

security, we need to take politics out of this equation. We need to take poison pills that threaten working American families off the negotiating table.

Mr. Speaker, I am ready and willing to work to keep the government of the greatest nation in the world open, and I know my Democratic colleagues will as well. I hope every Member of this body is ready to do the same.

I want to express my condolences to San Bernardino and its families on their loss. I urge Congress to get moving on gun safety legislation.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 22, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 546 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 546

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 22) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I confess to you, I usually use the time that the Reading Clerk is reading the rule to collect my thoughts and think about what the bill is before us today and how I am going to try to persuade my colleagues to vote "yes." But we only got about 15 seconds of the Reading Clerk this morning because this rule is so straightforward and so simple.

I am thinking, why is it—because I sit on the Rules Committee. I think we do good work up there. Good work is sometimes complicated work. Why is it that the rule is so short today? And the

answer is because we are in conference report season, Mr. Speaker. We are in conference report season.

We have already done the hard work in committee. We have already done the hard work on the floor. The Rules Committee has already done the hard work of sorting through dozens and dozens and dozens and dozens of amendments. The Senate has done the same hard work.

And we are now here on the conclusion of that work, on the first long-term transportation bill in more than a decade.

Mr. Speaker, Democratic administrations, Democratic Presidents, Democratic Houses, Democratic Senates have failed to do what we are doing today. Republican administrations, Republican Presidents, Republican Houses, Republican Senates have failed to do what we are doing today.

In divided government today, Mr. Speaker, I dare say my friend from Colorado didn't get everything he wanted in this bill, I certainly didn't get everything I wanted in this bill, but we are taking the first big step forward toward certainty for the American people on transportation that we have seen in more than a decade under both administrations.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 546 is a standard rule for consideration of a conference report to accompany H.R. 22, the FAST Act, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act.

I want to thank Chairman BILL SHUSTER for the way that he conducted this entire process. Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure of serving on his committee, and between his leadership, the ranking member's leadership, Mr. DEFAZIO, we have crafted a bipartisan, bicameral bill.

I was privileged to serve on the conference committee, Mr. Speaker, that completed this work, and it worked the way conference committees are supposed to work. I guess, because, Mr. Speaker, it is the first conference committee I have been on.

I have been here 4½ years. We don't see things get to conference that often. I was a staffer around here, chief of staff, for a decade, never saw a conference committee from that perspective.

Mr. Speaker, these things don't happen that often. They should happen more. We considered a conference committee report on education yesterday. We are doing transportation today. I think we might be on to something. I think we might be on to something. It is called doing the long, hard work, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know how many sound bites you have read about the transportation bill. I don't know how much press is being paid to this bill. It has taken not days, not weeks, not even months, but years to bring folks together around this solution, and folks have worked incredibly hard to make that happen.

It is regular order, Mr. Speaker. It is regular order. This is the way it is sup-

posed to happen. We are not supposed to have a bill airdropped into the House of Representatives, into the Senate under a take-it-or-leave-it circumstance.

What you are supposed to have are those days, those weeks, those months, and, yes, even years of discussion and debate and moving people together, finding that common ground, finding those solutions, moving it to a conference report at the end. And that is exactly what we have done here today.

Mr. Speaker, this is a report that contains views from across this conference—Members from rural districts, Members from urban districts, Members from districts that focus on mass transportation, Members from districts that have incredible road needs.

It covers folks from the West in single-Member States, single-district States, and folks from the East, with some of the highest population densities in the country. It is an amazing accomplishment to bring all of those folks together.

I would tell you, Mr. Speaker, historically, that has been the way transportation has been. Transportation is not one of those issues that divides us as Republicans and Democrats or even from the East and West. It is one of those issues that brings people together.

It is one of those issues—and there aren't many—but it is one of those issues that we actually have a constitutional responsibility to perform. The Constitution does not ask much of this United States Congress when it comes to developing policy and practice domestically here in this country, but transportation is one of those issues.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned it was the first long-term bill in more than a decade. That is absolutely true. Length is important all by itself; certainty in transportation, important all by itself.

We passed a 2-year transportation extension, Mr. Speaker. We put in the requirement to streamline some of the regulatory process. Here we are, more than 2 years later, and those regulations haven't even come out yet.

Building is a long-term process. Rule-making, so that people can build, is a long-term process.

Having long-term certainty is valuable in and of itself, but that is not just what this bill does. It focuses on the national highway freight network, Mr. Speaker.

Between Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, for example, there are three major Federal arteries. We have the Baltimore-Washington Parkway running those 35 miles north. We have U.S. Route 1 running that distance. We have U.S. Interstate 95 running that distance. Those roads are never separated by more than about 4 miles.

Now, whether or not we need three major Federal arteries running between two cities over a course of 35 miles, that is a debate that we can have. What the scope of Federal transportation funding should be is a debate

that we can have. And, in this bill, we did have it, Mr. Speaker.

We are focusing on moving goods to market. This is a bill about getting to your child's soccer game on time. This is a bill about freeing up congestion on America's roads and improving America's mass transit in a way that you don't miss the first pitch. But this is also a bill about moving freight to market. It is a bill about making America's economy work.

In a 21st century world, we cannot have a 20th century transportation system. We focus on those issues that have been left on the sidelines for far too long. We focus on bridges, Mr. Speaker. Bridges. It seems so simple. It is a transportation bill; there ought to be more that goes on than just roads and just buses.

Bridges, Mr. Speaker, turn out to be that chokepoint that so many of us have in our district. It turns out it is expensive to build a bridge. It is environmentally difficult to get the permits. It is an engineering marvel to put together some of the bridges that we have here today.

As dollars have gotten tight, many of our communities have not focused on the safety of existing infrastructure in ways that we all know our constituents demand. We make that investment in safety and security today.

Mr. Speaker, we streamline a lot of Federal regulation in this bill. There is not a man or woman on this floor who doesn't believe that we have an obligation to protect this great Earth. There is not a man or woman on this floor who doesn't believe that constructing in an environmentally sensitive manner is a priority for us all.

But there is also not a man or woman on this floor who believes it ought to take 10 years to get a yes-or-no answer. There is not a man or woman on this floor that thinks it ought to take 8 years to get a yes-or-no answer. If the answer is no, the answer is no. But we deserve, our constituents deserve some certainty in that construction process.

We eliminate duplication. We speed up delivery. We allow States, through a pilot program, Mr. Speaker, to begin to enforce some of these Federal mandates. In many cases, it is not the mandate itself that is the problem. It is the Federal bureaucracy that is overburdened and can't come through on permitting.

We allow States, under this bill, as long as they abide by the Federal standards, to go ahead and implement those standards on their own so that they can prioritize the projects that are most important to them.

Mr. Speaker, an issue that I know is important to all of our colleagues: We take some steps to get veterans back to work. This isn't the first bill that has done that, of course. We have done bill after bill after bill after bill on this floor, Hire More Heroes most recently, to say, if the only thing standing between you and putting our veterans back to work is Federal regulation, we

want to get Federal regulation out of the way. We build on that again in this bill, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know if you have any truck-driving schools in your district, but I can't find a truck-driving school in my district that doesn't have job offers waiting today for folks who sign up today. The demand is so great, Mr. Speaker, for folks to move goods to market.

But we have limitations on who is eligible to drive trucks, and for good reasons. For good safety concern reasons, we don't want folks 19, 20 years of age to be driving these heavy trucks.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have, returning from Afghanistan, returning from Iraq, folks who have been trained by the finest training facility in all the world, the United States military, folks who have been trained in the skills required, the safety skills required, to move heavy equipment from one place to another.

Those men and women are returning from serving us and are looking for work. If they were talented enough to serve us overseas, are they not talented enough to serve us here domestically? Of course they are. We take steps to recognize that here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am still waiting on that opportunity when I can come to the floor and tell you I got absolutely everything I wanted in absolutely every line of the bill. It has only been 4½ years for me; I haven't had that opportunity yet. I am still hoping that opportunity comes.

But what I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that I came here to make a difference. I came here to move the ball forward. I came here to do the hard things, not the easy things. The easy things have already been done.

There is a reason we haven't passed a long-term bill in more than a decade. It is because it is hard to do. And I take great pleasure and great pride, as a member of the Rules Committee, the Transportation Committee, and the conference committee, in bringing this rule to the floor today.

If we pass this rule, Mr. Speaker, we can move to that conference report, and we can deliver for America what has been undeliverable for more than a decade.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I commend my colleagues on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, who we will be hearing from shortly, for their diligence in developing a thoughtful, long-term, sustainably funded surface transportation compromise that really has many of the priorities that Republicans and Democrats brought to the table.

As the gentleman from Georgia said, this is an example of what we call regular order of a conference committee.

I want to inquire of the gentleman from Georgia, what was the vote on the

conference committee on this final transportation bill?

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend for yielding. It was a unanimous approval of this provision.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, you did even better than the education conference committee. We were 39-1. There was actually one person on that conference committee who didn't support it. What a great job that you and your colleagues did.

The education conference committee was the first chance in 7½ years that I had to serve on a conference committee; my friend from Georgia, his first chance during his time in Congress to do it.

And that is a procedural matter. When the American people hear, oh, conference committee, that sounds procedural. Yet another committee; what does that mean? But the product of these committees are substantial bills.

□ 0930

Part of the problem here in this institution is that it is a bicameral legislature, and the House and the Senate don't talk to each other enough. The formal way they talk to one another is through a conference committee. What that means is there are Senators and Representatives on the same committee working on the same bill, rather than what happens too often around here where the House passes one bill and the Senate, if they pass a bill at all, passes a very different bill, and never the twain shall meet. Mr. Speaker, thanks to this procedural conference committee, the differences between the House and the Senate have been worked out.

So we were on the education bill yesterday. The Senate will likely consider that exact same bill next week, which means it will likely go to President Obama's desk before Christmas. This transportation bill the House considers today, I don't know the Senate's schedule, but hopefully in the next week or two they will consider this exact same bill, and hopefully it will go to President Obama's desk.

So we had a very quick meeting of the Rules Committee yesterday. My goodness, usually when the Rules Committee meets, those are contentious meetings. We have a lot of amendments from Democrats and Republicans that want to have their voice heard. But on a final conference report, it went pretty quickly, and members of our committee on both sides of the aisle had a lot of praise for the chair and the ranking member of the committee that had worked tirelessly to put this deal together.

The Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act—they came up with a clever acronym, FAST. That works well, right? Transportation, fast, we all want to go fast, not too fast. The act commits \$305 billion over a 5-year period towards improving our Nation's

roads, bridges, transit systems, and railways. This is something that Republicans and Democrats both agree is the job of government. Transportation, infrastructure, and making sure people can get from one place to another is one of the most critical roles that our government plays.

In the first year, FAST increases spending on highways by \$2.1 billion. By the final year, the funding levels will reach \$6.1 billion in addition to current investment. It also raises transit funding from \$3.6 billion to almost \$10.6 billion by 2020.

It establishes a Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects program that helps focus our attention on projects that increase the competitiveness of American goods and services by expanding and improving upon heavily trafficked freight routes. Two that affect us in Colorado—very near and dear to my district—are highway 25, from Denver to Wyoming, and highway 70, from Denver to Salt Lake City, which we were able to successfully include an amendment in the House version, which I am proud to say is also reflected in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, these Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects open the door to economic development, improve the flow of goods across our great country, increase the quality of life for residents, ease congestion and safety concerns, and, along our particular corridors, are to the benefit of tourism and the tourism industry as well.

This bill helps leverage private investment in our surface transportation program by promoting the use of public-private partnerships which simply have become a reality for many infrastructure projects today like those used to expand highway 36 from Denver to Boulder, which I drive on most days that I am back home in Colorado.

The FAST Act encourages installation of vehicle-to-vehicle and vehicle-to-infrastructure equipment—which the Colorado Department of Transportation has been at the cutting edge of designing and implementing—to improve congestion, ensure passenger safety, and really help create a 21st century infrastructure. This bill helps increase dedicated bus funding by 89 percent over the life of the bill, a change that was direly needed after the last highway authorization.

The FAST Act maintains local flexibility for STP Metro funding, allows governments to dictate what is best for our communities, and leaves the door open for complex transportation infrastructure projects like the northeast line of the Denver Regional Transportation District's FasTrack system, which our voters approved a decade ago.

The bill requires a feasibility study to determine an impairment standard for drivers under the influence of marijuana, something that I introduced a bill on and have been working hard on to increase the safety of driving in

States where marijuana is legalized, like my home State of Colorado.

This bill increases funding for high-way railway grade crossings and requires operators to report the movements of hazardous materials along railroads, many of which, again, traverse my district. In Fort Collins, in Loveland, and in Longmont, where trains run through the downtown every day, these types of commonsense safety measures are desperately needed and welcomed.

The bill includes reforms to the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing loan program—a loan that can be used to divert cumbersome traffic out of the middle of our downtown areas like in Fort Collins—to ensure speedy approval.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good bill. The policy changes are thoughtful and progressive. The funding levels authorized are an improvement upon those of the past. The financing sources we tap, while not ideal, are workable.

Now, it is always fair to say in any compromise that we could have done better. There are a few things I am disappointed that this bill doesn't contain.

We were on the edge of cutting a deal that would have included international tax reform that would have brought American wealth home, used the taxes gained to fund transportation and infrastructure restoration projects nationwide, and prevented the offshoring of corporations, which we continue to see.

Earlier this Congress, Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill with my friend, Representative DELANEY, that would have deemed repatriation at 8.75 percent to fund both a 6-year highway bill at increased funding levels and create a new, national infrastructure bank. Combining international tax reform—desperately needed in its own right—with bold and robust infrastructure investment is a forward-thinking, problem-solving solution and exactly the type of move that I wish—and the American people wish—that Congress could have made.

Our failure to come to a deal on the repatriation of overseas wealth has, unfortunately, robbed the American people of hundreds of billions of dollars in public investment and continues to abandon the \$2 trillion in overseas earnings that could have been brought home.

In addition, we fail to address the tax incentive that American companies have to merge with overseas corporations or relocate their own headquarters overseas to avoid paying American taxes. We came close—we came close—to addressing this in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Congress to address international tax reform as soon possible to prevent the continuing offshoring of companies and the moving of jobs overseas, as well as to ensure that over \$2 trillion in overseas earnings can be invested here in Amer-

ica rather than face an enormous tax penalty if it is brought back, thereby preventing it from being brought back and providing an incentive for companies to invest in overseas growth and infrastructure rather than investing in infrastructure and growth here at home.

Mr. Speaker, the failure to contain corporate tax reform is not my only challenge in supporting this bill. There were certainly other programs that I believe we could have invested in, like improving even more the TIFIA investment which funds important projects like those needed along highways 70 and 25 in my district. I would have liked to have seen a direct funding stream tied to improvement and maintenance projects along designated high-priority corridors.

Finally, I would have liked to have seen the plight of communities with rail running through their downtowns addressed in the bill, an issue very near and dear to the cities in my district, cities like Fort Collins, Loveland, and Longmont, which are changed entirely by constant disruption of train horns and road blockages through our busy downtown areas.

The economic loss that we face in our communities, on top of the disturbance to residents' quality of life, isn't something that we can continue to sit by and do nothing about. We are going to work with every bit of flexibility in the bill. We continue to work with the department on less expensive implementation of quiet zones and of trying to reopen the rulemaking around train horns, which we expect to happen shortly, but there is no specific statutory fix to that issue in this bill itself.

So while I support this bill and commend the effort and the regular order that led to us getting here, we still need to look at what we can do. We see this bill as a floor, not a ceiling. There is even more we can do to bring our transportation infrastructure into the 21st century, to ensure its funding source is reliable and sustained, to repatriate overseas earnings and invest them here at home, and to eliminate an incentive for American companies to move overseas.

I hope my Republican colleagues agree that passage of this bill doesn't mean that we retire from presenting new, thoughtful ideas to improve our Federal highway system. I hope that Republicans and Democrats will continue to partner to address and solve some of these issues that I have raised that are not included in this bill.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to tell my friend how much I appreciate what he had to say about international tax reform and what our opportunities are to grow America rather than grow our competitors abroad and to say there are a lot of different provisions in this bill. The Transportation Committee was unanimous in its support of this bill, as were

several of the other committees who were involved in the conference, but there were a few stragglers out there on some of the extraneous provisions that were placed in here.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE), a member of the freshman class of 2010 and a member of the Transportation Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, the Congress has offered Members the classic Sophie's choice. Either vote "no" on the transportation bill and guarantee no reforms to road and bridge building happen, or vote "yes" and get reforms necessary to save money and streamline construction, but do it without actually paying for it and keep racking up the national debt.

While many of my colleagues are sure to rush to the floor in the next few hours to pat themselves on the back for accomplishing this marvelous, transformational highway bill, we should not be popping champagne. There is no backslapping deserved.

While I am encouraged by the fact that in many ways the policy related to surface transportation takes a significant step forward, I am deeply discouraged by the phony pay-fors.

Mr. Speaker, during the upcoming debate on this legislation, you and the American people are going to hear repeatedly that this bill is fully offset and fully paid for, essentially that new revenue and savings will keep the cost of this bill from adding to our national debt. This is, plain and simple, not the case. Most of the offsets are from general fund transfers.

Now, it would take a magician of miraculous skill to transfer money out of a fund that has a negative balance of \$400 billion. If, in fact, there is money to transfer from an empty fund, I might suggest that we instead try to make the fund a bit less empty instead of transferring it to more spending.

But I digress. Let's take a look at the pay-fors.

One of a long series of phony offsets is selling off oil that is currently owned by the American people in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. While you are stewarding the American people's money, you are supposed to buy low and sell high, not the other way around. Not only are we selling off a public asset at near record low prices, we are also counting on getting over double the current market price in order to make all the math work. If you can find a buyer to pay \$94 per barrel for oil, like the authors claim, while the market price is \$41, I have got a bridge to nowhere to sell you.

Another phony offset is hiring aggressive private contractors to go after people who are delinquent on their Federal taxes. Now, listen, I am all for collecting all outstanding taxes. But what does that have to do with road building? If, in fact, we can collect an additional \$2.5 billion by doing this,

shouldn't that money be put against the \$400-billion deficit we are facing already?

Why is it an offset that generates its revenue amount over 10 years when the highway bill is only for 5 years? What is going to happen in year 6? Will all the road building the country needs be completed by then? Are there not any other roads going to need to be built in year 6? Are we not, then, just going to have to borrow even more money?

Mr. Speaker, the bill does make a very reasonable point that taxes must be indexed to inflation to keep from losing value every year. I found this quite ironic. That makes total sense. So it is applied to the gas tax; right? Wrong.

Mr. Speaker, here is my favorite phony pay-for. The bill's authors didn't have the political courage to deal with user fees for drivers, but instead are indexing taxes collected by the U.S. Customs Service. Now, that is really ironic, but that tax is easy to hide from constituents. Now Americans returning from overseas will pay more for them in taxes to pave our roads while people who use the roads simply look on and smile.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there is more. There are modifications to royalty payments. Wow, that has got everything to do with roads. Or how about denying passports to those who have unpaid taxes? This is allegedly going to raise \$350 million. Of course, that has nothing to do with roads, and, in fact, may not even be possible without all kinds of court trials and cases.

Mr. Speaker, I know you can sense my frustration. At the end of the day, this bill will pass, the President will sign it, and while everyone is patting themselves on the back for passing a long-term solution, we are going to continue to pile debt on our grandchildren.

We are so close, though, to getting this right. We streamlined the process to get roads built faster saving taxpayer dollars. We have returned more decisionmaking back to the States, and we have reduced the bureaucracy and red tape around transportation construction.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Georgia have eloquently explained some of the benefits of the piece of legislation. These are valuable and not insignificant reforms. It is because of these reforms that I am going to reluctantly support this bill in spite of these phony, god-awful pay-fors. Here is why: I realize that if this bill does not pass, what we will get instead is another extension of current policy and more borrowing, because that is what the Congress has done since I have been here.

So this goes back to the classic Sophie's choice I mentioned at the beginning of my conversation here. To get the good, I must accept the bad; to reject the bad, I must reject the good. If only this body, this Congress, had the political courage to tell the Amer-

ican people a simple truth: if something is worth buying, it is worth paying for. Taxing tomorrow should not replace living within our means today. It hurts future generations, and I am profoundly disappointed. We can and should do better for the people who sent us here to speak for them.

□ 0945

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds before I further yield.

I agree with many of the critiques from the gentleman from Wisconsin. I think, when you pick apart a lot of the ways that this bill is paid for, you will find that they either won't generate the amount of revenue we think they will or you are borrowing from the out-years, meaning years 5 through 10, to effectively fund years 1 through 5. I know a lot of Members on both sides of the aisle will weigh that in their vote. I wish that the committee could have done better in finding pay-fors.

I would like to briefly address the national petroleum reserve. I think it is great that Democrats and Republicans are coming together around selling assets the Federal Government has that are nonproductive assets, like the petroleum reserve that was set up for a time when America relied on foreign oil. We are now net producers of crude oil.

I introduced an amendment that was not allowed for the energy bill yesterday to sell down the entire strategic petroleum reserve, which I think we should. However, the accounting for it in this bill shows us magically receiving twice the value per barrel for the price of oil than the futures market actually indicates that we would get. That is simply fictitious accounting in terms of how this bill is paid for.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to yield 5 more minutes to my friend from Wisconsin because I strongly, strongly agree with the framework that he advanced.

I have come to this floor repeatedly with a simple suggestion that we index the gas tax and move forward with paying for our future. It is, I think, an interesting question if we had followed regular order dealing with transportation funding, if we would have had a hearing that would have had the President of the AFL-CIO, had the President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, truckers, AAA, legislators from seven red Republican States that have raised the gas tax and the sky didn't fall come forward and talk to Congress about what would make a difference.

Because they have all agreed that we shouldn't be borrowing from the future, that we should right-size this, not playing budget games, and be able to have the most effective way to create millions of family wage jobs and show that we can do our job the same way that was led by President Eisenhower and President Reagan.

That said, I think this bill does represent an important step forward because there was some regular order followed by the committee. I take my hat off to Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO, who worked their way through a variety of contentious issues and brought forward a piece of legislation that provides modest, but important, increases in our funding programs.

It retains the basic structure. It has some improvements streamlining the process. It protects transit, safety, pedestrian, cycling programs, and a higher speed passenger rail. It speaks to a multiplicity of interests that Americans care deeply about.

It has embedded in it areas of innovation to encourage us to use technology to be able to improve the transportation system. I think there is no question that this is a new frontier, that 10 years from now we will not recognize much of what happens in the transportation space.

We will be able to coax more value out of our transportation system. We will be able to stretch dollars and unleash a great deal of innovation and activity. This legislation encourages that.

Part of the innovation is that, while I think we should index and raise the gas tax to actually adequately fund a robust bill, I think it is important for us to get rid of the gas tax and replace it with something that is sustainable over time.

And, again, this legislation has some provisions that will enable States to experiment with pilot projects like we have had in Oregon for the last 10 years for a fee that is based on road use, that would be sustainable, that would be fair, that actually could be adjusted in ways to help rural and small-town America and be able to give greater access to transportation in a more efficient fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we will use the 5 years of stability, ending the saga of 35 short-term extensions because we wouldn't face the funding question.

I am hopeful that we will use these 5 years to be able to refine some of the improvements that are in it and to be able to directly face the question of whether or not we are going to pay for our transportation future, that we won't use gimmicks, that we will use the tried-and-true user fee and replace the gas tax with something that is better and more sustainable.

It is time to start building that foundation now. It is not just more money, but it is transforming how the transportation systems work. I think this bill gives us leverage to move forward on that. Rebuilding and renewing America is a nonpartisan issue. It is an issue that can actually bring us together while we make our communities more livable, our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

We can put millions of Americans to work at family wage jobs that will im-

prove the quality of life for communities from coast to coast. This bill is a step in that direction. But it is only going to work if we accept our responsibilities to properly fund it, to face the future, and accept responsibility to do our job right. I hope we will.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to not just celebrate the successes that we are having today, but to associate myself with my colleagues who say the next round of hard work begins tomorrow.

There is a reason that we have the funding pay-fors that we have in this bill. It is not a lack of political courage. I have colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have courage to spare. It is a lack of trust.

When my constituents back home send me a dollar's worth of taxes and get 50 cents worth of road out of it, they say: ROB, what is the deal?

The streamlining that goes on in this bill grows that trust. The elimination of duplication, the focus on national priorities instead of pet projects, on and on and on, builds that trust.

The time to build that trust is before the next highway bill, not at the end of a highway bill cycle. There is a lot of work for each and every one of us to do in a bipartisan way to go out and build that trust.

I think about what my friend from Oregon said: We are going to squeeze a lot of efficiency out of our transportation system.

The innovation title in this bill is absolutely going to allow us to do more with less, which is precisely why constituents are worried about an indexed gas tax that puts transportation spending on autopilot, because all of our experience is, if you raise it, someone will spend it.

Balancing efficiency with productivity is a challenge that we all face that begins with trust generated back home, Mr. Speaker. My great hope is that the reforms in this bill, combined with the reforms in MAP-21, combined with the leadership that States and localities are taking with their own revenue bases, are going to create that trust for a generation to come.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TRUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Like the others you have heard from this morning, I commend those who have worked so hard on this bill. But, like them, I, too, have reservations about the final product.

It continues to underfund our Nation's infrastructure and it relies on unsustainable revenue sources and budgetary musical chairs; yet, it does include some policy provisions that I believe will result in better project development and delivery.

I represent the heart of the Las Vegas Valley, a region that is home to over 2 million people. We receive and

enjoy the visits of over 43 million people from around the world annually. Having a transportation system to safely and efficiently move these people and products around is vital to our economic success.

That is why I am thankful that this final report includes a number of provisions that I advocated for, including language to ensure our States and MPOs consider the needs of the traveling public when developing their long-term transportation plans.

The bill will also create a national travel and tourism advisory committee comprised of stakeholders from across the industry to develop a plan to identify and invest in infrastructure and operational improvements along the most important travel corridors.

In addition, the final bill includes language I submitted that will extend the authorization for the development of Interstate 11, a major regional project in the Southwest.

Lastly, the conference report includes provisions I advocated for in the committee to make our roadways safer for all users, not just cars and trucks, but pedestrians and cyclists who have seen increased accidents and fatalities in recent years.

For these reasons that affect my district and the rest of the country and for others that have been mentioned, I think the bill deserves support. While it is not perfect, it is a step in the right direction.

For that reason, I will vote for it. I urge others to do so as well.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say I think my friend from Nevada missed one of those great successes that she had—I will call it the Rodney Davis-Dina Titus amendment—to make sure that localities have even more control over their spending decisions.

It is one of those episodes, Mr. Speaker, where folks didn't get everything they wanted, but because folks were in there advocating for their constituents throughout the entire process, we ended up further down the road today than we would have been yesterday but for the Davis-Titus team pushing forward on that language.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this bill is, and that is what regular order gets us. It is so frustrating. I feel like I am in a room full of racehorses here trying to wait for the doors to open. The gates have just come open, and we all want to get to the finish line.

Our new Speaker has made some commitments about bringing more involvement and individual Member participation in the process. That is new to this institution in many ways, Mr. Speaker, but it is not new to the Transportation Committee. It is not new to the work that you and I have been doing on the committee for these past many months. That is why this bill is worthy of the support of so many of our colleagues.

I can go through a similar list as my friend from Nevada of ideas that came

from the folks who lead back home. Folks who are in the tourism industry know more about tourism than those of us who are not, as do folks who are in the visitor industry, folks who are in the construction industry, folks who are in the concrete industry, on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, when you open the process up, you end up with fewer folks with political agendas at the table. You end up with more folks with practical agendas at the table. When you open the process up, you don't end up with politicians looking for their own piece of the pie. You end up with the public sharing their expertise and their experience. That is how you end up with a bill like the FAST Act today.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great pleasure for me to serve on the Transportation Committee with folks like the gentlewoman from Nevada, like the gentleman from Illinois, to be able to have a common goal—very different approaches on how you want to achieve that goal, very different constituencies pushing you towards that goal—but to know that, if you put in the time and if you put in the hours, you will get a result.

So often in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, it seems like we are tilting at windmills. When I joined the Transportation Committee, I knew that we were not going to be tilting at windmills. We were going to be slaying a dragon. This bill slays that dragon today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am pleased to be here as a conferee to the conference that worked to resolve the difference between the House and Senate versions on the surface transportation reauthorization.

A huge thank you goes to Chairmen SHUSTER and GRAVES and Ranking Members DEFAZIO and NORTON and their committees and personal staff for all the work that was put in to get us to this 5-year authorization.

The fact is that America is literally falling apart. I am glad that we are going to be sending the President a long-term authorization this week. Making our infrastructure work and work for us smarter is really critical.

□ 1000

The bill does a lot to support research, development, and the deployment of transportation technology.

I am pleased with the overall research title, including specific investments in hazardous materials, R&D, and traffic congestion mitigation, but I do have a couple of concerns with oversight.

The Intelligent Transportation Systems Joint Program Office was moved out of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology and into the Federal Highway Administration. We have to be vigilant that

this move doesn't undermine the multimodal coordination of ITS research and development.

A new deployment program was funded through a large tax on existing R&D programs. While I support the deployment program, we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that today's R&D investments enable tomorrow's new deployment opportunities. So we shouldn't be shortsighted.

Nonetheless, I support the FAST Act. It is a bipartisan, bicameral, long-term authorization to fund highway transit, highway safety, motor carrier safety, hazardous material safety, and even passenger rail programs and projects.

Let me be clear. It is not the bill I would have written, and it is definitely not perfect, including some of the problematic pay-fors that have been discussed today. But it will provide certainty, invest in America's infrastructure, and create good-paying American jobs.

The bill is funded at the higher Senate-approved level, which is important.

I am happy to have worked in a bipartisan fashion with my colleagues on the floor and in committee to make a difference in people's lives.

In our region, our Senators, Representatives NORTON and COMSTOCK, and I have provided new and direct Federal oversight of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

We have also worked to include transit-oriented development eligibility in TIFIA. Yes, this would mean that many of the transit-oriented projects across the Nation, in the metropolitan Washington region, and in my county, Prince George's County, along the Green Line, will now be able to qualify for Federal financing because most transit-oriented development infrastructure projects are less than the \$50 million threshold that TIFIA currently requires.

In working with several Members, we were able to restore funding for the High Density States program that will allow transit systems in these States to maintain jobs, service, and service frequency and continue to help those who rely on public transportation.

Though I oppose today's rule, we have to enact a bill that will construct and rebuild our road, bridge, transit, and rail infrastructure that creates jobs here at home and enables the United States to compete internationally in the 21st century.

This is a good first step. Let's not stop here. Let's continue to work in this fashion to rebuild America's infrastructure.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I thank Congressman POLIS for the time he has granted me.

Mr. Speaker, after more than 2 years of obstruction by a vocal, ideologically

driven minority that led to a 5-month shutdown of the Export-Import Bank, I could not be more pleased to rise and speak in strong support of the provision in the conference report that would finally put the Ex-Im Bank back in the business of supporting U.S. jobs.

After having spoken with and having listened to the stories of countless users of the Ex-Im Bank, both in my district and across the country, I can tell you without a doubt that the 4-year reauthorization of the Bank in this conference report is absolutely necessary and essential to ensure that U.S. businesses, both large and small, can operate and survive in the global marketplace.

From the loss of satellite contracts in California, to the many potential job losses across this country, to offers from our foreign competitors that have urged American exporters to take their operations to Canada or overseas to Europe and China, there is no question that the shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank has done great damage.

In joining with Whip HOYER, Leader PELOSI, Representatives HECK and MOORE, as well as with Representatives FINCHER and LUCAS, we showed that a determined majority of Democrats and Republicans who work together will ultimately prevail.

It is time to put an end to this wholly destructive and entirely unnecessary period that has caused us so much pain and fear and hopelessness for so many businesses and workers across this country whose livelihoods rely on the Ex-Im Bank.

I urge the passage of the conference report.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Today, I recognize the patriotism and volunteer service of Major Fredric Arnold, a World War II P-38 fighter pilot in the Army Air Corps.

Mr. Arnold flew and survived 50 combat missions and was promoted to the rank of major at the age of 23. He received numerous medals, including the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal with nine oak leaf clusters.

While assigned to the Office of Flying Safety, he wrote and illustrated the first ever flight training manuals for the P-38, P-47, P-51, and P-80 fighter aircraft, and he created educational air combat situation drawings for the P-38 Lightning, which saved the lives of inexperienced American pilots.

Today, at age 93, Mr. Arnold lives in Boulder, Colorado, where he is creating a monumental bronze sculpture, funded by The Radiance Foundation, which depicts 12 life-sized fighter pilots who are engaged in a World War II flight briefing, in order to honor the 88,000 airmen who lost their lives during the war and to ensure future generations remember the sacrifices that were made to protect our freedom.

This sculpture is entitled, "Lest We Forget: The Mission," and it will be exhibited at the World War II Museum in New Orleans, Louisiana.

I am proud to recognize Major Fredric Arnold for his service as a fighter pilot and for his personal commitment to honor and help us all remember the aviators who served this Nation during World War II.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend from Colorado if he has any other speakers remaining.

Mr. POLIS. We are prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up bipartisan legislation that would close the loophole that allows suspected terrorists to legally buy guns. This bill would bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the terrorist watch list.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, a third of our Nation's major roads are rated as poor or mediocre, and one in four bridges is in need of significant repair or expansion, many of them dangerous, while 45 percent of Americans don't have access to public transit.

Congestion on our roadways has gotten so bad that Americans are wasting an average of 8.4 billion hours—that is 8.4 billion hours less in productivity—and 4.5 billion gallons of gas over a decade while being stuck in traffic.

The average commuters are wasting nearly \$800 of their own money and 5 full days of their lives each year in traffic. In my district alone, population and congestion has far outpaced our ability to maintain our critical thoroughfares.

If you have ever been to Colorado, you will know that there is one way up to our world-class ski resorts and ski areas and unparalleled 14,000-foot peaks from the Denver metro area. It is called highway 70. If you have ever taken it on a Friday evening or on a Sunday evening, you have probably sat in your car at a dead stop, waiting at times perhaps even for hours.

If you have ever been to the largest city in my district, Fort Collins, home to one of our greatest universities, Colorado State University, you have probably found similar circumstances along highway 25 during rush hour.

The expansion of highway 25 and the high-speed rail along highway 70 have been given completion dates of 60 years from now. That isn't good enough. Fort Collins, Loveland, Boulder, Vail, Frisco, Breckenridge—none of these tourism- and recreation-driven communities can survive without making improvements for 60 years.

The future of these projects lies with a long-term, robustly funded surface transportation reauthorization. Our future depends upon our States' and municipalities' ability to rely on what level of Federal support they can expect to receive and what their Federal partnerships will look like year in and year out.

By providing consistency in funding levels and a several-year commitment to critical infrastructure projects, as we do today in this conference report, we open up a future for major highway improvements like those needed with highways 25 and 70 in my district and with highways and roads across the entire Nation.

While I have outlined the issues and misgivings I have with this bill—and I certainly agree with Mr. RIBBLE about the lack of courage this Congress has to actually pay for a bill and to instead devise clever gimmicks that only partially pay for the bill, including assuming that we are going to get twice the money per barrel for oil that the Federal Government owns and the actual market price would bear—I think that this bill, nevertheless, is a step forward over continued short-term reauthorizations, which I have been voting against the last several times they have come before us and which, I should point out, also generally include gimmicky ways of paying for it.

So if this Congress, which it seems to have done, has chosen not to address the real issue of how to pay for something and has chosen to instead use gimmicks, it is still better to do that in a predictable manner rather than to come up with a new gimmick every 60 days—a gimmick of the month, if you will—which is what this Congress has been doing throughout this year.

I thank my colleagues for the inclusion of my amendments in this bill, particularly an amendment to designate Highway 70 from Denver to Salt Lake City as a High Priority Corridor. That provision will open up funding sources and opportunities for a highway that has been a nightmare for residents, for tourists, and for freight truck drivers for decades, particularly during its busiest times.

I appreciate the committee's desire to be transparent and receptive to ideas brought by Members who don't serve on the committee.

I am hopeful that what happened here this week, as my colleague from Georgia started out by saying, not only with the surface transportation reauthorization but also with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is only a beginning—a beginning of big things, of good things, of hard compromises, of the success of regular order, of discussions between the House and the Senate that will hopefully bode well for future developments.

I am hopeful that we can get back to work after a long hiatus of gridlock and grandstanding. I hope this is the first of many.

I congratulate my colleagues for coming together on such a pivotal piece of legislation.

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

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

We have talked about how much work has gone into this bill—not days, not weeks, not months, but even years in trying to get here.

I want to say what I said when I began, which is, when Democrats controlled every single lever of government, they could not get a bill like this done. When Republicans controlled every single lever of government, we failed to get a bill like this done. Today, with the leadership of BILL SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO, we are getting that done.

But it is not just at the Member level. And I want to associate all of the hard staff work that goes into making something like this happen. Mr. Speaker. Chris Bertram, our staff director over on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; Matt Sturges, our deputy staff director over on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; Collin, Geoff, Murphie on my own staff, Alex Poirot—folks who have put in hour after hour after hour, right through the Thanksgiving holiday, making sure that America's priorities get done.

Folks back home don't care how much hard work it takes; they care that we put in the hard work. And this is an example of that success today.

Mr. Speaker, so often, I hear my colleagues say, "If I had written this bill myself, it would have been different." Generally, when I hear my colleagues on the other side of aisle say, "If I had written this bill it would be different," I think, "Thank goodness you didn't write this bill." I have no doubt that they think the same thing when I say that.

We rarely get everything that we want, but we rarely have an opportunity to come together and be as successful as we are today.

The only roadblock between us and a long-term transportation bill for the first time in more than a decade is my yielding back the balance of my time.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 546 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority

member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

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 Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority 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."

The Republican majority may 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 Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule. . . because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

Mr. WOODALL. 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. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 666]

YEAS—243

Abraham	Denham	Holding
Aderholt	Dent	Hudson
Allen	DeSantis	Huelskamp
Amash	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Babin	Dold	Hunter
Barletta	Donovan	Hurd (TX)
Barr	Duffy	Hurt (VA)
Barton	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Bartleson	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (KS)
Bilirakis	Ellmers (NC)	Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (MI)	Emmer (MN)	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Jolly
Black	Fincher	Jones
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Blum	Fleischmann	Joyce
Bost	Fleming	Katko
Boustany	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Kelly (PA)
Brat	Portenberry	King (IA)
Bridenstine	Fox	King (NY)
Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	Kinzinger (IL)
Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Buchanan	Garrett	Knight
Buck	Gibbs	Labrador
Bucshon	Gibson	LaHood
Burgess	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Byrne	Goodlatte	Lamborn
Calvert	Gosar	Lance
Carter (GA)	Gowdy	Latta
Carter (TX)	Granger	LoBiondo
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Long
Chaffetz	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Clawson (FL)	Graves (MO)	Love
Coffman	Griffith	Lucas
Cole	Grothman	Luetkemeyer
Collins (GA)	Guinta	Lummis
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	MacArthur
Comstock	Hanna	Marchant
Conaway	Hardy	Marino
Cook	Harper	Massie
Costello (PA)	Harris	McCarthy
Cramer	Hartzler	McCaul
Crawford	Heck (NV)	McClintock
Crenshaw	Hensarling	McHenry
Culberson	Herrera Beutler	McKinley
Curbelo (FL)	Hice, Jody B.	McMorris
Davis, Rodney	Hill	Rodgers

McSally	Renacci	Stutzman
Meadows	Ribble	Thompson (PA)
Meehan	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
Messer	Rigell	Tiberi
Mica	Roby	Tipton
Miller (FL)	Roe (TN)	Trott
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Turner
Moolenaar	Rogers (KY)	Upton
Mooney (WV)	Rohrabacher	Valadao
Mullin	Rooney (FL)	Wagner
Mulvaney	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Murphy (PA)	Roskam	Walden
Neugebauer	Ross	Walker
Newhouse	Rothfus	Walorski
Noem	Rouzer	Walters, Mimi
Nugent	Royce	Weber (TX)
Nunes	Russell	Webster (FL)
Olson	Salmon	Wenstrup
Palazzo	Sanford	Westerman
Palmer	Scalise	Westmoreland
Paulsen	Schweikert	Whitfield
Pearce	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)
Perry	Sensenbrenner	Wittman
Peterson	Sessions	Womack
Pittenger	Shimkus	Woodall
Pitts	Shuster	Yoder
Poe (TX)	Simpson	Yoho
Poliquin	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)
Pompeo	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)
Posey	Smith (NJ)	Young (IN)
Price, Tom	Smith (TX)	Zeldin
Ratcliffe	Stefanik	Zinke
Reed	Stewart	
Reichert	Stivers	

NAYS—179

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Nadler
Ashford	Fudge	Napolitano
Bass	Gabbard	Neal
Beatty	Gallego	Nolan
Becerra	Garamendi	Norcross
Bera	Graham	O'Rourke
Beyer	Grayson	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Bonamici	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gutiérrez	Peters
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Heck (WA)	Polis
Bustos	Higgins	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Himes	Quigley
Capps	Hinojosa	Rangel
Capuano	Honda	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Richmond
Carney	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Israel	Ruiz
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Rush
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Ciçilline	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Keating	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Schrader
Clay	Kennedy	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Kildee	Scott, David
Clyburn	Kilmer	Serrano
Cohen	Kind	Sewell (AL)
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Sherman
Conyers	Kuster	Sinema
Cooper	Langevin	Sires
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Slaughter
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lawrence	Speier
Cummings	Lee	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Levin	Takano
Davis, Danny	Lewis	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Lipinski	Titus
Delaney	Loeb sack	Tonko
DeLauro	Loftgren	Torres
DelBene	Lowenthal	Tsongas
DeSaulnier	Lowe y	Van Hollen
Deutch	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Vargas
Dingell	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Veasey
Doggett	Lynch	Vela
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Duckworth	Matsui	Visclosky
Edwards	McCollum	Walz
Ellison	McDermott	Wasserman
Engel	McGovern	Schultz
Eshoo	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Esty	Meng	Watson Coleman
Farr	Moore	Welch
Fattah	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Aguilar	Meeks	Takai
Cuellar	Payne	Williams
Johnson, Sam	Rokita	
Maloney,	Ruppersberger	
Carolyn	Sanchez, Loretta	

□ 1042

Messrs. WALZ, LEVIN, and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 384, noes 40, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 667]

AYES—384

Abraham	Coffman	Foster
Adams	Cohen	Fox
Aderholt	Cole	Frankel (FL)
Allen	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Amash	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Amodei	Comstock	Gabbard
Ashford	Conaway	Galleo
Babin	Connolly	Garamendi
Barletta	Conyers	Garrett
Barr	Cook	Gibbs
Barton	Cooper	Gibson
Bass	Costa	Gohmert
Beatty	Costello (PA)	Goddlatte
Benishkek	Courtney	Gosar
Beyer	Cramer	Gowdy
Bilirakis	Crawford	Granger
Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Bishop (MI)	Culberson	Graves (LA)
Bishop (UT)	Cummings	Graves (MO)
Black	Curbelo (FL)	Grayson
Blackburn	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Blum	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Davis, Rodney	Griffith
Bonamici	DeFazio	Grothman
Bost	DeGette	Guinta
Boustany	DeLauro	Guthrie
Boyle, Brendan	DeBene	Hahn
F.	Denham	Hanna
Brady (PA)	Dent	Hardy
Brady (TX)	DeSantis	Harper
Brat	DeSaulnier	Harris
Bridenstine	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Brooks (AL)	Deutch	Hastings
Brooks (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Hensarling
Buchanan	Dold	Herrera Beutler
Buck	Donovan	Hice, Jody B.
Bucshon	Doyle, Michael	Higgins
Burgess	F.	Hill
Bustos	Duckworth	Himes
Butterfield	Duffy	Hinojosa
Byrne	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Honda
Capps	Ellison	Hoyer
Capuano	Ellmers (NC)	Hudson
Carney	Emmer (MN)	Huelskamp
Carson (IN)	Engel	Huizenga (MI)
Carter (GA)	Eshoo	Hultgren
Carter (TX)	Esty	Hunter
Cartwright	Farenthold	Hurd (TX)
Castor (FL)	Farr	Hurt (VA)
Chabot	Fattah	Israel
Chaffetz	Fincher	Issa
Chu, Judy	Fitzpatrick	Jackson Lee
Cicilline	Fleischmann	Jenkins (KS)
Clawson (FL)	Fleming	Jenkins (WV)
Clay	Flores	Johnson (GA)
Cleaver	Forbes	Johnson (OH)
Clyburn	Fortenberry	Johnson, E. B.

Jolly	Mica
Jones	Miller (FL)
Jordan	Miller (MI)
Joyce	Moolenaar
Kaptur	Mooney (WV)
Katko	Moulton
Keating	Mullin
Kelly (IL)	Mulvaney
Kelly (MS)	Murphy (FL)
Kelly (PA)	Murphy (PA)
Kildee	Nadler
Kilmer	Napolitano
Kind	Neugebauer
King (IA)	Newhouse
King (NY)	Noem
Kinzinger (IL)	Nolan
Kirkpatrick	Norcross
Kline	Nugent
Knight	Nunes
Kuster	O'Rourke
Labrador	Olson
LaHood	Palazzo
LaMalfa	Palmer
Lamborn	Pascrell
Lance	Paulsen
Langevin	Pearce
Larsen (WA)	Perry
Larson (CT)	Peterson
Latta	Pittenger
Lawrence	Pitts
Lee	Pocan
Levin	Poe (TX)
Lewis	Poliquin
Lipinski	Polis
LoBiondo	Pompeo
Loeb	Posey
Lofgren	Price (NC)
Long	Price, Tom
Loudermilk	Quigley
Love	Ratcliffe
Lowenthal	Reed
Lowe	Reichert
Lucas	Renacci
Luetkemeyer	Ribble
Lujan Grisham	Rice (NY)
(NM)	Rice (SC)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Richmond
(NM)	Rigell
Lummis	Roby
Lynch	Roe (TN)
MacArthur	Rogers (AL)
Maloney,	Rogers (KY)
Carolyn	Rohrabacher
Maloney, Sean	Rokita
Marchant	Rooney (FL)
Marino	Ros-Lehtinen
Massie	Roskam
Matsui	Ross
McCarthy	Rothfus
McCaul	Rouzer
McClintock	Roybal-Allard
McDermott	Royce
McHenry	Rush
McKinley	Russell
McMorris	Ryan (OH)
Rodgers	Salmon
Hahn	Sanford
McSally	Sarbanes
Meadows	Scalise
Meehan	Schiff
Meng	Schrader
Messer	

NOES—40

Becerra	Jeffries
Bera	Kennedy
Cárdenas	Lieu, Ted
Castro (TX)	McCollum
Clark (MA)	McGovern
Clarke (NY)	McNerney
Crowley	Moore
Delaney	Neal
Edwards	Pallone
Fudge	Pelosi
Graham	Perlmutter
Grijalva	Peters
Gutiérrez	Pingree
Huffman	Rangel

NOT VOTING—9

Aguilar	Meeks	Sanchez, Loretta
Cuellar	Payne	Takai
Johnson, Sam	Ruppersberger	Williams

□ 1051

Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Messrs. CUMMINGS, ASHFORD, BRAT, MOULTON, and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

Schweikert	Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin	Scott, David
Sensenbrenner	Serrano
Sessions	Sinema
Sewell (AL)	Sherman
Shimkus	Shuster
Simpson	Simpson
Sires	Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)	Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)
Stefanik	Stewart
Stivers	Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)	Takano
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Thornberry	Tiberi
Tipton	Titus
Torres	Trott
Tsongas	Turner
Upton	Valadao
Vargas	Vela
Wagner	Walberg
Walden	Walker
Walorski	Walters, Mimi
Walz	Wasserman
Schultz	Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman	Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)	Welch
Wenstrup	Westerman
Westmoreland	Whitfield
Wilson (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Wittman	Womack
Woodall	Yoder
Yoho	Young (AK)
Young (IA)	Young (IN)
Zeldin	Zinke

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.

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to House Resolution 542 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 8.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1053

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to modernize energy infrastructure, build a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce, bolster America's energy security and diplomacy, and promote energy efficiency and government accountability, and for other purposes, with Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, December 2, 2015, amendment No. 38 printed in House Report 114-359 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-359 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 26 by Mr. CRAMER of North Dakota.

Amendment No. 30 by Mr. ROUZER of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 37 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 170, not voting 11, as follows: