

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. 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.

□ 1115

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1367 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1367

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, July 24, 2008, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to the bill (H.R. 6578) to provide for the sale of light grade petroleum from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and its replacement with heavy grade petroleum.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials 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. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 1367 provides that it shall be in order on the legislative day of Thursday, July 24, 2008, for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules relating to energy.

Today, a barrel of oil costs \$124. Last week it was \$134. In June, it was over \$140 a barrel. Congress is acting, and the market is reacting. Many factors, we know, contribute to the price of a barrel of oil: demand, supply, our economy, speculation, actions that Congress does or doesn't take. But make no mistake, the actions that this Congress has taken and will take are having an impact, a positive impact, to bring down the price of a barrel of oil.

To just remind my colleagues what this Congress did, on May 13, we passed H.R. 6022, a bill I sponsored, to halt shipments to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. That bill was signed into law by the President.

On June 26, we passed H.R. 6377 to squeeze speculation out of the market

by directing that the CFTC, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, utilize its authority to better regulate the energy markets.

On July 17, a strong majority of the House supported H.R. 6515, the DRILL Act. This bill would actually open up 22 million acres in Alaska for drilling and direct oil companies to either use the leases they have on the remaining 68 million acres, or lose them. They have the opportunity to increase production. We are asking them to do it.

Every time the price of oil declines, consumers and businesses save money. Let me just give one example. The airline industry alone, it costs them \$430 million every time the price of a barrel of oil goes up \$1. In the past 20 days, the price of oil has come down nearly \$20. That is approximately an \$860 million savings for the airline industry and our traveling public.

The energy crisis that we face is real, and it requires long-term action, but it also requires immediate action. And the actions that we can take to take the pressure off the price, we should take. Although the price has recently fallen, we have much more we can do, and we must today take this opportunity to provide the immediate relief that will occur by releasing 10 percent of the oil now in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve into the market. That would get relief to the American consuming public within 2 weeks.

Incidentally, this is not an unprecedented action by Congress. It is smart policy, it is nimble policy. It has been done in the past by Republican and by Democratic Presidents. A few examples: on January 16, 1991, the first President Bush released fuel from the SPR. That was in conjunction with the start of the Gulf War. President Bush said this will send an important message to the American people that their \$20 million investment in an emergency supply of crude oil has produced a system that can respond rapidly.

A second time, September 22, 2000, President Clinton released 30 million barrels from the SPR into the market. President Clinton said, "This is the right thing to do. It is good energy policy. It is good national security policy, and good family policy." The market responded immediately with prices dropping 18.7 percent.

Incidentally, when the first President Bush did it, the price went down 33 percent. Our own President Bush, August 31, 2005, he authorized a drawdown of crude oil from the SPR. This was after Hurricane Katrina. Prices dropped 9.1 percent.

So what we have within our grasp is the opportunity to take an action recently taken by three Presidents that immediately resulted in the reduction of the price of gasoline. In one case 9 percent, in another case 18 percent, and in a third case 33 percent. This is a time-tested action that will help Americans now address the crippling cost of fuel.

Many of my colleagues have joined together urging the President to use

his authority to release fuel from the SPR. The President can do that with a stroke of the pen. But if the President refuses to act, Congress must act. We know, incidentally, Madam Speaker, that this bill will not solve our energy problems. It is going to take a long-term change in our energy policies to release ourselves from our addiction to oil. Releasing fuel from the SPR is not a substitute for a long-term policy, but it is a necessary action and a practical action to provide immediate relief now by using a resource that does belong to the American people.

Let's keep in mind that we do need a change in direction on our energy policy. Our country has 2 percent of the proven reserves of energy in the world. We are about 4 percent of the population, and we are consuming 25 percent of the world's energy. That is not sustainable. It is not good for our long-term security. We know we can do better by having a policy that includes higher mileage standards for our vehicles, higher energy efficiency standards, tax incentives for clean energy alternatives, better construction designs, and restoration of mass transit and rail. By doing that, we can create jobs, improve our environment, develop affordable energy, and strengthen our national security. But let's take the immediate short-term actions that are within our grasp to take that will provide immediate relief to our airline industry, to our businesses, and to our consumers and American families. Take the actions that we can take, and take them now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

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

Let me start by answering my good friend regarding the issues that he brought up and the things that he said.

First of all, the bottom line is that there could be 10 million acres or 20 or 50 million acres that could be, quote, "given to or leased" by oil companies. They don't want to drill every bit of acreage they have; they only want to drill where the oil is. Dry holes are not good for anybody.

Secondly, when you look at what the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is all about, it is there to protect this country. We should view that ANWR is also a strategic petroleum reserve here for the United States. There are 19 million acres in ANWR. Oil companies aren't after all 19 million acres, they are only after 2,000, just 2,000. That's where the oil is.

And perhaps number three, the gentleman needs to understand this, that energy companies are there to be in the business of providing energy. They are not there for any other reason. They are there to help the American consumer, to support our economy, and to

make sure that America is the greatest Nation on the face of this earth.

I am proud that we have the largest economy in this world and we use energy to make us more successful. We should not apologize or say it is a mistake that America utilizes energy. We simply need to make sure that what we are doing is having a comprehensive, across-the-board view, and not allowing drilling here in America and offshore is a national security issue. That's the side of the story that my friend did not tell this morning. That's why this bill is something we should oppose.

For the last 5 months, everyday consumers and our national economy have been suffering because of this Democrat majority's stubborn and mind-boggling unwillingness to increase the supply of domestically produced oil to reduce prices at the pump. And for over a year and a half, Republicans have been unified in a commonsense approach and a comprehensive approach to bringing down the price of gasoline for consumers, only to have that plan ignored by the new Democrat majority in favor of agenda that prioritizes scapegoats over solutions.

Rather than taking this opportunity to work in a constructive, bipartisan way to address the real domestic energy supply issues, they have let sky-high energy prices stand and continue 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, and we are spending only 40 minutes to debate a fig-leaf piece of legislation that releases 3½ days' worth of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The gentleman is correct, when there is more oil supply that is available, the price does go down. The gentleman is correct, there have been previous orders by the President to reduce the supply that is in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve directly for consumers. But 3 days' worth is all we are talking about. That is not a long-term fix. We need a strategic petroleum reserve that is called ANWR to make America competitive.

So rather than doing something that would be long term, all they are trying to do is something that would be a political, short-term fix.

Madam Speaker, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is intended to deal with natural disasters and national security crises, not preventable, man-made political disasters like the short supply of energy that we have today in America because of the Democrat Party no-energy strategy.

The world understands it. As a matter of fact, I was out on the west side of the Capitol just yesterday as Republicans were talking about our ability to go drill here in America and offshore. And whole loads, bus loads of Democrat staffers and others are out front saying, No drill, shame on the Republican

Party. My gosh, I do understand that that is the policy of the new Democrat majority. We're working their plan. That's why gasoline is at \$4 a gallon. We simply disagree in the Republican Party.

However, there is one small bright spot associated with this legislation, and it is by bringing it to the House floor today, the Democrat leadership is finally admitting there is a supply-side component to addressing America's energy concerns. My colleague was very plain and forward when he said: When we dump oil into the marketplace, the price goes down. Unfortunately, seriousness of purpose in dealing with the problem has not accompanied this long-overdue revelation—which is why we are here debating this do-nothing cover vote today instead of real solutions to our problems.

□ 1130

Yesterday I joined my Republican colleagues when we proposed a smart, innovative and comprehensive approach to addressing our Nation's energy independence solution, a problem whose guiding philosophy can be summed up by one simple principle, use less and find more.

Rather than just releasing over a weekend's worth of energy and calling it a day, like the Democrat proposal does, the Republican plan is to increase the supply of American-made energy in an environmentally sound way. This is what Republicans are pushing on the floor of the House of Representatives yet again today.

We believe our deep-water oil resources, ocean resources, could provide an additional 3 million barrels of oil per day as well as 76 trillion cubic square feet of natural gas. These are proven reserves. We should open the Arctic coastal plain, which could provide an additional 1 million barrels of oil a day. We should allow development of our Nation's shale oil resources, which could provide an additional 2.5 million barrels of oil per day, and we would increase the supply of gas at the pump by cutting bureaucratic red tape that hinders the construction of new refineries.

To improve energy conservation and efficiency, our legislation will provide tax incentives for businesses and families to purchase more efficient vehicles. It will provide tax incentives for businesses and homeowners who improve their energy efficiency. To promote alternative and renewable energy technologies, this legislation will spur the technology of alternative fuels through government contracting by repealing the section 526 prohibition on government purchasing of alternative energy and promotion of coal-to-liquids technology.

We will establish a renewable energy trust fund using revenues generated by exploration in deep ocean and on the Arctic coastal plain. We will extend permanently the tax credit for alternative energy production, including

wind, solar and hydrogen, and we will eliminate barriers to the expansion of emission-free nuclear power production.

Speaker PELOSI and this new Democrat majority have the power to bring these already-developed commonsense solutions up for a vote at any time. Trust me, Madam Speaker, the Republicans are here to help. But what we want is real solutions. We want to drill now to save America.

Speaker PELOSI should choose to be with Republicans in a bipartisan answer, but, instead, this Speaker is choosing to ignore the American public in favor of a radical environmentalist agenda. I will be giving every Member of this body the opportunity to show where they really stand on energy independence during the vote on the rule's previous question. I encourage every single Member who agrees with me that this country needs to increase its supply of safe and reliable American energy to force this Democrat leadership to finally act by rejecting the cynical rule and the meaningless underlying legislation so that this House and the American people will be prepared for real legislation that will have a real effect at the pump.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. Thank you, Mr. WELCH.

Madam Speaker, we have on the floor right now for consideration legislation which will make it possible for American consumers, who are being tipped upside down at the gasoline pump every time they go in with their vehicle and having money shaken out of their pockets, to have immediate relief, to have the United States be on the side of the American consumer.

Now what has been happening over the last couple of months is really unfortunate. The Republicans and President Bush have been arguing that the answer is to go and to drill up in the remotest parts of the Arctic, when their own Department of Energy is saying that it will take 10 to 20 years for any of that oil to get to the gas pumps in the United States and, when it does, it will only offer insignificant relief to the American consumer.

Meanwhile, the President went over to Saudi Arabia, just a month and a half ago, to beg the Saudi Arabians to please produce more oil that we can use right now, because that would drop the price in oil. The Saudis said, "Well, we'll think about it. Maybe we'll produce another two or 300,000 barrels of oil, but you'll have to send back your Secretary of Energy in another 3 weeks for us to talk to him."

Well, you can either promise the American people something that doesn't happen 10 to 20 years from now,

which is what the Republicans have been doing, or you can use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve right now, which is what our legislation will do, and it will say to the President, Mr. President, you must use 10 percent of all the oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve right now, 70 million barrels of oil, and you must use it over the next 5 or 6 months. That would average out to about 500,000 barrels of oil a day. That's the signal that the marketplace would absolutely respond to, because it would send shivers up the spine of the speculators, of the manipulators, of the OPEC cartel that has been playing games with the American consumer.

How do we know that this is going to work? We know it's going to work because when past Presidents have turned the spigot on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, President Bush I, just before the first Persian Gulf war, the price dropped 33 percent for oil.

In the year 2000 when Bill Clinton used it, it dropped 18 percent. And even when this President Bush used it right after the Katrina storm, it dropped 9 percent. We know this works.

But what's going to happen? The Republican leadership is going to get on a plane and fly up to the Arctic wildlife refuge. Instead, they should get on a plane and fly down to Houston and take a look at the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and ask the President to just turn the spigot on and to send that oil right now, not 10 or 20 years from now, but 10 or 20 days from now so that Americans, who are enjoying their August vacations know that the American government is on their side.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MARKEY. The reason the Republicans won't use it, however, is that they argue that we're not in an emergency. I think that is not how the American people view where we are. \$4 a gallon for gasoline. The price for home heating oil and natural gas this winter rising by the day. We have the airline industry in crisis. We have the trucking industry in crisis. We have food prices skyrocketing.

The American people believe we are in an energy emergency. What we do in this bill is we say, Mr. President, it might not fit your definition of what an emergency is, but it fits the definition for the American people. We want you to deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve now. We want you to tap into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to protect the American consumer now.

We don't want you to wait, Mr. President, until after some war in Iran and deploy it then too, sir, but please do not wait until then. Please understand that Americans want their oil. They paid for this oil. They've paid \$100 billion to put this oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in Houston, in Louisiana, in Mississippi. They want relief now.

Vote "aye" on this legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, you know, I would love to cut a deal with the gentleman right now and say Republicans would be completely for this bill if you would do something for more than the 3 days' supply if we would really approach the emergency that the American people are talking about, and let's do something long term. We have already had President Clinton 12 years ago sign the pen that said we are not going to go after ANWR. We would have had that online now.

Why do we assume that in 5 or 6 or 7 years we are not going to need this energy? We are going to need the energy.

This new Democrat majority, to a Member, is withholding from the American people the opportunity to get prices down now. To say that we would raid the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for 3 days' worth of gasoline is laughable. It's laughable because the American people understand that what this new Democrat majority is all about is having the energy prices stay where they are. They see that the Democrat plan evidently is working, the Democrat plan to squeeze American interests out and to send the money overseas.

We have seen that now for 18 months. That's the Democrat majority's plan. They want to keep building Dubai. They want to keep giving the money to countries who do war against the United States and don't hold us in favor. They want the money and the business to be done overseas. They want the jobs to go overseas. That's really where this new Democrat majority is.

If it were the Republican Party and reversed, it would be about all the special interests that we're trying to give. But in this case, it is about the American consumer that sees that their prices are at a high level simply to make sure that this Democrat majority sends the money overseas because they really don't like the energy companies here in America. That's anti-American.

Madam Speaker, the Republican Party has great alternatives that are on the table today. We want a long-term comprehensive fix for energy, and we will continue to tell the American people, just as we are here telling our colleagues here today, that we recognize who has the capacity and the ability to bring a bill to the floor today to answer the problem. The problem is the lack of resources of supply in the gasoline marketplace, and it's extending also to high fuel prices that will be paid in the Northeast this winter, and it is the new Democrat majority that is responsible for that. This is their plan. They're getting what they wanted, and we will keep building Dubais and keep sending our money overseas as long as we cut off American jobs and American energy companies.

I think it's a bad thing for policy for this country. That's why the Republican Party has an alternative. I wish

that it would be heard today on the board to where we could vote for it.

Madam Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, a member of the committee on Energy and Commerce and a leader on energy issues in Congress, Mr. INSLEE.

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

Mr. INSLEE. Of course we need a long-term energy plan that can wean ourselves off this addiction to oil. President Bush said we are addicted to oil, and he turns around and says let's just get more addicted to oil.

I don't understand why the Republicans then voted against our bill to call for new clean energy sources of electricity so we can electrify our car and not have to burn oil. I don't know why they voted against our tax package that would allow tax breaks for companies like the Sapphire Energy Company that's making biofuels out of algae. That's a long-term solution to this problem, but we have got to have a short-term solution too.

I will tell you this, listening to my Republican colleagues, if you run out of gas on a dusty rural road somewhere, you better hope it's not a Republican Congressman who pulls up and basically comes to your aid and says, I can't help you now, can't help you next week, can't help you next year. I'll be back around here in 10 years. Then maybe we'll do something about it. Because that is all they are suggesting, and that is a plan doomed for failure. We can't wait 10 years for solutions to this problem. We need solutions that will work.

Let me suggest that the evidence is very, very clear about doing very small releases from the SPR, and I was shocked to learn how successful this can be. I went to a bipartisan war game at the war college last week with some of my colleagues, and we war gamed out what would happen if there was an interruption of our oil supplies due to overseas disruption.

Let me tell you what I learned since then: Small releases from the SPR can have huge ramifications for the price of gasoline. Look what happened in 1990 during Desert Shield when the first President Bush allowed release. Here is what the Energy Department concluded:

"The rapid decision to release crude oil from government-controlled stocks in the United States and other OECD countries helped calm the global oil market, and prices began to moderate. When the 1991 SPR drawdown was announced in connection with Operation Desert Storm, the price of oil immediately dropped \$8 a barrel."

Now why does this small less than 10 percent change in SPR, how can it have these enormous ramifications? The answer has to do with human psychology. These markets are driven by

psychology, and that's why the three times we have been done this before, all the last three Presidents, including this President, has achieved reductions from 5 to 30 percent within 30 days in the price of oil.

Don't allow Americans to be told they have got to wait 10 years for relief. Let's act now in conjunction with the legislation we are going to pass eventually to tamp down speculation. Democrats have both a long-term and a short-term response. Pass this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, let me agree with the gentleman. Psychology does have a lot to do with this. That's why Republicans, instead of trying to fall victim for a 3-day fix or for a long-term fix—so let's get into the psychology for just a second.

How about if somebody brought legislation to the floor that said, you know what? I think we ought to open up American deep-water oil resources, ocean resources, because we do understand there are war games that bipartisan Members of this House go attend to where we do understand that if international shipping where oil was concerned, if there was a bad mistake or a problem, that we would be in trouble.

□ 1145

So why don't we, as just a good idea, let's open up America's deep water ocean resources, which could provide an additional 3 million barrels of oil per day, but it doesn't end there, and 76 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Why don't we also bring to the table, let's open up the Arctic Coastal Plain, which could provide an additional 1 million barrels of oil a day. But there is more.

How about allowing the development of America's shale oil resources for an additional 2.5 million barrels a day?

So instead of having just a 3-day fix and arguing all these new issues that we bring up would take 10 to 20 years to bring to the consumer, not true. It can be done tomorrow. We could decide, and we should have decided 12 years ago. We should have decided last year. We should decide that today, what we want to do is to make available the resources of this country in the event, in the future, there really is a big problem.

So the Republican Party is here on the floor today with real live answers to real live problems that are happening every day.

And so once again, we will give this new Democrat majority credit. The energy prices are the way that the Democrat Party wants them to be. They do want prices to be high. They do not want a supply unless it is paid for by the government. And they are not for a long-term solution because it would mean that we would be using those big oil companies resources.

My gosh. We are going to hold the American consumer hostage. We are going to hold people in the Northeast who use and need this oil this winter

hostage, when, in fact, when it is 100 degrees outside, we are saying, do this now; let's prepare. Let's be prepared for the future.

And instead, this new Democrat majority argues, time in and time out, not going to drill, not going to put any more supply in, and prices will simply continue to rise.

Madam Speaker, somebody will have to face up to the day of reckoning, and that day of reckoning is going to be when American consumers, in the dead of winter, are not only paying high prices at the pump, but also high prices to heat their home.

We are trying to do something today. We have been trying to do something for 18 months, and this new Democrat majority refuses, refuses to see the facts of the case.

We reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a man who serves on the select committee, Mr. HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, I just would like to say to my friend across the aisle that I, as a member of the Democratic majority, consider the repeated, deliberate use of the phrase "Democrat majority" to be a pejorative use. That is not certainly what we call ourselves. And we could call you the Republic minority, but we don't. So, in the interest of bipartisanship and comity, I would suggest "Democratic majority" is the normal term to use.

I congratulate you on accepting and adopting most of the parts of your plan from our plan. The renewable energy and conservation components, which, by the way, the Vice President sneered at in 2002, I think it was, when he said that conservation may be a personal virtue, but it is no way to build a national energy policy.

We have been working, in this Congress, in the last year and a half to pass the first increase in fuel mileage standards in 32 years, to provide record, billions of dollars to alternative fuels research and development, record billions of dollars for carbon sequestration so that we can use coal that we have in this country without releasing carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

We have been trying, and I might say that perhaps your friend or the colleague in the Republican Party in the other body, Senator DOMENICI, could use a little talking to, perhaps from you, to get him to drop his resistance to the renewable energy standard and to the extension of the renewable tax credits which we have been fighting for on this side and have been stymied in the Senate by a small number of Republicans who are holding that up.

But allow me to go to what I was going to say, which is that in New York this morning, gas prices are over \$4.25 and in some cases \$4.50 and have been this high for weeks. These sky high prices are squeezing families in

my district right now. Today we are trying to give them relief using SPR oil to increase supply and bring down prices.

A release of oil from the SPR is a proven method of calming markets and lowering prices. The last three Presidents have used it successfully. And I urge all my colleagues to support it to do the same thing today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from using the second person and to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SESSIONS. We reserve our time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, the GOP, the Grand Old Oil Party, is up to it again. Now, it is as if the first six years of the Bush administration never existed. The Republicans controlled the House, the White House, and the United States Senate.

Vice President DICK CHENEY, at the President's behest, met secretly with the oil and gas industry and other energy producers and proposed an energy policy, a Republican energy policy. That policy was passed by the Republican House of Representatives, adopted by the Republican Senate, and signed by the Republican president. We have been living under it now for a couple of years, and it is having the predictable results. We are now more dependent upon foreign oil. And many of us who voted against that Republican energy policy said it was pushing the country in that direction. We are seeing prices jacked up to unbelievable levels. Many of us predicted at the time that the Bush/Cheney Republican energy policy would have those results.

They didn't mandate increases in fuel standards. They didn't mandate development of alternative fuels. They had a few pretend things about hydrogen which was far enough off in the future that it didn't upset their benefactors in the oil industry because they know hydrogen is 20, 30 years off. But things that we could have been moving toward quickly they were against.

Now suddenly they are all for action. They are all for action.

What do we need? We need more leases on the Outer Continental Shelf. Well, what about the fact that the industry today is sitting on leases that can access 80 percent of the known reserves of oil and gas off the United States of America? But they are simply not developing them.

Now, the industry says, well, they just don't have enough deep water drilling rigs and other things. But last year Enron, I mean—sorry. That is another guilty party here. But ExxonMobil made more money than any corporation in the history of the world, \$40 billion. And what did they do with two thirds of their profit? Did they put it into new supply? Did they put it into new drilling equipment? Heck no. They bought back their own

stock to enrich their board and their execs. The president who retired got a \$400 million retirement, and he bought an oil field in Africa with his retirement. Now that is where their profits and their money went.

They are in no hurry to develop new resources. But they would like to lock up what might still be out there while Bush and CHENEY are in the White House so that they can get sweetheart deals like the one proposed yesterday for oil shale, because these are their oilmen in the White House. Plain and simple. That's what this bum's rush is all about.

The American people need short-term price relief. It isn't going to come through letting more leases in sensitive areas that the industry sits on. It would come from breaking the back of the speculators, something they don't want to do, closing the Enron loophole.

Remember Ken Lay, head of Enron from Texas, the President's biggest political benefactor throughout his entire life?

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. The Enron loophole was created for him to trade oil and gas off the books. Well, Ken Lay is dead, before he went to prison. Enron is bankrupt, and the loophole lives on, and that is the price we are paying at the pump today because of commodity speculation.

Take on the speculators, break their back. Break their back any way you can. Re-regulate them or take oil out of the SPR. Break the back of the speculators. That will give us short-term price relief. Develop our resources in the midterm, and new energy future for the long term, not dependent upon oil and foreign oil.

Mr. SESSIONS. You know, it's great to hear about this private meeting that took place in the year 2000, and to now learn about all the attributes of the meeting.

I would speculate, since I am sure the gentleman did, that ANWR would have been in that list of things that the President of the United States would have wanted, the consumers want, that ANWR would have been on there, that every place that we would drill economically, and ecologically, in a sound way, that that would have been on the table too. That is exactly probably what the President had in mind and probably what the energy companies had in mind.

Let's put American resources, jobs and national security to the advantage of the American people, instead of the plan to send all this money overseas to build Dubai. That is a mistake.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Texas for yielding time to me.

You know, the collective wisdom of the American people is a force to be reckoned with. And the American people are speaking very, very loudly today about what we need. They are speaking about the need for a comprehensive energy policy; an energy policy that looks at all the possibilities that we have. And that is just, in fact, what House Republicans are offering, and I would venture to say a fair number of Democrats on the other side of the aisle want this. But this approach is being blocked by the Democratic leadership, unfortunately.

Madam Speaker, I would urge that the Democratic leadership listen to the collective wisdom of the American public.

Now this idea about drawing down out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is incredibly irresponsible. We are on the verge of a new hurricane season where we may need that oil. We have geopolitical unrest around the world where we may need that oil. The current volume held in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is just over 700 million barrels, and at current usage of 20 million barrels a day in this country, that is 35 days. 35 days. That reserve, that Strategic Reserve was put in place for real, dire emergencies.

Now, some would argue, yes, the price at the pump is really hurting American families, and I fully agree. I have spoken to many of my constituents who are feeling the pain at the pump today. But that is no excuse, that is no excuse for this Congress to shirk its responsibility to come forward with a comprehensive energy policy that focuses on production in an environmentally responsible way by opening the Outer Continental Shelf in Alaska, by investing in alternative and renewables, by looking into clean coal technology, shale oil, building out refining capacity to meet our needs, investing in nuclear energy. All of these things, all of the above is what this country demands and is what is necessary.

So I would suggest it is time to quit this irresponsible posturing in this body, and let's move forward with a comprehensive energy policy.

This is a national security issue. It is clearly a national security issue. Speak to any of our generals and our troops who are fighting in the Middle East. This is a national security issue. And I urge my colleagues to get serious about this issue. The American people have gotten serious about it. So why are we delaying? What is the reason for procrastination?

□ 1200

We can come to a reasonable compromise in this body to deal with all of it. And I would point out that exploration and production today can be done in a very environmentally sound way. My district in southwest Louisiana has been doing this. If you look at the oil and gas industry, in the aftermath of Hurricanes Rita and

Katrina when 80 percent of it was out, we didn't have spillages in the Gulf of Mexico. Everything was done in a very sound and responsible way. The evacuation was carried out well, and this oil and gas production came back on line very quickly in the interest of the American people.

And finally, I would add that by increasing responsible, environmentally sound American exploration and production, we're creating good, high-paying American jobs, also a very important stimulus to this economy.

Clearly, what we need today is a comprehensive energy policy coupled with strengthening of the dollar, and I think we will work our way out of this economic crisis.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, could I please find out how much time is left on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Vermont has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I believe I heard the gentleman say he has no additional speakers; is that correct?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I would like to, with permission, recognize the chairman again, Mr. MARKEY, but only if there is no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, we will reserve our time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from Vermont.

You know, this Strategic Petroleum Reserve is an incredible weapon to be used in order to protect the American consumer from being gouged at the pump right now. And the Republican Party and President Bush and Vice President CHENEY are talking about anything but using the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in order to protect the American consumer at the pump today. And there's a good reason. Because the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is to the oil industry what kryptonite is to Superman. It saps them of their strength immediately. It decreases dramatically their power over ordinary citizens across our country. And that's why they object to it.

You're going to keep hearing from Republicans how they really want to help consumers 10 and 20 years from now. But you're not going to hear a word about their support for deploying 500,000 or 1 million barrels of oil a day right now into the marketplace that will drive down the price of oil, drive down the price of gasoline at the pump today.

That's what we're going to continue to wait to hear them say.

Now, they have plenty of time left in order to make that statement in this debate today, but you're not going to hear it. You're not going to hear them talking about immediate relief.

They're going to continually talk about oil that will come from drilling on our beaches 10 or 20 years from now. Well, that's fine 10 and 20 years from now, but what are they going to do now? What are they going to do between now and Labor Day when Americans are driving all over the country? They're doing to say, We can't use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We can't drive down the price of oil now. We have to wait.

This is going to be an important bill to give protection to the American consumers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Just so the gentleman from Massachusetts has an opportunity to call my bluff, I'll take him up on it. I'll take him up on it.

We do believe there is something immediately that can be done, and we've been asking for this for years and years and years because the fact of the matter is, as we've already heard, there is a lot of psychology. The gentleman from the State of Washington talked about psychology just a few speakers ago. Well, here is the psychology. If you bring your own oil to the table, the other side sees what you're willing to do and their oil's worthless because they cannot hold you hostage.

So what the Republican Party does want to talk about today is today, tomorrow, Labor Day, and moving forward. And that's why we're talking about bringing 3 million barrels of oil per day, 76 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, 1 million barrels of oil from the Arctic coastal plane, and 2.5 million barrels a day from the shale that's in this country. Darn right we want to talk about today.

But the fact of the matter is that we've been talking about this for years, and now they make it seem like the debate just started today. The debate did not start today. The debate started back when President Clinton was in office. We asked for and passed a bill at that time, and the President said, "No. You cannot have ANWR."

And now we get to today and they act like, "Well, it just started. But Republicans don't want to talk about today." Darn right we want to talk about today. We want to talk about what has been talked about, that is the psychological effort as well as a today's efforts; and that's why the Republican Party is here yet another day.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, another day, another energy gimmick. It must be the 110th Congress.

The American public, hammered by high fuel prices, is getting tired of the Democrats' Jed Clampett energy plan. You just can't shoot at a bunch of imaginary targets and hope that energy is going to come bubbling up from the ground. Today is another such gimmick. Depleting America's emergency oil nest egg at a time when the world is increasingly unstable in oil-pro-

ducing nations like Nigeria, like Venezuela, and Iran, why, even a hillbilly like me doesn't think that makes much sense.

Tapping our energy reserve for 3 measly days of energy, 3, 3 days of energy, that won't lower prices, nor does it send a signal to the world that America is serious about taking more responsibility for meeting our own daily energy needs.

If this bill were to pass, and it will fail spectacularly today, but if it were to pass at the end of the drawdown, America would be more dependent on foreign oil than we are today. We would be more dependent on foreign oil than we are today. And how does that solve the problem?

So here is the question: How high does gas have to get before Congress will act? How many families will be hurt? How many small businesses will go under? How hard will our economy be hit before our Speaker allows an up-or-down vote on producing more American-made energy?

Congress has voted on conservation, we voted on renewable and passed them both. Why can't we get a vote on more exploration here at home with our resources? Speaker PELOSI to the Democrat leadership, I know that you have the right heart. Tell the special interests to step aside. Make room for the little guy who doesn't have a lobbyist, who hasn't contributed to your campaign. Let them have an up-or-down vote on this floor, a vote now for the American Energy Act so we can produce more American-made energy so we can get serious about lowering gas prices here in America.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how much time remains on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The gentleman from Texas has 3½ minutes. The gentleman from Vermont has 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Vermont is through with his speakers and wishes to close.

I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

I wanted to have a quote up here that was from Mr. KANJORSKI. And this was in an interview that he was giving to one of the local newspapers or television stations. And he was talking about really the Democrats' promise to end the war in Iraq and bringing all of the troops home, but it relates to their energy policy, too, and what they promised when Speaker PELOSI, then-minority leader in April of 2006, says, "We as Democrats have a common-sense plan to lower the skyrocketing price of gas." At the time it was about \$2.10 a gallon.

But Mr. KANJORSKI said, "We sort of stretched the truth and people ate it

up." Well, there's been some truth stretching going on lately in this building, and I think what we've got to realize is that we need to do something to increase the supply other than taking out of our savings account.

If you have a shortfall every month and you take out of your savings to make up for that shortfall or to increase the supply of money that you have, you're eventually going to run out of that. We would run out of oil, and we don't need to do that because then we would certainly be at the mercy of our enemies.

This is Mr. DEFAZIO back on January 18 of 2007, Mr. Speaker, when the Democrats came out with their energy plan. He said, "It is sad to see the Republicans come to this. Now they laughingly say this will lead the higher prices." At the time, gas was \$2.10 a gallon. Today it's about \$4.10 a gallon.

We told the Democrats then that their energy plan was not going to work, that it was not going to help Americans lower the gas prices and the price to heat their homes. We're telling them the same thing today: by taking out of our Strategic Petroleum Reserve to increase the supply is not the way to go. That's not the commonsense plan that Speaker PELOSI promised us back in April of 2006.

We don't need to deplete our savings, the energy reserve that we have in cases of emergency like when we used it for the first Gulf war and when we used it for Katrina. We don't need to use our savings.

And so with that, I want to say that this is another situation where, Mr. Speaker, the American people have heard the Republican idea of increasing supply, an all-of-the-above policy, and the Democrats are still doing things under suspension when they could do this under regular rule. They've got 218 votes. Mr. Speaker, the reason I think the majority party does not want to do it is because they know their energy plan is a failure. They want these bills to fail that they have under suspension.

Let's bring about something to this floor that will let the duly elected people of this country vote on an energy policy that will bring relief to the Americans at the pump. And that policy is to increase our oil supply from our own natural resources.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today I urge my colleagues to vote with me to defeat the previous question so this House can finally consider real solutions to rising energy costs.

If the previous question is defeated, I will move to amend the rule to allow for the additional consideration of H.R. 6566, the American Energy Act.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD 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 our time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, this bill is really a simple and straightforward opportunity for Congress to take an action taken by previous Presidents and Congresses to lower the price at the pump for the American consumer and for American businesses.

The Strategic Petroleum Reserve has over 700 million barrels of oil. That is an asset that was bought and paid for by the American taxpayer, it's an asset of the American taxpayer and citizen, and it's there to be used for the benefit of the American citizen and the American taxpayer.

This legislation would direct that 10 percent of that reserve—10 percent only; 70 million barrels—could be released. And what we've seen in history is that in the three most previous instances where, with a stroke of a pen, the President has used that authority to release this asset belonging to the American people, it's resulted in a reduction in the price at the pump of gasoline from 33 percent to 18 percent to 9 percent. So it's a proven action that Presidents have taken to benefit the American consumer.

It's also responsible. You know, 20 days ago, oil was over \$140 a barrel. It's \$124 a barrel today. And that means that when we are replenishing the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, it's going to cost less for the American taxpayer.

There is a reason why so many interested parties who are affected by the high price of oil strongly support this. The Air Transport Association, National Farmers Union, American Truck Association, League of Conservation Voters, many Republican Members of Congress: ZACH WAMP, RODNEY ALEXANDER, HEATHER WILSON, Senator COLLINS, Senator HUTCHISON, Senator ISAKSON. And the reason is that whatever we are going to do in the long term to change our energy policy, why would we not take the immediate action in the short term that can provide immediate benefit to the American consumer and to American businesses?

□ 1215

It just stands to reason that a responsible Congress is going to take those actions that can provide direct and immediate relief to the American consumer. That's what the release of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve will allow. Ten percent, not all of it. It's not robbing the savings bank. It's using an asset that belongs to the citizens of this country to provide help to the families of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1367 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 24, 2008, for

the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to the bill (H.R. 6566) to bring down energy prices by increasing safe, domestic production, encouraging the development of alternative and renewable energy, and promoting conservation.

(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 major-

ity's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1367 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 1367, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1362; and adoption of House Resolution 1362, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 184, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—232

Abercrombie	Doggett	Lee
Ackerman	Donnelly	Levin
Allen	Doyle	Lewis (GA)
Altmire	Edwards (MD)	Lipinski
Andrews	Edwards (TX)	LoBiondo
Arcuri	Ellison	Loeb sack
Baca	Ellsworth	Lofgren, Zoe
Baird	Emanuel	Lowe y
Baldwin	Engel	Lynch
Barrow	Eshoo	Mahoney (FL)
Bean	Etheridge	Maloney (NY)
Becerra	Farr	Markey
Berkley	Fattah	Marshall
Berman	Filner	Matheson
Berry	Foster	Matsui
Bishop (GA)	Frank (MA)	McCarthy (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Gerlach	McCollum (MN)
Blumenauer	Giffords	McDermott
Boren	Gillibrand	McGovern
Boucher	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Boyd (FL)	Gordon	McNulty
Boyd (KS)	Green, Al	Meek (FL)
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	Meeks (NY)
Braley (IA)	Grijalva	Melancon
Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	Michaud
Butterfield	Hall (NY)	Miller (NC)
Capps	Hare	Miller, George
Capuano	Harman	Mitchell
Cardoza	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan
Carnahan	Herseth Sandlin	Moore (KS)
Carney	Higgins	Moore (WI)
Carson	Hill	Murphy (CT)
Castle	Hinchey	Murphy, Patrick
Castor	Hodes	Murtha
Cazayoux	Holden	Nadler
Chandler	Holt	Napolitano
Childers	Honda	Neal (MA)
Clarke	Hooley	Oberstar
Clay	Hoyer	Obey
Cleaver	Inslee	Olver
Clyburn	Israel	Pallone
Cohen	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell
Conyers	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Cooper	(TX)	Payne
Costa	Jefferson	Perlmutter
Costello	Johnson (GA)	Peterson (MN)
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Cramer	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kagen	Rahall
Cuellar	Kanjorski	Ramstad
Cummings	Kaptur	Rangel
Davis (AL)	Kennedy	Reichert
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Richardson
Davis, Lincoln	Kind	Rodriguez
DeFazio	Klein (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen
DeGette	Kucinich	Ross
Delahunt	Langevin	Rothman
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger

Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schriff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton

NAYS—184

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
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
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

NOT VOTING—18

Bishop (UT)
Boozman
Boswell
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Cubin
Dingell

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1241

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

Messrs. RAMSTAD and LOBIONDO changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 190, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

YEAS—226

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
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
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
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)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth

Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Poster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hereth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Schakowsky
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui

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

NAYS—190

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Crenshaw
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
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)

NOT VOTING—18

Bishop (UT)
Boozman
Boswell
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Cole (OK)
Cubin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1248

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.

Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Dingell
Gohmert
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hulshof
Kirk
LaHood

Lamborn
Miller, George
Ortiz
Rush
Tiahrt

Stated against:

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 525, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5501, TOM LANTOS AND HENRY J. HYDE UNITED STATES GLOBAL LEADERSHIP AGAINST HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution H. Res. 1362, 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.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 185, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

YEAS—231

Abercrombie	Edwards (TX)	Lofgren, Zoe
Ackerman	Ellsworth	Lowey
Allen	Emanuel	Lynch
Altmire	Engel	Mahoney (FL)
Andrews	Eshoo	Maloney (NY)
Arcuri	Etheridge	Markey
Baca	Farr	Marshall
Baird	Fattah	Matheson
Baldwin	Filner	Matsui
Barrow	Foster	McCarthy (NY)
Bean	Frank (MA)	McCollum (MN)
Becerra	Gerlach	McDermott
Berkley	Giffords	McGovern
Berman	Gillibrand	McIntyre
Berry	Gonzalez	McNerney
Bishop (GA)	Gordon	McNulty
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	Meek (FL)
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Melancon
Boren	Grijalva	Michaud
Boucher	Gutierrez	Miller (NC)
Boyd (FL)	Hall (NY)	Miller, George
Boyd (KS)	Hare	Mitchell
Brady (PA)	Harman	Mollohan
Brown, Corrine	Hastings (FL)	Moore (KS)
Butterfield	Herseth Sandlin	Moore (WI)
Capps	Higgins	Moran (VA)
Capuano	Hill	Murphy (CT)
Cardoza	Hinche	Murphy, Patrick
Carnahan	Hodes	Murtha
Carney	Holden	Nadler
Carson	Holt	Napolitano
Castle	Honda	Neal (MA)
Castor	Hooley	Neal (MA)
Chandler	Hoyer	Oberstar
Clarke	Inslee	Obey
Clay	Israel	Olver
Cleaver	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Clyburn	Jackson-Lee	Pascarell
Cohen	(TX)	Pastor
Conyers	Jefferson	Payne
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Costa	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Costello	Jones (OH)	Pomeroy
Courtney	Kagen	Price (NC)
Cramer	Kanjorski	Rahall
Crowley	Kaptur	Ramstad
Cuellar	Kennedy	Rangel
Cummings	Kildee	Reichert
Davis (AL)	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Davis (CA)	Kind	Richardson
Davis (IL)	Klein (FL)	Rodriguez
Davis, Lincoln	Kucinich	Ros-Lehtinen
DeFazio	Langevin	Ross
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Rothman
Delahunt	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Lee	Ruppersberger
Dicks	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Salazar
Donnelly	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda
Doyle	LoBiondo	T.
Edwards (MD)	Loeb sack	Sanchez, Loretta
		Sarbanes

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder

Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Townes
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)

Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

□ 1255

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 526, I did not record my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 24, 2008, I missed rollcall votes 525 and 526.

I request that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect that had I been present and voting, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote 525: "Nay" (On the Rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 6578);

Rollcall vote 526: "Nay" (On Calling the Previous Question on the Rule providing for H.R. 5501).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I missed three votes today due to an emergency dental procedure. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote 524: "yes" on motion on ordering the previous question on the rule providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (H. Res. 1367).

Rollcall vote 525: "yes" on H. Res. 1367, the rule providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules.

Rollcall vote 526: "yes" on motion on ordering the previous question on the rule for H.R. 5501—Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 (H. Res. 1362).

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSUMER ENERGY SUPPLY ACT OF 2008

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6578) to provide for the sale of light grade petroleum from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and its replacement with heavy grade petroleum, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6578

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 "Consumer Energy Supply Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term "light grade petroleum" means crude oil with an API gravity of 30 degrees or higher;

(2) the term "heavy grade petroleum" means crude oil with an API gravity of 26 degrees or lower; and

(3) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. SALE AND REPLACEMENT OF OIL FROM THE STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE.

(a) INITIAL PETROLEUM SALE AND REPLACEMENT.—Notwithstanding section 161 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6241), the Secretary shall publish a

NAYS—185

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cazayoux
Chabot
Childers
Coble
Conaway
Crenshaw
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
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

NOT VOTING—18

Bishop (UT)
Boozman
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Cole (OK)

Cubin
Dingell
Ellison
Gohmert
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hulshof

Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Picketing
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souders
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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