Lummis; Michael Conaway; Steve Stivers; Kevin Cramer; Henry

Cuellar; Gene Green; Blake Farenthold; Bill Flores; Chris Stewart; Mark Amodei; Tim Huelskamp; Charles Boustany; Bill Johnson; Andy Harris.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2013.

Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WITTMAN: Thank you for your letter dated March 21, 2013, to President Barack Obama expressing your support for the completion of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) to evaluate potential effects of multiple geological and geophysical (G&G) activities in the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). President Obama has asked me to respond. A similar letter is being sent to each co-signer of your letter.

We share your commitment to ensuring that our resource management decisions are based on the best available science. To that end, the information developed from the PEIS will help guide future decision making regarding the resources available on the Atlantic Coast OCS as well as the social, economic, and environmental impacts of developing those resources.

The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) is in the process of preparing a PEIS under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate potential effects of multiple G&G activities in these areas, including seismic surveys using air guns. BOEM was directed to develop this PEIS under the Conference Report for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010.

This PEIS is part of a region-specific strategy for oil and gas exploration and development in the Mid and South Atlantic that focuses on the need to update resource information in order to inform future decisions about whether and, if so, where leasing would be appropriate in these areas. Seismic surveys and other G&G activities being evaluated in this PEIS are valuable to understanding the location, extent, and properties of hydrocarbon resources. G&G surveys are also used to identify geologic hazards, archaeological resources, and hard bottom habitats that would need to be avoided during exploration and development. A variety of G&G techniques in addition to air guns are being evaluated in the study. These techniques are also used to understand the potential to site renewable energy structures and locate marine mineral resources, such as sand and gravel used for beach and barrier island restoration.

In preparing the PEIS, BOEM uses the best available science and works with experts and other regulatory agencies, such as the National Marine Fisheries Service. BOEM has contributed close to \$40 million over the last decade on groundbreaking research to better understand the potential for acoustic impacts to marine life from geophysical sound sources. The BOEM has also conducted several expert stakeholder workshops to discuss and identify information needs on acoustic impacts and reasonable measures to manage and mitigate such effects.

We appreciate your interest in potential seismic exploration in the Mid and South Atlantic OCS waters. Please be assured that completion of this important environmental review remains a high priority for us.

Sincerely,

TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU,
Acting Assistant Secretary—Land
and Minerals Management.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. As part of the Interior Department's 5-year plan, they are preparing to allow companies to re-evaluate the potential oil and gas resources in the Mid- and South Atlantic using seismic and other testing. The Interior Department is currently going through the process of preparing a programmatic environmental impact statement for that testing because they have received nine permit requests for seismic airgun surveys. They have determined that because of the scope of interest, a programmatic EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act is needed prior to permitting any new, large-scale seismic surveys. The programmatic EIS would establish a framework for future NEPA evaluations of site-specific actions while identifying and analyzing mitigation measures for future programmatic use.

Despite the claims of the majority, Mr. Chair, the Interior Department already intends to finish the programmatic EIS by the end of this year. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management Director Beaudreau testified before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee on May 16 of this year that:

In the spring of 2012, BOEM released the draft programmatic environmental impact statement, or PEIS, for proposed geological and geophysical activities in the Mid- and South Atlantic for public comment. The completion of this PEIS is part of a region-specific strategy with respect to oil and gas exploration and development that will focus on the need to update information in order to inform future decisions on whether, and where, leasing would be appropriate. The final PEIS is expected to be published this year.

That's just what Interior said just over 1 month ago. Their intention is to finish this work by the end of this year. But if for some reason Interior needs to complete additional surveys, we should not prevent them from doing so. But that's what this amendment would do. It would potentially short-circuit the NEPA process. We should allow the Interior Department to finish its work to ensure that these activities can occur in a way that does not adversely impact the environment and not tie their hands, as the gentleman would do.

I urge defeat of this amendment that would potentially truncate a proper environmental review, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RIGELL. How much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RIGELL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman's argument. I certainly don't agree with it. The concern that we have—that I have personally—is that the administration's willingness to keep the tempo

and the cadence of this whole process going forward is real. And if I approach this with a great sense of urgency, it's because people are hurting. We need to diversify our local economy. This bill that the underlying bill supports could create 18,000 jobs in the Hampton Roads area of Virginia alone.

I so appreciate the full support that we have, in principle, from Senators WARNER and KAINE on this very issue. This is a commonsense, common ground, overall initiative to grow revenue that we need for better roads and healthier schools in an environmentally responsible way, moving forward with coastal Virginia energy. Our Governor supports it. Our general assembly supports it. Our two U.S. Senators support it, in principle. I ran on it. And it has the support of so many different groups, including the local chapter of the NAACP, the chambers of commerce. It's just a wonderful and, frankly, diverse group of coalitions that has come together to say this is what is best for Virginia and job creation. We need to move forward with this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his arguments. And we have no problem with the underlying process. The question is, why should we truncate this process at this time when important work is now being done by the Department of Interior? We do not object to the Department of Interior going forward. The Department has said in a timely manner they will finish this this year. That is appropriate. It is not necessary at this moment to eliminate the environmental process when in fact we know it's moving forward in a fair and a judicious way. If anything comes up, we need to hear that and understand that for future oil leases.

And so I really request that we urge the defeat of this amendment and allow the proper process to go forward because we do not oppose the underlying theme of the bill but we do oppose the truncation of the process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RIGELL. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. RIGELL. I appreciate the gentleman's argument but my deep concern about the Federal government's real commitment to moving this forward is legitimate. I urge the adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. But the Federal Government does have a commitment in the Department of Interior to finish this in a timely manner. It has just been reported in the past month that they are working at this. They will finish it this year. So notwithstanding the very strong arguments of the gentleman from Virginia, we do not support truncating the environmental review process, and I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. 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 Virginia 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. WITTMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, 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. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1720

NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO SUSPEND DESIGNATION OF BANGLADESH AS A BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-42)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 502(f)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the "1974 Act") (19 U.S.C. 2462(f)(2)), I am providing notification of my intent to suspend the designation of Bangladesh as a beneficiary developing country under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program. Section 502(b)(2)(G) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(b)(2)(G)) provides that the President shall not designate any country a beneficiary developing country under the GSP if such country has not taken or is not taking steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights in the country (including any designated zone in that country). Section 502(d)(2) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(d)(2)) provides that, after complying with the requirements of section 502(f)(2) of the 1974 Act, the President shall withdraw or suspend the designation of any country as a beneficiary developing country

if, after such designation, the President determines that as the result of changed circumstances such country would be barred from designation as a beneficiary developing country under section 502(b)(2) of the 1974 Act.

Pursuant to section 502(d) of the 1974 Act, having considered the factors set forth in section 502(b)(2)(G), I have determined that it is appropriate to suspend Bangladesh's designation as a beneficiary developing country under the GSP program because it is not taking steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights to workers in the country.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 27, 2013.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI) at 6 p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, H-232 U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 27, 2013 at 5:28 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 189.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

OFFSHORE ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2231.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1802

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy ex-

ploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113-131 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113-131 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. FLORES of Texas.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. CASSIDY of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. RIGELL of Virginia.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 233, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—188

Andrews	Clay	Enyart
Barber	Cleaver	Eshoo
Beatty	Clyburn	Esty
Becerra	Cohen	Farr
Bera (CA)	Connolly	Fattah
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Foster
Blumenauer	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Bonamici	Crowley	Fudge
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Gabbard
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Garamendi
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Garcia
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Grayson
Bustos	DeGette	Green, Al
Butterfield	Delaney	Gutiérrez
Capps	DeLauro	Hahn
Capuano	DelBene	Hanabusa
Carney	Deutch	Hastings (FL)
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Heck (WA)
Cartwright	Doggett	Higgins
Castor (FL)	Doyle	Himes
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Hinojosa
Chu	Edwards	Holt
Ciilline	Ellison	Honda
Clarke	Engel	Horsford