

floor today—said simply by increasing production by 1 percent, Mr. Speaker, that has an impact of dropping the price by 10 percent.

We have heard some of the best and the brightest, absolutely the A team, some of the folks who came through in the 2006 election, we have heard from the best and the brightest, and yet no answer. They didn't even pick it up. This is not some fact that I trotted out 2 minutes ago, this is a fact that I put out two or three or four times, and yet the silence on the other side of the aisle has been absolutely deafening. Why, because it doesn't fit into the orthodoxy that has absolutely bound this leadership and has taken this debate from what should be a national security debate, what should be a transition time in our public life, what should bring us all together, Mr. Speaker, and has devolved into simple pettiness and capitulation. We can do better. We know what we need to do.

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 motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Messrs. WATT, AL GREEN of Texas, CLEAVER, BACHUS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. PEARCE.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6515, DRILL RESPONSIBLY IN LEASED LANDS ACT OF 2008

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1350 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1350

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, July 17, 2008, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to a measure concerning the domestic production of oil and natural gas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise

and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Res. 1350 provides that it shall be in order on the legislative day of Thursday, July 17, 2008, for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules relating to a measure concerning the domestic production of oil and natural gas.

The energy crisis that we face is real. It requires immediate attention and short and long-term action. As a Nation, we have in our reserves less than 2 percent of the proven oil and gas reserves in the world. But with 4 percent of the population, we consume nearly 25 percent of the world's oil. That's not sustainable over the long term.

We must take this opportunity now to provide relief immediately to people paying over \$4 at the pump, \$5 for home heating oil, and we need a commitment to a new energy future focused on creating clear and clean domestic alternatives.

Under suspension of the House rules, this body will take up later the Drill Responsibly in Leased Lands bill. The bill promotes the responsible domestic production of oil and natural gas on the 20 million acres that make up the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. That would provide an estimated 10.4 billion barrels of oil, a higher estimate than the consensus estimate of oil that is available in ANWR.

The DRILL Act, as it is called, will increase oil production and do it sooner than other alternative proposals. It will facilitate also the construction of existing pipelines within 5 miles of where they already are located. So its environmental footprint will be minimal, and engineering challenges also minimal. This will help move oil and natural gas to the market.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule which is a cynical attempt to provide political cover for Members of this body who have chosen to elevate partisanship and politics above American consumers and our economy.

Today, both everyday consumers and our national economy are suffering. Mr. Speaker, we are suffering because of this Democrat majority's mind-boggling unwillingness to increase the supply of domestically produced oil to reduce prices at the pump. That's why we are suffering. We are suffering because the policy here in this body in Washington, D.C., and you can read about it

in articles in virtually every single paper across the country, and that is the leadership of this House of Representatives does not want to get the right thing done so consumers can have more energy and oil at the pump.

For weeks now, Republicans have been unified in a commonsense and comprehensive approach to bringing down the price of gasoline for consumers, only to have every single one of those plans and votes on the floor of this House of Representatives ignored by the Democrat majority in favor of an agenda that prioritizes legislation like naming historical trails and gambling the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to prevent the development of increased energy production in New England alone.

□ 1145

They are going out of their way to make sure that commonsense legislation that will help the free market and the energy companies, who should be our friends, to provide what consumers need and to produce a better economy.

These priorities completely ignore the wishes of the American people and will do absolutely nothing to bring relief to millions of Americans who are really suffering as a result of high energy prices. I think that if the American people knew that the plan, or part of the plan, was to sue OPEC, they would laugh just like Members of this body have done.

Rather than taking this opportunity to work in a constructive, bipartisan way, to address these domestic energy supply issues that have led to sky-high energy prices for consumers, today we are being asked outside of regular order, and with no opportunity for Members to offer their own good ideas to bring down the price of gasoline, to spend a whopping 40 minutes debating a fig-leaf legislation that wasn't even released to Republicans until late last night.

Republicans have already put forth a number of smart, innovative ideas to bring down gas prices like H.R. 3089, the No More Excuses Energy Act of 2007, which would reduce the price of oil by opening new American refineries, investing in clean energy sources such as wind, nuclear, and captured carbon dioxide, and making available more American energy through environmentally sensitive exploration of the Arctic energy slope and America's deep sea reserves.

But, of course, we know we can't get close to that. We also have H.R. 2279, the Expand American Refining Capacity on Closed Military Installations Act, which would reduce the price of oil by streamlining the refinery application process and by requiring the President to open at least three closed military installations for the purpose of setting new and reliable American refineries in place.

H.R. 5656, which would reduce the price of oil by allowing the entire Federal Government, not just the Department of Defense, NASA and our intelligence community, to procure advanced alternative fuels derived from diverse sources such as oil shale, tar sands and coal-to-liquid technology.

H.R. 2208, the Coal-to-Liquid Fuel Act, which would reduce the price of oil by encouraging the use of clean coal-to-liquid technology by authorizing the Secretary of Energy to engage and enter into loan agreements with coal-to-liquid projects that produce innovative transportation and fuel; and, H.R. 2493, the Fuel Mandate Reduction Act, which would reduce the price of oil by removing fuel-blend requirements and onerous government mandates that contribute to unaffordable gasoline. In other words, red tape.

Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership have the ability to bring each and every one of these already developed commonsense solutions up for a vote at any time, but they have chosen to ignore the American public in favor of a radical environmentalist agenda, and each one of these bills is also the subject of a discharge petition that would force their consideration. Every single Member of this body, even though they may agree or disagree with Speaker PELOSI on whatever her agenda might be, can take a commonsense approach and come down and sign a discharge petition that would bring this legislation to the floor of the House of Representatives.

I encourage every single Member of this body who agrees that this country needs to increase its supply of safe and reliable American energy to force this Democrat leadership to finally act by joining me in signing each and every one of these.

It's simple, by the way, for the new Members, as you hear this, all you have to do is walk down to the very front, sign these discharge petitions, and we could, this afternoon, be debating and voting on commonsense ideas to bring down the price of gasoline.

Instead, this Democrat majority, led by Speaker NANCY PELOSI, has chosen to bring up redundant legislation that has been overtaken by events before it can even be considered. The Bush administration has already announced that a new round of leases will be held for the National Petroleum Reserve, making today's restatement of current policy as useless as the restatement of the current "use it or lose it," or, said another way, making energy companies drill dry holes. So, what we need is commonsense activities that would bring commonsense prices down for the American public.

Perhaps the most galling of all is the inclusion of section 5 of today's legislation, which forces cumbersome requirements and restrictions on the construction of any new pipeline from Alaska to the rest of the United States simply on behalf of big labor bosses. While the inclusion of this requirement is no surprise coming from the Democrat ma-

jority that wants to take away a worker's right to a private ballot so that big labor bosses can more easily manipulate the outcomes, it is disappointing that this Democrat majority would blatantly include this requirement at a time when we can see that it should be addressed to make life easier for bringing down the cost of gasoline for all Americans.

Today's bill is being brought forth by the Democrat leadership in a weak attempt and effort that does nothing more than restate current law and restate existing requirements that oil production on lands be developed while adding new restrictions to pipeline construction for the benefit of big labor bosses. I challenge anyone on either side of this aisle to produce a study other than the partisan and logically challenged report developed by the Democrat staff of the Natural Resources Committee that reapplying the so-called "use it or lose it" provision to the National Petroleum Reserve will create even one additional barrel of oil. This is a supply-side problem. This is a problem that the new Democrat majority has made happen, and this is a problem that the American people are asking each of us to solve.

So, the Republican Party is here on the floor of the House of Representatives on behalf of the American people asking all the Members of this body to please understand what we are doing. I think it's a cynical rule that we are debating now, as well as the underlying legislation. We need real legislation. We need to put the American people first. We are not just some country, we are America, and we can win.

Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a brief remark.

The number of bills that were referred to by my friend from Texas, none of those, not a single one of those bills, will get supply out of the ground and into the gas tank in the foreseeable future. The legislation that we are going to be considering today is about getting supply as quickly as possible by taking advantage of something that's available and ready to be leased next to a pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield 3 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

Mr. HODES. I thank my distinguished colleague from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am not shocked but disappointed to hear the callous and cynical suggestions from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that Democrats are responsible for the inflation in gas prices that so many Americans are suffering from today, that somehow, in the past 2 years, it is the Democratic energy policy that has caused the inflation in the price of oil and gas. Let us remember that we have two oilmen in the White House and \$4 a gallon gas today. Let us remember that we have an energy policy that was made in secret by the Vice President,

by the oil companies, for the oil companies and of the oil companies and, today, we are reaping the benefits of that secret energy policy on which we have been stonewalled time and time again.

We have 68 million acres of land available on and offshore, on which the oil companies could drill. We have the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska on which the oil companies can drill. Eighty-one percent of all known oil reserves are available to drill on right now. The estimates are that there is a 14-year supply just waiting for Big Oil to put metal to the ground, put metal to the ground and drill.

That's why I rise in support of this bill. All the oil companies have to do is to start drilling on available land, and they could help increase supply and help consumers. Calls from the White House and their allies on the other side of the aisle who somehow claim that we should open ANWR and offshore areas to drilling, which in 20 to 30 years might start producing, are cynical attempts to deflect us from the real challenges that Americans face today and that we face as a Nation in going forward to a new energy policy.

It's estimated that the average American would spend about \$57,800 before the first drop of oil could be produced from ANWR. So what's the point to deflect us from the pain that Americans are feeling now to try to point fingers and to set us aside from changing our energy policy?

What part of "drill now" don't the oil companies understand? What part of "drill now" don't my colleagues understand? No one is stopping the oil companies from drilling. It's time to drill now, help the American people with gas prices, heating oil costs.

This bill says "drill now."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I think it's interesting, he says "drill now," but we can't drill where the oil is. ANWR is 19 million acres. We need less acreage than is the size of one-ninth of Dallas-Ft. Worth International Airport. We don't need the 19 million acres. We need one-ninth the size of DFW International Airport, or only 2,000 acres.

Oil companies would go drill in all these places, except they are dry holes. They want to drill where the oil is, and that's where the Republicans want to give them that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 20 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Vermont has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield for such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California from the Rules Committee, our ranking member, Mr. DREIER.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Big D for yielding me time and for accurately pointing out the size that we are looking at exploring in an environmentally sound way in Alaska is the size of the Dallas-Ft. Worth International Airport. I have often said the Dulles International Airport. It's a pretty small area, and I think we need to do that.

I just don't get it. I have enjoyed listening to a load of our newly elected friends from the other side of the aisle over the past hour and a half as we have debated the motion to instruct conferees come to the floor and talk about the need for us to increase exploration. Obviously these newly elected Members have been hearing from their constituents just like virtually everyone has.

I appreciate the fact that they have had their ear to the ground, and they have heard the hue and cry from the American people that we need to do everything we can to address this problem.

The thing is, this bill, as was correctly stated by my friend from Dallas, is nothing but a reaffirmation of current law, and it is called the DRILL Act. The thing that is very perplexing about this is that we are trying to have an all-of-the-above solution, which does include drilling in an environmentally sound way, and yet this bill, which was introduced late last night, just provided to members in the minority again very, very late last night, was cobbled together. We had a Rules Committee meeting yesterday, and no one knew what it was.

We offered, at that juncture, a bipartisan, and I stress a bipartisan, package of legislation which has been introduced, considered. A number of those measures are right here in the well with discharge petitions, and these measures are provided, having gone through an airing by Members of this body, and, yet, we are not given a chance to do that, to have a vote on it.

Now, again, this is called the DRILL Act, but fact of the matter is, the structure around which we are considering this measure should be we are afraid to vote on the potential for drilling act, is really what it is.

□ 1200

Why?

Because we know full well that this procedure, known as suspension of the rules, is really building on what is taking place in our House Appropriations Committee right now and virtually every other committee in this Congress; and that is, we are afraid to have any kind of debate, discussion or debate or vote on the issue of drilling.

Now, I am one who believes, as our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have said, that we need to pursue alternative energy sources, renewable energy, we need to do everything we can to encourage conservation, and we have a lot of very interesting proposals out there to do that.

But I think common sense says that, for the next few decades, even though we need to do everything we can to wean ourselves off of our reliance on fossil fuels, we have no choice. And so that is why, when I listen to my colleagues say that we should pursue the petroleum reserve and get 10 billion barrels, why don't we also look at ANWR to go for 10 billion barrels?

Again, I believe that the American people want us to come together to address this. As we listen to the horror stories of what has happened, one of the most telling came to me from a grandparent who said that, in one of our town hall meetings, they can't afford to pay for the gasoline to drive to visit their grandchildren from the San Gabriel Valley of California down to Long Beach. And the notion that this dramatic increase in gasoline prices is literally dividing families is something that I think we, as Democrats and Republicans, should come together to address.

Now, as we listen to our need to expand drilling and to encourage big oil to do that, I think we need to look at the fact that, for at least a decade and a half plus, we have been trying to encourage things like exploration in ANWR. And what has happened? Well, in the other body we had members of the Democratic Party filibuster this measure.

I also have to say that in 1995, 13 years ago, we all know that we were able to get through both Houses of Congress, through both Houses of Congress, a measure that would allow us to, in an environmentally sound way, explore that tiny area in Alaska. And what has happened as a by-product of that? Well, unfortunately, then-President Clinton chose to veto that measure.

USA Today, which is hardly a Republican publication, had an editorial just a few weeks ago in which they said that if that measure had been signed, rather than vetoed by President Clinton, we wouldn't be standing here having this discussion that we are now.

And so that is why we have come forward, and Mr. SESSIONS is going to move to defeat the previous question so that we will have an opportunity to make in order legislation like the very thoughtful proposal from our Democratic colleague, Mr. BOUCHER, the gentleman from Virginia, who has, as a hardworking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, come up with a way in which we could proceed on this. A lot of thought has gone into this, a lot of work. And this was introduced a while back.

There are five other bills, along with Mr. BOUCHER's, that have been introduced. And all we are saying is, why don't we have a debate on those and have an up-or-down vote, so that we can, again, pursue what we describe as our all-of-the-above solution to what is obviously a very serious problem that is having a ripple effect across our entire economy, and, in fact, as we all know, across the global economy.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule so that we can come forward with a measure that will allow us to do what it is the American people want us to do; work together, Democrats and Republicans alike, for a solution to this very, very pressing problem.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Congresswoman SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for the time and for his leadership on this extraordinarily important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the DRILL Act, a real solution for the hardships facing our families and a real answer to the mistruths being spread to the American people.

The truth is that there are millions upon millions of onshore and offshore acres available for drilling, but the oil companies are only using a fraction of them.

The truth is that the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, also known as the NPR, is home to 20 million acres that could produce 10.6 billion barrels of oil. This area, Mr. Speaker, has been set aside for oil and gas exploration since the 1920s, but not a single oil company is producing there.

Mr. Speaker, the cry by those on the other side of the aisle and Big Oil, that the problem is that the oil companies don't have access to drill, is false. And it is an effort to deflect the American people from holding the two oilmen in the White House accountable, as well as their friends, for an energy policy that has given Big Oil record profits, and the American people \$4 a gallon gas.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know why we need to open up ANWR when we have this huge, untapped resource right next to the existing oil infrastructure in Alaska known as the NPR.

The DRILL Act will accelerate the development of the NPR by requiring the Bureau of Land Management to offer annual lease sales of the land.

Our bill also calls for the President to facilitate the completion of oil pipelines into the NPR, and to speed construction of a natural gas pipeline to the Continental United States to move the product to the market. When this natural gas pipeline gets built, NPR will be even more important, as it holds over 60 trillion cubic feet of gas, nearly 16 times what ANWR holds.

And Mr. Speaker, the DRILL Act also incorporates important use it or lose it legislation which requires oil producers to drill on the leases they already have before asking us for new ones.

Again, the truth is that Big Oil holds leases on 68 million acres in the U.S. that they could drill on but they are not doing so.

And lastly, this bill also reinstitutes the ban on the export of Alaskan oil so that American oil is used right here at

home in the United States. Can you imagine, at this time of crisis, the same oil companies who are telling the American people that they want to be part of the solution, are sending the oil that they are drilling to other parts of the world, when we need that oil right here.

Mr. Speaker, the DRILL Act is a solution to the energy costs that our constituents are facing today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SUTTON. Let me also remind my colleagues that we have also passed landmark energy legislation, price gouging prevention legislation, legislation to take action against OPEC, and legislation to crack down on manipulation and speculation activities that have been driving up the oil prices.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill. It offers immediate relief. It is part of the solution, and I urge its passage.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the favorite son of the Volunteer State, Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), in his opposition to this rule. Mr. Speaker, let me read just one thing to you. Charles Krauthammer is one of our most respected syndicated columnists and television commentators. A little over 3 weeks ago he wrote this: "Gas is \$4 a gallon. Oil is \$135 a barrel and rising. We import two-thirds of our oil, sending hundreds of billions of dollars to the likes of Russia, Venezuela and Saudi Arabia, and yet we voluntarily prohibit ourselves from even exploring huge resources, huge domestic reserves of petroleum and natural gas. At a time when U.S. crude oil production has fallen 40 percent in the past 25 years, 75 billion barrels of oil have been declared off limits according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration."

Still quoting Mr. Krauthammer: "That would be enough to replace every barrel of non-North American imports for 22 years. That is nearly a quarter century of energy independence."

Mr. Krauthammer ended by saying: "The situation is absurd." Robert Samuelson, a couple of months ago in *The Washington Post*, and he is another syndicated columnist, but not a conservative or a Republican by any stretch of the imagination. He wrote this. He said, "The truth is that we are almost powerless to influence today's prices. We are because we didn't take sensible actions 10 or 20 years ago. If we persist, we will be even worse off in a decade or two."

The first thing to do, Mr. Samuelson said: "Start drilling."

And George Will pointed out in a recent column that when we were able to

pass drilling in ANWR, 12½ years ago, President Clinton vetoed it. If he hadn't vetoed it, that would have been 27 million barrels of oil, 20 million barrels of gasoline and 7 million barrels of diesel fuel coming down to this country, coming down here every day, and would have had a great, great effect on this problem. And we are certainly in a problem.

A couple of months ago we heard in the Highways and Transit Subcommittee that 935 trucking companies had gone out of business in the first quarter of this year. And that survey only counted trucking companies with five trucks or more.

A couple of weeks ago, in the Aviation Subcommittee we heard that eight airlines had gone out of business in the last year and a half. And this is a needless crisis.

The Minerals Management Service estimates that the quantity of undiscovered, technically recoverable resources ranges from 66 to 115 billion barrels of oil.

One of our leaders has described this DRILL Act as a hoax of a bill, and it is a hoax because it still leaves 85 percent, or 611 million acres of our Outer Continental Shelf off limits for oil production.

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

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, let me close just simply by saying this. I have noticed over the years that almost all of these environmental radicals come from very wealthy or very upper income families, and perhaps they can afford 5 or \$6 a gallon gasoline. But many hardworking and average Americans cannot afford this. We are sending this country into a needless economic crisis.

We need to start drilling in an environmentally safe way where there is oil, as the gentleman from Texas has pointed out, and not pass a hoax of a bill such as this.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, Today we are going to take up the DRILL Act; Drill Responsibly In Leased Lands. We recognize, on the Democratic side of the aisle, that part of our energy portfolio is oil and gas. We have 68 million acres that the oil and gas companies have under lease today that they could drill that they are not drilling. That is 14 years worth of supply to the United States.

But what we have, instead, is we have an addiction to foreign oil. And we have a picture here of the President and the King of Saudi Arabia.

We have to break that addiction. So we need to drill here in the United States. And under this particular bill, we require the oil companies to either use it or lose it. Drill on those 68 million acres. 68 million acres is the size of

New England. Drilling locations, all across the United States and in the Outer Continental Shelf. Use it or lose it.

We cannot be tied to foreign oil forever. We have learned that lesson. It is time we have to have domestic drilling, and that is what the DRILL Act is. And even more so, it is time to switch to energy efficiency and renewable energy sources. If we are addicted to one commodity, we are going to be in trouble because we depend upon 8 oil countries and 5 oil companies and we are in real trouble.

Now, there is 68 million acres here is depicted. You can see, the size of New England, twice the size of Pennsylvania, bigger than Colorado. Huge amount of property.

Now, one of the things that we have done is there is another 23 million acres available in Alaska to drill, where there is a pipeline nearby.

□ 1215

The oil companies can drill there. Further, we can release some of the amount of oil we have in our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. And we have a chart here that shows that when we took oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in 1991, there was a 33 percent drop in the price of oil immediately; 2000, 18 percent, 2005, 9 percent. That's what we're asking the President to do.

We need immediate relief, and then we have to switch and get off the addiction to oil by pursuing renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it seems like the Democrat Party has an argument with themselves on this one. They're arguing with themselves.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished second baseman from the Republican championship baseball team, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I certainly thank the third base coach for yielding the time.

I do think that there is a healthy thing that's going on here, and that is the Democrats are beginning to hear from their constituents that we've got to do something about foreign oil, and we've got to use our American resources. I think that's good.

I think this bill will probably pass. I don't actually know why we're debating it. It's pretty much a restatement of current law. I heard one Democrat say it's a "drill now" bill. You know, that's what they are doing right now. They're exploring these leases. These leases are very expensive. They don't buy them to sit on them and for the U.S. Congress to think. This is really ridiculous that they're sitting on land where there are great reserves of oil, but for some reason, they're not drilling there.

Come on, guys. This is a capitalist system. These companies are money hungry. They run after profit. If there were oil in these places, certainly they

would be working on it. If you want to give them a nudge, I'm all for it.

I plan to support the bill. I think it ought to be voice voted out on suspension. It's no big deal. It's a rhetoric bill. It's not a realistic bill.

What we do know is that 65 percent of our land resources are tied up and off-limits. We do know that, for example, the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve is the size of South Carolina in a State twice as big as Texas. And in this massive amount of land the size of South Carolina, there is a tundra area of about 2,000 acres which we believe would increase our domestic American oil supply 10 percent. It was vetoed by Democrat liberal President Bill Clinton 10 years ago. If it hadn't been vetoed by the Democrat liberal, special-interest President, we would have that oil today. It's too bad.

And then we hear so often from the Democrats, well, you know, if you open up ANWR and all of these places, it will be 10 years before we get the oil. Well, where are these electric cars? Where are these battery-operated cars? I mean, all of this alternative energy, which I certainly support and have been funding from the appropriations side, working very diligently on, that's going to be 10 and 15 years down the road as well.

We've got to do three things on our energy crisis: we have to have conservation, we have to have innovation, and we have to have exploration. It's that simple. But you have got to explore where their actually is oil. I concur with the gentleman from Texas. This is good because the Democrats are admitting that we have to open up more lands.

So we're going to pass this bill. Nothing is going to happen to the price at the pump. It's not going to be affected by this because it's basically current law, but I'm glad that you guys are slowly, reluctantly entering into the debate of drilling because we believe that in an environmentally safe fashion, you can drill in Alaska, and you can drill offshore.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I just want to say 108 oil platforms were damaged in the Gulf of Mexico during Katrina, and there was no pollution. All of the problems in the gulf, pollution wasn't one of them because now we have environmentally safe ways to extract oil from the bottom of the ocean or from land.

I want to say this. You know, we tied up the offshore in the day of the 8-track tape player. That was when you had an 8-track tape player in your GTO and you were the cool, edgy, high-tech guy. Today in the world of iPods and BlackBerry's and cell phones and everything else, technology has moved past the good old 8-track tape player. And the same thing has happened in medicine, the same thing has entered in en-

tertainment, the same thing has happened in oil drilling. We have new technology, modern technology that will extract oil in an environmentally safe fashion.

I want to close with this. What is so sacred about protecting the American global environment but not the foreign global environment? The Democrats are fine if you are drilling offshore in your country or drilling on the land in your country, but not in America.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona, a leader in solar energy, alternative energy, Congresswoman GIFFORDS.

Ms. GIFFORDS. I thank the gentleman from Vermont.

The high costs of fuel are being felt throughout my southern Arizona district, and people are really hurting out there right now.

To bring down the cost of oil—this is pretty common sense—what we're going to have to do is force those big oil and gas companies to increase their production. That means drilling on the 68 million acres of Federal land that is already under control from these big oil companies.

Today, we're going to vote on H.R. 6515, the Drill Responsibly in Leased Lands, or Drill Act. This bill is going to require both oil and gas companies to start using their Federal leases both onshore and offshore, and if they don't use it, they should lose it.

It will also accelerate the leasing process in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, and that's an additional 20 million acres. We have to be realistic, and I don't think the American people are being fooled. It's going to take 5 to 7 years before we benefit from increased drilling.

That's why we're also calling on the President to immediately release a small amount of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The hardworking taxpayers of my district have paid for that reserve supply to be used in a time of crisis. And when I talk to my constituents across the over 9,000 square miles of my district, we know because they agree that \$4 to \$5 a gallon is a crisis.

So I urge the President to take action on the SPR, and I also ask my colleagues to join with me in passing H.R. 6515. We have to address this energy challenge, stabilize our economy immediately, but then look to the future in terms of renewable energy. And in Arizona, solar energy is certainly the key to that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to let the gentleman from Vermont know that our time allocation is out of balance now, and I would appreciate if the gentleman would use up that time and make it more equitable between us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I am always here to accommodate my friend from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield at this time 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN).

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you, Mr. WELCH. Thank you for the hard work that you're doing.

Mr. Speaker, it's a very good thing that the American people can see today that we're working together, not just working together but we're beginning to join hands to begin to solve this energy crisis that we're all facing.

I think we can all agree that we have to drill for new oil right here in America and guarantee that the oil that comes from our hands stays within our boundaries and is sold to American citizens first. We can all agree that we have to invest in every single form of renewable energy—biomass, wind, solar—and indeed we have to look into the newer and modern techniques and nuclear energy in finding a way towards becoming an energy-independent nation.

Thirdly, we have to prevent any price manipulation in the market price not just here in the United States but also throughout the world. We have to guarantee that there really is a free marketplace in oil where places like OPEC don't control the supply and determine the price. We need a competitive and open marketplace, and we've done that here in this Congress moving the ball forward.

But it's not just about drilling. It's not just about investing. It's not just about preventing things. The people I represent, that I have the honor of representing in northeast Wisconsin, they need help now. I mean, their fingernails are not long enough to hang on to what is coming. They need help now.

So in the long term, drilling brings oil 10 years from now, investing 5, 10, 15 years from now, but preventing price manipulation in the marketplace, that can have an immediate effect. So I would urge the CFTC to do its job and provide the oversight to guarantee that we don't have to pay more than the price ought to be.

Finally, the President did accommodate us. We sent letters to him asking him to stop purchasing oil and putting it into our SPR, our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. And he accommodated. And that was put in effect July 1. Now he should listen to us again. He should begin to release 5 to 6 days' worth of our Strategic Petroleum Oil Reserve. Why? Because it will immediately drop the price of oil.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KAGEN. Our Strategic Petroleum Reserve has about 703 million barrels of oil. If we release 5 to 6 days' worth, it would immediately drop the price at the pump by putting immediate supplies onto the marketplace. These are things that the President can do right here and right now. Our constituents need help today as we begin to invest and plan for the future.

But first and foremost, let's understand that this crisis we're in was absolutely and totally predictable since

1973. And our government on both sides of the aisle has failed in the past. Let's not fail again. Let's work together.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we have one additional speaker, and I believe that the gentleman from Vermont has about twice as much time as we have. So I would like to inquire about his opportunity to utilize more of his speakers or to ask where he is in this process.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, can you tell us the time allocation at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes. The gentleman from Vermont has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. We reserve our time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, a member of the Committee on Natural Resources, Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There are a lot of reasons we're in this pickle we are today. But let's just remember one. George Bush elected 2000; DICK CHENEY's secret meetings with the oil and gas industry. They formulated an energy policy. That energy policy was adopted by the Republican House, the Republican Senate, and signed by the Republican President. That was in 2005. Many of us said it was shortsighted, it would make us more dependent upon imported oil, and it has.

When George Bush was elected, 52 percent of our oil was imported. Today it's 58 percent. Many of us said it would drive up the price. It has. When George Bush was elected, it was \$1.46 a gallon. Today it's \$4.39 a gallon in my district.

So they're saying now suddenly, Whoa. It's the Democrats' fault. No. We're living under the failures of the Republican oil industry energy policy. There's actually 164,968,695 reasons why we're living under that. That's the amount of money the Republican Party has received from the oil industry in the last 18 years, \$164 million in political contributions. Now, that's a pretty big motivation.

There's another thing going on here. Since George Bush took office, the profits of the oil industry have been \$511 billion in this country. That's \$511 billion out of Americans' pockets and into the oil industry's pockets. They made more money under 7 years of George Bush than they made in the entire quarter century preceding his presidency. Yeah. There's something a little bit rotten here.

They talk about drilling offshore and all of that stuff. Well, let's talk about short-term relief.

There's three ways to get short-term relief. One is release our oil. Release our oil. We have paid to put oil in the Strategic Reserve for emergencies. This is an emergency. It's been done three times: 1991, the price went down 33 percent; 2000, it went down 18 percent; 2005, it went down 9 percent.

□ 1230

That would give relief today at the pump, and there's another thing that we could do, but they're against this, too.

The gentleman from Texas talked about, oh, they want to file a complaint against OPEC. Well, you know, we probably do, but George Bush isn't going to do that, that's for sure. Here's George Bush holding hands with King Faisal of Saudi Arabia when he was over there begging them to increase production.

OPEC's production, with a doubling in the price of oil, is down 2½ percent. They have colluded to drive up the price of oil and limit the supply, and we have a legal option, which the President refuses to use. He refuses to file a complaint in the World Trade Organization for a clear violation of the rules of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, article 11, by the OPEC countries.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. That would have an immediate impact for the American people. And then there's the speculators.

Today, the largest holder of oil resources in the United States of America is not ExxonMobil, not Shell, not Conoco, name all of our oil companies. No, it's Morgan Stanley on Wall Street, through their speculative activity, followed by Goldman Sachs and followed by others who are speculating and driving up the price of this market.

We have credible testimony from Wall Street experts, if we reined in the speculation which was created by the Enron loophole—remember Enron? Texas corporation, Ken Boy Lay, the President's best friend. He's dead. Enron's bankrupt. He would have gone to jail for fraud. But the loophole lives on, and we're all paying at the pump. An estimated 50 percent, according to Wall Street experts, is going into speculative activities, but they don't want to take on speculative activities. They just want to talk about one thing, and that is, they want to drill in ANWR.

Well, guess what, ANWR was made a national wildlife refuge in 1950. The Naval Petroleum Reserve was made a petroleum reserve by Warren Harding. Now, why was this a natural preserve and this an oil preserve? Because they know there's more than 10 billion barrels of oil under here. Republicans change it from a naval reserve to a national reserve, and Bill Clinton actually leased it. And yesterday, George Bush announced he's going to lease more of it.

There's 10 billion barrels of oil under this. That's our Saudi Arabia. They've drilled 25 wells, but they haven't tried to connect to the Alaska pipeline. They've capped the wells and they're sitting on them. And why are they sitting on them? Because they think if

they keep manipulating the market they can make as much money as possible today and even more down the road. They are sitting on supplies of oil, and they are failing to develop what they could.

Mr. SESSIONS. We reserve our time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding.

And, you know, we have a wonderful situation in here. We have a very interesting and productive dialogue, I believe, about something we all want to do, and that's to solve our energy crisis to take the pressure off the American consumers whose lives are being terribly affected, adversely affected, by these high gas prices and the economy as well.

I call back to the words of a very smart person who once said the significant problems that we have today cannot be solved by the same level of thinking that created them. And unfortunately, this idea that we are going to drill our way out of the problem, both the short term and the long term, is the same level of thinking that got us into this problem. The man who said that was Albert Einstein. He was a pretty smart guy.

What we are proposing, and you have heard many instances of it and suggestions of it today, is that we have the ability, we have the resources right now to have an impact, a downward impact on prices. All we have to do is free our own oil, free America's oil. It's in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

As my colleague from Oregon just pointed out, we have been able to reduce the price three separate times over the last 17 years by releasing that oil. We can do it again and we should do it again. But more importantly than that is the entire attitude we take toward what's down the road, no pun intended.

My colleague from Tennessee on the other side of the aisle just mentioned a few minutes ago, he asked where are the electric cars, where are these hybrid cars? Well, actually, they're very close on the horizon. We met with Ford executives just a few weeks ago in my hometown of Louisville, Kentucky. They are on the verge of some significant breakthroughs. They have a plug-in hybrid that uses hydrogen power, as well as electricity. They're working on a battery car. They have several versions of alternative power sources they're working on.

General Motors has promised to have a battery-powered car on the road in 2010. We know in California there's a new manufacturer that's developed a battery-powered car.

These are the technologies that will be our future. We need to be investing in them, because as President Bush said the other day, what we are trying to do with this long-term approach is change the psychology of the market, change the psychology of the speculators, so that if they see down the

road that there's not going to be that much need for oil, the price will come down. I agree with him totally.

But wouldn't the effect be that much more dramatic if the speculators said not only is there going to be a reduced demand for oil in 2020 or 2030, there's going to be virtually no demand for oil in 2020 or 2030? That would really scare the speculators out of this market and drop the price. That's where we need to be investing our attention, our resources.

We can take tax breaks away from the oil companies—we have tried to do it a number of times already—and invest it in these technologies because they're not that far away. They are actually closer than the policies that will bring us relief at the gas pump maybe in 2030.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, English economist John Maynard Keynes said, "When the facts change, sir, I change my mind. What do you do?"

Well, it's obvious today that the facts have changed, and our friends in the new majority don't change their thoughts or ideas to adjust to the facts of the case.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'd like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN).

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, you know, the only way to produce more energy for America is to produce more energy. It's not taxing the energy. It's not releasing more reserve from the Strategic Reserve. If we released what is being proposed today from the Strategic Reserve, it would be a 3-day supply. But yet when President Bush earlier announced that he was going to lift the offshore ban on drilling, the price of a barrel of oil dropped \$9, and the markets responded.

The way you change the energy and the cost to America is to introduce more energy to the marketplace. And one of the ways we can do that is to make it easier for oil and gas companies to be able to drill.

I have introduced a piece of legislation, H.R. 6379, the Federal Exploration and Production Reform Act, that would allow oil companies and gas companies to be able to get their permits processed in a timely manner from the Bureau of Land Management and would help us be able to put that production online in immediate form. Right now, it takes an average of 213 days to get a permit processed through the Bureau of Land Management. That's not acceptable. They even have a huge backlog of permits.

And we've heard all the debate here today that over 65 percent or so of our energy comes from foreign countries. We have over \$700 billion of our money going to other countries, many who are hostile to America. We're making those countries rich by buying their energy.

I am convinced that we can produce our own energy here in America, whatever form it might be, whether it's oil, gas, clean coal technology. There's wind, solar, nuclear, biofuels. All those

things are possible. I know they're possible because America's a great Nation. We have smart people. We have innovation. We have creativity. We can do whatever we want to do if we put our heads to it, if we put our minds to it, and allow it to happen.

But this Congress has stopped it from happening. We've had lawsuits, we've had rules and regulations, we've had bureaucratic red tape that has tied up the industry from making the innovations, producing the energy that would fuel our Nation, and we can no longer afford to do that. The American people are suffering. Businesses are suffering, and now it's time for this Nation to generate our own energy.

Let's get rid of the Federal bureaucratic red tape, the time delays. Let's put Americans to work. Let's quit transferring our wealth to other foreign countries and risking our national security and our economic security.

We can invest that money here in America. We can generate revenue that could go to transportation, education, health care, go to our infrastructure in our Nation. Let's put Americans to work. Let's invest here and let's produce energy.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I reserve my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I will take from those words that the gentleman from Vermont has no further speakers and would be interested in me closing at this time.

Mr. Speaker, since taking control of Congress in 2007, this Democrat Congress has totally neglected its responsibilities to do constructive things to address the domestic supply issues that have created today's skyrocketing gas prices, diesel prices, and energy costs that the American families are facing. And today, once again, they are proving to Americans that they have a failure of leadership and vision.

Mr. Speaker, we'll see what happens when the August break comes around and our friends in the new Democrat majority head home to find out how much home fuel prices are going to spike with home heating fuel, and we will find out what happens in September when we come back from the break.

So to avoid that, Mr. Speaker, today, I urge my colleagues to vote with me to defeat the previous question so this House can finally consider in July, as opposed to September, real solutions to the rising energy costs. If the previous question is defeated, I will move to amend the rule to allow for this House's consideration of H.R. 5984, H.R. 2208, H.R. 3089, H.R. 2493, H.R. 5656, and H.R. 2279.

Mr. Speaker, these may not be household understood names of bills, but in September, the new Democrat majority, after spending August at break, is going to find out they should have done something, rather than doing nothing.

Yesterday afternoon in the Rules Committee, hours before Republicans were even given a copy of today's legis-

lation, the same amendment was defeated by the Democrat majority by a party-line vote.

While I do not have a great deal of hope that this Democrat majority will provide a better outcome than the one provided by my Democrat Rules Committee colleagues, the vote on this previous question will allow every single Member of this body, especially those Members of the much- and often-reported bipartisan working group on drilling, to stand up for real solutions to this energy crisis—it's easier to do it in July than it will be in September—not just ineffective restatements of current policy that do absolutely nothing to increase the production of American energy for consumers.

I encourage everyone that believes that a comprehensive solution to solving this energy crisis and achieving energy independence includes increasing the supply of American energy to join me and to defeat this rule and the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place this motion and extraneous material in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas.

First of all, there is common agreement here. You don't have to be a rocket scientist to know this. People are suffering. They cannot afford spending more than \$4 a gallon for gas, and folks in my part of the country, the cold weather region, are living with enormous anxiety about how they're going to pay \$5 a gallon for home heating fuel. So the problem that we face is real and it is urgent.

I disagree with one of the authors of the energy policy that got us here, and that is the former senator from Texas, Phil Gramm, who is advising their Presidential candidate. And he recently announced that we really don't have a problem. He said, "You've heard of mental depression; this is a mental recession." And he's saying that America is a nation of whiners.

You know what, people have a right to complain about an energy policy where they can't afford to fill up their gas tank. They're living in enormous anxiety when the fuel truck shows up to heat their home, and they have to make decisions between food and fuel, between medicine that they need and the fuel that's required to keep their home warm.

□ 1245

This is about rejecting the energy policy that has failed us and has brought us here.

You know, my friend from Texas made a statement that I agree with. He said the oil companies should be our

friends. That is right. Oil companies have been very good at what they do—exploring for oil, finding oil, refining oil, producing oil, and getting it to the market. But the policies that we've had in place since President Bush became the leader of this country have enriched the oil companies. But the oil companies, in turn, with over \$500 billion in profits, have not reinvested that money into either producing where they can or moving to an alternative energy policy.

You know, one of the folks raised the question as to whether or not this is a "fig leaf" bill, whether there's rhetoric in this bill because we're talking about 20 million new acres that has a proven capacity of at least 10 billion barrels of oil. Is it a question of Congress not making lands available for drilling onshore and offshore when we know already there are 68 million acres onshore and offshore available, and this bill makes it clear we want to make 20 million acres more available? Is it a question of lands where there is oil available being denied access? Or is it a failure on the part of the oil companies to invest?

You know, ExxonMobil, in one quarter, made about \$40 billion in profit; for 1 year, \$40 billion in profit. Did they put that profit into new drilling technology, into exploiting some of the leases that they have, into getting oil out of the ground and into the market? No. They spent \$32 billion buying back their own stock.

Basically what you're seeing is that the oil companies that have been doing extraordinarily well under this energy policy that's got us to this crisis have not been reinvesting their money, but they've put their capital on strike. They've been buying back shares and maintaining the value of their stock at the expense of exploiting the oil fields that they have immediate access to.

Well, I want to go through some of the arguments that my friend from Texas made. He accused the Democratic Congress of a mind-boggling refusal to increase production. That's just flat out wrong. You've got the 68 million acres where the oil companies right now have the legal right to go in and drill, and they haven't done it. That's not an act of Congress, that's a corporate decision made by the major oil companies.

Second, he said that the energy companies don't go there because they are "dry holes." That's just flat out wrong. I mentioned earlier I actually do think the energy companies are good at what they do. They don't waste their money or their stockholder money. And when they decide to spend their money on purchasing a lease, it's because they've come to their own independent conclusion that it's worth that investment, that there is oil in the ground or under the sea.

So those oil companies have access to it. Why don't they drill? And also, why aren't there drills available, the drilling rigs for offshore drilling and drill-

ing rigs on land? There's two reasons: one, the oil companies are doing great sitting on these leases; the longer that they wait, the more they make. If they bought a lease when oil was at \$30 a barrel and then it goes to \$75 a barrel and up to \$130 or \$140 a barrel, that's money in the bank. The longer they wait, the more they make.

A second reason is, they aren't willing to risk the profits in increasing production. As long as there is a shortage of supply, the price stays up. And their profits are exploding as we speak. So there is an enormous amount of responsibility that we have and expect from the oil companies.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and the resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1350 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, July 17, 2008, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to the following measures: (1) The bill (H.R. 5984) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the limited continuation of clean energy production incentives and incentives to improve energy efficiency in order to prevent a downturn in these sectors that would result from a lapse in the tax law. (2) The bill (H.R. 2208) to provide for a standby loan program for certain coal-to-liquid projects. (3) The bill (H.R. 3089) to secure unrestricted reliable energy for American consumption and transmission. (4) The bill (H.R. 2493) to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for a reduction in the number of boutique fuels. (5) The bill (H.R. 5656) to repeal a requirement with respect to the procurement and acquisition of alternative fuels. (6) The bill (H.R. 2279) to expedite the construction of new refining capacity on closed military installations in the United States.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated

the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a 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. WELCH of Vermont. 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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 188, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]

YEAS—228

Abercrombie	Berry	Capuano
Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Cardoza
Allen	Bishop (NY)	Carnahan
Altmire	Blumenauer	Carney
Arcuri	Boren	Carson
Baca	Boucher	Castor
Baird	Boyd (FL)	Chandler
Baldwin	Boyd (KS)	Clarke
Barrow	Brady (PA)	Clay
Bean	Braley (IA)	Cleaver
Becerra	Brown, Corrine	Clyburn
Berkley	Butterfield	Cohen
Berman	Capps	Conyers

Costa	Kagen	Rangel	LaHood	Nunes	Shadegg	Dicks	Kind	Richardson
Costello	Kanjorski	Reichert	Lamborn	Pearce	Shays	Dingell	Klein (FL)	Rodriguez
Courtney	Kaptur	Reyes	Latham	Pence	Shimkus	Doggett	Kucinich	Ross
Cramer	Kennedy	Richardson	LaTourette	Peterson (PA)	Shuster	Donnelly	Langevin	Rothman
Crowley	Kildee	Rodriguez	Latta	Petri	Simpson	Doyle	Royalb-Allard	Larsen (WA)
Cuellar	Kilpatrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Smith (NE)	Edwards (MD)	Lee	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Kind	Ross	Lewis (KY)	Platts	Smith (NJ)	Edwards (TX)	Levin	Salazar
Davis (AL)	Klein (FL)	Rothman	Linder	Poe	Smith (TX)	Ellison	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Royalb-Allard	LoBiondo	Porter	Price (GA)	Ellsworth	Lipinski	T.
Davis (IL)	Lampson	Ryan (OH)	Lungren, Daniel	Pryce (OH)	Souder	Emanuel	Lofgren, Zoe	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Lincoln	Langevin	Salazar	E.	Putnam	Sullivan	Engel	Lowey	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda	Mack	Radanovich	Tancredo	Eshoo	Lynch	Schakowsky
DeGette	Larson (CT)	T.	Manzullo	Ramstad	Thornberry	Etheridge	Mahoney (FL)	Schiff
Delahunt	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta	Marchant	Regula	Tiahrt	Farr	Maloney (NY)	Schwartz
DeLauro	Levin	Sarbanes	McCarthy (CA)	Rehberg	Tiberi	Fattah	Markey	Scott (GA)
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky	McCaul (TX)	Renzi	Turner	Filner	Marshall	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lipinski	Schiff	McCotter	Reynolds	Upton	Foster	Matheson	Serrano
Doggett	Loebach	Schwartz	McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Walberg	Frank (MA)	Matsui	Sestak
Donnelly	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott (GA)	McHugh	Rogers (KY)	Walden (OR)	Giffords	McCarthy (NY)	Shea-Porter
Doyle	Lowey	Scott (VA)	McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Walsh (NY)	Gillibrand	McCollum (MN)	Sherman
Edwards (MD)	Lynch	Serrano	McMorris	Rohrabacher	Wamp	Gonzalez	McDermott	Sires
Edwards (TX)	Mahoney (FL)	Sestak	Rodgers	Roskam	Weldon (FL)	Gordon	McGovern	Skelton
Ellison	Maloney (NY)	Shea-Porter	Mica	Royce	Weller	Green, Al	McIntyre	Slaughter
Ellsworth	Markey	Sherman	Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland	Green, Gene	McNerney	Snyder
Emanuel	Matheson	Sires	Miller (MI)	Sali	Whitfield (KY)	Grijalva	McNulty	Solis
Eshoo	Matsui	Skelton	Moran (KS)	Saxton	Wilson (NM)	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)	Space
Etheridge	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter	Murphy, Tim	Scalise	Wilson (SC)	Hall (NY)	Meeks (NY)	Speier
Farr	McCollum (MN)	Smith (WA)	Musgrave	Schmidt	Wittman (VA)	Hare	Melancon	Spratt
Fattah	McDermott	Snyder	Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Wolf	Harman	Michaud	Stark
Filner	McGovern	Solis	Neugebauer	Sessions	Young (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)	Stupak
Foster	McIntyre	Space				Herseht Sandlin	Miller, George	Sutton
Giffords	McNerney	Speier				Higgins	Mitchell	Tanner
Gillibrand	McNulty	Spratt	Andrews	Gilchrest	Paul	Hill	Mollohan	Tauscher
Gonzalez	Meek (FL)	Stark	Boswell	Herger	Pickering	Hinchey	Moore (KS)	Taylor
Gordon	Meeks (NY)	Stupak	Cooper	Hunter	Ruppersberger	Hinojosa	Moore (WI)	Thompson (CA)
Green, Al	Melancon	Sutton	Cubin	Inslee	Rush	Hirono	Moran (VA)	Thompson (MS)
Green, Gene	Michaud	Tanner	Doollittle	Lucas	Terry	Hodes	Murphy (CT)	Towns
Grijalva	Miller (NC)	Tauscher	Frank (MA)	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)	Holden	Murphy, Patrick	Tsongas
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Taylor				Holt	Murtha	Udall (CO)
Hall (NY)	Mitchell	Thompson (CA)				Honda	Nadler	Udall (NM)
Hare	Mollohan	Thompson (MS)				Hooley	Napolitano	Van Hollen
Harman	Moore (KS)	Tierney				Hoyer	Neal (MA)	Velázquez
Hastings (FL)	Moore (WI)	Towns				Israel	Oberstar	Vislosky
Herseht Sandlin	Moran (VA)	Tsongas				Jackson (IL)	Obey	Walz (MN)
Higgins	Murphy (CT)	Udall (CO)				Jackson-Lee	Olver	Wasserman
Hill	Murphy, Patrick	Udall (NM)				(TX)	Ortiz	Schultz
Hinchey	Murtha	Van Hollen				Jefferson	Pallone	Waters
Hinojosa	Nadler	Velázquez				Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Watson
Hirono	Napolitano	Vislosky				Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Watt
Hodes	Neal (MA)	Walz (MN)				Jones (OH)	Payne	Waxman
Holden	Oberstar	Wasserman				Kagen	Perlmutter	Weiner
Holt	Obey	Schultz				Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Welch (VT)
Honda	Olver	Waters				Kaptur	Pomeroy	Wexler
Hooley	Ortiz	Watson				Kennedy	Price (NC)	Wilson (OH)
Hoyer	Pallone	Watt				Kildee	Rahall	Woolsey
Israel	Pascrell	Waxman				Kilpatrick	Rangel	Wu
Jackson (IL)	Pastor	Weiner					Reyes	Yarmuth
Jackson-Lee	Payne	Welch (VT)						
(TX)	Perlmutter	Wexler						
Jefferson	Peterson (MN)	Wilson (OH)						
Johnson (GA)	Pomeroy	Woolsey						
Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Wu						
Jones (OH)	Rahall	Yarmuth						

NAYS—188

Aderholt	Capito	Franks (AZ)
Akin	Carter	Frelinghuysen
Alexander	Castle	Galleghy
Bachmann	Cazayoux	Garrett (NJ)
Bachus	Chabot	Grach
Barrett (SC)	Childers	Gingrey
Bartlett (MD)	Coble	Gohmert
Barton (TX)	Cole (OK)	Goode
Biggart	Conaway	Goodlatte
Bilbray	Crenshaw	Granger
Bilirakis	Culberson	Graves
Bishop (UT)	Davis (KY)	Hall (TX)
Blackburn	Davis, David	Hastings (WA)
Blunt	Davis, Tom	Hayes
Boehner	Deal (GA)	Heller
Bonner	Dent	Hensarling
Bono Mack	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hobson
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoekstra
Boustany	Drake	Hulshof
Brady (TX)	Dreier	Inglis (SC)
Broun (GA)	Duncan	Issa
Brown (SC)	Ehlers	Johnson (IL)
Brown-Waite,	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Ginny	English (PA)	Jones (NC)
Buchanan	Everett	Jordan
Burgess	Fallin	Keller
Burton (IN)	Feeney	King (IA)
Buyer	Ferguson	King (NY)
Calvert	Flake	Kingston
Camp (MI)	Forbes	Kirk
Campbell (CA)	Fortenberry	Kline (MN)
Cannon	Fossella	Knollenberg
Cantor	Fox	Kuhl (NY)

NOT VOTING—18

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. HOOLEY, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 509, unfortunately, I am getting a medical procedure done and cannot vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 194, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

AYES—222

Abercrombie	Boucher	Clyburn
Ackerman	Boyd (FL)	Cohen
Allen	Boyda (KS)	Conyers
Altmire	Brady (PA)	Costa
Arcuri	Braley (IA)	Costello
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Courtney
Baird	Butterfield	Cramer
Baldwin	Capps	Crowley
Barrow	Capuano	Cuellar
Bean	Cardoza	Cummings
Becerra	Carnahan	Davis (AL)
Berkley	Carney	Davis (CA)
Berman	Carson	Davis (IL)
Berry	Castor	Davis, Lincoln
Bishop (GA)	Chandler	DeFazio
Bishop (NY)	Clarke	DeGette
Blumenauer	Clay	Delahunt
Boren	Cleaver	DeLauro

NOES—194

Aderholt	Cole (OK)	Heller
Akin	Conaway	Hensarling
Alexander	Crenshaw	Hobson
Bachmann	Culberson	Hoekstra
Bachus	Davis (KY)	Hulshof
Barrett (SC)	Davis, David	Inglis (SC)
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, Tom	Issa
Barton (TX)	Deal (GA)	Johnson (IL)
Biggart	Dent	Johnson, Sam
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jones (NC)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jordan
Bishop (UT)	Drake	Keller
Blackburn	Dreier	King (IA)
Blunt	Duncan	King (NY)
Boehner	Ehlers	Kingston
Bonner	Emerson	Kirk
Bono Mack	English (PA)	Kline (MN)
Boozman	Everett	Knollenberg
Boustany	Fallin	Kuhl (NY)
Brady (TX)	Feeney	LaHood
Broun (GA)	Ferguson	Lamborn
Brown (SC)	Flake	Lampson
Brown-Waite,	Forbes	Latham
Ginny	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Buchanan	Fossella	Latta
Burgess	Fox	Lewis (CA)
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Calvert	Galleghy	LoBiondo
Camp (MI)	Garrett (NJ)	Lungren, Daniel
Campbell (CA)	Gerlach	E.
Cannon	Gingrey	Mack
Cantor	Gohmert	Manzullo
Capito	Goode	Marchant
Carter	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)
Castle	Granger	McCaul (TX)
Cazayoux	Graves	McCotter
Chabot	Hall (TX)	McCrery
Childers	Hastings (WA)	McHenry
Coble	Hayes	McHugh

McKeon	Regula	Smith (NJ)
McMorris	Rehberg	Smith (TX)
Rodgers	Reichert	Souder
Mica	Renzi	Stearns
Miller (FL)	Reynolds	Sullivan
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Tancredo
Moran (KS)	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Murphy, Tim	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Musgrave	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi
Neugebauer	Roskam	Turner
Nunes	Royce	Upton
Pearce	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
Pence	Sali	Walden (OR)
Peterson (PA)	Saxton	Walsh (NY)
Petri	Scalise	Wamp
Pickering	Schmidt	Weldon (FL)
Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Platts	Sessions	Westmoreland
Poe	Shadegg	Whitfield (KY)
Porter	Shays	Wilson (NM)
Price (GA)	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Pryce (OH)	Shuler	Wittman (VA)
Putnam	Shuster	Wolf
Radanovich	Simpson	Young (FL)
Ramstad	Smith (NE)	

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews	Herger	Paul
Boswell	Hunter	Ruppersberger
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Rush
Cubin	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Doolittle	Lucas	Tierney
Gilchrest	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1320

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 510, if I were present I would have voted "yea." Unfortunately, I am getting a medical procedure done and cannot vote today.

DRILL RESPONSIBLY IN LEASED LANDS ACT OF 2008

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6515) to amend the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an expeditious environmentally responsible program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6515

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 "Drill Responsibly in Leased Lands Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA: LEASE SALES.

Section 107(a) of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an expeditious environmentally responsible program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska in accordance with this Act. Such program shall include no fewer than one lease sale in the Reserve each year during the period 2009 through 2013."

SEC. 3. NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA: PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION.

The Secretary of Transportation shall facilitate, in an environmentally responsible manner and in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior, the construction of pipelines necessary to transport oil and gas from or through the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska to existing transportation or processing infrastructure on the North Slope of Alaska.

SEC. 4. ALASKA NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECT FACILITATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Over 35 trillion cubic feet of natural gas reserves have been discovered on Federal and State lands currently open to oil and gas leasing on the North Slope of Alaska.

(2) These gas supplies could make a significant contribution to meeting the energy needs of the United States, but the lack of a natural gas transportation system has prevented these gas reserves from reaching markets in the lower 48 States.

(b) FACILITATION BY PRESIDENT.—The President shall, pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (division C of Public Law 108-324; 15 U.S.C. 720 et seq.) and other applicable law, coordinate with producers of oil and natural gas on the North Slope of Alaska, Federal agencies, the State of Alaska, Canadian authorities, and other interested persons in order to facilitate construction of a natural gas pipeline from Alaska to United States markets as expeditiously as possible.

SEC. 5. PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS AND OTHER PIPELINE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS.—The President, as a term and condition of any permit required under Federal law for the pipelines referred to in section 3 and section 4, and in recognizing the Government's interest in labor stability and in the ability of construction labor and management to meet the particular needs and conditions of such pipelines to be developed under such permits and the special concerns of the holders of such permits, shall require that the operators of such pipelines and their agents and contractors negotiate to obtain a project labor agreement for the employment of laborers and mechanics on production, maintenance, and construction for such pipelines.

(b) PIPELINE MAINTENANCE.—The Secretary of Transportation shall require every pipeline operator authorized to transport oil and gas produced under Federal oil and gas leases in Alaska through the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, any pipeline constructed pursuant to section 3 or 4 of this Act, or any other federally approved pipeline transporting oil and gas from the North Slope of Alaska, to certify to the Secretary of Transportation annually that such pipeline is being fully maintained and operated in an efficient manner. The Secretary of Transportation shall assess appropriate civil penalties for violations of this requirement in the same manner as civil penalties are assessed for violations under section 60122(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 6. BAN ON EXPORT OF ALASKAN OIL.

(a) REPEAL OF PROVISION AUTHORIZING EXPORTS.—Section 28(s) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185(s)) is repealed.

(b) REIMPOSITION OF PROHIBITION ON CRUDE OIL EXPORTS.—Upon the effective date of this Act, subsection (d) of section 7 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2406(d)), shall be effective, and any other provision of that Act (including sections 11 and 12) shall be effective to the extent necessary to carry out such section 7(d), notwithstanding section 20 of that Act or any other provision of law that would other-

wise allow exports of oil to which such section 7(d) applies.

SEC. 7. ISSUANCE OF NEW LEASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—After the date of the issuance of regulations under subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall not issue to a person any new lease that authorizes the exploration for or production of oil or natural gas, under section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (33 U.S.C. 226), the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands Act (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), or any other law authorizing the issuance of oil and gas leases on Federal lands or submerged lands, unless—

(1) the person certifies for each existing lease under such Acts for the production of oil or gas with respect to which the person is a lessee, that the person is diligently developing the Federal lands that are subject to the lease in order to produce oil or natural gas or is producing oil or natural gas from such land; or

(2) the person has relinquished all ownership interest in all Federal oil and gas leases under which oil and gas is not being diligently developed.

(b) DILIGENT DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall issue regulations within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act that establish what constitutes "diligently developing" for purposes of this Act.

(c) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS.—Any person who fails to comply with the requirements of this section or any regulation or order issued to implement this section shall be liable for a civil penalty under section 109 of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1719).

(d) LESSEE DEFINED.—In this section the term "lessee"—

(1) includes any person or other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is in or under common control with, a lessee; and

(2) does not include any person who does not hold more than a minority ownership interest in a lease under an Act referred to in subsection (a) authorizing the exploration for or production of oil or natural gas.

SEC. 8. FAIR RETURN ON PRODUCTION OF FEDERAL OIL AND GAS RESOURCES.

(a) ROYALTY PAYMENTS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall take all steps necessary to ensure that lessees under leases for exploration, development, and production of oil and natural gas on Federal lands, including leases under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (30 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), and all other mineral leasing laws, are making prompt, transparent, and accurate royalty payments under such leases.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION.—In order to facilitate implementation of subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and in consultation with the affected States, prepare and transmit to Congress recommendations for legislative action to improve the accurate collection of Federal oil and gas royalties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that time for debate on the pending measure be expanded to 60 minutes.