

vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. CARDOZA. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 3121, FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of the Committee on Financial Services, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3121) to restore the financial solvency of the national flood insurance program and to provide for such program to make available multiperil coverage for damage resulting from windstorms and floods, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neugebauer moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3121 be instructed, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of the conference, to (1) include in the conference agreement the provision in section 106 of the bill S. 2284.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) will be recognized for 30 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Section 106 of the Senate flood insurance bill would reform the National Flood Insurance Program in a significant way by phasing out taxpayer subsidies and requiring that rates are based on an actual risk of flooding basis.

The Senate bill achieves this goal more quickly and fairly than the House bill, which does not begin phasing out premium subsidies for nonresidential properties and nonprimary residences until 2011.

We owe it to the American people whose lives get turned upside down in the aftermath of flood disaster to encourage an efficient, effective program, with adequate resources to be there for them when they need it.

Risk-based pricing will reassure taxpayers that they are not subsidizing those who choose to live in high-risk areas near coastal lowlands or flood plains where many property owners have repetitive losses.

Section 106 of the Senate version of the flood bill would also eliminate subsidies within 90 days of enactment for prospective policyholders of nonresidential structures, nonprimary residences, and severe repetitive loss properties.

It would also eliminate subsidies within 90 days for properties that undergo improvements or renovations that exceed 30 percent of the fair market value of the property, and any property that sustains damage exceeding 50 percent of the fair market value after the enactment of this bill.

In addition, Section 106 includes a provision that would prohibit subsidies and require risk-based pricing for prospective policyholders if the property was not insured within 90 days of enactment or if the policy lapses as a result of deliberate choice by the policyholder.

Risk-based pricing would also be required if the prospective policyholder refused to accept an offer for mitigation assistance or relocation following a major disaster.

These are prudent measures to strengthen flood programs, phase out taxpayer subsidies, and encourage a premium pricing structure that is based on the actual risk of the property to flooding.

While not part of this motion, I also believe it would be ill-advised to force

the National Flood Insurance Program to take on new risk of wind coverage, as it would expose taxpayers to further losses and could unnecessarily interfere with the functioning of private wind insurance markets.

The Republican minority believes that the chief objective of Congress should be to reform the existing National Flood Insurance Program, including the removal of subsidies over time to improve the long-term solvency of the program. Adding new coverage to the program that has already lost \$18 billion is a move in the right direction.

Madam Speaker, I want to stop and reiterate that the program, the reason this is so important is that we continue to subsidize this program and the deficits keep going up. Now, some people say, Well, the program pays for itself. But the truth of the matter is, Madam Speaker, this Congress is going to have to write off billions of dollars because the system is currently insolvent now, and now others want to increase and expand the coverage and postpone putting risk-based premiums in place.

The American people already are dealing with a lot of other issues. They don't need to be dealing with having to subsidize the National Flood Insurance Program any longer.

As the conferees work on this final flood insurance bill, we ask that they produce a bill that is fiscally responsible and does not saddle future taxpayers with more losses.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, on reading this motion to instruct, it seems reasonable, well-thought-out, and we have no problems with it.

Therefore, with that, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. In addition to rising to offer this motion to instruct on H.R. 3121, the Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act of 2008, I believe it's also critical that we talk about another issue that is very important to the American taxpayers, and that is a sound and reliable energy policy for our country.

I am repeatedly frustrated and I know the American people are repeatedly frustrated that this Congress has done nothing this summer, this year, to produce one additional barrel of oil to help reduce the dependency problem that this country has on foreign oil. This is not only an economic security issue for our country, it is a national security issue for our country.

We know that we have seen in the last few days that the Iranian Government is flexing their muscle and they are saying that they want everybody to know that they are a world power and that if people make them mad, or if they decide to do something, that they could close the Strait of Hormuz, where I think someone said almost 40 percent of the world's oil passes through that port. That just says to us

that this is a national security issue as well.

There's a very simple solution to America's energy problem. It's not complicated, it's not complex. It's a simple, three-letter word. It's yes. It's saying yes to drilling for oil within the borders of the United States of America. It's saying yes to drilling in Alaska and off the Outer Continental Shelf. It's saying yes to continuing to develop and use the 250-year coal supply that America has. As someone said a while ago, we are the Saudi Arabia of coal.

□ 1130

There are new technologies out there converting coal and liquefying it to use as a very clean and efficient energy source.

It is saying yes to building more nuclear power plants in this country. We haven't built a new nuclear power plant in I think over 30 years. It is a very safe, reliable source of energy and does not create a lot of greenhouse gases.

It is saying yes to building new refineries in our country. Not only, Madam Speaker, are we importing 70 percent of our oil, but because we haven't built a new refinery in this country in over 30 years, we are importing from 10 to 15 percent of our gasoline.

It is saying yes to renewable and alternative energy sources, such as wind, solar and biofuels.

Madam Speaker, what we need to do is have a balanced energy program, looking at renewables, looking at new technologies, but also producing American resources.

This growing energy crisis is affecting every facet of Americans' daily lives. As they try to drive to work, I had recently a telephone call with a constituent, and he said, Congressman, I have to drive three times a week to get medical treatment, and it is over 100 miles to and from to get that treatment. He said, I am down to the decision now whether I can afford to be able to go and get my treatment or buy groceries or make my rent payment. I need some help.

Madam Speaker, the American people are looking to this Congress to do something. And we can do something. We can say yes; yes to new technologies, yes to producing American resources, instead of exporting billions of dollars to foreign countries and letting them develop their resources.

I believe last month, June, the average import, this is daily import, Madam Speaker, was 13 million barrels a day, 13 million barrels a day. That is \$1.8 billion dollars every day that America gets up and writes a check to send somewhere else. Not to invest in America. We write a check for \$1.8 billion every day to send to some foreign countries.

Madam Speaker, unfortunately, some of those countries that we send that check to aren't all that friendly to the American people. Our friend, Mr. Hugo Chavez from Venezuela, we write him a

check every day for \$170 million. I am sure the American people are pretty excited that \$170 million of investment that could be building America's resources and creating jobs in America is going down to South America, to Venezuela, to one of the people that have said we are imperialists and that they have invaded America not with armies, but with their oil.

So, Madam Speaker, what we have to do is we have to begin to look at why we are not doing anything in this Congress.

One of the things I have noticed that we worked on this summer, and I know the American people will be extremely excited to know, is that we have protected foreign cats, foreign dogs, monkeys, and today we will spend about 3 or 4 hours naming a scenic route. Now, I think that really goes a long way to assuring the American people that we are in fact working on energy solutions that will bring lower energy prices for the American people.

Madam Speaker, we have to begin to say yes, not only to these high energy prices affecting Americans' ability to go to and from work. Teachers, for example, in rural areas, driving 50, 75 miles, their cost of transportation is almost doubling, but their salaries are not going up. Those teacher contracts are out right now and they are saying, should I accept that teaching contract in that little rural community, where it is going to almost take a pay cut to do that because of the cost of gasoline?

It is affecting food prices. One of the things we know about energy, Madam Speaker, is it is interwoven in every aspect of our life. In the production of food, farmers are paying record prices for fertilizer and for diesel. So that is just the production side. The chemicals have gone up. Several chemical companies in the last few weeks have announced double digit increases in the cost of their commodities.

Now that we have produced those products, now we have to get those products to the processors and to the market. The cost of processing that food has gone up. Once we produce that food and we process it, then we have to deliver it to the distribution systems, and from the distribution systems to the grocery stores, and then the American people have to go to the grocery store. All along the way, these high energy prices are causing huge inflation for our country, and, Madam Speaker, we have to do something about it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I was under the false impression that we were here to talk about flood insurance. I guess flood insurance isn't that important to my Republican colleagues, and that is fine by me.

I said yes, you must have missed it, I said yes to your motion to instruct. Now, after your debate, I am kind of

maybe rethinking my position, but probably not, because I don't want to get dragged down there.

But I am no energy expert. I am learning as we go along. It is not in my background. But I know one thing: For 12 years, the Republicans did nothing on energy. Nothing. For almost the entire time I have been in Congress, we have had two oilmen running this country. They have done nothing on energy. Now, all of a sudden, they found it, and we have to sit here today and listen to a Republican advertisement while we are debating flood insurance. Flood insurance.

I understand the politics of it, and that is all well and good, but it just does amaze me that it is not enough to keep campaigning out on the street. Go knock on some doors, and maybe you will win some elections. You don't win elections by pontificating on the floor of the House. You do it by meeting and greeting people and then listening to what they want.

One of the things they want is for the oil companies to drill on the 68 million acres they already have. Why aren't they drilling there? Why not?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAPUANO. Not at this point, because I am going to get the rest of the ad in a few minutes. You will get your time.

They are concerned that somehow we are sending money to someone who is not too friendly. I know that. We all know that. Why didn't you do anything for 12 years? How did you just find this now? And did you just discover it as we were getting into flood insurance?

Now, I understand fully well. I had no intention of debating this issue. Again, the motion to instruct that we came here to debate is fine. We do need to act on flood insurance, and we will. And I also realize that I will hear the rest of the Republican ad in a moment.

I, for one, have never engaged in pontification on this floor. I haven't done a single Special Order yet in 9 years, because my way to communicate with my constituents who elected me is to go home and say hello and shake their hands and look them in the eye and listen to them, not to pontificate amongst each other.

I understand that that is not the way you campaign. That is fine, and I look forward to the remaining few minutes of the Republican national ad that hasn't worked thus far and I doubt will work between now and November. But I am looking forward to hearing all the wonderful things that you are going to do now, when you didn't do them for 12 years.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In attempting to respond to the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, he said, what have we been trying to do in terms of energy? Did we just discover it? Well, no, that is not the case. We have been trying to work on energy for the last number of years. Let me just give the gentleman some figures.

On ANWR exploration, every time it has been brought up in the last 6 or 7 years, 91 percent of the Republicans have supported it; 86 percent of the Democrats have voted against exploration in ANWR, a clear delineation between the two parties.

Coal-to-liquid. We are the Saudi Arabia of coal. We have more coal than anybody else in the world. So wouldn't it make sense to try and use new technology to take coal to liquid? Every time it has been brought up, 97 percent of the Republicans have supported it; 78 percent of the Democrats have opposed it. That is not pontificating. That is voting on the floor.

Oil shale exploration. Along with Canada, again, we are the Saudi Arabia of oil shale. Every time it has been brought up, 90 percent of the Republicans have voted for it; 86 percent of the Democrats have voted against it.

Outer Continental Shelf exploration. Every time it has been brought up, 81 percent of the Republicans have voted for it; 83 percent of the Democrats have opposed it.

The gentleman says, why aren't we drilling on some of those leases? Well, the definition of an idle lease is a lease where drilling has not yet occurred. That means you have to go through all of the existing red tape, such as permitting and environmental laws. The process can take years. It is a self-fulfilling prophecy on the other side of the aisle.

My friend on the other side of the aisle and his allies in the environmental community, what have they done? Environmental protests have increased by 718 percent over the last 7 years. Three million acres of currently leased land is tied up in courts, where it cannot be utilized.

You ask why they are not leasing? Because they can't, because they are subjected to lawsuits. Companies are unable to begin exploring on the land they have already leased. Fifty-two percent, 52 percent of the wells that have been drilled, exploratory wells offshore, have proved to be dry holes. That is why they are not producing on those.

When I was here 20 years ago during the Reagan administration serving in this House, the Reagan administration managed to lease 160 million acres of onshore land. Today only 50 million acres are leased. ANWR contains 10.4 billion barrels of oil. 100 percent closed. Offshore, 86 billion barrels of oil we believe are there by the U.S. Minerals and Management Service. 97 percent of it is closed off.

And the gentleman says we are pontificating. We are not pontificating. We are asking your side of the aisle to allow us to have votes on these issues. Allow us to have a vote on ANWR; allow us to have a vote on coal-to-liquid; allow us to have a vote on oil shale; allow us to have a vote on offshore drilling, Outer Continental Shelf exploration; allow us to have a vote on refinery capacity increases. That is not pontificating. That is saying allow the American people to have these particular supply-oriented responses to the energy crisis voted on the floor.

Now, the gentleman may say, we just go home. I go home. I just got back from home. I talked to people in my district. You know what they said? Get back to Congress and vote to change the laws to allow supply.

Now, once again, unless your side of the aisle is capable, excuse me, Madam Speaker, unless the other side of the aisle is capable—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, unless the other side of the aisle is capable of suspending the law of economics, the law of supply and demand, we have to start dealing with the supply side.

We have dealt with the demand side. The American people in the last several months have dropped their usage per capita of gasoline greater than they have at any time since we have kept records. The American people are responding in responsible ways. They are responding on the demand side. They are asking us to help them be able to respond on the supply side.

That is not pontificating. That is not politics. That is governance. We are asking for good governance. Allow us to have the chance to vote on these things on the floor, and then let the votes fall where they may. Maybe the gentleman from the other side of the aisle is correct in his assessment that the American people don't want more supply. I suspect he is wrong. The only way we will know is if we have a vote. Just give us a vote.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I didn't hear much that surprised me. I guess I must have been mistaken. If I heard 52 percent of the holes were dry, that means 48 percent of them weren't, and they are not producing.

I know for a fact that in the oil wells and the oil rigs that they have in Alaska now in Prudhoe Bay, they claim to have more natural gas than they know what to do with. Yet they have never built a natural gas pipeline. There was no obstruction to that. None whatsoever. I must have missed it.

During the 12 years I talked about, Republicans controlled the House, the Senate and the White House for most of those years and still did nothing. Still did nothing.

Some Democrats do have some concerns, and I am proud to be one of

them. Some concerns are about simply saying drill anywhere you want, don't worry about the environment. I don't necessarily think in the final analysis that is the way out. I think there are other ways. I do think that some drilling is appropriate, most of us do, which is why we are encouraging oil companies to do it. I don't get it.

□ 1145

And maybe I am mistaken, but a few years ago we had a vote on the floor of this House relative to offshore drilling in Florida. And then Governor Bush and every Republican member of the Florida delegation voted against that. Voted against that.

Now, I don't mind. But let's be honest about this. You did nothing for 12 years. You think you have a political hit here. Good luck. Good luck. Because I think the American people have already tried your way, to just simply give everything to the oil companies and not ask for anything back. I think they want to try a new way. And in the final analysis, we will get where we want to go. November will allow us a greater majority here, it will allow us more Members of the Senate, and it will probably give us the White House with people who actually want to do something rather than simply talk about it.

Now, my full degree of preparation for this debate was to be pulled out of a hearing on the entire financial crisis with Secretary of Treasury Paulson and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Bernanke. I wish I had come here more prepared with statistics and votes from 1902 and all those other things; but the truth is, this is nothing more than a political commercial.

The rebuttal is easy. It is almost painfully childish: The American public hasn't bought it and won't buy it. But I also realize, my presumption is there is still more time left for Republican advertisement, and we will hear a few more minutes of it as we speak now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I appreciate the gentleman, and I think the leadership in his party has been very clear of what their energy policy is: No, we are not going to do anything about it.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this.

My good friend from the other side said he didn't come prepared to talk about his side's strategy on energy. Well, let me share with you what an aide from the Democrat side said just this week. He said, "Right now, our strategy on gas prices is to drive small cars and wait for the wind."

That is the problem, Madam Speaker. Because when we went home last week, all of us went home last week for the Fourth of July break, we met with our constituents; and we heard what I suspect my friend from Massachusetts

would hear if he asks, and that is, that they understand, the American people understand that supply is important. And this is a dynamic situation.

He talks about a vote a number of years ago on whether or not there ought to be offshore exploration. Well, Madam Speaker, the situation has changed. The American's people opinion has changed. What has done that? \$4 a gallon gasoline that the other side has done nothing about.

On our side we have attempted for years, literally for years to increase supply. In fact, as has been recited by my good friend from California earlier, we have passed all sorts of legislation out of the House of Representatives. What has happened is that they have died in the Senate. They have not gotten the 60 votes that they needed. But, Madam Speaker, I have great confidence in the responsiveness of the United States Senators, who have also been home and appreciate that this situation has changed.

The American people are demanding American energy for Americans, and there are solutions that are on the table. H.R. 3089, No More Excuses Energy Act, would reduce the price of gasoline by opening new American oil refineries. Investing in clean energy sources such as wind, nuclear, and captured carbon dioxide, and making available more homegrown energy through environmentally sensitive exploration of the Arctic Energy Slope and America's Deep-Sea Energy Reserves.

H.R. 3089, Madam Speaker. It is there for the taking. All we ask for is a vote. We are not guaranteeing passage, but we do believe that it is appropriate for the most deliberative body in the world to have an opportunity to vote on increasing the supply of American energy for Americans. And the problem is, is that our friends on the other side don't want to have that vote. Why? I am not quite certain, because I know that their constituents are telling them what our constituents are telling us, and that is, increase American energy for Americans. Instead, what is their policy? Drive small cars and wait for the wind.

Madam Speaker, we demand a vote on H.R. 3089 and the other bills that will increase American supply, American energy for Americans. Let's vote now.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I think we have gotten all the wind we need right here right now. I am not so sure how to harness it, but I think we have gotten it, so we don't have to wait for it.

And I understand the gentleman doesn't want to read any of the bills we have put forward. I understand that. Nor should he waste his time, because he is not going to vote for them anyway. I know that. But he still hasn't answered the reason; again, a very simple question: 68 million acres and they are not drilling on them. Why? The obvious answer is they want to keep prices up.

Why aren't they using the refineries to their full capacity?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAPUANO. No, I don't yield. I will get the rest of the advertisement later.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. The gentleman asked a question.

Mr. CAPUANO. No, I don't yield.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAPUANO. I do not yield.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. You asked a question.

Mr. CAPUANO. I do not yield. I have got the full advertisement.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CAPUANO. You have wasted enough time for the American public right now. You are wasting taxpayer dollars right now. You are entitled to do it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlemen will suspend. The gentleman from Massachusetts controls the time.

Mr. CAPUANO. The gentleman said why don't I ask my constituents. Why doesn't he come to my district and ask my constituents? If he thinks I don't talk to my constituents, that is fine. You can insult me all you want. It is of no concern. The American people know your answer. Your answer is to simply give oil companies anything and everything they want and ask for nothing back. Our answer is to allow them to drill where there is oil, to do so in a responsible manner, to pay their taxes, and to not basically gouge us with ungodly prices and ungodly profits.

I understand you don't want to join us in that. I respect that. Why you don't, I don't get; I don't have to get.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I look forward to the remainder of the Republican advertisement.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) 3 minutes.

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of a comprehensive energy policy. And the gentleman from Massachusetts and I are friends and neighbors by offices and talk all the time.

And do you know what? It may be entirely true that Nebraskans think differently than suburban Boston folks. And that is why we go back and we talk to our constituents. And what I hear—and this isn't evenly divided; this is 95-5—that people are angry at the price of gas; they are angry at Congress doing nothing. And we sit here in this body and we have no real energy bills to discuss, so we have to use a flood insurance bill to be able to discuss these type of issues.

But my friend from Massachusetts brings up a point that I want to kind of correct and kind of agree with. We have been in Congress now five terms. I have been on the Energy Committee for 8 years; and almost every year that I have been on that committee, we

have done an energy bill. Most of them haven't gotten to the President. We did get an energy bill that included drilling to the President in our first term, which was vetoed by President Clinton, that included ANWR.

My friend would probably remember a lot of vicious debates on this floor about opening up drilling in Alaska and ANWR and the deep waters off the coast of Florida and the gulf coast. We had incredibly intense debates on that, and we passed those. We passed the refinery bill that would expand our refining capacity and diversify where they are at in this body. So to be able to come and say on the House floor that we haven't done anything for 12 years is not accurate.

What is accurate is a bipartisan opposition to energy in the Senate, where we did good work, but unfortunately we had a group of 40 that was mostly Democrat but Republicans also that voted to kill refinery expansions, that voted to—well, sometimes they voted on deep-sea and ANWR, but most of the time they just ignored what we did here, in the Senate. And I am angry and upset at that.

But the people are demanding action now. And what I would like to see is, instead of this partisan rhetoric that we are hearing on the floor today, that my friends on the other side would say, hey, let's all get together. Because you talk about conservation. I wrote with Baron Hill the CAFE bill that ups the amount of fuel efficiency for the auto manufacturers. I am open to more of those types of discussions.

Let's get together and work on an energy policy, instead of this partisan bickering that we are hearing right now.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and classmate for not getting further down that nasty little road. He made a good point. No new points. But I appreciate his tone.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, could I inquire of the amount of time that I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 22½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I encourage our discussion on flood insurance. But like my colleagues, I am very frustrated with the high price of gasoline. And I believe that West Virginians deserve a comprehensive all-of-the-above approach.

I had a lot of conversations just last night with West Virginians, and they had wonderful, creative solutions. They had amazing ideas: Let's use algae, let's use cooking oil, let's use biomass; and, of course from West Virginia, let's use coal.

We also had a gentleman who offered a great national call for conservation, that we would incorporate our youth

through education and other methods to get involved with how we can conserve. But the most thing I heard was the question of frustration, and why are we not doing anything?

Unfortunately, this House has yet to act on any legislation that will actually make a difference. And it is time for a change. It is time for this Congress to get serious about protecting consumers and taking action on real solutions.

West Virginians are less concerned, as the previous speaker said, about the political battles that are encompassing Capitol Hill. We are more concerned about a bipartisan breakthrough that actually increases supply and makes our Nation more self-reliant.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) may consume.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, who came here to discuss what I thought I came here to vote on, and that is the Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act of 2008.

Lest we lose sight of the importance of flood insurance, coming from an area where that is a continuing critical problem and knowing that those in the Midwest and certain portions of the South are presently suffering in that regard, it is regrettable that we are not focusing on the importance of that particular legislation.

Now, let me also add my voice to the voices of my colleagues on the other side who continue to say that they want to do something about the continuing increase in the price of gasoline.

I recently was before an editorial board, the Sun Sentinel Newspaper, in my hometown, and I was asked the question: What are you all in Congress going to do about gas prices?

A footnote right here. I would that my colleagues would stop the folly of using the words of an aide in a congressional office as the strategy of the Democratic Party. What I said to my newspaper was we were going to use an awful lot of hyperbole between now—we, meaning the Congress; we, meaning the U.S. House and Senate; we, meaning Democrats and Republicans; we, meaning liberals and conservatives.

What we were going to do between now and the election, I said to them, was talk a lot about things that are likely to take place in the future but that cost an immense amount of money in order to accomplish. And I said to them, let me give you the hyperbole. We are going to use the language geothermal. We are going to say biomass. You are going to hear alternative energy, solar or wind. You are going to hear all of those things, and many of those things are certainly going to be a part of our energy production at some point in the future.

I also rather suspect that what is going to happen is those companies that supply energy today are more likely than not to be involved in that

research and production of the alternative energy sources. But to say that the Democrats have done nothing, and I am now here 15 years and I have seen 12 years of the Republicans' attempts to do something about energy which amounted obviously to nothing.

So the Democrats are in charge 1½ years, and we are told with a White House that is more than involved in the energy issues of this Nation and this world, and with a Senate that won't move a single solitary thing that is productive coming from the House of Representatives; we still have managed to enact into law the Energy Independence and Security Act in 2007, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Fill Suspension and Consumer Protection Act.

□ 1200

We enacted into law the Food Conservation and Energy Act of 2008, and I won't go into all of the details. There is more coming, reducing transit fares, cracking down on price gouging, use or lose it, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to have forgotten that we just voted on before we left here, and that we are likely, just so I give them a heads-up, give you another chance not to go with use it or lose it, which compels the oil industry to start drilling or lose permits on 68 million acres of undeveloped Federal oil reserves which they are currently warehousing, keeping domestic supply lower and prices higher. We need to further close the Enron loophole which was also a part of that legislation.

We have also passed the Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act. We passed the Gas Price Relief For Consumers Act. We passed the Energy Gouging Prevention Act.

So I continue with what I said to my newspaper, we were going to say switch grass. We were going to say algae. We were going to say use cane as Brazil does. We were going to say all of those things, and then when we finish, we are not going to do one single solitary thing that is going to cause Jane Lunchbucket, when she goes to the gas pump next Thursday, to witness a reduction in her gas prices.

We have tried as best we can to deal with speculators that we know have driven up some of these prices. We are doing everything that we can to try to ensure that the 200,000 acres of oil shale that are already under the control of six companies are utilized.

We allow that people need to understand that if we drill off the coast of Florida, and let it be clearly understood by everybody in this House of Representatives that I will be the last man standing saying that you will not drill off the shore of Florida beyond the limits of the law that all of us agreed to until such time you change that law. Florida's beaches are pristine. Florida's tourism depends upon them, and I am astounded that my California colleagues would come here and say that they want that kind of drilling. We own that opportunity. Sixty-eight

million acres are already leased; as well as 23 million acres in the Arctic. What in the world are you talking about? Why are the oil companies not doing that drilling at this point?

And you come down here with some simplistic solution saying that some child in an office back there said drive small cars and wait for the wind. We aren't going to wait for the wind. T. Boone Pickens is not waiting for the wind. He has been an oil man all of his life, and he has decided that among the things that he is going to do is get involved in wind research.

I go to Denmark frequently in an organization that I work with. Denmark is supplying more than 30 percent of their energy with wind. And most of the windmills that you see come from that Denmark area. Assuredly at some point wind is going to be a major source, as is geothermal, as is gasification.

All of us know the buzz words, but let's stop kidding Americans. The solutions are costly, and the energy companies are the ones that are more likely to do this rather than us sitting around here with some mumbo-jumbo and a bunch of people running down here so that they can have a bumper sticker.

Everybody goes home, everybody buys gas, everybody knows it is high, and none of us in this place are going to do one doggone thing between now and the time that we leave here that is going to cause it to come down that much that it will be dramatic.

I have one more proposal: A tax credit for Jane Lunchbucket and Joe Lunchbucket. Give them a tax credit. When I was a child, we had oil coupons because oil was cheap, not cheap, but at the same time was not plentiful. So during the Second World War, we did what was necessary, and I would ask all of my colleagues in this body, just ask yourself the question: What would Roosevelt do? I think what he would do is say that we have a national crisis and that we owe it to ourselves to focus on what it will take, worldwide, in this global economy that we live in and in our Nation to undertake to do what is necessary for the American public.

I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct, but I also rise in support of my colleagues who today are stressing the plight of the American people concerning the price of gasoline.

Let me just note that this weekend I was surfing in my district. My wife and I are avid surfers, and my friend and colleague from Florida, who also, of course, represents a State with a long coastline, should understand that we have had offshore oil rigs off California for many, many years, off of my district for many, many years. The only

oil spill we have ever had has come from a tanker which had an accident off our shore.

Those people who are adamantly opposed to offshore oil drilling, as we have just heard, are actually making us more vulnerable. They are making their pristine beaches more vulnerable to spills because a tanker has about a 500 percent greater chance of spilling oil than does an offshore oil rig.

In fact, let us note that we have heard the argument time and again, why aren't the oil companies drilling off the land they have already been given? In my area that is very clear. The reason the oil companies can't proceed is that they have been stopped by roadblocks put before them, legislative and legal and regulatory roadblocks by radical environmental groups that won't let them drill and won't let them get to that oil. As long as the alliance for the radical environmentalists and the liberal wing of the Democratic Party keeps hold, we are not going to get that supply.

The price of oil is high, gasoline is high because the supply is down. The supply is down because there is a coalition between the liberal left and radical environmentalists that have prevented any type of new supply from being developed in the last 30 years. It's as simple as that. The money being extracted from our pockets at the pump is a result of the lack of supply. The idea that pristine beaches are going to be threatened by offshore oil rigs has been used to diminish supply and increase the price of oil at the pump.

I rise in support of the motion to instruct and the arguments in favor of more supply of oil for our country.

Mr. CAPUANO. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was not going to speak here this morning, but I have heard the rhetoric on the floor and it is really sort of disheartening to be a Member of this body and see all the pointing of fingers going on on energy. I sit on the Energy and Commerce Committee and in my role as the chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, we have held six hearings in the last 2 years about what is happening with gas prices, oil supply, and what is happening in our markets, especially with speculators. We continue to work on legislation to do a number of things.

But I think the honest thing we have to tell the American people, any Member of this House, Democrat or Republican, if they had it within their power to lower a price of a gallon of gas, they, we, would do it. We would have done it. We realize the pain that is being felt by the American people.

When I was home doing my Fourth of July parades, people demanded we do something. I finally said to one of them, "Don't you think if Congress had the magic wand and could lower gas

prices tomorrow, we would have done it?" There are some things that are out of the hands of the U.S. Congress at this point in time.

So what is our strategy to move forward? What can we do immediately? Supply and demand. It is more than just supply and demand. The price has doubled within a year, and there have been no shortages in the supply.

If you take a look, when we were doing these Fourth of July parades, oil was \$145 a barrel. Today, Thursday, July 10, USA Today, Moneyline, it is \$136.05. Why did it drop \$10 in less than 7 days? That's the volatility we see in the market right now. It is a very volatile market. Some of us want to bring stability to the market and lower these prices. Why the \$10 drop when nothing has really happened? There is no more supply that came on the market. We do have more speculators. We do have this Democratic Congress holding hearings, like in the Ag Committee, regarding excess speculation in the market. Some of us have been working on that angle since 2006.

We have had legislation, the PUMP Act, to stabilize prices and to lower prices. So if you take a look at the PUMP Act regarding how we get these prices down from \$136, it is to close the Enron loophole. The Enron loophole says the Commodity Futures Trading Commission will not deal with energy or energy derivatives. We had turned a blind eye to what happened in the market.

We should close the swaps loopholes. Eighty-five percent of the trades now on energy are going through a swap loophole.

We should enforce the aggregate position. You're only supposed to hold 20,000 contracts for oil on NYMEX. So I hold 20,000 on NYMEX. I hold 20 on Dubai, I hold 20 on the London exchange, the ICE Exchange, as they call it. There are 60,000 contracts. Every contract represents a thousand barrels of oil.

The foreign boards of trade. You set up a foreign board of trade and you give it a name like the London Exchange or ICE Exchange, and guess what, we outsource the enforcement of the trading that is going on in this country for West Texas intermediate crude oil. That's what has happened. We've outsourced our responsibility, and we rely on London and Dubai to enforce laws to make sure that the markets are performing accurately and not these wild swings we see each and every day.

So I don't care if you're Democrat or Republican, if we had a way to lower gas prices, we would do it.

I believe one thing we can do to immediately bring some relief, without drilling all over the world, is close these loopholes, the Enron loophole, the swaps loophole, enforce aggregate positions, close the foreign boards of trades. We can do that. We are having a hearing today, and it will be going again tomorrow, and hopefully next

week we can bring forth this legislation. So let's take the speculators out of the market so we bring a stable price and less volatility in the market.

And then let's look at opening more areas for drilling. Democrats are for that. We are for that when we take a look at the long term. And why don't we streamline. In fact, we did. In 2005, the Energy Policy Act, passed under the Republican majority, I was a conferee to that bill, we streamlined so we could bring more refineries online, but no one has done that. We streamlined the process so it is easier.

So all of this finger pointing going on here is not doing the American people or any of us a lot of good.

We have to look at alternative fuels. The first commercial bio-diesel fuel in Michigan is in my district. I am proud of that. Is it enough? No, but it is a start.

So we need a short-term strategy and a long-term strategy. I think the PUMP Act prevents an unfair manipulation of prices, gives a short-term strategy, stabilizes the prices, and gets the volatility and excess speculation out of the market. And then let's look at long-term solutions.

So instead of coming down here and saying one side is going to do this and one side can't do that, that is hogwash. None of us have within our power to lower gas prices today or tomorrow. Let's be honest with the American people. What we can do is get the speculators out of the market, do a reasonable approach, and let's take a look at some long-term solutions.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, just in response to the gentleman, what can we do, we can increase the supply. And as the other previous speaker from Florida said, we are not talking about geothermal or switch grass, Madam Speaker. We are talking about proven technology. We know we that can use oil. We know that we can use nuclear. We know that we can use coal. And the only way you are ever going to lower the price is increase supply, yet my colleagues on the other side are saying "no." The American people are saying "yes."

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) who has been trying to bring this point to the forefront in this Congress.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I also want to address what the gentleman from Michigan on the other side just got through saying about they are for drilling. Well, if they are for drilling, why is it that they pulled the appropriations bill when there was just a mention of having an amendment to allow drilling?

Let me just go back to April 2006 when then-minority leader NANCY PELOSI, now Speaker, said the Democrats have a commonsense plan to lower the skyrocketing price of gas. Where is that plan? Well, the plan was supposed to be, I guess, H.R. 6, the Energy Independence and Security Act of



2007 which came forth. I am assuming this was the commonsense plan that the Democrats had.

□ 1215

Well, you know what? If they want bipartisan for it, if they wanted to vote on drilling, if they want to vote on getting to the Outer Continental Shelf, or if they wanted to be serious about tar sands, alternative fuels, coal-to-liquid, shale oil, then why did we have a closed rule? Why did we shut out half of the American people in this country that have representation in this body that didn't have a voice about an amendment on the floor that did not have an amendment in the Rules Committee?

If we're so bipartisan now that this issue has come up and that the majority has not been able to address it, why are we wanting to be bipartisan now? Why weren't we bipartisan when we passed H.R. 6? And let me tell you this: In that bill of over 300 pages, crude oil's mentioned five times, gasoline is mentioned one; exploratory drilling is mentioned two; offshore drilling, zero; domestic drilling, zero; domestic oil, zero; domestic gas, zero; domestic fuel, zero; domestic petroleum, zero; gas prices, zero. Commonsense, goose egg.

Greenhouse, 103; green building, 101; ecosystem, 24; climate change, 18; regulation, 98; environmental, 160; geothermal, 94; renewable, 333; swimming pool, 47. And yes, don't forget the popular CFL light bulb, 350 times.

Madam Speaker, we cannot regulate our way to energy independence. We cannot tax our way to prosperity. When is the majority party going to understand that we have got to do some of these things that we hear them talking about?

It's time to show the American people, Madam Speaker, that we mean business about lowering the price of gas at the pump. I want to quote this, and I think this is a representation of what the Democratic Party did to the American people in 2006.

This is a quote from Mr. KANJORSKI from a newspaper:

"Now, anybody who is a good student of government would know that wasn't true," Mr. KANJORSKI said at an Ashley town hall meeting in August. And he was talking about ending the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. "But you know the temptation to want to win back Congress—we sort of stretched the facts, and the American people ate it up."

Well, I've got something to say to Mr. KANJORSKI and the majority party. The people are paying the price for that meal that they had of lies and untruths and half-truths. They're paying the price for it at the pump.

It's time we took action. It's time we make it where the American people

didn't have to make the choice of visiting a sick relative in the hospital or going to work.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I wouldn't mind getting a list of these radical environmentalists. I would like to know who they are because I wouldn't want to associate with them. I don't know where they're meeting to somehow deny the oil companies their massive profits. I would like to know what they are doing. When they get the list of radical environmentalists, I would just respectfully ask that they send it over to me because I would like to know who they are so I can make sure not to hang around with them.

As I understand it, I still haven't heard any reason—I don't understand this. We have said "yes" to drilling. We have given out 68 million acres to do it on. We have given out 10,000 permits that are being unused now. Right now as we speak. There are refineries that have excess capacity right now. Right now. Today. Right this very minute. Not being utilized.

With all of this land that they have that they don't want to use, we're simply trying to get them to use it. Even JOHN MCCAIN says he doesn't want to drill in ANWR. He knows that that's a red herring. He knows that that's not the answer. He knows that there are other answers that are more readily available that will get us where we want to go more quickly without destroying the last bit of environmental parts of this country that we have.

Now, don't get me wrong. I'm not going to agree with many things that Mr. MCCAIN has to say. But he's right on one. And I'll give it to him.

If the companies don't want to use the land that they have, why don't they give it back? Either drill or get off the plot. Very simple. Or explain to us who these radical environmentalists are who have somehow secretly been so successful at foiling the good-hearted intentions of our major oil companies in providing us low-cost oil. Because if that's the case, I will sign up with Exxon and Sunoco right now and deny my friends on the environmental side, unless, of course, I find that they're so successful, they're so capable that maybe they'll convert me, and maybe I will join them. But I'd certainly like to know who they are.

Mr. DOYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAPUANO. I certainly will yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOYLE. Since the oil companies apparently don't want to drill in all of this land that's accessible to them today, and since our friends on the other side of the aisle want so desperately to get oil out in America to lower gas prices, I would ask them to join Democrats in asking President Bush to release 10 percent of its gross 70 million barrels of oil in the economy immediately, not 10 years down the road once we start some new drilling project, but immediately we could have oil in the domestic economy just by re-

leasing 10 percent of the SPR without affecting any national security concerns and gasoline prices could come down.

So I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will join us in asking President Bush to do that immediately.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, maybe they can just say "yes" to that.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, it's my honor to yield 1 minute to the distinguished minority leader, Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from Texas for yielding.

I think all of us understand that American families are struggling with the high costs of food, health care, and yes, the high cost of gasoline. Small businesses are struggling. And what Americans are about to see in the coming months is that the cost of fuel is in virtually everything that we buy and everything that we use. And when we begin to see these giant price increases in the coming months, the squeeze on American families and small businesses is going to get a lot worse.

That's why I and my Republican colleagues have been supporting a plan that says, Let's do all of the above. If we're serious about energy independence, we're serious about wanting to help our economy, help families, and help small businesses. We know we need to conserve more fuel, more energy in America. That's why many of us voted to increase CAFE standards to get higher fuel mileage for American cars. We also need to continue to promote biofuels, and whether it's cellulosic ethanol, whether it's regular ethanol, biodiesel, there's still room to grow in the biodiesel area.

We also need to have alternative sources of energy, whether it be wind, whether it be solar, geothermal, hydroelectric. All of these alternatives are out there. But we ought to make sure that the incentives that we have are sufficient to help bring these alternatives to market as soon as we can.

But we also need to be serious about nuclear energy. France produces almost 80 percent of its electric from nuclear energy. In America, we've put such a stranglehold on the ability to construct a nuclear plant that it takes over 15 years and billions of dollars to maybe, maybe get one sited, much less build it and to operate it. We can meet all of the safety concerns of nuclear energy in a much more efficient way that would allow people to bring these plants on and save the oil, gas, and coal that is used today.

But even if we did all of these, we haven't done enough. We haven't done enough to take the step toward truly helping Americans be energy independent. And that's where we need to drill. We need more American-made oil and gas. And we can do this. But a lot of people on the other side continue to say no.

1989, when the ANWR bill was on this floor, GEORGE MILLER, my colleague and friend from California, said, We shouldn't pass this. Because even if we passed it, we wouldn't see any oil or gas out of ANWR for 10 or 12 years. Well, let's see. I'm not the greatest mathematician, but that was somewhere around the year 2000 we would have started to see a million to a million and a half barrels of oil a day coming out of ANWR.

The House has passed ANWR drilling legislation 10 or 12 times. It's the Senate that continues to block it. But in 1995, the Senate actually came along. We passed an ANWR drilling bill. We sent it to President Bill Clinton. And he said when he was vetoing the bill that well, even if this were to become law, we wouldn't see any oil or natural gas out of ANWR for 10 years. Well, let's see. That's 2005. So for the last 3 years we would have been getting a million to a million and a half barrels of oil a day.

Now, my colleagues on the other side want to make all kinds of excuses. They want to blame the speculators, they want to blame the oil companies, they want to blame everybody other than who they should blame. Get the mirror out. Look in the mirror, because it's my colleagues on the other side over the last 20 years who, over 85 percent of the time, have voted to block more American-made energy. Every single time.

Now, we've been having this debate the last several months about having a pro-energy vote here on the floor of the House. Right here. Right here in the people's House. Why can't we vote? Why can't we have a debate? Why can't we let the American people see where their Congress is, where their Members are? What do we have to fear? Oh. We have to stop the appropriation process because oh my goodness, somebody might offer an amendment that would lift the moratorium on offshore drilling. We can't expose our Members to a vote like that. They might vote the wrong way.

Why can't we have a vote right here on the floor of the House on drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, a 19-million acre plot of ground and where we would use about 2,000 acres to actually do the drilling? Now, if you want to look at that, that's the size of a postage stamp on a football field. That's how much of ANWR would be affected by oil production up there.

Why not have a vote? Why not let the Members make a decision. Offshore oil drilling. How about oil shale in the Intermountain West? Why can't we have a vote here to have more energy production?

But I'm going to say it one more time. We need to do all of the above if we're serious. And we can drill in an environmentally sound way, and that's what we should be doing.

Madam Speaker, I support the gentleman's motion to instruct, and I would tell my colleagues on the other

side we're not going to leave here for the August recess until we get a vote on having more American-made energy.

And I see my friend, the majority leader, coming down. Maybe he can promise us that we will get a vote over the next 3 weeks on having more energy produced right here in America.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was in my office, as I have been over the days recently, where I see the distinguished minority leader rise, I see other Members on that side of the aisle rise, beat their chests about drilling. My side of the aisle is for drilling. We just had a press conference on drilling. But as I sit there, I think to myself, you know, the American people gave the opportunity to the Republican Party, the minority party now in the House of Representatives, to lead this country; and they gave them all of the power in Washington. They gave them the Presidency, the House of Representatives, and the United States Senate. They did that in the year 2000. They had already given them the House, and two oil men were elected President and Vice President.

In January, the Vice President decided to have, and he had over the coming months in 2001, he convened a meeting, a secret meeting of those involved in the energy industry to adopt energy policies.

Now that meeting—the minority leader is now leaving, but we will see him later—that meeting perhaps resulted in success, I don't know. I don't know what the meeting was about.

But during the course of the Presidency of Bill Clinton, oil went from \$1.06 to \$1.46. A nickel a year, 5 cents per year was the increase in the cost of gasoline at the pump for Americans.

□ 1230

And then, President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, the Republicans came to town, all of town, and gas went from \$1.46 in January 20, 2001, to over \$4.10 on average throughout this country. Pretty stark. It now goes up from time to time 5 cents a day, where under Bill Clinton 5 cents a year.

And then the Republicans, 5 years later, adopted a bill, 2005, their energy policy. They were in control of the House, control of the Senate, and they had the Presidency. They passed that bill. Gas was then about \$2.20. And they said we've adopted an energy policy—said it on the floor, said it when they signed the bill—we have done a bill now that's going to stabilize prices, going to make sure that Americans have energy supply. That's what they said. That's not what we said.

Now, ladies and gentlemen who are listening to this debate on this floor, I tell you that there are 68 million acres right now, right now available for leasing. You wring your hands and say,

well, open up places for drilling. We've done that, friends. Look at the statistics, 68 million acres in the lower 48 and another 20 million acres, give or take a million, in Alaska.

They talk about a wildlife refuge that they want to drill in, but they don't talk about the 20 million acres in the National Petroleum Reserve area in Alaska currently available. The administration could be pursuing leases on it. We may well have legislation to say, Administration, start moving, start drilling, start bringing product to the market so we'll bring prices down.

Now, of course, one of the aspects of bringing prices down, my friends, will be that the oil companies will make less profits. I know everybody in America believes that the oil companies want to get more products so they can bring prices down and make less profit. I know all Americans believe that's the way the system works.

The Republicans keep harping on drilling. We want to drill. We want to produce more American product. And by the way, we're going to bring legislation to the floor that's going to say when you drill, sell it here in the United States of America, keep our resources here in the United States of America.

I want to tell my friends, there are 88 million acres. And now, let me tell you something, 88 million acre, that's Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Delaware, and most of Maryland. Now, I know my friend from Texas thinks that's not much of an area of space, but I will bet everybody listening to this debate thinks that is a pretty large piece of property on which you can drill in America today. Why? Because we want to produce energy.

But I will tell you, one of the reasons we're in this pickle is because for a quarter of a century, for a quarter of a century that I've served in the Congress, a little more than that, the Republican Party has taken the position, no, we don't want to invest in alternatives, we don't want to see alternative energy sources developed.

And you can say it's not true as much as you want, I tell my friend, but the record reflects that has not been the priority. The priority has been, let's get more oil. We want to get more oil.

But I will tell you a country, as Boone Pickens said—I don't know whether you read Boone Pickens. He's one of the people who thinks that some of the policies you have been pursuing aren't too bad. He's not a Democrat. Here is what Boone Pickens said. The problem, of course, is our growing dependence on foreign oil. It's extreme, it's dangerous, and threatens future generations. And he says in this article in *The Wall Street Journal*, you are not going to drill yourself out of this hole that we've dug. He says, rightfully, that we need to see investments in alternatives.

Now, happily, last year when we took office, took control of the House and



the Senate, we adopted a bill, the President signed that bill, which looks to alternatives to complement the relatively small supply. America demands 25 percent of the energy resources in this world, and we have 3 percent of the petroleum supply. My friend the minority leader said he wasn't much of a mathematician, but you don't have to be much of a mathematician to know that if you're relying on that 3 percent, it's not going to be there very long.

So, yes, my friends, we need to find more domestic product. We need to drill where we now have authorized drilling to occur, and if that doesn't produce the resources that experts tell us are on that property, then I tell you this. Then we ought to look at other alternatives, and perhaps we ought to look at other alternatives now.

But for you to have a blind eye and pretend to the American people that somehow we're not allowing people to pursue drilling on our soil here in America and on the Outer Continental Shelf, I want you to know, that is currently authorized where drilling is not occurring, then you are misleading the American people. The American people ought to know: The Democrats want to make sure that we have more domestic product.

The Speaker has written a letter to the President just the other day saying, Mr. President, we have 773 million barrels of oil that are in our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Mr. President, use some of those, as your father did, as Bill Clinton did, at a time of economic crisis to help our people, help our people get to work, help them get their kids to school, help them afford their other expenses.

So I tell my friends that we need to deal with this issue. We're going to deal with this issue. We're concerned about this issue, all 435 of us, but to hear day after day after day that somehow we, who came to office just 18 months ago, after an energy policy was conjured up by the Vice President and the White House and an energy bill was passed in 2005, that somehow, somehow what's happening now is our fault, the American public aren't buying that. Polls show that.

But I will tell you, that we can work together because we need to be energy independent. It's a national security objective, an economic security objective, and we also need to keep our environment from choking our children and generations to come.

We're committed to both of those objectives, and we will join with all those who want to do the same.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, one of the things I want to say is we are more than willing to work in a bipartisan way if the majority leader has a plan to supplant the fact that we import 13 million barrels a day. If he's got some plan to do that, the Republicans will stay here till December to pass that legislation.

I just want to also let the gentleman know that the largest wind farm in the

world is in my congressional district, and there's more wind power in my congressional district than in the whole State of California. We were able to accomplish that in just 5 years.

Madam Speaker, what the American people that are here today, they want to know is, is this Congress, is this majority, going to do something about energy. Either yes or no.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I think everything that needs to be said has been said. I appreciate the opportunity to listen to the preview of the November election. I look forward to seeing the 30-second version. I don't know how it's going to be cut down, but I'm looking forward to it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1317, and adopting House Resolution 1317, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1286, WASHINGTON-ROCHAMBEAU REVOLUTIONARY ROUTE NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL DESIGNATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1317, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 185, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

YEAS—226

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen

Altmire  
Arcuri  
Baca

Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow

Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castle  
Castor  
Cazayoux  
Chandler  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleave  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Edwards (MD)  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Giffords  
Gillibrand  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Hastings (FL)

Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeback  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey

Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

NAYS—185

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggert  
Blibray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Buchanan

Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Chabot  
Childers  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.

Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Forbes  
Fossella  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gilchrest  
Gingrey  
Goode