

That's the thing that concerns me, because there are no facts about the profits made and the people laid off, other than the fact it was done by the Obama administration.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. QUAYLE).

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today because I support this bill.

And I do have a fact. The fact of the matter is that we have a gas crisis going on right now, and the fact of the matter is, when I go home and I fill up my tank, I cringe at how expensive it is. Our friends on the other side of the aisle, their so-called solution is to increase our taxes and to demagogue oil corporations, because that's the classic bogeyman approach that they go to.

But that is not a solution to get our people back to work, to get our economy moving again, because right now we are having some anemic growth in our economy. And if we start to increase taxes and have an energy increase in costs that is happening at the pump, that is going to have a negative effect on economic growth.

Instead of actually having solutions where we can get the people in the gulf back to work, where we can get our economy moving again, where we can actually tap the energy sources that we have in the United States, we have an administration that only pursues moratoriums on gulf drilling, moratoriums on actually having energy supplies.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman.

If we actually started to look and invest in those sorts of thing and get our energy independence going, we could have charts down on this floor that show job growth.

According to CBO, if we pass today's legislation, we will generate \$800 million in revenue over 10 years. Combined with the energy initiatives that the House passed last week, these three votes will create an estimated 250,000 jobs in the short term and 1.2 million jobs over the long term.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill and get our economy and our American people back to work.

□ 1610

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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. FLEISCHMANN) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL, 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. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective

oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 754, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-75) on the resolution (H. Res. 264) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 257 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. 1231.

□ 1616

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. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes with Mr. CAMPBELL (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, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) had 16½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) had 12½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If enacted, this bill will open up areas of the Outer Continental Shelf where there are the greatest known oil and gas reserves that contain billions of barrels of oil. With resources like these, it is a wonder that we continue to rely on other countries for most of our energy. While the administration is encouraging other countries to produce oil, Americans are unable to access large areas of our own energy supply here.

H.R. 1231 will hold the administration accountable by setting production goals to make sure that we provide enough energy for our country while reducing the dependence on foreign oil. Gas prices have increased by 12.9 cents per gallon in my hometown of Chattanooga, Tennessee, during the last month alone.

Plain and simply, we know that increased oil and natural gas production will drive down gas prices. We should have the ability to access our vast resources at home. Mr. Chairman, we have the means to provide relief for our growing energy deficit, and passage of this bill will be a step towards providing these means for our country.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. BERG).

Mr. BERG. Mr. Chairman, my home State of North Dakota is rich in natural resources, and we have seen tremendous economic opportunity from the Bakken field. Through EMPOWER North Dakota, we were able to adopt a long-term energy plan in our State. It encouraged new energy development; and it created high-paying, high-quality jobs in the energy industry. In fact, today our unemployment rate is the lowest in the Nation.

We can have the same success on the national level, but to do so we need a long-term commonsense plan that is a national energy policy that must work to increase America's energy production, lower gas prices, and ultimately break our dependence on foreign oil.

□ 1620

America's families and small businesses are hurting. Gas prices are over \$4 a gallon. Energy bills are hindering business growth. National unemployment remains a very high 9 percent. There is enormous potential in the gulf for energy development that can help turn our country's problems around. Our addiction to foreign energy is not sustainable. It threatens our national security. It's time to invest our resources that we have here in the United States. We need to lower energy costs and get Americans back to work.

As a member of the House Energy Action Team and a proud North Dakotan, I'm committed to working hard towards a national long-term energy policy. Let's pass this bill, get the gulf back to work and break our dependence on foreign oil.

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

The majority, the sponsors of this bill, say that we need it because supply is dwindling and gasoline prices are climbing and employment is terrible. Well, I'll grant they have got a point on a couple of items here. But it has nothing to do with this legislation. They bring forward a bill to help the oil supply when it is a fact, I say to my colleague, that 79 percent of all of the potential oil reserves as calculated by

the nonpartisan prospectors on the whole Continental Shelf are already under the current leasing program. Sixty million acres. This is indisputable. Sixty million acres offshore are under existing lease and contain 11.5 billion barrels. So this "hurry up and drill" legislation is certainly not necessary for that.

As for employment, I said it before and I'll say it again. It is a fact. During the 5 years previously when the four oil companies took home \$485 billion in profits, their combined American workforce dropped by 10,200 employees. They made money. They laid people off. So we can check that one off, too. It's not about employment.

How about prices? This year's leases have nothing to do with this year's price at the gas pump—or next year's. In fact, not for 20 years. Might it have an effect? Oh, yes, there's a supply problem. The supply problem is that U.S. oil reserves amount to about 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. About 2 percent. My colleagues say, Oh, no, those calculations are wrong. Okay, I'll give you a break. Let's say we're off by a factor of two. How about a factor of three? How about a factor of four? We would still be one of the smallest oil supplies of the oil-producing countries. So this is not about that.

The prices are determined right now at the pump largely by speculation. According to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, speculators increased their energy future contracts—their positions—by 64 percent over the last couple of years, totaling more than a million contracts. They are trading in each day far more paper barrels than barrels of oil are ever delivered. It's speculation, pure and simple. Speculators have moved from holding 30 percent of the open interest in the commodity markets to 70 percent. And you wonder why the prices at the pump are so high. Even Goldman Sachs says that speculation is responsible for many tens of dollars of the hundred dollars a barrel that is now the world price for oil.

Going back a decade, the majority voted to exempt all energy derivatives from CFTC regulations. And then when the Dodd-Frank financial reform bill came along, they opposed the enactment to give the CFTC the power to regulate energy derivatives. They voted to slash the CFTC budget as part of H.R. 1. Right now in the Agriculture Committee and the Financial Services Committee, they are working to block any possibility that the CFTC would put in regulations to limit or reduce speculation.

So if my colleagues want to do something to deal with the high gas prices, I will give them a list of things to do. It is not this bill. We do not need to cut corners. We do not need to deem that inadequate applications for leasing are adequate. We do not need to deem that environmental impact statements that are clearly inadequate are adequate.

We do not need to open up the east coast and west coast to willy-nilly rapid drill prospecting. We certainly do not.

Now, one thing I'll hand my colleagues. They yesterday said we really need to get away from these environmental regulations that are stymying the oil companies, that are making it hard for them to earn their profits, these burdensome environmental regulations. I'll give them one thing. These regulations, the environmental impact statement that was prepared for the drilling in the Gulf of Mexico this year that they want to expand on into the future that has in it a plan for dealing with walrus, because they think that's a really good environmental impact statement that's based on the real world facts—you're right. In the Macondo well in the blowout of the Deepwater Horizon, we didn't lose a single walrus's life.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. In closing, I just repeat, let's live in the real world. Let's deal with the facts. Facts matter. And this bill can have devastating consequences for workers, for those who have to travel by car and buy gasoline, and for those who earn their living fishing and dealing with tourism in the gulf and in New Mexico and in California. Let's not pass another "Amnesia Act." Let's not ignore the spill and drill, baby, drill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. May I ask how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this legislation. I would like Americans to understand that the issue of whether we should drill or not is long overdue because I have heard this argument for 36 years because I was here when we drilled and opened the Trans-Alaska pipeline to provide 17 billion barrels of oil to America—17 billion barrels of oil.

I've heard people say that there's only 2 percent. That is a figure that was arrived at in 1955. We have new estimates with new technology. We think we have about 20 percent of the world's reserves in fossil fuels. And we're not producing them. I've heard the argument this wouldn't change the price of gasoline. It's not quick enough. I heard that 25 years ago.

We need to produce so we have a stable supply of domestic fossil fuels so other countries and speculators don't take advantage. They have us right now in a position they can take advantage of because we are not producing any oil of any consequence in the United States right now. We're down to 600,000 barrels a day in Alaska. If we drop much more, we won't even have that 600,000 barrels a day. Yet we have in Alaska in the Chukchi Sea, there's

been \$5 billion spent to find oil. We have not had the permit to drill because of this administration. They think there's 27 billion barrels of oil in one offshore development. The other one has approximately 14 billion barrels of oil in one offshore development. Of course, we have ANWR, which that side does not support, to a great degree, that has probably 39 billion barrels of oil.

□ 1630

You add up that amount of oil and you have oil that will last this country for a hundred years.

Now, yes, we ought to have other forms of energy. But the Obama administration is trying to force this country into a green energy future. This is a policy. I heard the former Speaker say it. Of course it makes sense to reduce our dependency on oil, as I said before, but no one takes into consideration the impact upon the economy of this Nation.

New Jersey is building an LNG plant to receive gas from overseas. That's well and good, buying foreign gas, when we have trillions of feet of gas in the United States of America.

We are costing not only jobs but the dependency—and everybody talks about the high price of gasoline. It's caused primarily because of spiking. Some little incident in the Middle East—the OPEC countries supposedly have 70 percent of our oil—raises the price of that gasoline. You can't have a model economy and a business and have those spikes. If the price was \$5 across the board and you knew it was going to be \$5 across the board for the next 40 years, you could build your economy on that. But we have gas at \$5 a gallon now, the first of June, and it may go up to \$6 in August. It may be down a little bit. We need to stabilize it. Only we can do this.

But this administration is trying to convert America into their green technology. Technology of wind. Technology of, let's say, solar. Wind power is 17 cents a kilowatt compared to 5 cents for coal. Mr. and Mrs. America, you're paying for that. And again, as I said in one of my statements, this, in fact, is a tax on the American people. This is an Obama tax because of the lack of the cheaper fuel that's necessary to keep our economy running.

The impediments of oil and gas production is another reason, the slowdown of Federal leases. We talk about everything that's leased and permitting offshore and onshore. Only six permits have been issued since the Gulf of Mexico, the time the BP spill happened—six permits. Leasing in the Gulf of Mexico coast has been delayed for several years. Offshore permitting for oil and gas has been slowed down to a real slow crawl.

America, I keep telling you, you are being taxed by an administration that does not understand the necessity for fossil fuels for our economy. The movement of product, the receiving of product and the shipping of product, the deliverance of people, the deliverance of

supplies by air, ship, plane, train, automobile, and truck. That's what makes this country great.

And here we sit with a group that says, oh, we're going to save the environment. I'm all for that. But you don't have an energy policy and you can't have it off fossil fuels. Anybody who says we're going to have one off fossil fuels is not even thinking about fuels, not even thinking about energy. You can't do it with wind power. We might get a little wind power if we put a propeller on the top of this Capitol to collect all the hot air that comes out of here most of the time. That might work. But we're not going to do it with solar power. You need all the forms of energy. And this administration so far has not promoted anything but the two most expensive: wind and solar.

We need our fossil fuels. We need to make sure the agencies under this administration make sure that we develop our energies, or we cannot go anywhere. And if they can't do it, then it's up to this Congress. This Congress, this bill, this legislation, and the two previous bills are a step forward, a necessary step for this Nation. We need to keep going. So employ Americans and quit buying foreign oil. You talk about being hooked on dope, that's what we are. We're hooked on foreign oil. Yet we have people that say we can't develop our own oil, we can't develop our own resources, that it will hurt somebody, somebody will be harmed and we can't do it.

That's not true. We can do it. In the gulf there were 41,000 wells drilled without a spill. Add one spill and everybody thinks the world came to an end. It was bad, yes. Do we learn from it? Yes, as we did with Exxon Valdez. We learned from that and we will improve upon that. But not to let them drill, not to let them produce that oil, not to let them help America out, not employ Americans, that is dead wrong.

So I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation and reject the amendments that are going to be offered. They are not the amendments they should be.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1231. I had offered amendments because I believe in responsible increase in offshore drilling. I offered amendments to improve upon this bill that would have provided for revenue sharing with coastal states and a study and report back to Congress to ensure that the Department of Interior has proper funding for staffing and training and technical engineers and such other personnel as is necessary to responsibly increase offshore drilling.

As a Representative from an oil and gas producing District and state, I am aware that offshore drilling is an important component of the nation's energy supply and provides many Gulf communities with significant jobs and income.

My state supplies 20 percent of the nation's oil production, one-third of the nation's natural gas production; a quarter of the nation's refining capacity and nearly 60 percent of the nation's chemical manufacturing.

The Texas energy and petrochemical clusters employ 600,000 people, which represent

70 percent and 15 percent, respectively, of the total U.S. workforce in those industries.

Houston is home to some of the world's largest oil, gas, and petrochemical facilities.

As the fourth most populous city in the United States, and the greater Houston area remains a diversified regional economy, with the energy industry contributing 50 percent of our economic base for employment. Even so there is no denying the importance of the energy industry for creating jobs in Houston and across our Nation.

We have consistently led the nation in petroleum production since the early 10th century and we have one-fourth of total U.S. oil reserves.

As a coastal state we provide the resources and the mechanisms to support the offshore drilling industry and we also bare the highest risk to our natural resources. Its stands to reason that we should also have access to revenue generated from Offshore leases.

Federal Revenues from offshore leases were estimated at \$18.0 billion in FY 2008 by the Department of the Interior. During the previous 10 years (1998–2007), revenues from federal OCS leases reached as high as \$7.6 billion in FY 2006. Higher prices for oil and gas are the most significant factors in the revenue swings. Of the \$18.0 billion offshore revenue in FY 2008, \$8.3 billion was from royalties and \$9.5 billion came from bonus bids. Coastal states can use that money to further support the industry that utilizes our highways and waterways.

A significant portion of oil and gas produced from Gulf Outer Continental Shelf leases is transported to those refineries for processing via offshore pipeline through state waters.

Providing coastal states with additional access to revenue will enable these states to protect their natural resources and advance the transport of oil, gas, and petrochemicals across the United States.

Coastal States like Texas with energy development off their shores in federal waters have been seeking additional federal revenues generated off our shores.

We particularly want more assistance for coastal areas that may be most affected by onshore and near-shore activities that support offshore energy development.

Currently, the affected states receive revenue indirectly from offshore oil and gas leases in federal waters. This is in contrast to the direct revenues to states that have onshore federal leases within their boundaries.

Coastal states bear the greatest risks if there is a disaster. Because of the current and wind patterns in the Gulf of Mexico, Texas' coastal natural resources are most at risk for environmental damage in the event of an oil spill from an offshore production platform or pipeline. In addition, a substantial portion of federal Outer Continental Shelf production is refined in Texas and then transported via state highways or pipeline located in the state.

A significant amount of the infrastructure that will be used to explore and develop the resources in these new lease sales will be constructed in Texas and transported through state waters. The same might be said for other coastal states whose shores and resources are dedicated to offshore drilling.

Annual rental rates are \$5–\$9.50 per acre, with lease sizes generally ranging from 2,500–5,760 acres. However, annual rental rates for the March 2009 sale in the Central Gulf of

Mexico begins at \$11.00 per acre for lease in water depths over 200 meters. Initial lease terms of 5–10 years are standard, and leases continue as long as commercial quantities of hydrocarbons are being produced.

Demand for petroleum products in the U.S. remains strong. In 2005, each of the estimated 296 million people in the U.S. used an average of almost three gallons of petroleum every day. In 1978, the average American used 3.5 gallons per day.

In 2006, crude oil imports totaled 10.1 million barrels per day (MBD), two-thirds of the total U.S. supply of 15.2 MBD, according to the Energy Information Administration (EIA) of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). After several additions of other petroleum products by refiners and fuel blenders, total petroleum consumption came to 20.6 MBD for 2006.

The oil and gas industry supports job growth in my state of Texas and across our nation.

In Texas, the oil and gas industry supports 1.7 million jobs and approximately 25 percent of the state's economy, whereas nationwide the industry supports 9.2 million jobs and 7.5 percent of our nation's economy.

We should focus our attention on providing the Department of Interior with funding and resources it needs to provide for training and staffing of technical engineers and other such necessary personnel to review drilling permit applications and determine future offshore lease sale areas.

The Department of Interior must be properly funded and staffed with technical engineers to review permits, examine lease sales, and ensure that each application is afforded proper consideration.

For these reasons, I urge the Members as they vote on this important measure which certainly relates to job creation and national energy independence, that they consider a fair and balance approach as we aim to protect the environment and determine the most responsible measures to provide for the energy our nation requires.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1231. This bill will ensure that our federal offshore oil and natural gas resources are accessible to us. This is essential for America's energy security.

For years, I have supported bills that would increase funding to research and development projects dealing with new and cleaner energy sources as well as provide financial incentives to produce energy from wind, solar, biomass, and geothermal, for consumers to purchase fuel efficient vehicles, increase energy efficiency standards for buildings and appliances, and promote public transit efforts. I will continue to support programs and projects seeking to create cleaner energy technologies because we all benefit from a cleaner environment.

Finally, coming from Texas, which is the nation's leader in renewable energy production and a pioneer in developing its own state portfolio standard, I support efforts to promote renewable energy production that meets the unique circumstances and resources of each state.

But even with these increases in renewable energy, the Energy Information Administration found that oil, natural gas, and coal will continue to make up the large majority of U.S. energy use in 2030 and beyond. As our nation's energy demand continues to increase, reasonable access and exploration of our offshore resources is a key component of our nation's energy security.

It is our job to provide affordable and reliable supplies of energy to American consumers, and this bill will help in our effort.

For these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in the bill is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 1231

*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 "Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act".

#### SEC. 2. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM.

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:

"(4)(A) In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall make available for leasing and conduct lease sales including—

"(i) 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; and

"(ii) 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.

"(B) 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.

"(5)(A) In the 2012–2017 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 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. 3. 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) 2012–2017 PROGRAM GOAL.—For purposes of the 2012–2017 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the production goal referred to in paragraph (1) shall be an increase by 2027 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."

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112–74. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only 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. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, as a designee of Chairman DOC HASTINGS, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 10, strike "(4)" and insert "(5)".

Page 4, line 6, strike "(5)" and insert "(6)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment that corrects a drafting error in the bill that was discovered by the legislative counsel after H.R. 1231 was reported from the committee with bipartisan support.

The amendment changes the paragraph numbers in section 2 so they correctly reflect the sequence of appearance in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection and we urge swift passage.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 12, insert " , except in locations that would interfere, conflict with, or impede operations of the Armed Forces," after "conduct lease sales".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this simple amendment clarifies that any expanded oil production will not interfere with ongoing operations by the Armed Forces of the United States.

I appreciate Congressman BOBBY SCOTT and Congressman JIM MORAN for their cosponsorship of this amendment. There are no stronger advocates for the military in my State than those two gentlemen.

□ 1640

As you know, the United States has more than two dozen coastal naval bases, including those located in Virginia, Washington, California, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Maryland, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maine, and Hawaii.

The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Readiness published a report, noting that many of these potential locations for oil exploration could and might conflict with DOD operations in these locations. For example, DOD has surface/subsurface operating areas and DOD special use airspace/warning areas off every coastal State in the continental United States.

You can see from this map that there are the red dots where they actually have bases and that the spiderwebs are where they have operations offshore.

These areas are important because the military uses some of these areas for surface and subsurface training as well as practice with live ordnance. Oil wells and live ordnance don't mix so well. For example, the Norfolk Naval Base in my home State of Virginia uses 78 percent of the proposed Lease Sale 220 area right now for training and live ordnance practice. The Navy wants to

ensure that oil drilling in that area does not interfere with live ordnance release and impact, including air to surface bombing; sensitive undersea and surface operations; combined shipboard systems qualification trials; and equipment testing and evaluation.

Norfolk is America's largest naval base and is a major driver of our State's annual \$10 billion government contracting economy. It would be difficult to quantify how many billions of dollars taxpayers have spent building and maintaining these military installations all around the continental United States, but relocation costs would be substantial, and we don't have that money.

My friend from Alaska talks about putting people out of work or putting people into work. Believe me, if we had to close or relocate these bases, there would be a lot of weeping and mashing of teeth in the unemployment line all across America. The costs wouldn't just be borne by the taxpayers, Mr. Chairman, but also by the servicemen and -women who would have to relocate, and by the tens of thousands of contractor employees who rely on the DOD.

Perhaps it's possible to co-locate oil drilling infrastructure in areas now used by the Navy or other components of the Armed Forces. In that case, this amendment would not get in the way of the oil exploration. This amendment simply ensures that any additional oil drilling which takes place in accordance with this bill will not conflict with the national security operations of the Armed Forces.

I am sure that energy development and national security can be mutually reinforcing and compatible, and I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would support this common-sense amendment to protect our national defense and national security. I know we can all agree that preserving those should be paramount as we consider changes to our Nation's energy policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Both the Outer Continental Lands Shelf Act and the 2003 National Defense Act already fully protect the Defense Department's responsibilities in the Outer Continental Shelf and the State coastal areas of the OCS. H.R. 1231 continues these protections.

As Chairman HASTINGS stated last week during debate on a very similar amendment to H.R. 1230, preserving the working relationship between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior is of great importance to the Natural Resources Committee. Because of this, H.R. 1231 meets the mutual goals of balancing national security and energy independence, but

this amendment would upset the balance.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense never notified, never talked to us about any opposition to this legislation.

H.R. 1231 fully supports the Department of the Interior's work with the Department of Defense in addressing the necessary stipulations that will protect the military mission on the OCS during the development of lease sales.

I also want to point out that gaining access to domestically available and affordable energy resources is also of paramount importance to our national security because it lessens our dependence on foreign sources of energy. Let me say that again. It must be very clear: Energy security and energy independence are a national security priority.

Additionally, developing our own energy resources benefits the Department of Defense. According to the Brookings Institution, every \$10 increase in the price of a barrel of oil increases the cost of Defense operations by \$1.3 billion. Lowering energy prices should be a priority for American consumers and for the Department of Defense.

This amendment isn't truly aimed at protecting DOD activities. It's aimed at trying to block lease sales and stopping offshore energy and development. That's what this is about. So I congratulate the people who are offering this amendment. It's exactly what you'd like to do.

Again, Defense activities are not hindered by energy development. The Departments of Defense and the Interior work well together to balance the needs of our Nation. H.R. 1231 allows both offshore energy leasing and military activities to go forward and exist in a safe, responsible way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I would just say to my friend from Alaska that I won't have anybody questioning my sincerity about trying to protect the national security interests of the United States of America. I come from a State with a long military tradition. I am proud of that tradition, and I am here sincerely to protect national security. If we want to disagree with that, that's fine, but questioning the motivations of whether there is another agenda is a different matter.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield the balance of my time to my distinguished colleague from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. May I ask the Chair how much time is remaining?

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

Mr. MORAN. I thank the Chair, and I thank my good friend from Virginia.

I would remind my good friend from Alaska that the U.S. Atlantic Fleet is based at the Norfolk Naval Base, and operates in the same waters that this legislation proposes to sell for oil and gas development. Filling this area with drilling rigs is a bad idea.

Now, we have been told verbally and in writing that there should be no lease sales in 72 percent of this lease area because it's in direct conflict with the operations of the Navy. Five percent, in addition, would interfere with aerial operations and should not host permanent surface structures like drilling rigs. There is another 1 percent that would have site-specific stipulations. Then you're left with 22 percent, and much of that 22 percent is dedicated to the shipping lanes for the country's two busiest commercial ports: Hampton Roads and Baltimore.

There are other areas offshore, I'm sure, that are also important to the Armed Forces, but we are responsible for Virginia. We know the situation there. We are not going to jeopardize those jobs. I would say that national security interests ought to trump oil and gas development.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. May I inquire of the time remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alaska has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia's time has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. It's unnecessary and boy if we can't get the government to work together there is something wrong, something deadly wrong. This is about defense. This is about the department of enter, this is about the American people. We ought to be able to work together and I'm sure they can. I'm confident of it and the idea that this is going to hurt the mission is again a way to stop drilling. That's all it is. Maybe if we had that 23 percent open and we knew exactly where it was we might be able to drill there but I don't think they would support that either.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" on this amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY.

This amendment would prohibit offshore lease sales from going forward if those leases would interfere or impede the operations of the United States Armed Forces.

I represent the Hampton Roads region of Virginia, which is home to the world's largest Naval Base at Norfolk. Our Navy trains extensively off the coast of my state in the Virginia Capes Operations Area. A significant section of a proposed lease sale for drilling off Virginia's coast is within this important military training zone.

There are nearly 30 coastal naval installations in the United States and the Defense Department has expressed concerns that offshore oil and gas development could hinder the military's ability to train in many of these offshore areas.

I have long had reservations about drilling off the coast of Virginia. I believe the environmental, economic and national security risks for drilling off the coast of Virginia far outweigh any benefits. This amendment would simply ensure that offshore oil and gas development will not disrupt these vital functions to our national defense.

I urge my colleagues to support the Connolly Amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112–74.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

“(7) ELIGIBILITY FOR NEW LEASES AND THE TRANSFER OF LEASES.—

“(A) ISSUANCE OF NEW LEASES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, beginning with the 2012–2017 5-year program, the Secretary of the Interior shall specify that the Secretary will not accept bids on any new leases offered pursuant to this Act from a person described in paragraph (2) unless the person has renegotiated each covered lease with respect to which the person is a lessee, to modify the payment responsibilities of the person to require the payment of royalties if the price of oil and natural gas is greater than or equal to the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

“(ii) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person referred to in clause (i) is a person that—

“(I) is a lessee that—

“(aa) holds a covered lease on the date on which the Secretary considers the issuance of the new lease; or

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

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

“(iii) MULTIPLE LESSEES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of clause (1), if there are multiple lessees that own a share of a covered lease, the Secretary may implement separate agreements with any lessee with a share of the covered lease that modifies the payment responsibilities with respect to the share of the lessee to include price thresholds that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

“(II) TREATMENT OF SHARE AS COVERED LEASE.—Beginning on the effective date of an agreement under subclass (I), any share subject to the agreement shall not constitute a covered lease with respect to any lessees that entered into the agreement.

“(B) TRANSFERS.—A lessee or any other person who has any direct or indirect inter-

est in, or who derives a benefit from, a covered lease shall not be eligible to obtain by sale or other transfer (including through a swap, spinoff, servicing, or other agreement) any new lease made available in an oil and gas leasing program under this section, or the economic benefit of such a new lease, unless the lessee or other person has—

“(i) renegotiated each covered lease with respect to which the lessee or person is a lessee, to modify the payment responsibilities of the lessee or person to include price thresholds that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)); or

“(ii) entered into an agreement with the Secretary to modify the terms of all covered leases of the lessee or other person to include limitations on royalty relief based on market prices that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

“(C) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

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

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

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

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

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

“(iii) NEW LEASE.—The term ‘new lease’ means a lease issued in a lease sale under this Act.

“(iv) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Interior.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the first quarter of this year, the oil companies were actually able to make \$35 billion in profits; but in my amendment, we are able to say to them, because of a flaw in leases in the 1990s which required them to pay no royalties on public lands—taxpayers’ lands—for oil they’re drilling for right now and charging \$100 a barrel, \$4 a gallon at the pump, that we think there is something wrong when the taxpayers don’t get anything back.

□ 1650

And so what my amendment says is that they can’t apply for any more leases on taxpayers’ land unless they’re willing to renegotiate the mistaken leases that were given to them that, by the way, will allow them to escape having to pay \$53 billion in taxes, in royalties. That’s another word for taxes, “royalties.” When you’re talking about

oil, “royalties” is the word we use to describe taxes.

This blank check to the oil industry is absolutely undeserved. The Republican approach to offshore oil royalty policy is to treat the Big Oil companies like royalty and to treat the consumers and taxpayers like peasants. They’re just going to give away all these breaks to the oil industry.

You know, Prince William and Kate Middleton just left on their honeymoon. Their royalty honeymoon is just beginning. But for the oil companies who are drilling for free on public land, they have a royalty honeymoon that has been going on for way too long, and today, we’re going to give the Members of the House a chance to end the honeymoon on the royalties that the oil industry has to pay.

Now, what are the Republicans going to do? They’re going to oppose it. They’re going to say, no, we need more tax breaks, \$4 billion worth of tax breaks, for the oil industry. And so where are they going to find the money for those additional tax breaks that they want to give to the oil industry? Well, they looked around and they decided that the best place to find it was in Medicare, that is, in the health care that we give to Grandma and Grandpa. And so what they have done is they’ve set up a drilling rig for the oil industry on top of the Medicare program so they can drill into the pockets of Grandma and Grandpa to find the \$4 billion in tax breaks, and then on top of that, protect them against having to pay the royalties, the taxes on where they’re already drilling for free on taxpayers’ land in our country.

Now, that’s an unbelievable combination, and they do it while cutting the renewables budget by 70 percent. Can you believe this? It’s 2011. The Republicans have already passed a bill cutting the renewables budget—wind and solar, biomass, geothermal—by 70 percent, and they’re setting up an oil rig on top of the Medicare program of Grandma and Grandpa to drill for even more tax breaks for the oil industry. This is just an unbelievable debate that we’re having.

And they say over here, “Well, you know, we’re the all of the above party; we want to do it all.” But the truth is that they’re really the oil above all party, and that’s what this debate is all about, how can we get even more for the oil industry.

So what my amendment will do is to just give people an opportunity to reclaim that \$53 billion from the oil industry and give it to Grandma. Of all the people who don’t need a break, a subsidy this year, it’s the oil industry. You know who needs a break? You know who needs a subsidy? It’s Grandma. Let’s not cut Medicare. Let’s not cut her health care in order to help the oil industry. Vote “aye” for the Markey amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I rise in opposition to the amendment.



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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. With all due respect to Grandma and Grandpa, there's no Grandma and Grandpa that has Medicare taken away from them or anywhere else. That's pure demagoguery on this floor, and we know that, tied into the oil companies.

It's ironic to me, this House has debated and voted on this amendment over the years. They've defeated it by a bipartisan vote. Just like a bad penny, it keeps showing up and the Big Oil is all bad. All I know, the American public is being taxed every year, \$1,100 every year by this administration's high gas prices.

Let's review the facts. The Deepwater Royalty Relief Act leases were issued by, oh, boy, Bill Clinton and Bruce Babbitt in 1996 and 2000. Oh, my good Lord, it was the Republicans that did all this. They're the ones that issued these leases, and those who hold these leases have repeatedly been successful in challenging the Interior Department's authority to include price thresholds in lease agreements. The Department of the Interior has lost at the Federal district court, the appellate court, the United States Supreme Court, and now we're going to interfere with a court decision?

If this amendment passes, those holding such leases will be required to renegotiate the lease terms with DOI to include price thresholds before getting new leases. Bill Clinton would turn over—no, he's not in his grave, so I can't say that. The Secretary does not—and I repeat does not—have the authority to include price thresholds on these leases. In addition, forcing companies to renegotiate the leases would be a violation of contract law and would be challenged in court.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that just comes out of where, I don't know. It's a time to demagogue on the floor about Medicare. It has nothing to do with oil leases. It has nothing to do with the so-called tax breaks that Bill Clinton and Bruce Babbitt put in place. George Bush wasn't there. Mr. Obama wasn't there. Bill Clinton did this.

Lo and behold, somebody has to renegotiate something. Let's start renegotiating contracts all over the countryside. Maybe we ought to start doing that. Some of the contracts made, and I think we did this the last election, their contracts were terminated.

I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Could the Chair tell me how much time we have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Alaska has 2½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Alaska has the right to close.

Mr. MARKEY. We have a big choice here. We can reclaim \$53 billion from the oil and gas industry that they owe to the American taxpayer and put it

into wind and solar and all-electric vehicles and the revolution that we need to transform our country's relationship with OPEC. We should be able to tell OPEC, We don't need your oil any more than we need your sand.

This is a chance here to reclaim the \$53 billion in windfall profits by escaping royalties that the oil industry owes, and put it into a new technology innovation agenda that talks about the future of wind and solar and electric vehicles that will transform our relationship with the rest of the planet.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' comments, but wind power is subsidized energy. That's all it is. Wind power is subsidized by the taxpayer. Solar power is subsidized by the taxpayer. To try to transform this country into using wind and solar by raising the cost of gasoline to the American consumer is dead wrong. That's not the way to solve this problem.

I will support wind power when it's not subsidized. I will support solar power when it's not subsidized, and I will support nuclear power when we can, which the gentleman's opposed every time, and I will support hydro-power. In fact, I will support all forms of power so we can become more independent, and I go back to the concept of fossil fuels. It moves objects. It moves objects. Wind power doesn't move objects, no. Solar power doesn't move objects, no. It takes fossil fuels to run our ships, our planes, our automobiles, our trucks, and our trains. That's the commerce of this Nation, and that's what's hurting this Nation today in the recovery.

We have to start producing our own fossil fuels so we can have the commerce that's necessary to employ people and create the jobs in this country. In this country, it should be done. Yes, we can have the other forms of power, but we have to have the fossil fuels to continue hopefully the recovery of this country economically.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112-74.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

“(7) DATA REGARDING BONUSES PROVIDED TO EXECUTIVES.—In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall include requirements under which the Secretary shall make available to the public data provided by each lessee under the program with respect to the bonuses provided to the executives of the lessee from the most recent quarter.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

I rise to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 1231. As our constituents see soaring gas prices, oil companies have revealed record profits. The top five multinational oil companies earned over \$1 trillion in the past decade. These firms are eating up more and more of our constituents' paychecks.

And where is it going? Only a small portion of the profits are reinvested back into the company to pave the way for efficiencies and research into alternatives to oil. Rather, oil companies are providing bumps to stockholders and high bonuses to their company executives, a pat on the back for high prices at the pump.

My amendment would provide transparency to the U.S. taxpayer. The amendment requires the Secretary to disclose the executive bonuses for any company that is given a drilling lease.

The time is now to hold the largest oil companies accountable, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment in order to provide transparency back to the American taxpayer.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, when I first saw this amendment, I was wondering if we were debating financial services legislation here on the floor. Clearly, this amendment attempts to raise issues outside the realm of today's debate on increasing American-made energy and creating jobs.

The Department of the Interior should spend its time focusing on reviewing permits, conducting environmental safety reviews, protecting our resources and leasing offshore areas that are most prospective for oil and natural gas production. The Department shouldn't have dozens of employees sitting around reading companies' Securities and Exchange Commission filings and assembling a list of which executives got what bonus.

The information that this amendment would burden the Interior Department with gathering and publishing is already publicly disclosed. It should be made public, and that's why it already is. This amendment is not about openness and transparency of disclosing information. That's already the law.

The real effect of this amendment is duplicative requirements and government waste. Let's get away from the political games and gotcha amendments. Let's allow the Department of the Interior to focus on OCS safety, environmental protection and leasing, and leave the bonuses to the Securities and Exchange Commission officials studying that. I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in terms of the relevancy to this debate, I would take this time, in the spirit of bipartisanship, to thank the Rules Committee for allowing this amendment and, thus, I agree with them that this is relevant to this debate.

I would like to comment on one more thing. My friend from Alaska brought up the point of a burden. The burden that exists right now is the burden that's being borne right on the gas pumps of the people in my district, in his district, and the people in the United States of America. That is the burden that working families are undergoing, the suffering that they are undertaking as they pay over \$4 a gallon for gasoline in my district. Transparency and accountability are necessary, though the people who are beholden to the price spikes know where their money is going.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The question I ask is, How much would this cost the Department of the Interior? Would this take away from safety inspections? And to my good friend from Massachusetts, the burden is going to get worse. You are going to be paying about \$5 a gallon by the first of June; if not, maybe a little bit later, but not later than the Fourth of July. And the burden is something that bothers me a great deal.

But in Massachusetts alone, not one time has any one of your Members in the Congress ever voted to produce energy, other than wind power and solar power. And that doesn't drive your constituents' automobiles. That doesn't drive your trucks that deliver your products to the restaurants or the hospitals. That doesn't drive that train that people ride to try to get automobiles off the road. It doesn't drive the ships to bring the products to your shores. Fossil fuel is the key to our commerce; and we should recognize that in this Congress. And we should develop an energy plan that includes everything. You can't do it with just wind power. You can't do it with solar power. But you can do it with all powers.

That's what's wrong with this Congress and this administration and, yes, previous administrations: they don't grasp the necessity of having more power available to increase the economy of this country. And we're on the cusp right now. I believe this bill will help us. If it does not help us, then shoot me another solution. I have not seen one on that side of the aisle.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112-74.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, strike the closing quotation marks and second period at line 19, and after line 19 insert the following:

“(7) WORST-CASE CONTAINMENT AND CLEAN-UP PLAN REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall include, in each 5-year oil and gas leasing program, a requirement that each applicant for a permit to drill under a lease issued in a lease sale under the program must include a plan for containment and clean-up of a worst-case oil and gas discharge scenario in activities conducted under the permit, if issued.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

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

Last summer, we all saw the painfully disorganized and ineffective response to the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. The frustration was palpable across our country. During that tragedy, it was clear that BP and the Federal Government had no plan to contain the oil spill and that BP lacked the capacity to respond to a spill of that magnitude.

The amendment that I am offering today is very straightforward and simple, one that seeks to implement the lessons learned from the events of last summer. My amendment would require that all applicants for a drilling permit under a lease sold under H.R. 1231 submit a plan for containment and clean-up of a worst-case scenario oil or gas spill.

This amendment does not limit drilling. It says simply and sensibly that

when we drill, we should have a plan in place before an accident occurs. We shouldn't wait until a disaster like last year's 3-month-long spill has already begun. There wasn't a person I spoke to who wasn't horrified by the devastating oil spill in the gulf. I believe that the American people want us to learn from that environmental and economic tragedy, and this amendment helps us accomplish that. When we drill, we should have a plan for dealing with possible disaster.

Some have argued that we don't need a law because initial steps are being taken at the agency level or by oil and gas companies. Some have said that requiring a worst-case-scenario plan is anti-drilling or anti-jobs. We shouldn't get distracted from the simple truth of this amendment: when we drill, we should have a plan. We have seen the consequences of not having a plan, and it was lost jobs.

□ 1710

This amendment is pro-jobs. Requiring oil and gas companies to have a plan in place will not prevent the creation of a single oil and gas job, but it will protect fishing jobs and tourism jobs instead of asking us to put those jobs at risk should a spill occur.

Our constituents deserve to know that we have required oil and gas companies to plan for the worst. Opposing this amendment irresponsibly denies the tragic events of last summer.

For the sake of our economy, our environment, and our coastal jobs, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, simple amendment requiring oil and gas companies to have a plan. Join me in demonstrating to our constituents that we have learned from the events of last summer, and we are taking steps to prevent such a disaster in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, here again is another amendment that is redundant, but let's call it what it is: It's an obstruction.

The Department of the Interior already requires that applicants must calculate worst case discharge before approving a permit. On June 18, 2010, the Department of the Interior issued a notice to lessees outlining the information requirements and standards to be met before a permit would be approved. In the notice it is required that a lessee “describe the assumptions and calculations that you used to determine the volume of your worst case scenario.”

It's already required on permit applications today, and is further reiterated by the language in H.R. 1229, which passed the House earlier today.

The minority continues to try to divert attention away from the real issue of increasing energy production, creating jobs, lowering energy costs, and



improving national security by lessening our dependence on foreign oil.

In fact, it seems that the Democrats simply do not want to face the fact that this bill says we can move forward with an aggressive program of responsible oil and gas development while, at the same time, ensuring that increased safety measures are undertaken. These are not mutually exclusive goals.

Republicans want to make U.S. offshore drilling the safest in the world, and it is the safest in the world, so we can produce more American energy, create American jobs and strengthen our national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. I thank my colleague for bringing this issue up. The June 18 notice to lessees is a great first step toward having worst case scenario containment and cleanup plans. But a notice to lessees is not the same as legislation. It is not intended to set policy, and it is not intended to have the force of law, which is why I am offering this amendment today.

We need Federal laws, not notices, that require companies to submit worst case scenario oil spill containment and cleanup plans to ensure that another spill like the BP spill never happens again. Our constituents deserve to know that we have required oil and gas companies to plan for the worst, or give them an honest reason why we think no such plan is necessary, given the events last summer.

If the majority agrees that we should have a plan, they should support this amendment. It simply requires that oil and gas companies have a plan, nothing more. It is about drilling safely, it protects jobs, oil and gas jobs, tourism and fishing jobs. And again, as I said, if the majority agrees that we should have a plan, they should support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I can only say that, to my knowledge, there's little chance of any oil drilling off the coast of Massachusetts. But there is a great possibility off the coasts of Florida, Virginia, Alaska, California, and this bill really sets out which areas should be drilled, not in large massive areas, but specifically.

I personally will tell you, if I could drill in Alaska, offshore, which we should be able to do, but this administration has delayed a permit for 5 years—5 years. Five billion dollars put into investment to develop that field. It can't be done because of this administration.

This bill tries to expedite that process for the good of this Nation and for the good of the people, not the good of the oil companies, because we need that oil.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. TSONGAS. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112-74.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

“(7) MAKING MORATORIUM IN THE EASTERN GULF OF MEXICO PERMANENT.—The Secretary shall not make available for leasing in any oil and gas leasing program under this section any area referred to in section 104(a) 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).”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer to H.R. 1231 an amendment that would make the current ban on drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico permanent. This amendment would not have any effect on the budget as scored by the Congressional Budget Office. However, it would have a significant impact on the economy of Florida, given that the State's tourist industry will be protected from future oil spills which could destroy our beautiful beaches and coastal areas. Certainly, Florida's coastline is a treasure, not just for Floridians but for all Americans and people throughout the world. For years, the Florida delegation has worked together to protect our coastline and natural resources, and as long as those rigs are in this area, the potential for devastation to Florida beaches persists.

If an accident was to occur causing oil to wash ashore and to Florida beaches, both the environmental and the economic damage would be devastating to the State. And following the disaster off of Louisiana's gulf coast last year, we saw a quick glimpse of what could happen to Florida's economy in the event of an oil spill.

I toured the region by helicopter last year and witnessed the devastation firsthand. That said, before any new areas are opened and Florida's pristine beaches are put at risk, I would very much like to see drilling in the areas that are already open and increased funding for research for new technology.

I strongly believe that any drilling off of Florida's gulf coast would be ex-

tremely deterrent to the State economy and ecosystem. As we saw in the BP oil spill last year in the Gulf of Mexico, wherein 11 workers died and an estimated 5 million barrels of crude oil poured into the Gulf of Mexico, the risks of drilling oil off of Florida's shores bring about extreme risk to our State in an already depressed economy, and with unemployment in the State of Florida still hovering at 11 percent, the last thing we need is to endanger nearly 1 million tourist-related jobs and the \$60 billion tourist industry in the Sunshine State.

Drilling off the coast of Florida is a misguided miscalculation. The risk of danger to the environment and the economy greatly outweighs any potential benefits. I would very much like to see increased drilling in areas already open and increased funding for research for new technology.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. The underlying bill is focused on opening the Outer Continental Shelf to safe and responsible energy production. This bill aims to fulfill the promise that both Democrats and Republicans made to the American people when we voted in a bipartisan basis in 2008 to lift the moratoria on offshore energy production.

Since taking office, President Obama and his administration has effectively reimposed the moratorium. This bill would reverse his actions.

In December 2006, a majority of the House and the Florida delegation voted in favor of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, a bipartisan compromise that opened a portion of the western and central gulf but maintained the eastern planning area moratoria until 2022.

□ 1720

This amendment seeks to go backwards and single-handedly undo that agreement to close off forever the possible energy production in a portion of the Gulf of Mexico. This is exactly the wrong direction for America to be heading.

Congress should not foreclose the possibility of future energy production. This is especially true in the eastern planning area of the gulf, which the Department of the Interior believes contains technically recoverable resources in the amount of 4 billion barrels of oil and over 21 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Let's be clear, the area in the eastern gulf covered by this amendment is currently under moratorium until 2022. That is over a decade from now. This bill does not propose to change the 2022 date.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. More than 20 years after the Exxon Valdez oil spill,

we have yet to clean up Prince William Sound in Alaska. Oil is still being found buried in sand from the BP oil spill.

The frequent occurrence of extreme weather that the eastern gulf coast experiences, including hurricanes and severe storms, could easily produce an oil spill, even with the technological improvements in oil and natural gas operations. Storms along the gulf coast in 2005 caused 124 oil spills in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico, Hurricane Katrina caused a 233,000 gallon oil spill, and Hurricane Rita worsened the damage with 508,000 gallons of oil spilled. If these rigs were in the gulf coast, our beaches would face complete destruction. As we have seen recently, cleanup methods for these spills are incapable of removing more than a small fraction of the oil.

In addition, from the BP oil spill alone, Florida has over 284,000 claims with only 117,000 paid. That is less than half, for a total of over \$1.45 billion. For the total gulf region, there have been 10,000 fishing claims, 122,000 food and lodging claims, 74,000 retail and sales claims, and a total of \$1.6 billion paid on even more lost earnings and wages. We cannot afford another disaster of this magnitude. With more drilling, we still are living on borrowed time. Support the Corrine Brown amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 112-74.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 19, strike the final closed quotation mark and the following period.

Page 4, after line 19, insert the following new subparagraph:

“(C) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary may not include in any oil and gas leasing program under this paragraph any lease sale in the Northern California Planning Area.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, according to this bill's drafters, the legislation would not require leasing permits in the northern California planning area, which is the coastline of my district. My amendment merely makes that clear.

Drilling on the north coast of California is a disastrous idea, and the legislation must be clear that it is not acceptable to drill off California's north coast. Because this amendment is a clarification of the legislation's intent, there is no cost associated with it.

Just about 3 weeks ago, we marked the 1-year anniversary of the Nation's worst oil spill. I will not let what happened to the Gulf of Mexico happen to the north coast of California. I have introduced separate stand-alone legislation which would permanently ban drilling off the coast of my district.

It is important to me and to my constituents that H.R. 1231 clearly notates that drilling will not occur in the northern California planning area along the coasts of Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte Counties. The coastal area of my district is one of only four major upwellings in our world's oceans.

An upwelling is where cold, nutrient-rich waters are brought from the ocean depths to the surface. Upwelling regions promote seaweed and growth, which, in turn, supply energy for some of the most productive ecosystems in our world, including many of our world's fisheries.

North coast ecosystems also sustain some of the largest salmon populations in the lower 49 States and provide essential habitat for Dungeness crab, rockfish, sole, and urchin.

In 2006 and 2008, commercial fishery disasters that virtually eliminated salmon fishing in California were economically disastrous to my district, to our States, and our Nation. If an oil spill were to occur off the coast of my district, the environmental and economic costs would be staggering. Drilling for oil or gas off California's north coast could cause serious harm to the unique and productive ecosystem and abundant marine life found in this area.

My district is economically dependent upon the rich natural resources we are blessed to have, but it is also subject to significant earthquakes which exacerbate the issues, the threats, and the problems related to oil spills.

One of my counties just wrote to me, and I quote, “The modest amount of oil available in terms of our Nation's daily demand does not justify jeopardizing our fisheries, our environment, and our economic livelihoods.”

This amendment will merely protect the north coast of California and will simply clarify what the drafters of this bill say that the bill does, and that is that they claim that it does not re-

quire drilling off the coasts of Mendocino, Humboldt, or Del Norte Counties.

I urge a “yes” vote on this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this is the second amendment of three today designed to close off portions of the Outer Continental Shelf to oil and natural gas exploration production, the opposite of what the bill under consideration today is about. The underlying bill is focused on opening the Outer Continental Shelf to safe and responsible energy production.

H.R. 1231 aims to fulfill the promise that both Democrats and Republicans made to the American people when we voted on a bipartisan basis in 2008 to lift the moratoria on offshore energy production. Since taking office, President Obama and his administration have effectively reimposed the moratorium, and this bill would reverse his actions.

This amendment proposes to take America in exactly the wrong direction in which we should be heading. Congress should not foreclose the possibility of future energy production. With the price of gasoline going to \$4 and \$5 a gallon, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and keep our focus on those offshore areas that contain substantial oil and natural resources, where increased American energy production will create new jobs, lower energy prices, and increase our economic and national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I want to point out that the majority party has told me and told my staff that the bill that they have offered today, the bill that we are going to be voting on, does not affect the north coast of California. Now, my effort with this amendment is merely to trust but verify.

□ 1730

To oppose this amendment really calls into question, what is the underlying motivation of this bill? Does it do what they claim and not affect this region of our ocean, again, one of only four major upwellings in the world's oceans. This is an area that feeds and promotes the fisheries and the marine life not only in my area, but in all the ocean. And the idea we would put it at any kind of risk. Those of you who know the area know how rough the water is, know how rocky the shores are. If there was an oil spill there, it would never be cleaned up. The area is seismically active. To drill in that area with the threat of earthquakes, you are

looking at a situation that would make the Gulf of Mexico disaster pale in comparison.

It is not too much to ask that we merely verify what it is the majority party says that they are not doing with this bill. And the idea that this amendment would be opposed is quite startling to me. I believe that this is something that everyone can get behind. To say that the bill doesn't do this and then refuse to take the amendment calls into question the motive of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. How much time do I have left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from California brings out some legitimate points. But right now, today, under existing law, the northern California planning area is available for leasing. This bill does not change that current situation. It has been available since 2008 when gasoline prices hit \$4 a gallon and the President and Congress lifted the offshore drilling moratoria.

I will remind the House that in 2008 the coast of California was opened for potential leasing and drilling, that Democrats were in the majority in the House and NANCY PELOSI of San Francisco was Speaker of the House. For months, they resisted Republican efforts to end the offshore ban, but eventually the American people won out and the bans were lifted.

I would also like to point out that this bill provides direction that when the Federal Government is writing 5-year leasing plans, that the focus be on areas with the greatest estimated oil and natural gas resources. This particular planning area does not have and has not registered high in this regard and this bill does not direct that leasing occur in this planning area. With gasoline back to the 2008 highs of over \$4 per gallon, let's keep the focus on where it should be, increasing American offshore energy production. That's what we're trying to do.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I don't know that there is a great deal more to add to what he has just said about permits and about the issue that has been discussed just recently.

The thing that really bothers me is just a few years ago, 25 years ago, we were importing about 28 percent of our oil. Today we are importing 62 percent of our oil, more than double what we were doing just a few years ago, and the American people are paying the price. Instead of \$1.50 or \$2 a gallon for gas, they are spending \$4 a gallon for gasoline.

Nationwide, there are 86 billion barrels of oil. Fifty-one percent of that is in the Gulf of Mexico, which means there are 44 billion barrels of oil in the Gulf of Mexico, and there are 240 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. For us to

continue to be dependent on foreign energy sources is crazy. We ought to start drilling and doing what needs to be done here in America. And we can do it in an environmentally safe way. We can do it in Alaska, offshore, we can do it in a number of places. But to sit by and continue to send our money to Saudi Arabia and other countries around the world that aren't our friends just doesn't make any sense, and the American people understand it.

I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle ought to go back and talk to their constituents, who are paying the price at the gas pump.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 112-74.

Mr. INSLEE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

“(7) WASHINGTON STATE APPROVAL REQUIRED.—Under this section, the Secretary shall not make available for leasing for exploration, development, and production of oil and natural gas any area of the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Washington unless such leasing is approved by the Governor and legislature of the State of Washington.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

I rise to protect the beaches and shoreline and economy of the State of Washington. This amendment is quite simple. It would simply say that we will not allow the Federal Government to run over the State of Washington on issues of drilling off of our coastline, that we won't be shackled to this antiquated policy of drilling without first providing reasonable protection, without first addressing the issue of rampant speculation that is what is exposing my consumers to \$4 a gallon gas in the State of Washington, and without freeing us to do what we should be doing, which is developing new, clean

energy sources. I want to address each one of those.

Basically our position is we don't think in the State of Washington, or any State, and particularly the State of Washington, which is the Evergreen State, we ought to have this policy foisted upon us that is not an evergreen energy policy for this century for three reasons.

Reason number one: Despite the fact that we have had this enormous passage of time since this horrendous spill in the gulf, this Chamber has not passed into law one single safety provision to bring additional safety to anywhere on our coastline. My amendment would simply say that the people of the State of Washington and their elected officials ought to be able to make a decision that we have got adequate, reasonable safeguards for drilling before it happens off of the State of Washington. That has not happened, and it is inexcusable.

Second, before this happens, the people of the State of Washington ought to have reasonable protection against the rampant speculation that is going on that is driving up these prices. Even Goldman Sachs has recognized we have had four times the speculative positions taken and probably a \$20 amount that has driven up these prices associated with this unchecked speculation. Yet this Chamber and my friends across the aisle have not done a single thing to address this speculation. Until we do that, we shouldn't have my neighbors and my constituents have foisted down their throats this policy of mandatory drilling without them first making a decision.

Third, the people of the State of Washington want to help in our energy crisis and they are capable of helping in this energy crisis if this Chamber will just free them to do it.

Here is how they want to help. They want to produce lithium ion batteries that can run electric cars so we don't have to start being shackled and just addicted to oil. But this Chamber hasn't done a single thing, a single thing this year, to help clean energy sources that Washington State business people want to produce.

I look at the EnerG2 company that is making ultracapacitors. This Chamber isn't helping them make electric batteries for electric cars.

I look at the REC company in Moses Lake, Washington, that is making the polysilicate cells for photovoltaic cells to produce the electricity for electric cars. This Chamber hasn't done a single thing to help that company advance.

I look at the Targeted Growth company and the Boeing company that are developing biofuels so that we can have a competitor to gasoline so we can drive those prices down. This Chamber hasn't done a single thing to help those companies develop Washington State jobs for a new energy future.

Now, we have got a lot of energy off of our coastline. It might be in assorted ways. But I know it is in offshore wind. But we aren't doing a single thing to help the offshore wind energy. All we are doing is trying to shackle an antiquated energy policy on the people of the State of Washington.

I would have liked this amendment to have helped all of my colleagues on the Pacific Coast, but because of some of the financial rules that we have, we have only been able to bring this involving the Evergreen State. But I would hope that all of my colleagues would join me in saying that before this gets forced on the citizens of Washington State, we adopt some reasonable measures.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1740

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, acting for Natural Resources Committee Chairman DOC HASTINGS of Washington State, I oppose this amendment.

As explained in the debate on the prior two amendments, this bill is focused on increasing American-made energy, creating new jobs, and decreasing our dependence on energy from foreign nations. Congress needs to focus on increasing energy production, and this amendment goes in the opposite direction. In fact, this amendment attempts to impose unprecedented and impossible obstacles to fostering more American energy in Federal waters.

It is stated that the purpose of the amendment is to give the State of Washington a say on leasing in Federal waters off the State's coast. However, multiple Federal laws already provide Washington State, and every State, the opportunity to participate in any such decisions. What this amendment would do is grant double veto power for Washington State to prohibit Federal activities in Federal waters outside the State's borders. The Interior Department provides repeated opportunities for public comment and participation throughout the planning and leasing process.

Furthermore, the Coastal Zone Management Act requires State consistency review with its State coastal zone management plan before the Federal Government takes action in Federal waters off of any particular State. On top of that, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act provides clear requirements for consultation and cooperation with affected State and local governments. Considerable care and protection is provided to each and every State, with extra consideration guaranteed to coastal States. This is as it should be.

What is particularly revealing about this amendment is that it only gives Washington State double veto power

over certain types of offshore energy leasing. It singles out only oil and natural gas, but provides no such veto power over other forms of energy leasing. This includes wave energy, wind, solar, and other renewable forms.

This double standard exposes the real intent of this amendment. It's not truly aimed at ensuring a voice for Washington State; it's intended to score political points. But the political points the amendment attempts to score are entirely hollow. Why? Because there isn't estimated to be any recoverable oil or natural gas in Federal waters off of Washington State.

Again, this bill only goes into areas that have really large potential. Again, multiple Federal laws already guarantee all Americans have an opportunity to participate in an offshore planning process, especially the Governors, State and local officials, and citizens living in coastal States that will be impacted by leasing, should it take place.

For those reasons, I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. INSLEE. Thank you.

First, I wish my friend DOC HASTINGS from Washington was with us today. He's not feeling well. But Mr. YOUNG is doing an admirable job with a weak argument, and I'll report that they're getting represented.

I just want to point out we haven't seen horrendous damage to any ecosystem from a wind spill yet. If you spill a little wind, you don't end up covering large gulf areas with hydrocarbons or destroying oyster and shrimping grounds like have been in the gulf. There are differences from multiple sources.

We are simply saying that before we move forward with additional offshore drilling, we ought to have reasonable safety protocols, we ought to address speculation, and we ought to have an energy policy that looks at all of the above.

My friends across the aisle told us you were going to give us an all-of-the-above energy policy. All you have given us is an all-of-the-below energy policy. We need a little better than this.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alaska has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My good friend from Washington, they may not have a wind spill, but there's opposition to wind power. And wind is extremely expensive and only can be successful as long as it's subsidized by the taxpayer. As long as this administration keeps insisting on wind and solar power, they're doubly taxing our taxpayers of this Nation and hurting our economy. That's reality.

So they're doubly taxed because now they're paying taxes because of the high cost of oil, the high cost of gasoline. And \$1,100 a year they have additionally been taxed this year versus last year. And yet we talk about wind power. They're taxed because that comes out of the general fund. We're borrowing money from the Chinese. That's reality.

Wind and solar are fine as long as they're subsidized. As long as you pay for them, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, they're fine. But that's an additional tax on you. If it was so economical, so well to be done, then we would have done it a long time ago. And I say it will work. It's like ethanol. It works. It's still not economical.

So we have to go back to what commerce is run by—and it's fossil fuels. We can have all those other forms of energy. I do not want them subsidized. We can have all those other forms of energy, but we have to have the ability to move product. I look at the Port of Seattle, the Port of Tacoma. Every one of those ships is burning a fossil fuel that deliver those goods. Every truck that leaves that port that goes out to deliver those to the people around this Nation is burning fossil fuels. Every train that leaves is burning fossil fuels. Every airplane that lands, built by Boeing, is driven by fossil fuels.

This is a chance for us to speak up in Congress and say we are going to develop our natural fuels in this country so we can compete legitimately. You cannot compete by borrowing money to buy foreign oil, and that's what that side wants to do. I'm saying that's wrong. And I will join hands with you if you vote for ANWR and you vote for other forms of energy, too. Let's get it all together, guys. Let's have an energy plan. All we're trying to do here is undo what the Obama administration did, and that's put a moratorium in.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE). The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. INSLEE. 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 Washington will be 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 House Report 112-74 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. KEATING of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) 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 193, noes 228, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

AYES—193

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Pascrell
Andrews	Goodlatte	Pastor (AZ)
Baca	Green, Al	Payne
Baldwin	Grijalva	Pelosi
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Perlmutter
Becerra	Hanabusa	Peters
Berkley	Hanna	Pingree (ME)
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Polis
Bilirakis	Heinrich	Posey
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Quigley
Blumenauer	Hinchev	Rahall
Boswell	Hinojosa	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Holt	Reyes
Braley (IA)	Honda	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Richmond
Butterfield	Inlee	Rooney
Capps	Israel	Ros-Lehtinen
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Cardoza	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carnahan	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castor (FL)	Jones	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Keating	T.
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Sarbanes
Clay	Kissell	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Schrader
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Cooper	Levin	Sewell
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Courtney	Lipinski	Shuler
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Sires
Critz	Loeback	Slaughter
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (NJ)
Cuellar	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lujan	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Stark
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Sutton
DeFazio	Markey	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Matsui	Tierney
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Deutch	McCollum	Towns
Diaz-Balart	McDermott	Tsongas
Dicks	McGovern	Van Hollen
Dingell	McIntyre	Velázquez
Doggett	McNerney	Visclosky
Doyle	Meeks	Walz (MN)
Edwards	Michaud	Wasserman
Ellison	Miller (FL)	Schultz
Engel	Miller (NC)	Watt
Eshoo	Miller, George	Waxman
Farr	Moore	Weiner
Fattah	Moran	Welch
Filner	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Nadler	Woolsey
Forbes	Napolitano	Wu
Frank (MA)	Neal	Yarmuth
Fudge	Olver	Young (FL)
Garamendi	Owens	
Gibson	Pallone	

NOES—228

Adams	Akin	Altmire
Aderholt	Alexander	Amash

Austria	Gowdy	Nunnelee
Bachmann	Granger	Olson
Bachus	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Paul
Barrow	Green, Gene	Paulsen
Bartlett	Griffin (AR)	Pearce
Barton (TX)	Griffith (VA)	Pence
Bass (NH)	Grimm	Peterson
Benishek	Guinta	Petri
Berg	Guthrie	Pitts
Biggart	Hall	Platts
Bilbray	Harper	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Pompeo
Black	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Hayworth	Quayle
Bonner	Heck	Rehberg
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Reichert
Boren	Herger	Renacci
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Ribble
Brady (TX)	Holden	Rigell
Brooks	Huelskamp	Rivera
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Buchanan	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Bucshon	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Buerkle	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Campbell	Jordan	Ross (AR)
Canseco	Kelly	Ross (FL)
Cantor	King (IA)	Royce
Capito	King (NY)	Runyan
Carter	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Chabot	Kline	Schilling
Chaffetz	Labrador	Schmidt
Chandler	Lamborn	Schock
Coble	Lance	Schweikert
Coffman (CO)	Landry	Scott (SC)
Cole	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Conaway	LaTham	Sensenbrenner
Costa	LaTourette	Sessions
Cravaack	Latta	Shimkus
Crawford	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Culberson	Long	Simpson
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Dent	Lummis	Southerland
DesJarlais	Lungren, Daniel	Stivers
Dold	E.	Stutzman
Donnelly (IN)	Mack	Terry
Dreier	Manzullo	Thompson (MS)
Duffy	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Ellmers	McCaul	Tipton
Emerson	McClintock	Turner
Farenthold	McCotter	Upton
Fincher	McHenry	Walberg
Flake	McKeon	Walden
Fleischmann	McKinley	Walsh (IL)
Fleming	McMorris	Webster
Flores	Rodgers	West
Foxx	Meehan	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Gallely	Miller, Gary	Wittman
Gardner	Mulvaney	Wolf
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Gerlach	Myrick	Woodall
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Noem	Young (AK)
Gohmert	Nugent	Young (IN)
Gosar	Nunes	

NOT VOTING—10

Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam	Sullivan
Giffords	Marchant	Waters
Hastings (WA)	Reed	
Hirono	Schwartz	

□ 1814

Messrs. YOUNG of Indiana, RIGELL, and WEBSTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. POSEY, ROONEY, JACKSON of Illinois, CRENSHAW, DIAZ-BALART, and FORBES changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 312, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 238, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

AYES—189

Ackerman	Garamendi	Pascrell
Andrews	Gerlach	Pastor (AZ)
Baca	Grijalva	Payne
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Bass (CA)	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Berkley	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Berman	Higgins	Platts
Bilirakis	Himes	Polis
Bishop (GA)	Hinchev	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Blumenauer	Hirono	Rahall
Boswell	Holden	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Holt	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Honda	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Inlee	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Carney	Jones	Sánchez, Linda
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	T.
Castor (FL)	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kind	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Kissell	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich	Schrader
Clay	Langevin	Schwartz
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Levin	Sewell
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Cooper	Lipinski	Shuler
Costa	LoBiondo	Sires
Costello	Loeback	Slaughter
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (NJ)
Critz	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lujan	Speier
Cummings	Lynch	Stark
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Markey	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
DeLauro	McCollum	Tonko
Dent	McDermott	Towns
Deutch	McGovern	Tsongas
Dicks	McIntyre	Van Hollen
Dingell	McNerney	Velázquez
Doggett	Meehan	Visclosky
Dold	Meeks	Walz (MN)
Doyle	Michaud	Wasserman
Edwards	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Ellison	Miller, George	Watt
Engel	Moore	Waxman
Eshoo	Moran	Weiner
Farr	Murphy (CT)	Welch
Fattah	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Filner	Napolitano	Woolsey
Fitzpatrick	Neal	Wu
Forbes	Olver	Yarmuth
Fortenberry	Owens	Young (FL)
Frank (MA)	Pallone	
Fudge		

NOES—238

Adams	Alexander	Austria
Aderholt	Altmire	Bachmann
Akin	Amash	Bachus

Barletta Graves (MO) Palazzo  
 Barrow Green, Al Paul  
 Bartlett Green, Gene Paulsen  
 Barton (TX) Griffin (AR) Pearce  
 Bass (NH) Griffith (VA) Pence  
 Benishkek Grimm Peterson  
 Berg Guinta Petri  
 Biggert Guthrie Pitts  
 Bilbray Hall Poe (TX)  
 Bishop (UT) Hanna Pompeo  
 Black Harper Posey  
 Blackburn Harris Price (GA)  
 Bonner Hartzler Quayle  
 Bono Mack Hayworth  
 Boren Heck Reed  
 Boustany Hensarling Rehberg  
 Brady (TX) Herger Reichert  
 Brooks Herrera Beutler Renacci  
 Broun (GA) Huelskamp Reyes  
 Bucshon Huizenga (MI) Ribble  
 Buerkle Hultgren Rigell  
 Burgess Hunter Rivera  
 Burton (IN) Hurt Roby  
 Calvert Issa Roe (TN)  
 Camp Jackson Lee Rogers (AL)  
 Campbell (TX) Rogers (KY)  
 Canseco Jenkins Rogers (MI)  
 Cantor Johnson (IL) Rohrabacher  
 Capito Johnson (OH) Rokita  
 Cardoza Jordan Rooney  
 Carter Kelly Roskam  
 Cassidy King (IA) Ross (AR)  
 Chabot King (NY) Ross (FL)  
 Chaffetz Kingston Royce  
 Chandler Kinzinger (IL) Runyan  
 Coble Kline Ryan (WI)  
 Coffman (CO) Labrador Scalise  
 Cole Lamborn Schilling  
 Conaway Lance Schmidt  
 Cravaack Landry Schock  
 Crawford Lankford Schweikert  
 Crenshaw Latham Scott (SC)  
 Cuellar LaTourette Scott, Austin  
 Culberson Latta Sensenbrenner  
 Davis (KY) Lewis (CA) Sessions  
 Denham Long Shimkus  
 DesJarlais Lucas Shuster  
 Diaz-Balart Luetkemeyer Simpson  
 Donnelly (IN) Lummis Smith (NE)  
 Dreier Lungren, Daniel Smith (TX)  
 Duffy E. Southerland  
 Duncan (SC) Mack Stearns  
 Duncan (TN) Manzullo Stivers  
 Ellmers Marchant Stutzman  
 Emerson Marino Sullivan  
 Farenthold Matheson Terry  
 Fincher McCarthy (CA) Thompson (PA)  
 Flake McCaul Thornberry  
 Fleischmann McClintock Tiberi  
 Fleming McCotter Tiberti  
 Flores McHenry Tipton  
 Forbes McKeon Turner  
 Foyx McKinley Upton  
 Franks (AZ) McMorris Walberg  
 Frelinghuysen Rodgers Walden  
 Gallegly Mica Walsh (IL)  
 Gardner Miller (FL) Webster  
 Garrett Miller (MI) West  
 Gibbs Miller, Gary Westmoreland  
 Gibson Mulvaney Whitfield  
 Gingrey (GA) Murphy (PA) Wilson (SC)  
 Gohmert Myrick Wittman  
 Gonzalez Neugebauer Wolf  
 Goodlatte Noem Womack  
 Gosar Nugent Woodall  
 Gowdy Nunes Yoder  
 Granger Nunnelee Young (AK)  
 Graves (GA) Olson Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—4

Giffords Johnson, Sam  
 Hastings (WA) Waters

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1822

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 240, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

AYES—186

Ackerman	Green, Al	Pallone	Pearce
Andrews	Grijalva	Pascrell	Pence
Baca	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)	Peterson
Baldwin	Hanabusa	Payne	Petri
Barrow	Harris	Pelosi	Pitts
Bass (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter	Poe (TX)
Becerra	Heinrich	Peters	Polis
Berkley	Higgins	Pingree (ME)	Pompeo
Berman	Hinchev	Platts	Posey
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)	Price (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Quigley	Quayle
Blumenauer	Holden	Rahall	Reed
Boswell	Holt	Rangel	Rehberg
Brady (PA)	Honda	Richardson	Reichert
Brady (IA)	Hoyer	Ros-Lehtinen	Renacci
Brown (FL)	Inslee	Ross (AR)	Reyes
Butterfield	Israel	Rothman (NJ)	Ribble
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard	Richmond
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rush	Rigell
Carnahan	(TX)	Ryan (OH)	Rivera
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda	Roby
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	T.	Rogers (AL)
Castor (FL)	Jones	Sanchez, Loretta	Rogers (KY)
Chandler	Kaptur	Sarbanes	Rogers (MI)
Chu	Keating	Schakowsky	Rohrabacher
Cielline	Kildee	Schiff	Rokita
Clarke (MI)	Kind	Schrader	Rooney
Clarke (NY)	Kissell	Schwartz	Roskam
Clay	Kucinich	Scott (VA)	Ross (FL)
Cleaver	Langevin	Scott, David	Royce
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Serrano	Runyan
Cohen	Larsen (CT)	Sewell	Ruppersberger
Connolly (VA)	Lee (CA)	Sherman	Ryan (WI)
Conyers	Levin	Sires	Scalise
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter	Schilling
Costello	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)	Schmidt
Courtney	LoBiondo	Smith (WA)	Schock
Critz	Loeb sack	Speier	Schweikert
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark	Scott (SC)
Cummings	Lowey	Stivers	Scott, Austin
Davis (CA)	Luján	Sutton	Sensenbrenner
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Thompson (CA)	Sessions
DeFazio	Maloney	Thompson (MS)	Shimkus
DeGette	Markey	Tierney	Shuler
DeLauro	Matsui	Tonko	Shuster
Dent	McCarthy (NY)	Towns	Simpson
Deutch	McCollum	Tsongas	Smith (TX)
Dicks	McDermott	Van Hollen	Stearns
Dingell	McGovern	Velázquez	Sensenbrenner
Doggett	McIntyre	Visclosky	Sessions
Dold	McNerney	Walz (MN)	Shimkus
Doyle	Meeke	Wasserman	Shuler
Edwards	Michaud	Schultz	Simpson
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Waters	Smith (TX)
Engel	Miller, George	Watt	Stutzman
Eshoo	Moore	Waxman	Sullivan
Farr	Moran	Weiner	Terry
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Welch	Thompson (PA)
Filner	Nadler	Wilson (FL)	Thornberry
Frank (MA)	Napolitano	Woolsey	Tipton
Fudge	Neal	Wu	Tiberi
Garamendi	Oliver	Yarmuth	Tipton
Gerlach	Owens	Young (FL)	Turner
			Upton
			Walberg
			Walden
			Walsh (IL)
			Webster
			West
			Westmoreland
			Whitfield
			Wilson (SC)
			Wittman
			Wolf
			Womack
			Woodall
			Yoder
			Young (AK)
			Young (IN)

NOES—240

Adams	Bachmann	Berg
Aderholt	Bachus	Biggert
Akin	Barletta	Bilbray
Alexander	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Altmire	Barton (TX)	Bishop (UT)
Amash	Bass (NH)	Black
Austria	Benishkek	Blackburn

Bonner	Guinta	Pearce
Bono Mack	Guthrie	Pence
Boren	Hall	Peterson
Boustany	Hanna	Petri
Brady (TX)	Harper	Pitts
Brooks	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Broun (GA)	Hayworth	Polis
Buchanan	Heck	Pompeo
Bucshon	Hensarling	Posey
Buerkle	Herger	Price (GA)
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Quayle
Burton (IN)	Himes	Reed
Calvert	Huelskamp	Rehberg
Camp	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert
Campbell	Hultgren	Renacci
Canseco	Hunter	Reyes
Cantor	Hurt	Ribble
Capito	Issa	Richmond
Cardoza	Jenkins	Rigell
Carter	Johnson (IL)	Rivera
Cassidy	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Chabot	Jordan	Roe (TN)
Chaffetz	Kelly	Rogers (AL)
Coble	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Coffman (CO)	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Cole	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita
Costa	Kline	Rooney
Cravaack	Labrador	Roskam
Crawford	Lamborn	Ross (FL)
Crenshaw	Lance	Royce
Cuellar	Landry	Runyan
Culberson	Lankford	Ruppersberger
Davis (KY)	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Denham	LaTourette	Scalise
DesJarlais	Latta	Schilling
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt
Donnelly (IN)	Long	Schock
Dreier	Lucas	Schweikert
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Scott (SC)
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Duncan (TN)	Lungren, Daniel	Sensenbrenner
Ellmers	E.	Sessions
Emerson	Mack	Shimkus
Farenthold	Manzullo	Shuler
Fincher	Marchant	Shuster
Flake	Marino	Simpson
Fleischmann	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Stearns
Flores	McCaul	Stutzman
Forbes	McClintock	Sullivan
Foyx	McCotter	Terry
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Thornberry
Gallegly	McKinley	Tipton
Gardner	McMorris	Tiberi
Garrett	Rodgers	Tipton
Gibbs	Meehan	Turner
Gibson	Mica	Upton
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Walden
Gonzalez	Miller, Gary	Walsh (IL)
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Webster
Gosar	Murphy (PA)	West
Gowdy	Myrick	Westmoreland
Granger	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Graves (GA)	Noem	Wilson (SC)
	Nugent	Wittman
	Nunes	Wolf
	Nunnelee	Womack
	Olson	Woodall
	Palazzo	Yoder
	Paul	Young (AK)
	Paulsen	Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—5

Giffords Johnson, Sam  
 Hastings (WA) Smith (NE)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1830

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PEARCE. 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. DESJARLAIS) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL, 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. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### AMERICAN ANGELS ABROAD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, they are America's angels abroad. They are ambassadors for America, and they are good folks that represent everything that is right about our country. They are the Peace Corps volunteers. And this is the 50th year of the Peace Corps. These are the most wonderful people I think I've ever met.

But there's a problem in the Peace Corps because many times these volunteers go overseas, they help out other countries, but they become victims of crime and victims of sexual assault. In fact, in 2009 there were 122 of them that were victims of sexual assault by predators in foreign countries.

And the problem is there's not much compassion, not much concern, and not much care with the Peace Corps about the plight of these victims according to the victims who testified today.

But those things are changing. Director Williams is committed to making the Peace Corps a safe place for our volunteers overseas. We're going to work with him and these victims to promote legislation so that we will have a protocol that is the law so that they are treated better.

We are the greatest human rights Nation in the world. We promote human rights, but human rights need to also apply to victims in the Peace Corps who are sexually assaulted overseas.

And that's just the way it is.

#### NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our Nation's law enforcement officers, the brave men and women who dedicate their lives to protecting our communities.

This week is National Police Week, and thousands of officers from across the country will gather here in Washington to pay tribute to those who have fallen in the line of duty. Sadly, in the past year, 162 officers have died in the line of duty, including two from Minnesota, Sergeant Joseph Bergeron of Maplewood and Mahnomen County Sheriff's Deputy Chris Dewey.

As we remember these officers, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to legislation that I have introduced that

would help protect those who protect us. H.R. 1789, the State and Local Law Enforcement Discipline, Accountability, and Due Process Act, would guarantee law enforcement officers have basic rights during disciplinary actions.

I ask and urge my colleagues to sign on to this legislation so we can also help protect our law enforcement officers.

#### TIME FOR CONGRESS TO GET OUR HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine in your household, if, for every \$1 you spent, 40 cents was borrowed?

That's the situation we're in with every dollar that we spend in the U.S. Congress today. And yet there are those who do not want to reform or change.

But if I brought in my family and said, listen, guys, for every dollar we spend, 40 cents is borrowed, we would say, okay, what can we cut out? Can we do with less travel? Can we do with fewer clothes? Can we cut back on the kitchen table a little bit? We would come up with some ideas. They might be tough choices, but it's the right thing to do.

It is time for Congress to get our house in order and to think about the next generation, not just the next election.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I can tell you, each and every day, people come to see me to ask for more money to be spent. We've got to change our culture of spending here and get the House under control.

#### RECOGNIZING NATIONAL MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize our men and women in uniform and join our community in celebrating National Military Appreciation Month. The month of May encompasses a number of celebratory days linked to our Armed Forces, their families, and our Nation's proud history. From Military Spouse Appreciation Day to Victory in Europe Day, and from Loyalty Day to Armed Forces Day and Memorial Day, the month of May is a time for our Nation to come together and give praise to our most heroic citizens.

Our Nation traditionally recognizes our troops' sacrifice in a somber manner on Memorial Day, but National Military Appreciation Month allows us to not only appreciate those who have given their lives for our freedom, but also to celebrate the resolve of our Nation through its most difficult times.

I welcome our Nation to join in recognizing the contribution of our servicemen and -women, past and present, for all that they have done to preserve our freedom and our way of life.

#### DIFFERING VIEWS ON IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest that the President announced this week he was going to give a major address on immigration. As one who's been involved in this issue for three decades, I was very interested to find out the approach the President was going to take.

So let me register my disappointment at the demonization of those who might have a disagreement with the President that was expressed by him in his speech yesterday. Talking about moats and talking about alligators and talking about intransigence on the other side of the aisle is not the way to attract bipartisan support to deal with one of the most difficult and important questions of our Nation. I wouldn't say I'm outraged. I would say I'm disappointed at the tone of those remarks of the President yesterday.

If, in fact, we're going to work together on issues as important as that, it would seem to me to be important for us to, in some way, at least accept the fact that there may be legitimate reasons for differences and try and bridge those differences, rather than expand them.

#### THE WESTERN CAUCUS

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, the Western Caucus has several members here tonight. We would like to talk about what is going on right now in the country. The administration seems to be waging a war on the western jobs, and that is carried out through a whole range of activities.

A couple of weeks ago, the administration and the President said that the administration is not doing enough to address the high gas prices. The President said in a speech at Georgetown that he would like to cut foreign oil by one-third by drilling at home. Well, we have been in the process of offering him the solution to what he said he would like to do.

Now, keep in mind that while the President is saying one thing, he's doing another.

□ 1840

While he says that we would like to drill for more oil here, understand that