

## MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). The question is on the motion to adjourn.

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 9, noes 386, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

## AYES—9

Doolittle	McKeon	Shimkus
Johnson (IL)	Miller, Gary	Waxman
Linder	Saxton	Weldon (FL)

## NOES—386

Abercrombie	Chabot	Gerlach
Ackerman	Chandler	Giffords
Akin	Childers	Gilchrest
Alexander	Clarke	Gillibrand
Allen	Clay	Gingrey
Altmire	Cleaver	Gohmert
Andrews	Clyburn	Gonzalez
Arcuri	Coble	Goode
Baca	Cohen	Goodlatte
Bachmann	Cole (OK)	Gordon
Bachus	Conaway	Granger
Baird	Conyers	Graves
Baldwin	Cooper	Green, Al
Barrow	Costa	Green, Gene
Bartlett (MD)	Costello	Grijalva
Barton (TX)	Courtney	Gutierrez
Bean	Cramer	Hall (NY)
Becerra	Crenshaw	Hall (TX)
Berkley	Crowley	Hare
Berman	Cuellar	Harman
Berry	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Biggert	Davis (AL)	Hastings (WA)
Bilbray	Davis (CA)	Hayes
Bilirakis	Davis (IL)	Heller
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Hensarling
Bishop (NY)	Davis, David	Herger
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Lincoln	Herseth Sandlin
Blackburn	Deal (GA)	Higgins
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Hill
Blunt	DeGette	Hinchev
Boehner	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Bonner	DeLauro	Hirono
Bono Mack	Dent	Hobson
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hodes
Boren	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoekstra
Boucher	Dicks	Holt
Boustany	Doggett	Honda
Boyd (FL)	Donnelly	Hooley
Boyd (KS)	Doyle	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Drake	Hulshof
Bralley (IA)	Duncan	Inglis (SC)
Broun (GA)	Edwards (MD)	Inslie
Brown (SC)	Ellison	Israel
Brown, Corrine	Ellsworth	Issa
Brown-Waite,	Emanuel	Jackson (IL)
Ginny	Emerson	Jefferson
Buchanan	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Burgess	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Burton (IN)	Etheridge	Jones (NC)
Butterfield	Fallin	Jordan
Buyer	Farr	Kagen
Calvert	Fattah	Kanjorski
Camp (MI)	Feeney	Kaptur
Campbell (CA)	Ferguson	Kennedy
Cannon	Filner	Kildee
Capito	Flake	Kilpatrick
Capps	Forbes	Kind
Capuano	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Cardoza	Fossella	King (NY)
Carnahan	Foster	Kingston
Carney	Fox	Kirk
Carson	Frank (MA)	Klein (FL)
Carter	Franks (AZ)	Kline (MN)
Castle	Frelinghuysen	Knollenberg
Castor	Gallegly	Kucinich
Cazayoux	Garrett (NJ)	Kuhl (NY)

LaHood	Myrick
Lamborn	Nadler
Langevin	Napolitano
Larson (CT)	Neal (MA)
Latham	Nunes
LaTourette	Oberstar
Latta	Obey
Lee	Olver
Levin	Ortiz
Lewis (CA)	Pallone
Lewis (GA)	Pascrell
Lewis (KY)	Pastor
Lipinski	Payne
LoBiondo	Pearce
Loeb	Perlmutter
Lofgren, Zoe	Peterson (MN)
Lowe	Peterson (PA)
Lucas	Petri
Lungren, Daniel	Pickering
E.	Platts
Lynch	Pomeroy
Mack	Porter
Maloney (NY)	Price (GA)
Manzullo	Price (NC)
Marchant	Pryce (OH)
Markey	Putnam
Marshall	Radanovich
Matheson	Rahall
Matsui	Ramstad
McCarthy (CA)	Rangel
McCarthy (NY)	Regula
McCaul (TX)	Rehberg
McCollum (MN)	Reichert
McCotter	Reyes
McCrery	Reynolds
McDermott	Richardson
McGovern	Rodriguez
McHenry	Rogers (AL)
McHugh	Rogers (KY)
McIntyre	Rogers (MI)
McMorris	Rohrabacher
Rodgers	Ros-Lehtinen
McNerney	Roskam
McNulty	Ross
Meek (FL)	Rothman
Meeks (NY)	Roybal-Allard
Melancon	Royce
Mica	Ruppersberger
Michaud	Rush
Miller (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)
Miller (NC)	Salazar
Miller, George	Sali
Mitchell	Sánchez, Linda
Mollohan	T.
Moore (KS)	Sanchez, Loretta
Moore (WI)	Sarbanes
Moran (KS)	Scalise
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky
Murphy (CT)	Schiff
Murphy, Patrick	Schmidt
Murphy, Tim	Schwartz
Murtha	Scott (GA)
Musgrave	Scott (VA)

## NOT VOTING—38

Aderholt	Holden	Renzi
Barrett (SC)	Hunter	Sutton
Boswell	Jackson-Lee	Tancredo
Brady (TX)	(TX)	Udall (CO)
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Visclosky
Cubin	Keller	Walberg
Culberson	Lampson	Walsh (NY)
Davis, Tom	Larsen (WA)	Wasserman
Dingell	Mahoney (FL)	Schultz
Dreier	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Edwards (TX)	Paul	Whitfield (KY)
Ehlers	Pence	Young (AK)
English (PA)	Pitts	
Everett	Poe	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1331

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6899, COMPREHENSIVE AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1433 provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 6899, the Comprehensive American Energy Security and Consumer Protection Act. The resolution provides 3 hours of debate on the bill, controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, American families and businesses from every city, town and village across our districts are struggling with the skyrocketing gas prices and ever-increasing energy costs, which have obviously gone over into the cost of food and every other commodity that we use. The American people are calling out for relief, which is why we have this comprehensive energy package before us today.

In considering this legislation, we must ask ourselves: How did our great Nation get into this terrible place concerning energy in the first place? Eight years ago, two oilmen took the reins of America's energy policy, and they never looked back. They held secret, closed door meetings with Big Oil and energy companies at a tremendous cost to the American people. And the Republican Congress supported them every step of the way. To this day, we do not know about the secret meetings that the Vice President held.

Just this past summer, the American people struggled through an excessive speculation crisis when oil prices jumped over \$150 a barrel. Of course, when the Democrats threatened to rein in speculators, they pulled over \$39 billion out of the futures market. We must address speculation before we leave this session. Because now, the oil prices are hovering over \$90 a barrel, and we cannot let that go uncaresd for.

Just last week, we saw the havoc that the Bush-Cheney energy policies have wreaked when the Interior Department's Inspector General reported



	Free our oil	Drill act	Use it, or lose it	Price gouging	Renewable energy	NOPEC price fixing	Public transit	Energy security
David Dreier, Rules Committee Ranking Republican .....	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	.....	NO	.....
	H.R. 6578	H.R. 6515	H.R. 6251	H.R. 6346	H.R. 6049	H.R. 6074	H.R. 6052	H.R. 6

A full list of measures that large percentages of House Republicans voted against:

Comprehensive energy legislation that includes the first new vehicle efficiency standards in 32 years, saving families up to \$1,000 a year at the pump. [93 percent, Vote 1140, 12/6/07, HR 6; 50.3 percent, Vote 1177, 12/18/07, HR 6].

Tax incentives for renewable electricity, energy and fuel from America's heartland, as well as for plug-in hybrid cars, and energy efficient homes, buildings, and appliances—four times in just the last 18 months. [82 percent, Vote 344, 5/21/08, HR 6049; 91 percent, Vote 84, 2/27/2008; 93 percent, Vote 1140, 12/6/07, HR 6; 95 percent, Vote 835, HR 2776].

Investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy, including solar, biofuels, hydropower, and geothermal energy, as well as new vehicle technology and energy efficient buildings and homes, with a 50 percent increase over the President's request. [56 percent, Vote 641, 7/17/07, HR 2641].

Landmark energy efficiency standards for buildings, homes, appliances, and lighting to save consumers \$400 billion through 2030. [93 percent, Vote 1140, 12/6/07, HR 6; 50.3 percent; Vote 1177, 12/18/07, HR 6].

Requiring that 15 percent of American electricity come from renewable energy by 2020. [83 percent, Vote 827, 8/4/97, amendment to HR 3221].

Reducing transit fares for commuter rail and buses and expanding service through grants to transit agencies. [52 percent, Vote 467, 6/26/08, HR 6052].

Responsible drilling in Alaska in the National Petroleum Reserve (NPR-A). [86 percent, Vote 511, 7/17/08, HR 6515].

Requiring oil companies to drill on 68 million acres they already control. [94 percent, Vote 469, 16/26/08, HR 6251].

Releasing a small portion of the government's oil stockpile, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, to bring down gasoline prices. [81 percent, Vote 527, 7/24/08, HR 6578].

Cracking down on price gouging oil companies that artificially inflate the price of energy. [74 percent, Vote 448, 6/24/08, HR 6346].

Repealing unnecessary subsidies for the top five oil companies earning record profits—four times over the last 18 months. [91 percent, Vote 84, 2/27/2008; 93 percent, Vote 1140, 12/6/07, HR 6; 95 percent, Vote 835, HR 2776; 81 percent, Vote 40, 1/18/07, HR 6].

Recouping royalties that oil companies owe American taxpayers for drilling on public lands. [86 percent, Vote 832, 8/4/07, HR 3221; 81 percent, Vote 40, 1/18/07, HR 6].

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from New York, the Chair of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for many months the liberal leaders that control this House have blocked, dodged, and refused to allow a vote on legislation to produce more American-made energy.

Democrat leaders have been absolute in their opposition to lifting the ban on drilling offshore, and they have repeat-

edly and adamantly refused any action on such legislation to help lower gas prices that are hurting people at the pump.

And yet today, Mr. Speaker, after these many months and years of stamping their feet and yelling "no," are we now to believe that these same liberal Democrats, standing before us today with a salesman smile on their face, are we to believe them that they are now declaring that this is a pro-drilling bill?

Mr. Speaker, the American people are not fools. They won't be taken in by this sham of a bill that will actually lock down Americans' ocean oil reserves.

There are two phrases that come to mind, Mr. Speaker, about this bill. The first is "grasping at straws," which is defined as trying to find reasons to be hopeful about a bad situation. The second phrase is "fig leaf," which means something you use to try to hide an embarrassing fact or problem. Mr. Speaker, with this bill, Democrats are grasping at straw fig leaves.

There's an election coming up, and Democrats are desperately in search of political cover, political cover for their long record of opposing drilling and producing more American-made energy.

This straw fig leaf bill was written in secret. There were no public hearings on this bill. The first copy of it was made public at 9:45 p.m. last night, barely 12 hours ago, and it's 290 pages long.

The Democrat-controlled Rules Committee blocked every single Member of this House from being able to offer their ideas for improving this bill. No amendments were allowed to the bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, Democrats are simply playing a political game. Everybody knows this bill will never pass Congress and become law, but don't take my word for it. Democrat Senator Mary Landrieu of Louisiana said this bill is "dead on arrival in the Senate." And when you examine the details of this bill, it certainly deserves to be dead, Mr. Speaker.

It permanently locks up vast amounts of America's oil and gas reserves, including more than 10 billion, with a B, 10 billion barrels of oil on Alaska's remote North Slope. It leaves 88 percent of America's offshore energy resources locked up. It increases taxes by billions of dollars, taxes which will land squarely on the shoulders of American consumers. And it permanently bans drilling within 50 miles of American shores.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why is this fact important? It's important because, ac-

ording to the Interior Department, of the nearly 10 billion, again B, barrels of oil believed to be offshore in California, only 5 percent is beyond the 50-mile barrier.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, what this simply means is that this bill permanently bans drilling on 95 percent of the oil believed to be off the coast of California.

As if a permanent ban on drilling in the first 50 miles offshore were not enough, drilling between 50 and 100 miles out would also be effectively banned. By refusing to allow States to share in revenue generated by offshore drilling, this bill guarantees that drilling offshore will never be permitted by the States.

Right now, States along the Gulf of Mexico are paid a share of the oil produced in those waters. Under this bill, royalty sharing won't be allowed. As a result, States would have no incentive to allow any drilling whatsoever. In fact, I would submit they would have a disincentive. Why would a State allow someone to come into their back yard and pay them no share of the profits that would be made by the offshore drilling? It is the equivalent of the government opening a Starbuck's or a McDonald's franchise in your garage or family home but paying you nothing, even to alleviate the cost of dealing with the impacts of that business.

And consider this, Mr. Speaker, if this is truly a drilling bill, why is there no outcry from the radical environmental special interests? Mr. Speaker, it's because they know that drilling will never happen under this plan. Those who are opposed to drilling can vote for this bill secure in the knowledge that drilling will never actually happen under this sham bill.

Mr. Speaker, my district in central Washington is the home of Grand Coulee Dam and vast amounts of hydro-power. It is the home of the only nuclear plant in the Pacific Northwest. It is home to the vast majority of wind farms in Washington State. And it is home to the Pacific Northwest National Lab, a leader in renewable energy research.

Those who call central Washington home believe in an all-of-the-above plan that lowers energy prices. That means promoting alternative energy sources like wind and solar power, recognizing a need for more nuclear power, protecting our valuable hydro-power dams, and also allowing drilling offshore in Alaska and on other Federal lands. But this bill, Mr. Speaker, does not address those issues.

The Democrat plan just means billions of dollars in higher taxes, more

government mandates that will increase costs for everyone, and a permanent ban on most of our offshore resources.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the American people deserve a vote on legislation that truly expands alternative energy sources and lifts the ban on offshore drilling and in Alaska. They deserve a vote on H.R. 6566, the American Energy Act, but the liberal leaders of this Congress have blocked a fair yes-or-no vote on this bill for months. They blocked a fair yes-or-no vote, Mr. Speaker, because I believe they know if it were on the floor, it would likely pass.

Mr. Speaker, BARACK OBAMA, JOE BIDEN, HARRY REID and NANCY PELOSI control the Democrat Party here in this Congress. They oppose drilling. They have fought and blocked it for years. Every time drilling has come up they've said "no, no, no." And this bill is just more of the same because it says no drilling in Alaska, no to truly lifting the offshore drilling ban, no to opening up oil shale in the western United States, no to hydropower as a renewable energy source, no to non-carbon emitting nuclear power, no to building new refineries here in America, and no to clean coal and coal-to-liquid technology. The only thing that the Democrat bill says yes to are tax increases, permanent bans on drilling, and continued high prices.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my opening remarks, I want to shine the light on an area of this bill that has not gotten much attention, partly because no one had a copy to read this bill before 9:45 last night.

Of serious concern are the costly new mandates included in the national Renewable Energy Standard that this bill creates. The most likely and certain result of this is to increase the power bills of almost every American family and business that it affects. That's right, Mr. Speaker, the Democrat bill isn't going to lower gas prices, but it will increase power bills.

The most egregious of it all is that this new mandate is slanted and biased by saying solar and wind power are renewable under the standard, but that hydropower isn't. This discrimination against hydropower is absolutely ridiculous. Hydropower is the most abundant source of renewable energy in our country. Hydropower is renewable, clean, non-emitting, non-polluting, and a reliable energy source.

Mr. Speaker, those are the facts.

And consider this; if capturing the sun shining and the wind blowing is renewable energy, then so is water running downhill, which is precisely what hydro is all about. But believe it or not, it is not renewable by definition under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, when Democrats—who just days ago were proudly declaring their career-long opposition to oil

drilling—are suddenly preaching the merits of this self-proclaimed drilling bill, you know, it's really hard not to laugh, except for the fact that families, workers, farmers, schools and small businesses are struggling under the high cost of gasoline, and really this Democrat Congress is doing nothing to help.

Instead of real solutions to real problems of high gas and energy prices that Americans are facing, this Democrat Congress has chosen to look after themselves in writing this bill. What do I mean by that? This bill will do nothing, nothing but give Democrats a talking point and a 30-second television commercial where they can smile and claim that they are supporting drilling for American oil.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this unfair rule and this sham bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity here to decide to make policy instead of continuing to play politics.

I happen to be among those who believe that we cannot drill our way out of this energy crisis, yet I support this bill that contains significant offshore and domestic drilling, and I'll tell you why. This will offer a transition fund so that we can go from an energy-dependent economy on oil to an independent energy economy.

What this bill will do is marry the argument that has been made on the other side that we have to have supply to get from here to there—that's true, it's indisputable—and that developing our own domestic resources is a way to help us get there. And it marries that to establishing that the revenues that will be generated will be used for the benefit of the American people to achieve the goal of energy independence, which requires two things: It requires investment in research and development of alternative energies, and it requires investment in the implementation of alternative energy projects.

So what you have here is a recognition that we do need supply; that's true. That's been the argument of the Republican side. Valid point. But it also recognizes that we need a sustainable financial fund in order to implement research and development in the implementation of clean energy projects.

This bill also cracks down on speculation, makes oil available, which will have an impact on the price of oil. It does a whole array of things that most of us are in agreement need to be done on wind, solar, biomass.

So, Mr. President, we can't drill our way out, but we can't get to where we

need to be, a post oil-dependent economy, unless we have a sustainable energy fund that will allow us to do that. We managed to do this in Vermont when we had a fierce debate over nuclear power, and in the storage of nuclear waste, assessed a fee that went into a clean energy fund. It is now allowing schools to literally cut in half their cost of heating their schools. This is a very wise decision and allows us to work together to get something done.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 19½ minutes. The gentlewoman from New York has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the Republican whip, Mr. BLUNT of Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

This bill comes to the floor today, this rule comes to the floor without an opportunity to talk about issues that have been before the House for months now. Our Members—even with a 9:45 notice last night that finally there was a bill that nobody had seen on this side of the aisle before 9:45, 10:45 Rules Committee meeting—brought a stack of amendments a foot high to the committee, none of which we're voting on today, amendments and legislation that have been out there for months for people to look at that do most of the things that the gentleman from Vermont just mentioned.

And I agree that we need to be doing everything—we need to be doing more biomass, we need to be doing more wind, we need to be doing more solar, but we need to be doing more of everything. And everything is not in this bill. There is no nuclear, there is no lawsuit permitting reform. There is no real way to do oil shale in this bill.

Most importantly, this bill that now purports to allow drilling offshore doesn't do that because you don't open the door to that offshore drilling. We have four States in America today that get 37.5 percent of the revenue taken from that resource near their State. We're telling the other States, the other coastal States, you're not going to get anything, but we want you to vote to open the door to that 100-mile area offshore.

We're taking too much permanently out of play. The 25–50 mile range that Republican bill after Republican bill—and in fact Democrats also supported bills that have that 25-mile boundary in there and let the States open that door, this doesn't do that. This doesn't produce any real new energy to solve this problem. And it sets efficiency standards for utilities that can't be met in the time frame necessary. This bill will raise almost every American's

utility bill, some by as much as 100 percent in a decade, and it won't produce the energy that it purports to produce.

I think it's a shame we're bringing this rule to the floor. I will vote against the rule. I am going to be working hard to find another alternative to this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, a member of the Committee on Rules, Ms. CASTOR.

Ms. CASTOR. I thank the distinguished chairwoman from the Rules Committee.

I rise in support of the landmark Comprehensive Energy Security and Consumer Protection Act and this rule. This represents the culmination of years of debate over energy policy. And it does contain numerous measures that have already been adopted by this body in a bipartisan fashion, but most importantly, this compromise energy bill represents fundamental change in the country's energy future and a significant break with White House policies that give little priority to ending the Nation's dependence on foreign oil.

Instead, this is the kind of comprehensive and balanced energy initiative that the American people have been calling for because it diversifies our Nation's energy portfolio and invests in new technologies and innovation. For example, we are going to make historic new investments in renewable energy through incentives for solar power and wind power that will have an additional benefit of producing thousands of new jobs across America.

We have the technology to save energy and to save consumers significant money. And this bill strengthens energy efficiency in residential and commercial buildings and promotes conservation as well. And American families could use a little cost savings right now. This energy bill also dramatically expands domestic supply and oil drilling because we realize that excessive entanglements in the Middle East do not serve our national security interests.

The contrast between the policies of the past and our forward-looking bill could not be more clear. There are real differences. Remember just 7 years ago the administration's Energy Task Force met behind closed doors. It consisted of oil company executives. And the administration fought tooth and nail to keep those meetings secret. Renewable sources of energy were not a priority, and a balanced comprehensive approach was not a priority.

So here is the question: Do the American people continue to subsidize big oil companies while they are making record profits, or do we shift our investment to cleaner, renewable fuels?

□ 1400

I know it has been difficult for some to stand up to the White House and the

big oil companies. But the American people are demanding it. We must make this transition and set new innovative priorities for this country when it comes to energy. Our ground-breaking effort, our reform and our new policy set this country on a path toward energy independence, particularly from the Middle East. So today we will cast aside the policies of the past and start down a path based upon the right energy priorities for America.

I congratulate Speaker NANCY PELOSI for her leadership in crafting this compromise future-oriented bill, and I thank my colleagues and the American people for their commitment to a new energy future for America.

I urge adoption of this landmark energy bill and this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my ranking member on the Rules Committee for a very fine statement that he made on introduction to his opposition to this rule, and I rise in opposition to the rule myself.

The folks at home have gotten the message relative to the level of competence or incompetence of the United States Congress. Polls indicate that our rates are somewhere at the 9 percent range, and there are serious doubts about our capability to effectively address major issues and in a sensible way come to conclusions that make sense for them.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was 82 days ago today that in the full Appropriations Committee I personally carried a substitute that would have opened the whole discussion and debate and the possibility of an up-or-down vote of drilling off our Continental Shelf. There is little question there is enough reserves if we will just tap them to assure American energy independence.

Since that time, the Appropriations Committee has closed down, literally they have done none of their work. And because of that, we find ourselves in the circumstance where today the leadership is undermining our ability to go forward towards energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan majority in the House has been calling for a real debate on energy issues for months now. But it was 82 days ago—during a scheduled full Appropriations Committee markup—that the real debate began.

That debate in full committee was short-lived and it ended rather abruptly; the majority leadership ordered Chairman OBEY to pull the plug on that markup when it became evident that they would lose a vote on off-shore drilling. The Appropriations Committee has not met since.

All year long, the majority leadership has abdicated its responsibility to have the Appro-

priations Committee proceed under regular order, largely relegating our work to the backburner. The assumption has been that BARACK OBAMA would be elected President in November. The assumption has been that the House majority would remain the House majority and that an Obama administration would be more inclined to support higher levels of spending in bills reflecting the majority's budget priorities.

Such a scenario, assumes that the House pass very few bills, pass a continuing resolution, and leave the future of the remaining bills unanswered until after the November election. But, what if JOHN MCCAIN is elected President? And what if he draws an even harder line on spending than President Bush? What then? Is the Appropriations Committee going to do nothing for the next 4 years?

Because the legitimate work of the House is now being dictated by election-year politics, it now appears that the Appropriations Committee will not meet again this year. It also appears that we will not have a chance to debate and consider a legitimate energy bill this year.

The vast majority of Americans support an energy policy that includes off-shore drilling for oil and natural gas. But the majority leadership still doesn't get it. Rather than working across party lines to develop a bipartisan bill—a consensus bill—we can all support, the House is being forced to consider a "take it or leave it" energy bill that leaves out over 80 percent of known energy reserves off our coasts.

This misguided strategy reflects decisions made at the highest levels of the majority leadership. It is especially disappointing to me because in recent years the Appropriations Committee has largely set aside partisan differences to pass all of our bills in a timely fashion. More often than not, we have been able to say, "We have fulfilled our responsibility. We have done our work." But not this year.

This year, one issue—the high price of oil and gas—has completely paralyzed the appropriations process and, indeed, the legislative process in the House of Representatives. We are now two weeks away from the beginning of the new fiscal year and what have we done? Nothing! Absolutely nothing! Instead, funding bills essential for every conceivable function of government have been put on a shelf to avoid votes on offshore drilling, on oil shale, and drilling in ANWR.

In past years, when controversial issues have come to the full committee, we took them head on.

During my service as chairman, we debated and considered raising the minimum wage, the millionaires' tax, and the Truman Commission. I was opposed to each of these amendments but felt our Members—Republicans and Democrats—deserved to have their voices heard.

Had the Interior bill been considered in full committee on June 18 as originally scheduled, the committee and the House would not be in this position today. It would have broken the logjam and enabled us to complete our work. And, it would have given Members of the House an opportunity to openly debate the most important issue facing our constituents today.

To me, preparing a long-term energy strategy is like preparing for retirement. It doesn't

happen overnight but takes careful, thoughtful, long-term planning. Addressing the OCS issue is just one leg of the energy stool (along with conservation, oil shale, renewables, etc.) just as a 401(k) plan is one leg of the stool when planning for retirement. I believe we have to take the long view just as we take the long view when planning for retirement. It can't and won't happen overnight.

Republicans and Democrats alike deserve an opportunity to have a straight up or down vote on energy amendments addressing the high price of oil and gas. Again, "all of the above" has been replaced with "take it or leave it."

Mr. Speaker, I don't recognize this place anymore. Once upon a time, members of the People's House worked together to serve the best interests of our country. Now, we either march in lockstep to the whims of the majority leadership or we are left out of the legislative process altogether.

When I first came to Congress, legislation was drafted not by the Speaker of the House but by committee chairmen with jurisdiction over the issue of the day. Members of the minority party had every opportunity to participate in the debate by offering amendments. But those days are no more. Members of the minority party no longer have any rights. We are basically told to "sit down and shut up" because the majority leadership knows best.

This Member has had enough. And my constituents have had enough. I encourage colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in rejecting this irresponsible approach to governing. Let's work together and openly debate energy policy. Let's vote on a consensus bill that addresses the high price of oil and gas. Remember, our constituents are closely watching this debate. They will remember what we do when they vote on November 4.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California, the Chair of the Committee on Natural Resources, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the Chair. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Rules Committee for bringing this resolution to the floor so we can debate on the energy bill and vote on the energy bill later today. And I rise in very strong support of this comprehensive, forward-looking bill that will provide relief at the pump, create good jobs in America and finally put our Nation on a path toward a clean, more independent and sustainable energy future. Surely that is something that all of us can support.

America understands the problem: Our Nation is addicted to oil. Consumers are paying record prices to heat and cool their homes and drive their cars and their trucks. Global warming is a real, serious and growing problem. Meanwhile oil companies are making more money than ever before.

That is why Democrats made energy a top priority when they took back the House and the Senate last year. We raised the fuel economy standards for the first time in 30 years, overcoming the objections of the auto industry, the

oil industry, the Republicans in Congress and the White House. And we passed one bill after another to improve America's energy policy and its energy future, to expand wind, solar and other renewable energy sources, to increase the efficiency and conservation and our use of energy, to curb speculation in the oil markets so consumers would not be ripped off by the oil speculators, to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve so that small businesses, truckers and airlines would not be thrust into economic hardship and to recoup tens of billions of dollars from the oil companies that are unfairly taken from the taxpayers. All of these are thrusting America into the future with respect to its energy resources, its supply and its usage.

But every bill was opposed by a majority of the Republicans in Congress and by President Bush. This is sort of the Goldilocks of the energy debate, too much wind, not enough solar; too much solar, not enough energy; too much going after the speculators, not enough going after the oil companies; too much going after the oil companies, not enough for the energy industry. They could never get it right. And they could never support an energy bill. And they have never been able, in all the time they controlled this Congress, to move America into the future of energy, to move America into renewables, to move America into efficiency. They voted against it all. And they didn't propose it. And at the end of their decade in Congress, gas was \$4 a gallon. They controlled the White House, and they controlled the Congress. At the end of their decade, gas was \$4 a gallon.

So what are we able to do here today? We're able to help consumers and the taxpayers by ending the subsidies to oil companies, subsidies that President Bush said were obsolete at \$50 a barrel. Well they are certainly obsolete today at \$100 a barrel or \$90 a barrel or \$140 a barrel. But the Republicans are going to hold to those subsidies. We are going to end the royalty holiday, a holiday for oil companies where they don't have to pay royalties. Where is the holiday for consumers? Where is the holiday for the person commuting to work? Where is the holiday for the person heating their home? Not from the Republicans. They fought tooth and nail. The President fought tooth and nail to hold on to those royalty holidays.

And finally we are talking about creating jobs for Americans here at home in green industries and the renewable energies of the future, in the efficiencies of the future. That is what the American energy future looks like. And that is what this Congress is going to be able to vote on. And that is what the American people are going to get as a result, a bright, renewable, smart energy future.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. BARTON of Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. First of all, all you need to know about this bill is the title of section 1 of the bill. This is title 1, section 1, section 101, prohibition on leasing. Prohibition on leasing. This is a pretend bill. This is a bill that has, once again, been put together in the dead of night. I was notified by my staff about 10:30 last evening that the Rules Committee was going to meet at approximately 10:45 in the evening. I'm not sure what time they did meet. We had prepared a number of amendments. We were led to believe that it might be a rule that if you had an amendment to the Rules Committee, it might be made in order. We were even led to believe there might be a Republican substitute made in order. So we were prepared for all of those, "we" being the Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Of course this is a closed rule, which means there are no amendments made in order. There is a motion to recommend. It is a 260-page bill. It has over 100 titles. If this bill were to become law, which it won't, but if it were, there wouldn't be one barrel of oil developed as a consequence of this bill because of title 1, section 1. This puts a permanent moratorium in place on any area that is currently not under lease unless you comply with the very specific instructions in this bill. And amongst those are if you have an existing lease in the Gulf of Mexico that was authorized under the Deep Royalty Relief Act, I believe, of 1998, you have to go in and renegotiate that lease before you can bid on any of these new leases. This is a bad bill. It is a terrible process.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. This is a terrible process, a closed system and a political sham. We should vote against the rule and then let those Democrats that wish to work with those Republicans that wish to bring a bipartisan product to the floor that can be voted on. The day before the election in the last Congress, the price for gasoline in Texas was approximately \$2 a gallon. The day Speaker PELOSI became Speaker, it was \$2.33. Today it's pushing \$4. If we don't do something about energy policy, it's going to go higher, not lower.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Mr. GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank our Chair of the Rules Committee for

yielding to me. I rise in strong support of our legislation H.R. 6899, The Comprehensive American Energy Security and Taxpayer Protection Act and this rule.

Why we identify this as a comprehensive bill is very simple. Our country needs a comprehensive legislation that deals with energy. We need everything for our country to both be energy efficient but also to be able to afford it. All sides of debate can longer insist on the "it's my way or the highway" approach to energy. We need all energy resources, both conventional and renewable. And everyone must be willing to sacrifice to reach that common ground.

I do not believe our bill goes far enough to address all of our domestic energy resources, especially nuclear energy. But however in every shortcoming there are positive concessions. Our legislation improves on a provision included in the original H.R. 6 by at least freezing independent oil and natural gas producers at their current section 199 manufacturing deduction rate instead of a complete repeal. Our bill modifies provisions from the flawed use of "use it or lose it" legislation which necessarily hammered future lease acquisitions. It retains but adds accountability to the tainted Royalty-In-Kind Program that we all read about.

It improves the management of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve with an idea offered by my good friend from Texas, NICK LAMPSON, by allowing a swap for heavy crude which could immediately lower prices for consumers.

Most dramatically, our proposal will help utilize our domestic oil and natural gas resources in the outer continental shelf. Our legislation incorporates most of the offshore drilling provision that I and other "Energy Democrats" first introduced in the LEASE Act by directing the immediate opening of all areas beyond 100 miles off our coasts. That is over 300 million acres of outer continental shelf that are automatically open to oil and natural gas leasing. States are given the option to opt in the additional 50 to 100 miles off their coast, an estimated 90 million acres for production.

My friends on the other side of the aisle argue that this does not open enough acreage in the Gulf of Mexico. I agree. I would like to open up the eastern Gulf of Mexico. But there was an agreement made by the Republican Congress in 2006 for Florida, and we are not going to break that agreement on the House side.

But let's not forget the fact that during the height of the Republican rule under both the Republican President and Congress, Republicans were only able to open 8.3 million acres of leasing in the Gulf of Mexico. And President Bush took 7½ years, almost 7½ years of his administrations to actually decide to take off the moratorium. So who really wants to drill?

Over 350 million acres will be open. This bill is hundreds of millions more acres that are directly opened in contrast to the Senate "Gang of 20," or in the Senate Republican Leader MITCH MCCONNELL's bill, his Gas Price Reduction Act, which has the support of only 44 Republican senators. We open so many more than even the Republican leadership and the Senate wanted to, more acreage for exploration and production.

Most importantly, we use the revenues from oil and gas production to transition to a clean energy future. Our bill would create a fund to invest in renewable, clean energy efficiency, land and water conservation and LIHEAP. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on, and I will continue as we go to the debate. This bill is a drilling bill, but it's also a future bill for comprehensive energy production.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. UPTON.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, there is a reason why Congress is in the 9 percent favorable rating. We have not done the Nation's business. I look at former Chairman BARTON sitting in the second row here. When we did the 2005 EPACT bill, we had lots of amendments here on the House floor, in fact, 23 different Democratic amendments, some amendments to amendments. And some of them would say at the end of the day that it was, in fact, a bipartisan bill because Congress worked its will. And I would say some of them were pro-energy. Frankly, some of them were anti-energy. One offered by Ms. SOLIS was described as an amendment that sought to delete refinery revitalization provisions in the bill. Thank goodness it was defeated. The bill moved forward, and it was signed into law.

But today we have a new bill that is hundreds of pages long. We haven't had a single hearing in subcommittee or full committee. We haven't had a single markup in subcommittee or full committee. And we have a rule that means when it comes to the House floor, there are no amendments allowed at all.

The Volt is an exciting new GM vehicle that is going to be in the showroom by 2010. It needs to be plugged in. We need to have electricity to make it move.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

Mr. UPTON. There are no amendments in here for coal. There are no amendments for nuclear. There are no amendments to provide for drilling offshore, no incentives, no amendments for oil shale, no amendments to bring

in Canadian tar sand where they are producing 1 million barrels a day. Mr. Speaker, there is no beef in this legislation. Many would say, "Where is the beef?" There is none. The rule needs to be rejected.

□ 1415

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the chairman of the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a very simple debate. The Republicans are very upset that the Democrats are going to take the oil companies and make them pay taxes to the American people when they drill on the land owned by the American people, and the Democrats then want to move the money over to wind and solar and plug-in hybrids for tax breaks. So the Democrats are saying that America needs an oil change. So, as Mr. GREEN just said, we open up vast new areas where the oil industry can drill, drill, drill; drill, baby, drill.

But what we put into the bill is something else as well. We put in change, baby, change. Because we only have 3 percent of the oil in the world, we have 4 percent of the population, and we consume 25 percent of the oil in the world on a daily basis. That is not a long-term recipe.

So we need an oil change. And what we need to do and what we are going to do is allow them to drill in thousands and thousands of additional acres, to go for the oil, to go drill, baby, drill, but then say we need back some of those tax breaks that you don't need at \$100 a barrel, \$140 a barrel, \$4 a gallon at the pump. We don't need to subsidize you anymore.

The taxpayer doesn't need to be tipped upside down and have money shaken out of their pockets as taxpayers to hand over to the oil companies, because they have already been tipped upside down and had money taken out of their pockets as consumers by the oil companies.

So we just take back those tax breaks, put a little bit of a tax on where they don't pay any taxes at all, and where do we shift it over to? Ladies and gentlemen, we shift it over to wind and solar and green buildings and plug-in hybrids. We shift it over to the future. We unleash a technological revolution that will break our dependence upon imported oil.

It is change, baby, change. It is innovate, baby, innovate. These guys are a one-note organization. They have been since two oilmen went to the White House 8 years ago.

Drill, baby, drill is not a long-term strategy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute

to another member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for America. Contrary to what my friend from Massachusetts says, there is no drill, drill, drill, no change in this bill. There is not one drop of oil in this bill. And let me explain why.

I went to the Rules Committee and said that any oil produced under this bill will be challenged in lawsuits and there won't be a drop produced. Let's put a limit on the lawsuits. The Rules Committee said absolutely no.

Why did I do that? Last year, the Bush administration issued 487 leases in the Chukchi Sea. Environmental groups sued not 484 or 485 or 486. They sued every single lease.

There are 748 leases also in Alaska in the Beaufort Sea. The environmentalists have sued all 748.

There were 12 drilling plans filed last year with the Minerals and Management Service to produce oil off of Alaska. How many were sued? All 12. The Center for Biological Diversity, the Natural Resources Defense Council, every single lease has been challenged in court. We could solve that problem with limits, reasonable limits on litigation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. SHADEGG. But instead, the Rules Committee said absolutely no, we want no limits on litigation. Not only are there lawsuits filed by environmental groups against every existing lease in Alaska and the lower 48, they filed a lawsuit against all future oil leases.

Any American who believes this bill will produce one drop of oil is being deceived by the lawyers that will sue and sue and sue.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), a member of the Committees on Natural Resources and Energy and Commerce.

Mr. INSLEE. You know, if we were having this debate in the 1800s, someone would be arguing about need to preserve whale oil, because that was the dominant source of energy in the 1800s and they couldn't see the emerging transition to different fuels. And now we have some people in this Chamber who don't understand the transition of fuels for Americans, the only transition that has a chance of breaking our addiction to oil and truly keeping down the price of energy.

I want to show you a transition fuel that is just on the cusp. I met a man named Tony Markel. He works at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Golden, Colorado, two weeks ago, and he showed me this.

This is a photo-voltaic panel. It is about 400 square feet, and it is plugged

into two plug-in electric hybrid cars. These are cars that run on electricity, only electricity, for about 40 miles, and if you want to go further than 40 miles, you use gasoline. This one system, a PV system, can power these two cars for essentially 40 miles, and then you use gasoline if you want to go more than 40 miles.

This bill that the Republicans hate is going to give Americans a step forward to this future, which is the only future, together with some biofuels and perhaps even some other technologies, that can break the stranglehold of the oil and gas industry over the American consumer. And it is clear to me from people at Boeing, who revolutionized commercial aircraft; from people at Microsoft, who revolutionized software, that now is a chance for Americans to revolutionize the world of new clean energy.

We know that we need innovation, not intransigence. We need invention, not insignificance. And we know we can't drill our way out of this problem. But we can, we must, and we will innovate our way to a clean energy future. This is a destiny of ours. It is a clean energy destiny.

In addition, I would like to add that Tony Markel is an employee of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. NREL is a national laboratory that provides great data and research on energy efficiency and renewable energy; however, NREL does not generally have a position on pending legislation, nor does it have a position on this bill, H.R. 6899.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 11¾ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 6 minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, our side of the aisle is responding to three fundamental facts that have changed everything: An economic crisis, an energy crisis, and a national security crisis. Higher energy costs are bringing down our economy; energy bought from overseas is depriving us of American jobs; and foreign purchase of energy is transferring our wealth, \$700 billion overseas. This is threatening our very national security.

We need a bill that has conservation, renewables, nuclear power, and, yes, American oil and American gas. That American oil and that American gas will pay for all the renewables we all want. It will help secure our Nation. It will grow our economy. And it will make sure that Americans have jobs, and our government has revenue.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make here is that the Republican bill, which has all of the above, sets aside \$8.8 billion that would be taken from the profits of this oil leasing, and that money would be put into alternative and renewable energy. That money would go to the long-term solution, which is electric vehicles. Lithium-ion car batteries would eventually come on to the market.

But the reality is in the short-term we cannot afford to do what the Democrats want to do. In the last 2 years that they have run the Congress, they have doubled the price of gas by putting in place moratoriums, including one on oil shale development, a moratorium, by the way, that is on three States, Utah, Wyoming and Colorado. We lift that moratorium in our bill because of the reserves there. They do not.

We have a situation today where what we would do is allow offshore drilling. Gazprom, the Russian oil giant, is up in the Arctic drilling. No. They say no drilling in the Arctic. Off the coast of Florida, we watch as the Cubans drill. No, we are not going to be allowed to drill there.

They take 88 percent and take it off the table, and the other 12 percent, they say you have got to get the State to go along with. That means they just continue this moratorium. This is outrageous.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. ROYCE. I appreciate that.

Our own United States Air Force would like to try coal-to-liquid. They would like to try gasification out of coal. This is used by South Africa to make gas. That is prohibited. The Democrats won't lift their moratorium on that.

Clean coal, nothing in here for clean coal. Another prohibition brought to us by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Basically, what the problem here is the leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle are so focused on saving the planet that they are not going to save the United States of America when we are in this crisis over these oil prices and dependency on foreign countries.

NANCY PELOSI herself, the Speaker of the House, said, "I want to save the planet." "I want to save the planet." The majority leader of the Senate said, "All fossil fuel is poison and we need to get rid of it." The gentleman from the

Sierra Club, Carl Pope, the executive director, said, "We are better off without cheap oil, without cheap gas."

We are better off without cheap gas? Tell that to the people in the 11th Congressional District back in Georgia when they are paying \$4 and \$5 a gallon.

The bottom line, my colleagues, is what the Democrats have done is come in here with a farce, a hoax of an energy bill, and say, okay, we know the American people, 85 percent of them want an energy bill and they want to be able to drill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman.

They want this, and they want it now.

I just want to call my colleagues' attention to this Charlie Brown cartoon. This young man is Charlie Republican. This is Lucy Democrat. Lucy Democrat has teed up an energy bill that includes drilling, but when Charlie Brown goes to kick that field goal, she yanks it away. That is what the Democrat majority has done, and it is shameful, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I continue to reserve.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this very misnamed bill and the rule that brings it to the floor.

First, it claims to be a comprehensive bill, yet it has nothing about nuclear energy, clean coal or increasing refinery capacity and halts much oil shale development. Second, and more importantly, it has no reforms or limitations on lawsuits by special interests environmental groups.

Radical environmental groups have successfully used lawsuits, the courts and administrative procedures to stop or drastically slow down all types of energy production and have really shut down this country economically in many, many ways. They have opposed not only drilling for oil, but also digging for any coal, cutting any trees, or, heaven forbid, any new nuclear plants. They want to go to wind power, but they oppose putting up any windmills.

I have noticed that almost all radical environmentalists come from very wealthy or very upper-income families. Perhaps they aren't hurt by high gas prices, high utility bills, higher prices for everything made out of wood and higher prices for everything. But almost all middle- and lower-income people are hurt by these higher prices.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DUNCAN. The trucking and railroad industries have been hit especially hard by higher diesel fuel costs. The president of Burlington Northern and Sante Fe Railroad told me his company spent \$1 billion on fuel in all of 2003, and spent over \$1 billion on fuel just in the first quarter of this year. All of these costs are passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices.

The Air Transport Association says each one penny increase in jet fuel costs the aviation industry \$200 million a year. Jet fuel has gone up far more than one penny, leading to much higher fares for the hundreds of millions who fly each year.

The hoax of a bill that we consider today is not a good bill, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1430

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a Member of this body who has been absolutely steadfast on the proposition of expanding our energy supply, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart.

America is in a crisis for affordable, available energy. Our folks back home want us to sit down and figure out how to have available, affordable energy. Four hundred Members of Congress, including me, who have been involved in this debate for years, this morning found out there is a 290-page bill that we are going to vote on today with no amendments.

That's not the process of how to get to a solution. That's the political process. This is a political process, not a process about solving America's energy crisis.

Mr. MARKEY's just sharing with us that we are holding back wind and solar and geothermal. That's not true. There is no Member of Congress that I know of that won't fund all of those.

The Peterson-Abercrombie bill funds every renewable that's on the books for 5 years. It funds all the conservation programs that both parties have thought of, and it funds environmental cleanups. It incentivizes all the forms of energy that will help us get to where we need to be.

The Pelosi bill, unfortunately, talks with one hand of opening up drilling. On the other hand, it locks it back up because of a 50-mile setback, and then States are supposed to open it up when Members of Congress don't have the courage to, with no reward of a royalty. No State legislature is going to open up the second 50 miles and get no royalties.

America doesn't want this political rhetoric. America wants us to sit down as Republicans and Democrats. They don't want a Republican bill or a Democrat bill. They want us to sit down and discuss energy into the night, day after day, until we get it right, and we fix and provide America available, affordable energy.

Folks, we can do that. We have lots of reserves. Twenty-eight years ago we started locking up our reserves and decided not to produce energy. We caused the shortage. We caused the high prices. We are the reason the oil companies have made huge profits.

When you lock up supply, the price triples. Whoever owns it gets rich. That's how it works, folks. We need to open up supply, bring prices down and give America energy to heat their homes and drive their cars so that they can afford to pay for them.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire if my friend, the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee, has any other speakers?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have one further speaker, and then I will close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from Washington for yielding and suggest to my colleagues that we are engaged in exactly what the American people are sick of, and that is political games here in Washington that are intended to be political games and to have no outcome.

Mr. Speaker, we have a bill that will be up soon. I don't know how many pages it is, because I haven't seen it yet. Of course, there is no Member of Congress who has seen this bill and no Member of Congress who has read it because it was introduced last night at 9:45. It's going to be up this afternoon, a bill that no one has seen, has been through no committee, written in the dark of night behind closed doors.

But what we do know about it is that it locks up about 88 percent of the known resources off our shores. We are the only country in the world that doesn't allow drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf, and this locks up 88 percent of it.

Is that a way to get to more energy? We have a bill that does all of the above on our side. But when you look at their bill, there is nothing about any nuclear energy in there, nothing about coal-to-liquids or coal to gas, nothing that is going to bring us, really, more American energy.

On top of all that, it has a big tax increase in it. If that isn't bad enough, we have an earmark in the bill, an earmark of \$1.2 billion for the City of New York, for some railroad bonds. This is

not the way the American people want us to get our jobs done. They want us to work together. They want us to listen to them, and they want us to do their will, and that's not what's happening today. If all this isn't bad enough, the rule that we are considering to allow this legislation to come to the floor doesn't even allow the minority, the Republican Members of the House, to offer a substitute, no amendments, no substitute.

Now, it was Ms. PELOSI, back when she was the minority leader, that called for this to be the most open and fair and ethical Congress in history. She said that bills should come to the floor generally under an open rule that would allow us to offer amendments, but, no, there are no amendments allowed.

There is no substitute allowed. This is intended for one purpose and one purpose only, as this bill is coming to the floor, so that some of my colleagues in the majority, the Democrat party can say, we voted on energy. Didn't do anything. They know this bill that they are bringing has no chance of becoming law, and yet they are bringing it up under a scenario which is, frankly, unfair. There is not one Member, one Member of this Chamber, who doesn't understand that this is unfair.

This rule should be defeated. Let's go back to the drawing boards and do this right, and we can do it right in very short order and have this bill on floor yet this week.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is the trouble when you introduce bills to hurt somebody, to try to punish somebody. When the Democrats took over a couple of years ago, they said they had a secret plan they were going to lower gas prices. The problem was the plan was deeply rooted in punishing average Americans.

If you drive a minivan, you are bad, and you are wrong. If you use electricity at home, you are wrong. If you commute more than 40 miles to work, you are wrong. So you have developed a plan that punishes them, and we are seeing the impact of that in every community in this country.

Single moms are having a difficult time packing their kids up. They have got to be at three events, they have got to pay for child care. They have got to stop and get gas to get them there. What they said is, you are wrong. You are wrong for working that hard.

What this bill does is it says "no" to more than it says "yes." You want to

hurt somebody so bad, oil companies, Alaskans, middle-class families. You are in such a hurry to do that, you have created a bill that hurts them more.

If you go home and try to put your kids on the Internet to do their homework, it will raise their monthly bill. If you cook their food on the stove, it will raise their monthly bill. If you put food in the refrigerator, this bill will raise their monthly bill.

It does nothing to help middle-class families. This is a slap in their face.

You say no to biomass, no to coal, no to shale oil, no to nuclear because you don't like it. This bill makes it easier for China to drill off our coast than it does for American companies to produce American-made energy.

This is not an energy bill for average Americans. I am a small-town guy. I plead with you, come to small-town America, see what these provisions, these plans are doing to average Americans in the middle class. It's killing them.

Don't punish America. Unleash the resources that we have to help America.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. May I inquire if my colleague has more speakers?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have two additional individuals, and then I am prepared to yield back.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, a Member who served here previously and who was very active on this issue, Mr. LUNGREN.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate with much interest as I notice the anti-drillers on the other side of the aisle straining to prove that their bill actually includes real drilling.

So you listen to it, and it appears they are lip-synching their message while the special interests, environmental extremists and lawyers, are actually writing and singing their anti-energy lyrics. No, no, no, no, that's what we are hearing.

It just appears to me that the Democrats have brought us their 290-page bill, and they are trying to display it as their newest legislative Grammy winner. What it really is is nothing more than their newest version of Drilli Vanilli.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. PORTER. I appreciate this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately an amendment that I proposed was shut out by the Democratic majority regarding renewable energy projects on public lands.

As you know, Nevada is on the forefront of a renewable energy. We have the third largest solar facility in the world in my district.

I have made some suggestions, so I have had to drop my own bill, since the leadership would not allow this to be heard, to ensure that when leasing or buying Federal lands, developers of renewable energy shall be able to lease or buy the property at existing fair market value.

It would expedite the process. We want to make sure if there is a solar or geothermal facility or wind or, whatever alternative energy, it is an expedited process.

It would direct the Secretary of the Interior to expedite these applications for renewable energy; direct the Secretary to also prioritize Federal land across the country, which could be used for renewable energy projects, and by local governments. It directs the Secretary to identify all Federal lands around the country that are suitable and feasible for alternative projects.

It's unfortunate this would not be heard by the majority party. This is something that is important to move this process along.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to act now to encourage the development of renewable resources on Federal lands, but as always bureaucracy and red tape are interfering with the process.

I am proud to introduce legislation that will remove regulatory and bureaucratic delays that are impeding the development of renewable energy projects on available Federal lands in resource rich states like my home state of Nevada.

According to the Department of Interior, there are currently 210 solar energy applications pending with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and 217 applications pending with the BLM for wind energy projects.

My legislation would help alleviate the bureaucratic hurdles and delays and streamline the application process needed to move renewable energy projects forward as we seek to address the current energy crisis.

My legislation will also:

Ensure that when leasing or buying Federal lands, developers of renewable energy projects shall be able to lease or buy the public land at the existing value fair market value, not the price of the land once the plant is built and improvements are made;

Expedite an efficient process for the submission and consideration of renewable energy projects;

Direct the Secretary of Interior to expedite all those applications for renewable energy projects currently in the logjam of bureaucratic delays;

Direct the Secretary to prioritize Federal land transfers for renewable energy projects to local governments; and

Direct the Secretary to identify all Federal lands around the country that are suitable and feasible for alternative energy projects.

A brief reminder of why renewable energy development is important to the Nation:

The economic impact of new renewable energy projects is immense—hundreds of thousands of jobs to develop and operate these power plants, bringing new tax dollars into rural communities, where unemployment is high and a boost to the local economies are sorely needed.

Renewable power plants reduce the Nation's dependence on fossil fuels and imports, enhancing our national security, improving our balance of payments, and stimulating our economy.

Renewable power plants improve our environment, reducing greenhouse gases and clearing our air.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation,

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, a member of the Committees on Natural Resources and Transportation, Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

If you listen to the Republicans here today, you would think that Detroit can't make more efficient automobiles, something the Republicans blocked for 12 years, which we did within the first year of taking back power here in the House.

They are saying that our electric generators can't produce 15 percent, one-sixth of their energy from renewable resources. In the United States of America in the 21st century, we can't get 15 percent from renewables? We have to rely on fossil fuels?

Do you believe that they say that the oil companies can't afford to pay the American taxpayers fair royalties for the nonrenewable resources they are extracting from our Federal land? If you do believe all that, then you probably believe that they do have a plan for independence and energy sustainability for the future.

Now the gentleman there spoke earlier, the gentleman from Washington, a good friend, about a fig leaf hiding an embarrassing fact or problem. There is one huge fig leaf over this debate today, and here is what is under the fig leaf: George Bush, holding hands with the King of Saudi Arabia.

Now the Bush administration, last time I checked, same party affiliation as that side of the aisle, the Republicans, led by Vice President CHENEY, last time I checked, a member of the Grand Old Oil Party, wrote an energy bill in secret. They pushed for it for 5 years.

When the Republicans controlled everything, the House, the Senate and the White House, they jammed through their energy bill over the objections of many on our side of the aisle who said wait, no, this isn't a forward-looking energy policy. It's going to make us actually more dependent on imported oil, and it's going to make us more dependent on fossil fuels, and it's not going to

give us a new energy future that the American people need. It's not going to make us more efficient, more sustainable and more affordable.

Now they are trying to hide that fig leaf. Now they have also talked about the price per gallon, that when Speaker PELOSI became Speaker almost 2 years ago, there has been a big run-up in prices.

Whoops. Here is when George Bush took office. Gas was about \$1.45 a gallon; today, bumping back up, over \$4 in some hurricane areas.

Now there is something else that goes along with that that they don't want to talk about, and this is what's really going on here, folks.

□ 1445

They want to talk about relief for American consumers. They don't give a fig leaf about relief for American consumers.

This is what the debate is all about. Look at the obscene growth in profits of the oil industry since the oil men in the White House, George Bush and DICK CHENEY, took over; from \$30 billion a year to \$160 billion this year, every penny of that extracted from the pockets of American consumers and American business. An unbelievable, unprecedented breath-taking run-up in profits.

And they say now they are concerned and want a change. They don't really want a change. They don't want this to change. They want us to continue to be dependent on oil and foreign oil and, yeah, maybe a smidgeon more of domestic oil.

Now they have a few other whoppers out there today. They say no drilling in Alaska. Whoops, sorry, wrong, guys. Actually, this bill would push the industry to get off its rear and begin to extract oil from the former Naval Petroleum Reserve, renamed the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska by the Republican Congress and put out for leasing. It has been leased. Bill Clinton, in fact, did the first leases. But guess what, 10 years later not a drop of oil, even though the known reserves, and why was it the Naval Petroleum Reserve for 80 years, because we knew there was a pile of oil under there, a huge pool of oil under there, more than 10 billion barrels.

No one knows if there is any oil under the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge, but they want to talk about the refuge. They don't want to talk about the fact that their friends in the hugely profitable oil industry have failed to extract any oil from the known 10 billion barrels of reserves in the Naval Petroleum Reserve Alaska.

This bill would push for production there, push them to connect it to the existing pipeline, and push them to bring that oil down to the lower 48.

As Members on my side said earlier, we need a transitional fuel. We need to

enhance our oil supply; this bill would do that. We also need to go after natural gas in a much more robust way, a cleaner fuel, a fuel of which we have significantly more reserves here in the United States of America which we don't need to import if we develop those reserves. This bill would do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me give the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This bill would also reform royalties. It would end the party. The Minerals Management Service under the Bush administration was swapping oil or something for royalties, or maybe it was sex, drugs and rock and roll. This bill would reform that process.

This bill would bring back integrity, fiscal responsibility, and give us a sustainable, renewable and cleaner energy future. Vote for a new future, not the same old Big Oil, Grand Oil Party plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, my plea to those Democrats who proclaim their support for more drilling and making America more energy independent, I urge you to vote "no" against this sham bill by voting "no" on the previous question. By defeating the previous question, I will move to amend the rule to make in order H.R. 6566, the American Energy Act.

Mr. Speaker, 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, once again I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question because that means we will have a vote on both their bill and our bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this whole debate boils down to one issue today: whose side are you on? Which side are you on, the side of the persons who sent you here, your constituents and the businesses that you represent, or are you on the side of the oil companies? I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1433 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Strike all after the resolved clause and add the following:

That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without

intervention of any point of order, consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6899) to advance the national security interests of the United States by reducing its dependency on oil through renewable and clean, alternative fuel technologies while building a bridge to the future through expanded access to Federal oil and natural gas resources, revising the relationship between the oil and gas industry and the consumers who own those resources and deserve a fair return from the development of publicly owned oil and gas, ending tax subsidies for large oil and gas companies, and facilitating energy efficiencies in the building, housing, and transportation sectors, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 6566, the American Energy Act, as introduced, if offered by Representative Boehner of Ohio or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 3 hours equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 noes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. 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.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6842, NATIONAL CAPITAL SECURITY AND SAFETY ACT**

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1434 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 1434**

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6842) to require the District of Columbia to revise its laws regarding the use and possession of firearms as necessary to comply with the requirements of the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *District of Columbia v. Heller*, in a manner that protects the security interests of the Federal government and

the people who work in, reside in, or visit the District of Columbia and does not undermine the efforts of law enforcement, homeland security, and military officials to protect the Nation's capital from crime and terrorism. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against that amendment are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 6842 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1434.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1434 provides for the consideration of H.R. 6842, the National Capital Security and Safety Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the chairman and ranking