

Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 807 is a same-day rule that provides for consideration of the rule to accompany H.R. 5183, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004. The rule waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, the current extension of the highway bill ends at midnight tonight. The Congress must therefore act immediately to ensure that there is no termination in projects or jobs while we continue to formulate the package that will reauthorize the Transportation Equity Act for another 6 years. The legislation must be moved forward today in order to continue funding for highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit and other programs at the levels approved in the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the transportation bill is one of the most strongly supported, popular, and bipartisan measures to be considered in the House. The programs authorized in this bill touch every American and affect their lives every single day. There are probably only a handful of Members who do not want to see the transportation bill reauthorized for another 6 years.

But it appears that the Republican leadership and the administration are stonewalling this process by their refusal to work in good faith with the other body. Let us look at the facts. Republicans are in charge of the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. But, instead of providing real leadership, the Republican leadership and the President have let the conferees dangle in the wind while we continue to pass short-term extension after short-term extension of these important programs.

By my count, Mr. Speaker, this is the sixth temporary extension to be considered and sent to the President. Do not get me wrong. I strongly support these programs. I understand that the

gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and others are doing their best given the draconian allocation set by the Republican leadership. I support these extensions because we cannot afford to let these programs expire. But it is important to know that the Republican leadership and the Bush administration have not done all they can to ensure that the full reauthorization is completed and signed before the programs expire.

Mr. Speaker, the President is the leader of his party. Yet the President has shown a lack of leadership on this issue. The transportation bill will provide every American with roads and bridges that they need. It will provide economic stimulus across the country with the various projects that are written into it. Most importantly, this bill will create new jobs at a time when the new jobs are desperately needed. But instead of looking out for the American public, the President and the Republican leadership in this body have held onto their ideology to the detriment of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that I support this extension. While I am concerned anytime the Republican leadership proposes a martial law rule, I also want to express my support for this particular rule that will allow us to consider this sixth extension and send it to the President before these programs expire. But I am disappointed and discouraged by the way the President and the Republican leadership have mismanaged this process, and I hope we can do better next year.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2004, PART V

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 811 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 811

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5183) to provide an extension of highway, safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking mi-

nority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 811 is a closed rule that provides for consideration of H.R. 5183, the Surface Transportation Act of 2004. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides 1 hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule further provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure currently has under its consideration the multiyear reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act. The current authorization expires at midnight tonight and the bill before us today provides funding for essential programs for an additional 8 months, through May 31, 2005. This extension is necessary to give the authorizing conferees additional time to agree on a larger reauthorization bill.

□ 1030

This Congress recognizes the many needs of our Nation and is answering the call by diligently working through its process to produce a bill that deals with the Nation's priorities in a whole host of areas.

The final authorization bill will ensure that we have a reliable and stable transportation infrastructure from Federal highways and highway safety to public transportation and motor-carrier safety programs.

In the meantime, the extension before us today authorizes \$24.5 billion for the Federal Aid Highway program for highway and bridge construction and safety-related infrastructure improvements. Mr. Speaker, \$5.2 billion is authorized for the Federal Transit Administration for grants to State and local transit agencies to reduce congestion and ensure mobility for all Americans in urban and rural areas.

Additionally, the bill authorizes \$200 million for highway safety programs, including programs to encourage seat-belt use and prevent drunk driving. The \$287 million is authorized for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for truck and bus-related safety programs.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill also releases the final portion of contract authority and obligation authority for

the highway program in fiscal year 2004. This funding was reserved until the end of the fiscal year and is now being used to ensure that States receive at least a 90.5 percent minimum guaranteed rate of return on their Highway Trust Fund contributions.

Without our action today, vital programs and projects under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation will be put on hold. States will not be reimbursed with the Federal share of projects. Safety grants will not be provided to States, and transit construction will be halted, all of which puts jobs at risk.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot allow States and transportation projects to suffer. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying extension.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and the underlying bill are for an 8-month extension of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century, TEA 21. It marks the sixth extension of that landmark legislation since it expired last year and reveals, once again, the rank and utter incompetence of the Republican leadership to get a transportation reauthorization bill. This extension, while absolutely necessary to keep the Nation's highway and transportation agencies running is, simply stated, another glaring failure of the Republican leadership in this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let us pause for a moment to remind everyone of the facts. They are in charge of the White House. They are in charge of the Senate, and they are in charge of the House of Representatives. The transportation reauthorization bill is one of the most strongly supported, popular and bipartisan measures to be considered in the House. The programs authorized in this bill touch every American and affect their lives every single day. There are probably only a handful of Members who do not want to see a transportation bill reauthorized for another 6 years. Nevertheless, this President and the Republican leadership, which have presided over a historic loss of more than 2 million American jobs, are stonewalling a transportation bill which will create 47,000 new jobs for every \$1 billion of investment.

The refusal of this leadership to work in good faith with the other body is costing our economy precious jobs, while the condition of our roads and bridges continue to deteriorate. Instead of providing real leadership, the majority party and the President have let the conferees twist in the wind while we continue to pass short-term extension after short-term extension of these important programs. The States, which we were elected to represent, are left to guess at when we will have a

transportation bill, as they endeavor to undertake critically important public works projects. According to the American Association of State Highway Transportation officials, 33 States say that a short-term extension rather than enactment of a 6-year bill will mean \$2.1 billion in project delays and the loss of over 90,000 jobs.

Now, I understand that the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and everybody on the committee are doing the best they can given the Draconian allocations set by the Republican leadership. The members of that committee, the bipartisan cooperation of that committee deserves to be praised by all of us, and it should be an example to the rest of this body. I support these extensions because we cannot afford to let these programs expire. But it is important to know that the leadership of this House and the administration have not done all they can to ensure that the full reauthorization is completed and signed before the programs expire.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the President is the leader of his party. Where is the leadership? The transportation bill will provide every American with the roads and bridges that they need. It will provide economic stimulus across the country with various projects that are written into it. And, most importantly, this bill will create new jobs at a time when new jobs are desperately needed. But instead of looking out for the American public, the leadership and the President have held on to their ideology to the detriment of this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that while I support this extension, I am disappointed and discouraged by the way the leadership has so profoundly mismanaged this process, and I hope that we can do better next year.

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

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

It is now almost October 1, and we are getting into the election season. I expect the gentleman from Massachusetts to have some finger-pointing going on. But I was here, as he was, when the debate occurred on transportation, and I would say that the authorizers had some pretty good, whole-hearted debate that seemed to almost be on the same page between Republicans and Democrats, the majority and the minority of this House.

I would remind all of us that while we had some harmony passing that legislation in the House and apparently in the other body, they had some harmony on what they passed, we have, as we well know as students of government, to pass an identical piece of legislation in the House, in the Senate and the President to sign it, or if he vetoes it, it would require a two-thirds vote in both of the bodies of Congress.

Now, what we have seen, because the other body has publicly debated some

of their positions, is that we have disagreements between the House and the other body and we have some from the White House on just what the spending will be. But while we are in an election year, we need to make sure we also get some of the facts back here. And that is that my understanding of this extender, is that the 2005 authorization is using the 2004 levels, and there is absolutely zero loss of anything, that each State will have their money. As a matter of fact, in the underlying legislation, it is my understanding that we will see that the \$2 billion that Members on both sides of the aisle worked hard to achieve for their districts will also be distributed to those States under the current formula.

Now, I cannot speak for Massachusetts, but I know, in New York, number one, that is going to be fair and equitable money. Number two, it is still a jobs bill that is keeping my people working across my State and, quite frankly, I think across the 50 States. So when we look at this, we also need to come to terms with a funding level of transportation authorization in a future 6-year bill that is equitable for all of us. And we know that different regions of the country have different viewpoints, and we know that non-mass-transit States have different views than those who are in high-growth States looking to develop further road infrastructure in their communities. It is not an easy bill to put together to get a 6-year consensus in this body, let alone between the House, the Senate, and the White House.

But the important thing that is to be noted today as we preserve those jobs, those jobs are working, and a "yes" vote today keeps these projects moving forward and protects those jobs. A "no" vote puts people out of work. I will willing to predict, Mr. Speaker, that we will have strong bipartisan support for the extension over the next 8 months.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York, for his comments. I always enjoy listening to his interesting spin on things.

The fact of the matter is, the problem is not with the authorizers. The authorizers have done a great job. As I said, we need to praise, in a bipartisan way, the members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. But the problem is with the leadership, and the problem is with the White House who is insisting on unbelievably low numbers for the reauthorization of this bill.

As a result of not having a 6-year bill, there are a number of States that have put projects on hold, and that means that these projects are not being built. They are not going forward. The jobs are not being created. We should have done better.

We are all going to support this extension. We have to. We have no

choice. This is the right thing to do. I am just lamenting the fact that we should have had a 6-year bill, and I regret that the White House and the leadership were not able to get together and make this a priority, especially at a time when there is record job loss.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the explanation of my friend, the gentleman from New York, and I agree with a number of the things he said. There will be a large, bipartisan majority supporting this extension, but the notion that somehow there are not problems associated with the repeated failure of Congress to pass, despite what my friend from New York says, what should be one of the easiest bills. We can take the bill that passed the Senate and put it on the floor of the House, and I am quite confident that it would pass with an overwhelming majority. It passed the other body with some 72 or 73 votes. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure offered up an approach to the Floor of the House that was substantially above that level. We have assembled the broadest coalition in the history of infrastructure legislation. We have interests ranging from the Sierra Club to the Chamber of Commerce, from the Women's Federation Garden Club of America to the cyclists, to the people who put down asphalt, who all agree on the basic structure of this legislation.

There has been a lot of hard work on behalf of the gentleman from Alaska and the gentleman from Minnesota to try and craft a piece of legislation that is acceptable. I see on the floor here my friends, the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Illinois, who have been working, chairing the subcommittee, trying to put something forward underneath these artificial restrictions.

But the point is that it is not a failure of agreement between the Members of the two bodies of Congress. We are substantially in agreement, and we are in agreement with the vast majority of the American public. And the failure to allow that agreement to be fully and fairly debated on this floor and enacted means that we are holding in suspense important transportation priorities.

Yes, we are going to allow the spigot to be opened, or rather, we will avoid slamming the spigot closed at midnight tonight. I do not think anybody in their right mind thinks that we would or should do that. But that does not mean that there are not negative problems associated with it. We have projects in the Pacific Northwest that were slated to go forward that are multiyear in nature, and because of the uncertainty, these are on hold; significant problems that speak to economic development, that speak to environ-

mental protection, to reducing congestion. And it is not just in the northwest. It is New York. It is in Massachusetts. It is Florida and Texas.

If we talk to any of the transportation officials, they will tell us that we are not well served having to repeatedly come to the floor with a short-term extension. But I am going to argue in support of this 8-month extension because, frankly, it is better to kick the can down the road past the election. We have shown that we are not really capable of doing that in an election year. With a new Congress, maybe with a new administration, without the pre-election posturing, I think we will, in fact, have a better piece of legislation. Were we to enact a flawed piece of legislation, it would not just be a problem for today or tomorrow; we would be crippling our transportation initiatives for the entire 6-year period of the authorization, and it would establish an artificially low standard for subsequent reauthorizations. We would be severely penalizing transportation for a generation to come.

I hope that, in the course of the next 8 months, but particularly in the course of the next 5 weeks, the American public takes the time to pin down the politicians in the House, in the Senate, running for President, about where they stand on transportation infrastructure. This is the most important transportation piece of legislation for the next 6 years. It is also the most important economic development legislation, and done right, it is the most important environmental legislation.

This should have been the easiest piece of legislation for this Congress to pass. Sadly, we are seeing today that it has proven that we are not up to the challenge. I hope we can take these next 8 months and do better by the American public.

□ 1045

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

Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentleman and what his view is, but I come from a State that has some complex transportation, from new to old aging infrastructure, to mass transit, to ports, to motor carriers, to dealing with buses and transit systems.

As I look at this, if we keep this moving forward by passing this extender, we are going to keep those projects moving forward to protect jobs. A "no" vote puts people out of work. It stops transit.

I have taken great care to listen to the transportation experts, and they assure me of the following. We came here with such great spirit in the House to pass this legislation, and it was bipartisan work. We certainly lauded both the chairman of the full Committee of Transportation and Infrastructure and the subcommittee chairs who put together this complex bill and in a bipartisan fashion. Yes, there certainly are differences of agree-

ment to different aspects of what I see in the other body just from public statements of negotiation. We have also seen that the White House and Department of Transportation has some of their opinions on this bill as well.

I accept the fact that we are getting into the election season, and we are going to have all sorts of consumption going on back home as to what this means. But what my transportation experts of New York say, as well as talking to experts in this body, they tell me that if we do this extension, it is going to maintain the spending in the 2005 authorization and 2004 funding levels and that basically no one will lose any money at all in any of our States or, for the most part, in our districts unless some of the Members do not have a relationship with their State transportation people on some of the priorities that they might be looking for in their State.

It is important to understand, for those who are listening to this debate, that this maintains the spending of a multiyear plan in the extension of 8 months, and it does in the 2005 authorization as well as looking at the 2004 funding levels that are currently available.

My local folks in New York, the State commissioner and his people, tell me that we will be able to continue in the continuity of a complex transportation system by being able to count on this extension and the funding to continue the multiyear projects.

So I do not quite understand the gentleman's aspect of where it starts and stops maybe as he sees the view, because I have been assured that we have continuity of transportation services in a multiyear fashion by extending this.

Again, I must say to my colleagues, a "yes" vote today keeps those projects moving forward and protects jobs and protects the work and plans that are in our respective States, and a "no" vote just plain stops that or puts people out of work.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon for a question.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's notion about having the funds flow.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I said I yield for a question. I do not want to hear the gentleman's debate on my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am seeking not to debate. I was just trying to establish a context for a question.

Is it not true that, in both the House and the Senate version of the transportation reauthorization, there are a vast number of specific projects, new starts, that are multiyear in nature and that cannot proceed in the absence of their being reauthorized, and that this extension has no bearing on those longer-term, complex, important projects in the gentleman's State and in mine?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the gentleman for his question, and what I understand is as follows. Sure, I have projects; I think most Members of this body have specific projects earmarked in our legislation. It is my understanding that the other body would not consider earmarks that we would like to begin in the 2005 project year. Therefore, the compromise of extension, because we have had disagreements between the two bodies and we also have the White House in consideration of getting a final bill, was that we would take \$2 billion of funding of Member-earmarked items of 2004 and roll them into our respective States on the existing formulas. That is what makes the States content to have that money back into their aspect of continuing in the projects.

The gentleman's influence, as a member of the Oregon delegation, might put an opportunity where the gentleman could talk to the DOT commissioner and begin their projects based on some of the monies they will receive.

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

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

Let me be clear to everybody here, because the gentleman from New York keeps on talking about this in terms of a "yes" or "no" vote. We are all going to vote for it because there is no other choice. Nobody is opposing the extension here. What we are simply saying is they have mismanaged this process.

He talks about jobs that could be maintained. Well, we want to not only maintain jobs, we want to create them.

Let me repeat to him, according to the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials, 33 States say that a short-term extension rather than enactment of a 6-year bill will mean \$2.1 billion in project delays and the loss of over 90,000 jobs. If we did our job right in this House, then this would not be the case. There would be more jobs coming.

I would remind the gentleman, again, I am pretty sure that one party, one party, controls the House and controls the Senate and controls the White House. Contrary to what the gentleman says, this is not about finger-pointing to point out that you guys cannot get your act together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

October 1, 2003: What is important about that date? That is the date that the last highway bill expired. Here we are, almost a year later, legislation that sets the course of all spending on roads, bridges, highways, mass transit in the United States of America has been in suspended animation working under a 7-year-old law for the last 11 months.

I guess if the Republicans controlled things, things would not be like that; that is the kind of thing we hear

around here all the time. They control the White House, the Department of Transportation, the House and the Senate. The White House is low-balling the number and underinvesting in America. They only want to spend \$259 billion. They want to take our gas tax money and spend it on other things instead of transportation.

The House did a little better, \$283 billion, not enough, but they did better. But they do not want to confront the President in an election year. We could roll them easily. It would be embarrassing, though, just before the election for him to be against jobs and investment in America and spending gas taxes on the purposes for which it was collected. The Senate did a lot better yet, \$318 billion.

Then, of course, there was the unanimous bipartisan vote of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, on which I serve, where we voted unanimously for \$379 billion, \$120 billion more than the President is willing to spend, because that is what the President's Department of Transportation said is necessary to take care of the problems in New York and other States. We need another \$120 billion over what the President's asking for to deal with those problems.

It is disingenuous to get up here and say, oh, if we follow these lower numbers, nothing is being hurt. We are foregoing new starts. We are foregoing new investments. We are foregoing additional investments that the President's own Department of Transportation says is necessary. Why? Why are we doing that? We collect gas taxes from each and every American every time they fill up their car, a bunch of them, and that money is supposed to be spent on roads, bridges and highways. We have seen the potholes. I have got failing bridges in my district. We could put hundreds of thousands of people to work tomorrow if we had more investment and more spending.

I cannot understand why they will not spend our gas tax money to put people to work and meet needed investment in our infrastructure. So I stand here saying we should be doing more than just this continuing resolution, obviously. We should have sometime in the last 11 months. The Republicans should have been able to get their act together and agree on a highway bill. That has not happened. Well, if we cannot do that, at least let us put a little more money in there, put a few more people back to work, begin to address some of these problems that are out there, begin to take care of some of the new starts that New York has asked for that cannot go forward under this legislation.

My colleagues cannot say, oh, the transportation experts in New York say this is going to take care of all the problems. It is not. It is not even beginning to address the backlog of problems of failing roads and bridges.

Another interesting statistic from the President's own Department of

Transportation is that, for every \$1 billion we spend on roads, bridges, highways, mass transit, we create 47,500 jobs; not just construction jobs, but those are good jobs and good wage jobs. And guess what? They cannot be outsourced to another country. That is a really good thing about those jobs, but what it also does is it spills over into communities and small businesses. The suppliers, the contractors, the equipment operators, they are all local. They are locally based. It helps our local communities who need more jobs and investment. It helps small businesses, 47,500 jobs.

So, that means by walking away from the higher numbers proposed by the Senate, that is \$318 billion, that we are foregoing \$34 billion of investment that is needed to repair our failing bridges, roads, highways and our mass transit inadequacies, new starts in New York and other States. I cannot do the math quite here, but 34 times 47 sounds like a heck of a lot of jobs to me, somewhere around 1.5 million jobs. This country could use another 1.5 million jobs. In fact, if the President would sign a bill at that higher number, then he could say he delivered on his promise of creating 2 million jobs during his presidency. Right now, he is kind of short on that.

This is at best an absolutely minimal stopgap that is not meeting the real needs of Americans, that is not putting people back to work, that is not spending their gas tax money in the manner in which it was intended when it was collected and extracted from them, when they bought gas at the pump.

I would say we have apparently no alternative but to support this inadequate level of funding, but the American people should be aware it is inadequate. It does mean no new starts. It does mean that we are not going to address a whole bunch of problems all around the country, and we can do better.

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

It is a well-known fact in the House that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is probably the largest of membership in our great body. It amazes me when I look at the members of the committee, that might share from the other side of the aisle, kind of going back and forth between an extension and the 6-year bill, kind of mixing it up.

I just want to make sure we have the record straight, although I have said it so many times in this debate already. The extension does not prejudice the 6-year bill. It actually keeps a continuity of funding levels at the authorization of our budget resolution.

The gentleman is actually continuing, as previous speakers have, to go back and forth between a simple extension that guarantees all States their money and some planning purposes over the next 8 months versus trying to get to a 6-year bill.

I am used to a situation where legislation does not come to the floor as

fast as some Members would want, that there is finger-pointing. I also acknowledge that we have disagreements between the other body, the White House and this on getting a conclusion of a 6-year bill.

But the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has made sure, with his subcommittee chairmen, that we have an 8-month extension that guarantees each State their money so they can continue in their planning purposes. As I have said before, it clearly says a "yes" vote today keeps those projects moving forward and protects jobs. A "no" vote puts people out of work and brings that construction to an end.

I also want to make sure that some of these alarmist accusations, that there is clear, on-the-record information so that they do not get caught up without a response. As the previous gentleman talked about the fact of money going all over the place, this bill includes an extension of the budgetary firewalls and spending guarantees for the highway category and transit category. These firewalls and guarantees protect the integrity of the Highway Trust Fund to ensure the highway user-related fees are used exclusively for highway transit and highway safety programs.

I want to just let America know that we extend those protections in this extension of 8 months, just as it was in underlying legislation in the past.

□ 1100

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as I look at this particular road bill, the reauthorization, I think of comments made back home, where it is called road kill. In essence, what is happening with this legislation and the reauthorization, quite frankly our folks back home will call it road kill; and let me explain why.

We have individuals this morning that got up in my district and districts throughout this country and they have traveled to work at the factory or at their workplace, and in many cases in my district, on unsafe roads. So this legislation will provide, if enacted, as it should have been, will provide a safe way for working moms and dads to go to work and return to their families later that afternoon, and in many cases working at low-wage jobs.

We have also heard that maybe we can pass this legislation in a lame duck session. Well, that obviously is not going to happen. But I submit to you that is what we have been doing the past year and a half: we have been having a lame duck session. And quite frankly with the lame duck session we have been having concerning transportation needs, we have provided an avenue for many of our folks back home to be sitting ducks, sitting ducks that un-

less we pass this legislation and fully fund it, as many of us on this side of the Chamber have asked for, it may bring about a situation where the American public and the jobs that we have will bring about an economy that will create a dead duck scenario.

It is my hope that we realize, as we engage in the next 8 months, and I am sure that is what is going to happen, that for the American public and the safety of the American public and the American workers, that we pass an adequately funded reauthorization bill that will help build roads to many of our rural areas; that will help the inner cities with mass transit; and will bring about safe traveling as well as providing an economic boost.

Many years ago, Mr. Speaker, when our interstate systems were built, it helped bring about what we called "just-in-time manufacturing." Small rural areas could in fact become the suppliers for the assembly lines of American manufacturers. As a result of that, we were able to move from small rural areas the products being built there, or that portion of it, to the larger manufacturing companies and create jobs in rural areas. We, in fact, by languishing and not fulfilling our responsibilities are bringing about a situation and circumstance for many of our workers and many of our families and our economy that will not be able to compete should, say, China decide to do as we did in the 1950s and the 1960s.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I was listening carefully to the comments of the gentleman, but I was at the point where I wondered if the gentleman intends to vote for the extension or not to vote for the extension, based on your remarks.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman from New York that my intention is to vote for a reauthorization bill adequately funded. Unfortunately, we do not have that option.

Mr. Speaker, my hope is that we do what is right and that we put first the safety of the American public and pass the reauthorization bill at the level it should be.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and let me just conclude for our side here by saying that this debate is not about whether or not we are going to support this extension. We are all going to support it. That is not the issue.

What we are expressing here is a frustration that we do not have a 6-year bill. And contrary to what the gentleman from New York says, most transportation planners that I have talked to, and I am sure he has talked to, if he has listened to them, would tell him that a 6-year bill is better than an 8-month extension for this reason: that many transportation programs require long-term planning. It is

not a quick one-time investment. With an 8-month extension there is not the certainty of what happens after 8 months.

My point earlier was simply that this is another missed opportunity by this leadership. The Republicans control the House, they control the Senate, and they control the White House. Surely, surely they could have worked out a deal. Surely they could have helped accomplish a 6-year extension. That is what the frustration is on this side.

Our Governors and our mayors and our town managers and our city planners are all looking for a long-term guarantee of funding, and they are not going to get that. They are going to get an 8-month extension. And, yes, that is better than nothing. We need to keep this funding going. But the fact is they cannot plan long term; and as a result of that, we are not going to create as many jobs. The future for some of the economic development that we all hoped for that will come from some of these projects will have to be put on hold, and I think that is a shame.

So I want to commend the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and all the Members who have worked hard in a bipartisan way. I only wish that their spirit of cooperation would have translated to the leadership of this House and the other body and the White House. We should be doing so much better than this. We should be passing a 6-year extension right now.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule, and I urge them to vote for the extension; and, hopefully, we will, sooner rather than later, get a 6-year bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague said it well, we should vote for this rule and then the underlying legislation. As I opened my remarks, I commented that I understand it is the election season. So many of us have to get up and try to say something for back home on whatever that may be.

I have talked to planners in my years of service, and some planners I know would like to have an exact fund for the entire length of their career in planning. But the reality is that this bill is going to provide an extension and continuity in both planning and money to our respective States. My State, as I outlined earlier, has a complex transportation network and understands that this extension keeps the funding levels the same as it has been. As a matter of fact, the opportunity of all States will have the same funding levels. So we have continuity of our programmatic services and dollars to the States and for them to also distribute as they see fit the monies that will come in this 8-month extension.

It is not easy to formulate an agreement of an extension, and I laud Chairman YOUNG of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and his subcommittee chairman in working with the other body to get a compromise of extension that works so well for our States as we continue this continuity of transportation projects and creating and maintaining the jobs that these construction opportunities exist through the transportation bill. But as we also look here, it is an opportunity for us to continue to get an agreement that both bodies and the White House will look to be a 6-year plan following the extension that is here.

My colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), has been clear. A "yes" vote today keeps the projects moving and keeps and protects jobs. A "no" vote puts people out of work. The extension will do the job and we can continue in having a multi-year plan of the future based on the results of our actions today. So I call upon my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying extension.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 811, I call up the bill (H.R. 5183) to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Pursuant to House Resolution 811, the bill shall be considered as read for amendment:

The text of H.R. 5183 is as follows:

H.R. 5183

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V".

SEC. 2. ADVANCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) APPORTIONMENT RATIO.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Transportation shall apportion funds made available under section 1101(l) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 111; 118 Stat. 876), as amended by this section, to each State in the ratio that—

(A) the State's total fiscal year 2004 obligation authority for funds apportioned for the Federal-aid highway program; bears to

(B) all States' total fiscal year 2004 obligation authority for funds apportioned for the Federal-aid highway program.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The ratios determined under this subsection shall be subject to the same adjustments as the adjustments made under section 105(f) of title 23, United States Code.

(b) PROGRAMMATIC DISTRIBUTIONS.—

(1) PROGRAMS.—Of the funds to be apportioned to each State under subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that the State is apportioned an amount of the funds, determined under paragraph (2), for the Interstate maintenance program, the National Highway System program, the bridge program, the surface transportation program, the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, the recreational trails program, the Appalachian development highway system program, and the minimum guarantee.

(2) IN GENERAL.—The amount that each State shall be apportioned under this subsection for each item referred to in paragraph (1) shall be determined by multiplying—

(A) the amount apportioned to the State under subsection (a); by

(B) the ratio that—

(i) the amount of funds apportioned for the item to the State for fiscal year 2004; bears to

(ii) the total of the amount of funds apportioned for the items to the State for fiscal year 2004.

(3) ADMINISTRATION OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized by the amendment made under subsection (d) shall be administered as if the funds had been apportioned, allocated, deducted, or set aside, as the case may be, under title 23, United States Code; except that the deductions and set-asides in the following sections of such title shall not apply to such funds: sections 104(a)(1)(A), 104(a)(1)(B), 104(b)(1)(A), 104(d)(1), 104(d)(2), 104(f)(1), 104(h)(1), 118(c)(1), 140(b), 140(c), and 144(g)(1).

(4) SPECIAL RULES FOR MINIMUM GUARANTEE.—In carrying out the minimum guarantee under section 105(c) of title 23, United States Code, with funds apportioned under this section for the minimum guarantee, the \$2,800,000,000 set forth in paragraph (1) of such section 105(c) shall be treated as being \$1,866,666,667 and the aggregate of amounts apportioned to the States under this section for the minimum guarantee shall be treated, for purposes of such section 105(c), as amounts made available under section 105 of such title.

(5) EXTENSION OF OFF-SYSTEM BRIDGE SET-ASIDE.—Section 144(g)(3) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "2004" the following: "and in the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005."

(c) REPAYMENT FROM FUTURE APPORTIONMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reduce the amount that would be apportioned, but for this section, to a State for programs under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, for fiscal year 2005, under a multiyear law reauthorizing the Federal-aid highway program enacted after the date of enactment of this Act by the amount that is apportioned to each State under subsection (a) and section 5(c) for each such program.

(2) PROGRAM CATEGORY RECONCILIATION.—The Secretary may establish procedures under which funds apportioned under subsection (a) for a program category for which funds are not authorized under a law described in paragraph (1) may be restored to the Federal-aid highway program.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Section 1101 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 111–115; 117 Stat. 1118; 118 Stat. 876) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) ADVANCE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) to carry out section 2(a) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V \$21,311,774,667 for

the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.

"(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Funds apportioned under section 2(a) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V shall be subject to a limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

"(3) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds made available by this subsection shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code."

(e) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), upon enactment of an Act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2005 (other than an Act or resolution making continuing appropriations), the Secretary shall distribute $\frac{1}{2}$ of the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs provided by such Act according to the provisions of such Act.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

(A) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNTS.—Any instruction in such Act that would require the distribution or reservation of obligation limitation prior to distributing the remainder of the obligation limitation to the States shall be executed as if the program, project, or activity for which obligation limitation is so distributed or reserved was authorized at an amount equivalent to the greater of—

(i) the amount authorized for such program, project, or activity in this Act; or

(ii) $\frac{1}{2}$ of the amount provided for or limitation set on such program, project, or activity in the Act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2005.

(B) MINIMUM GUARANTEE.—Obligations for the period October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005, shall not exceed the obligation limitation distributed by this subsection, except that this limitation shall not apply to \$426,000,000 in obligations for minimum guarantee for such period.

(3) TIME PERIOD FOR OBLIGATIONS.—After May 31, 2005, no funds shall be obligated for any Federal-aid highway program project until the date of enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing the Federal-aid highway program enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) TREATMENT OF OBLIGATIONS.—Any obligation of obligation authority distributed under this subsection shall be considered to be an obligation for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 2005 for the purposes of any obligation limitation set in an Act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 3. TRANSFERS OF UNOBLIGATED APPORTIONMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other authority of a State to transfer funds, for fiscal year 2005, a State may transfer any funds apportioned to the State for any program under section 104(b) (including amounts apportioned under section 104(b)(3) or set aside, made available, or suballocated under section 133(d)) or section 144 of title 23, United States Code, before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, that are subject to any limitation on obligations, and that are not obligated, to any other of those programs.

(b) TREATMENT OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS.—Any funds transferred to another program under subsection (a) shall be subject to the provisions of the program to which the funds are transferred, except that funds transferred to a program under section 133 (other than subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2)) of title 23, United States Code, shall not be subject to section 133(d) of that title.

(c) RESTORATION OF APPORTIONMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing the Federal-aid highway program enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall restore any funds that a State transferred under subsection (a) for any project not eligible for the funds but for this section to the program category from which the funds were transferred.

(2) PROGRAM CATEGORY RECONCILIATION.—The Secretary may establish procedures under which funds transferred under subsection (a) from a program category for which funds are not authorized may be restored to the Federal-aid highway program.

(3) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—No provision of law, except a statute enacted after the date of enactment of this Act that expressly limits the application of this subsection, shall impair the authority of the Secretary to restore funds pursuant to this subsection.

(d) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary may issue guidance for use in carrying out this section.

(e) PROHIBITION OF TRANSFERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no funds may be transferred by a State under subsection (a)—

(1) from amounts apportioned to the State for the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program; and

(2) from amounts apportioned to the State for the surface transportation program and that are subject to any of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)(A)(i) of section 133(d) of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—There shall be available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for administrative expenses of the Federal-aid highway program \$234,682,667 for fiscal year 2005.

(b) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds made available by this section shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, and shall be subject to a limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs; except that such funds shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 5. OTHER FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS UNDER TITLE I OF TEA21.—

(1) FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAYS.—

(A) INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS.—Section 1101(a)(8)(A) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 112; 118 Stat. 877) is amended—

(i) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$183,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: “The minimum amount made available for such period that the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall reserve for Indian reservation road bridges under section 202(d)(4) of title 23, United States Code, shall be \$8,666,667 instead of \$13,000,000.”.

(B) PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS.—Section 1101(a)(8)(B) of such Act (112 Stat. 112; 118 Stat. 878) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$164,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(C) PARK ROADS AND PARKWAYS.—Section 1101(a)(8)(C) of such Act (112 Stat. 112; 118 Stat. 878) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$110,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(D) REFUGE ROADS.—Section 1101(a)(8)(D) of such Act (112 Stat. 112; 118 Stat. 878) is

amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$13,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(2) NATIONAL CORRIDOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATED BORDER INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS.—Section 1101(a)(9) of such Act (112 Stat. 112; 118 Stat. 878) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$93,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(3) CONSTRUCTION OF FERRY BOATS AND FERRY TERMINAL FACILITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1101(a)(10) of such Act (112 Stat. 113; 118 Stat. 878) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$25,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(B) SET ASIDE FOR ALASKA, NEW JERSEY, AND WASHINGTON.—To carry out section 1064 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (23 U.S.C. 129 note; 105 Stat. 2005; 112 Stat. 185; 118 Stat. 878), of funds made available by the amendment made by subparagraph (A)—

(i) \$6,666,667 shall be available for section 1064(d)(2);

(ii) \$3,333,333 shall be available for section 1064(d)(3); and

(iii) \$3,333,333 shall be available for section 1064(d)(4).

(4) NATIONAL SCENIC BYWAYS PROGRAM.—Section 1101(a)(11) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 113; 118 Stat. 878) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” the last place it appears; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and \$17,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(5) VALUE PRICING PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 1101(a)(12) of such Act (112 Stat. 113; 118 Stat. 878) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and \$7,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(6) HIGHWAY USE TAX EVASION PROJECTS.—Section 1101(a)(14) of such Act (112 Stat. 113; 118 Stat. 878) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$3,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(7) COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO HIGHWAY PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1101(a)(15) of such Act (112 Stat. 113; 118 Stat. 879) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$73,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1214(r)(1) of such Act (112 Stat. 209; 117 Stat. 1114) is amended by striking “2004” and inserting “2005”.

(8) SAFETY GRANTS.—Section 1212(i)(1)(D) of such Act (23 U.S.C. 402 note; 112 Stat. 196; 112 Stat. 840; 118 Stat. 879) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(9) TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY AND SYSTEM PRESERVATION PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 1221(e)(1) of such Act (23 U.S.C. 101 note; 112 Stat. 223; 118 Stat. 879) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$16,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(10) TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE AND INNOVATION.—Section 188 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (E);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (F) and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) \$86,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”;

(B) in subsection (a)(2) by inserting after “2004” the following: “and \$1,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”; and

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking “2004” and inserting “2005”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end of the table and inserting the following:

“2005 \$1,733,333,333.”.

(11) NATIONAL SCENIC BYWAYS CLEARINGHOUSE.—Section 1215(b)(3) of the Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (112 Stat. 210) is amended by inserting before the period at the end “and \$1,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS UNDER TITLE V OF TEA21.—

(1) SURFACE TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH.—Section 5001(a)(1) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 419; 118 Stat. 879) is amended—

(A) by striking “2003, and” and inserting “2003,”; and

(B) by inserting after “2004” the following: “, and \$68,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(2) TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM.—Section 5001(a)(2) of such Act (112 Stat. 419; 118 Stat. 879) is amended—

(A) by striking “2003, and” and inserting “2003,”; and

(B) by inserting after “2004” the following: “, and \$33,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(3) TRAINING AND EDUCATION.—Section 5001(a)(3) of such Act (112 Stat. 420; 118 Stat. 879) is amended—

(A) by striking “2003, and” and inserting “2003,”; and

(B) by inserting after “2004” the following: “, and \$13,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(4) BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS.—Section 5001(a)(4) of such Act (112 Stat. 420; 118 Stat. 879) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and \$20,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(5) ITS STANDARDS, RESEARCH, OPERATIONAL TESTS, AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 5001(a)(5) of such Act (112 Stat. 420; 118 Stat. 879) is amended—

(A) by striking “2003, and” and inserting “2003,”; and

(B) by inserting after “2004” the following: “, and \$73,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(6) ITS DEPLOYMENT.—Section 5001(a)(6) of such Act (112 Stat. 420; 118 Stat. 880) is amended—

(A) by striking “2003, and” and inserting “2003,”; and

(B) by inserting after “2004” the following: “, and \$81,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(7) UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH.—Section 5001(a)(7) of such Act (112 Stat. 420; 118 Stat. 880) is amended—

(A) by striking “2003, and” and inserting “2003,”; and

(B) by inserting after “2004” the following: “, and \$17,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(c) METROPOLITAN PLANNING.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—There shall be available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) to carry out section 134 of title 23, United States Code, \$145,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.

(2) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall distribute funds made available by this subsection to the States in accordance with

section 104(f)(2) of title 23, United States Code.

(3) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—Funds made available by this subsection shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, and shall be subject to a limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

(d) **TERRITORIES.**—Section 1101(d)(1) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 111–115; 117 Stat. 1116; 118 Stat. 880) is amended by inserting after “2004” the following: “and \$24,266,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(e) **ALASKA HIGHWAY.**—Section 1101(e)(1) of such Act (117 Stat. 1116; 118 Stat. 880) is amended by inserting after “2004” the following: “and \$12,533,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(f) **OPERATION LIFESAVER.**—Section 1101(f)(1) of such Act (117 Stat. 1117; 118 Stat. 880) is amended by inserting after “2004” the following: “and \$333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(g) **BRIDGE DISCRETIONARY.**—Section 1101(g)(1) of such Act (117 Stat. 1117; 118 Stat. 880) is amended by inserting after “2004” the following: “and \$66,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(h) **INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE.**—Section 1101(h)(1) of such Act (117 Stat. 1117; 118 Stat. 880) is amended by inserting after “2004” the following: “and \$66,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(i) **RECREATIONAL TRAILS ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—Section 1101(i)(1) of such Act (117 Stat. 1117; 118 Stat. 880) is amended by inserting after “2004” the following: “and \$500,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(j) **RAILWAY-HIGHWAY CROSSING HAZARD ELIMINATION IN HIGH SPEED RAIL CORRIDORS.**—Section 1101(j)(1) of such Act (117 Stat. 1118; 118 Stat. 881) is amended—

(1) by inserting before “; except” the following: “and \$3,500,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”; and

(2) by inserting before “for eligible” the following: “and not less than \$166,667 instead of \$250,000 shall be available for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(k) **NONDISCRIMINATION.**—Section 1101(k) of such Act (117 Stat. 1118; 118 Stat. 881) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting after “2004” the following: “and \$6,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”; and

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting after “2004” the following: “and \$6,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(l) **ADMINISTRATION OF FUNDS.**—Funds authorized by the amendments made by this section shall be administered as if the funds had been apportioned, allocated, deducted, or set aside, as the case may be, under title 23, United States Code, except that the deductions under sections 104(a)(1)(A) and 104(a)(1)(B) of such title shall not apply to funds made available by the amendment made by subsection (a)(1) of this section.

(m) **REDUCTION OF ALLOCATED PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the amount that would be made available, but for this section, for fiscal year 2005 for allocation under a program, that is continued both by a multiyear law reauthorizing such program enacted after the date of enactment of this Act and by this section, by the amount made available for such program by this section.

(n) **PROGRAM CATEGORY RECONCILIATION.**—The Secretary may establish procedures under which funds allocated under this sec-

tion for fiscal year 2005 for a program category for which funds are not authorized for fiscal year 2005 under a multiyear law reauthorizing the Federal-aid highway program enacted after the date of enactment of this Act may be restored to the Federal-aid highway program.

SEC. 6. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) **CHAPTER 1 HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **SEAT BELT SAFETY INCENTIVE GRANTS.**—Section 157 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3) by striking “2002” and inserting “2003”; and

(B) in subsection (a)(8)(B) by striking “2002” and inserting “2003”; and

(C) in subsection (b) by striking “2003” and inserting “2005”; and

(D) in subsection (c)(1) by striking “2003” and inserting “2004”; and

(E) in subsection (c)(2) by striking “2003” and inserting “2004”; and

(F) in subsection (f)(4) by striking “2003” and inserting “2004”; and

(G) in subsection (g)(1)—

(i) by striking “and”; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and \$74,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”;

(H) in the heading to subsection (g)(3)(B) by striking “2004” and inserting “2005”; and

(I) in subsection (g)(3)(B) by striking “2004” and inserting “2005”.

(2) **PREVENTION OF INTOXICATED DRIVER INCENTIVE GRANTS.**—Section 163(e)(1) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking “and”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and \$73,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(b) **CHAPTER 4 HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.**—Section 2009(a)(1) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 337; 118 Stat. 886) is amended—

(1) by striking “and”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and \$110,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(c) **HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—Section 2009(a)(2) of such Act (112 Stat. 337; 118 Stat. 886) is amended by inserting after “2004” the following: “, and \$48,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(d) **OCCUPANT PROTECTION INCENTIVE GRANTS.**—Section 2009(a)(3) of such Act (112 Stat. 337; 118 Stat. 886) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” the last place it appears; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and \$13,333,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(e) **ALCOHOL-IMPAIRED DRIVING COUNTERMEASURES INCENTIVE GRANTS.**—

(1) **EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.**—Section 410 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3) by striking “7” and inserting “8”; and

(B) in subsection (a)(4)(C) by striking “and seventh” and inserting “, seventh, and eighth”.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 2009(a)(4) of such Act (112 Stat. 337; 118 Stat. 886) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” the last place it appears; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and \$26,666,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(f) **NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.**—Section 2009(a)(6) of such Act (112 Stat. 338; 118 Stat. 886) is amended by inserting after “2004” the following: “, and \$2,400,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”.

(g) **ALLOCATIONS.**—Section 2009(b) of such Act (112 Stat. 338) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “2004” and inserting “2005”; and

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking “2004” and inserting “2005”.

(h) **APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23.**—Section 2009(c) of such Act (112 Stat. 338) is amended by striking “2004” and inserting “2005”.

SEC. 7. EXTENSION OF MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There shall be available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for the Secretary of Transportation to pay administrative expenses of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration \$160,552,536 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.

(2) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Funds authorized by this subsection may be used for personnel costs; administrative infrastructure; rent; information technology; and programs for research and technology, regulatory development, and other operating expenses and similar matters. Such funds available may also be used to make grants to, or enter into contracts with, States, local governments, or other persons for implementation of the Commercial Driver's License Improvement Grants and the Border Enforcement Grants programs.

(b) **MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**—Section 31104(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) Not more than \$112,512,329 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”.

(c) **INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE GRANTS.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.**—Section 31107(a) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) \$13,315,068 for the period of October 1, 2004 through May 31, 2005.”.

(2) **EMERGENCY CDL GRANTS.**—From amounts made available by section 31107(a) of title 49, United States Code, for the period of October 1, 2004 through May 31, 2005, the Secretary of Transportation may make grants of up to \$665,753 to a State whose commercial driver's license program may fail to meet the compliance requirements of section 31311(a) of such title.

(d) **CRASH CAUSATION STUDY.**—There shall be available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to continue the crash causation study required by section 224 of the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 (49 U.S.C. 31100 note; 113 Stat. 1770–1771), \$665,753 for the period of October 1, 2004 through May 31, 2005.

(e) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—Funds made available by this section shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code.

(f) **RULE STAY.**—The hours-of-service regulations applicable to property-carrying commercial drivers contained in the Final Rule published on April 28, 2003 (68 Fed. Reg. 22456–22517), as amended on September 30, 2003 (68 Fed. Reg. 56208–56212), and made applicable to motor carriers and drivers on January 4, 2004, shall be in effect until the earlier of—

(1) the effective date of a new final rule addressing the issues raised by the July 16, 2004, decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *Public Citizen, et al. v. Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration* (No. 03-1165); or

(2) September 30, 2005.

SEC. 8. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS.

(a) ALLOCATING AMOUNTS.—Section 5309(m) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) by inserting “and for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005” after “2004”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(iii) OCTOBER 1, 2004 THROUGH MAY 31, 2005.—Of the amounts made available under paragraph (1)(B), \$6,933,333 shall be available for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005, for capital projects described in clause (i).”;

(3) in paragraph (3)(B) by inserting after “2004” the following: “(and \$2,000,000 shall be available for the period October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005)”;

(4) in paragraph (3)(C) by inserting after “2004” the following: “, and \$33,333,333 shall be available for the period October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”;

(b) APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION.—The Secretary of Transportation shall determine the amount that each urbanized area is to be apportioned for fixed guideway modernization under section 5337 of title 49, United States Code, on a pro rata basis to reflect the partial fiscal year 2005 funding made available by sections 5338(b)(2)(A)(vii) and 5338(b)(2)(B)(vii) of such title.

(c) FORMULA GRANTS AUTHORIZATIONS.—Section 5338(a) of such title is amended—

(1) in the heading to paragraph (2) by inserting “AND FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2004, THROUGH MAY 31, 2005” after “2004”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraphs (2)(A)(v) and (2)(B)(v);

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraphs (2)(A)(vi) and (2)(B)(vi) and inserting “; and”;

(4) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(A) the following:

“(vii) \$2,201,760,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”;

(5) by adding at the end in paragraph (2)(B) the following:

“(vii) \$550,440,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”; and

(6) in paragraph (2)(C) by striking “2003” and inserting the following: “2005 (other than for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005)”.

(d) ALLOCATION OF FORMULA GRANT FUNDS FOR OCTOBER 1, 2004, THROUGH MAY 31, 2005.—Of the aggregate of amounts made available by and appropriated under section 5338(a)(2) of title 49, United States Code, for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005—

(1) \$3,233,300 shall be available to the Alaska Railroad for improvements to its passenger operations under section 5307 of such title;

(2) \$33,333,333 shall be available for clean fuels formula grants under section 5308 of such title;

(3) \$65,064,001 shall be available to provide transportation services to elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities under section 5310 of such title;

(4) \$172,690,702 shall be available to provide financial assistance for other than urbanized areas under section 5311 of such title;

(5) \$4,633,333 shall be available to provide financial assistance in accordance with section 3038(g) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century; and

(6) \$2,473,245,331 shall be available to provide financial assistance for urbanized areas under section 5307 of such title.

(e) CAPITAL PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS.—Section 5338(b) of such title is amended—

(1) in the heading to paragraph (2) by inserting “AND FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2004, THROUGH MAY 31, 2005” after “2004”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraphs (2)(A)(v) and (2)(B)(v);

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraphs (2)(A)(vi) and (2)(B)(vi) and inserting “; and”;

(4) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(A) the following:

“(vii) \$1,740,960,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”; and

(5) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(B) the following:

“(vii) \$435,240,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”;

(f) PLANNING AUTHORIZATIONS AND ALLOCATIONS.—Section 5338(c) is amended—

(1) in the heading to paragraph (2) by inserting “AND FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2004, THROUGH MAY 31, 2005” after “2004”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraphs (2)(A)(v) and (2)(B)(v);

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraphs (2)(A)(vi) and (2)(B)(vi) and inserting “; and”;

(4) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(A) the following:

“(vii) \$41,813,334 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”;

(5) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(B) the following:

“(vii) \$10,453,333 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”; and

(6) in paragraph (2)(C) by inserting “or any portion of a fiscal year” after “fiscal year”.

(g) RESEARCH AUTHORIZATIONS.—Section 5338(d) of such title is amended—

(1) in the heading to paragraph (2) by inserting “AND FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2004, THROUGH MAY 31, 2005” after “2004”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraphs (2)(A)(v) and (2)(B)(v);

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraphs (2)(A)(vi) and (2)(B)(vi) and inserting “; and”;

(4) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(A) the following:

“(vii) \$28,266,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”;

(5) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(B) the following:

“(vii) \$7,066,667 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”; and

(6) in paragraph (2)(C) by inserting after “a fiscal year” the following: “(other than for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005)”.

(h) ALLOCATION OF RESEARCH FUNDS FOR OCTOBER 1, 2004, THROUGH MAY 31, 2005.—Of the funds made available by or appropriated under section 5338(d)(2) of title 49, United States Code, for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005—

(1) not less than \$3,500,000 shall be available for providing rural transportation assistance under section 5311(b)(2) of such title;

(2) not less than \$5,500,000 shall be available for carrying out transit cooperative research programs under section 5313(a) of such title;

(3) not less than \$2,666,667 shall be available to carry out programs under the National Transit Institute under section 5315 of such title, including not more than \$666,667 shall be available to carry out section 5315(a)(16) of such title; and

(4) any amounts not made available under paragraphs (1) through (3) shall be available for carrying out national planning and research programs under sections 5311(b)(2), 5312, 5313(a), 5314, and 5322 of such title.

(i) UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AUTHORIZATIONS.—Section 5338(e) of such title is amended—

(1) in the heading to paragraph (2) by inserting “AND FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2004, THROUGH MAY 31, 2005” after “2004”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(A) by inserting after “2004” the following: “and \$3,200,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”;

(3) in paragraph (2)(B) by inserting after “2004” the following: “and \$800,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005”;

(4) in paragraphs (2)(C)(i) and (2)(C)(iii) by inserting after “fiscal year” the following: “(other than for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005)”.

(j) ALLOCATION OF UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts made available under section 5338(e)(2)(A) of title 49, United States Code, for the period October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005—

(A) \$1,333,333 shall be available for the center identified in section 5505(j)(4)(A) of such title; and

(B) \$1,333,333 shall be available for the center identified in section 5505(j)(4)(F) of such title.

(2) TRAINING AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT.—Notwithstanding section 5338(e)(2) of such title, any amounts made available under such section for the period October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005, that remain after distribution under paragraph (1), shall be available for the purposes identified in section 3015(d) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 857).

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3015(d)(2) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 857; 118 Stat. 884) is amended by inserting “or in the period October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005” after “2004”.

(k) ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATIONS.—Section 5338(f) of such title is amended—

(1) in the heading to paragraph (2) by inserting “AND FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2004, THROUGH MAY 31, 2005” after “2004”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraphs (2)(A)(v) and (2)(B)(v);

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraphs (2)(A)(vi) and (2)(B)(vi) and inserting “; and”;

(4) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(A) the following:

“(vii) \$41,600,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”; and

(5) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(B) the following:

“(vii) \$10,400,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”.

(l) JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE PROGRAM.—Section 3037(1) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 5309 note; 112 Stat. 391–392; 118 Stat. 884) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraphs (1)(A)(v) and (1)(B)(v);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraphs (1)(A)(vi) and (1)(B)(vi) and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end of paragraph (1)(A) the following:

“(vii) \$80,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”;

(4) by adding at the end of paragraph (1)(B) the following:

“(vii) \$20,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”; and

(5) by inserting before the period at the end of paragraph (2) the following: “; except that in the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005, not more than \$6,666,667 shall be used for such projects”.

(m) RURAL TRANSPORTATION ACCESSIBILITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM.—Section 3038(g) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 5310 note; 112 Stat. 393; 118 Stat. 885) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following:

“(G) \$3,500,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting after “2004” the following: “(and \$1,133,333 shall be available for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005)”.

(n) URBANIZED AREA FORMULA GRANTS.—Section 5307(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading to paragraph (2) by inserting “AND FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2004, THROUGH MAY 31, 2005” after “2004”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A) by inserting “and for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005” after “2004”.

(o) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 3040 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 394; 118 Stat. 885) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (5);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) \$5,172,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”

(p) FUEL CELL BUS AND BUS FACILITIES PROGRAM.—Section 3015(b) of such Act (112 Stat. 361; 118 Stat. 885) is amended by inserting “(or, in the case of the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005, \$3,233,333)” after “\$4,850,000”.

(q) ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROJECT.—Section 3015(c)(2) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 322 note; 112 Stat. 361; 118 Stat. 885) is amended—

(1) by inserting “and for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005,” after “2004”; and

(2) by inserting “and \$3,333,333 for such period” after “\$5,000,000 per fiscal year”.

(r) PROJECTS FOR NEW FIXED GUIDEWAY SYSTEMS AND EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING SYSTEMS.—Section 3030 of such Act (112 Stat. 373-381; 118 Stat. 885) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (b) by inserting “and for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005,” after “2004”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1) by inserting “and for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005” after “2004”.

(s) NEW JERSEY URBAN CORE PROJECT.—Subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 3031(a)(3) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2122; 112 Stat. 379; 118 Stat. 885) are amended by inserting “and for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005,” after “2004”.

(t) TREATMENT OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under the amendments made by this section shall be treated for purposes of section 1101(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (23 U.S.C. 101 note) as amounts made available for programs under title III of such Act.

(u) LOCAL SHARE.—Section 3011(a) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 5307 note; 118 Stat. 637; 118 Stat. 708; 118 Stat. 886) is amended by inserting “and for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005” after “2004”.

SEC. 9. SPORT FISHING AND BOATING SAFETY.

(a) FUNDING FOR NATIONAL OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM.—Section 4(c) of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (5);

(2) by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) \$6,666,664 for the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.”

(b) CLEAN VESSEL ACT FUNDING.—Section 4(b) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 777c(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting “FISCAL YEAR 2004”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) FIRST 8 MONTHS OF FISCAL YEAR 2005.—For the period of October 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005, of the balance of each annual appropriation remaining after making the distribution under subsection (a), an amount equal to \$54,666,664, reduced by 82 percent of the amount appropriated for that fiscal year from the Boat Safety Account of the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund established by section 9504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to carry out the purposes of section 13106(a) of title 46, United States Code, shall be used as follows:

“(A) \$6,666,664 shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for 3 fiscal years for obligation for qualified projects under section 5604(c) of the Clean Vessel Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 1322 note).

“(B) \$5,333,334 shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for 3 fiscal years for obligation for qualified projects under section 7404(d) of the Sportfishing and Boating Safety Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 777g-1(d)).

“(C) The balance remaining after the application of subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be transferred to the Secretary of Transportation and shall be expended for State recreational boating safety programs under section 13106 of title 46, United States Code.”

(c) BOAT SAFETY FUNDS.—Section 13106(c) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(c)(1) Of the amount transferred to the Secretary of Transportation under paragraph (5)(C) of section 4(b) of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c(b)), \$3,333,336 is available to the Secretary for payment of expenses of the Coast Guard for personnel and activities directly related to coordinating and carrying out the national recreational boating safety program under this title, of which \$1,333,336 shall be available to the Secretary only to ensure compliance with chapter 43 of this title.

“(2) No funds available to the Secretary under this subsection may be used to replace funding traditionally provided through general appropriations, nor for any purposes except those purposes authorized by this section.

“(3) Amounts made available by this subsection shall remain available until expended.

“(4) The Secretary shall publish annually in the Federal Register a detailed accounting of the projects, programs, and activities funded under this subsection.”

SEC. 10. BUDGET LIMITATIONS.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS TO ANNUALIZED DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the matter that precedes subparagraph (A) of section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, strike “through 2002”.

(b) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—Section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended as follows:

(1) Strike paragraphs (1) through (7) and redesignate paragraph (8) (which relates to fiscal year 2005) as paragraph (1) and in such redesignated paragraph strike “(1) with respect to fiscal year 2005”, redesignate the remaining matter as subparagraph (C), and before such redesignated matter insert the following:

“(1) with respect to fiscal year 2005—

“(A) for the highway category: \$31,113,000,000 in outlays;

“(B) for the mass transit category: \$1,453,000,000 in new budget authority and \$6,535,000,000 in outlays; and”.

(2) Redesignate paragraphs (9) through (16) as paragraphs (2) through (9).

(c) CATEGORY DEFINED.—Section 250(c)(4) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B) by inserting after “Century” the following: “and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting after “Century” the first place it appears the following: “and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V”; and

(B) by striking “that Act” and inserting “those Acts”.

(d) CONFORMANCE WITH THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all adjustments made pursuant to section 110(a)(2) of title 23, United States Code, to sums authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) to carry out each of the Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs (other than emergency relief) in fiscal year 2005 shall be deemed to be zero.

(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ADJUSTMENT TO ALIGN HIGHWAY SPENDING WITH REVENUES.—It is the sense of Congress that, in any multiyear reauthorization of the Federal-aid highway program, the alignment of highway spending with revenues under section 251(b)(1)(B)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 should be restructured to minimize year-to-year fluctuations in highway spending levels and to ensure the uniform enforcement of such levels.

(f) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FULLY GUARANTEED FUNDING.—It is the sense of Congress—

(1) in any multiyear law reauthorizing of the Federal-aid highway program enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, the level of obligation limitations for fiscal year 2005 under the highway category and the mass transit category in section 8103 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (2 U.S.C. 901 note), as amended and extended, should equal the obligation limitations for such categories authorized in such multiyear law;

(2) the highway account category obligation limitation level for fiscal year 2005 should be equal to the sum of the Federal Highway Administration, National Highway Safety Administration, and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration obligation limitations for fiscal year 2005 in such multiyear law; and

(3) the mass transit category obligation limitation level for fiscal year 2005 should be equal to the sum of budget authority and obligation limitation authorizations for Federal Transit Administration programs for fiscal year 2005 in such multiyear reauthorization.

SEC. 11. LEVEL OF OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS.

(a) HIGHWAY CATEGORY.—Section 8103(a) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (2 U.S.C. 901 note; 112 Stat. 492; 117 Stat. 1128) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (5);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) for fiscal year 2005, \$35,392,000,000.”

(b) MASS TRANSIT CATEGORY.—Section 8103(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 901 note; 112 Stat. 492; 117 Stat. 1128) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (5);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) for fiscal year 2005, \$7,265,000,000.”.

(c) TREATMENT OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available under this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, shall be deemed to be zero for the purposes of section 110 of the title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 12. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY PROGRAMS THROUGH END OF FISCAL YEAR 2004.

(a) ADVANCES.—Section 2(a) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003 (23 U.S.C. 104 note; 117 Stat. 1110; 118 Stat. 876) is amended by striking “and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part IV” and inserting “the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part IV, and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Section 1101(c)(1) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (117 Stat. 1111; 118 Stat. 876) is amended by striking “the period of October 1, 2003, through September 24,” and inserting “fiscal year”.

(c) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS.—Section 2(e) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003 (117 Stat. 1111; 118 Stat. 478; 118 Stat. 876) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) through (4) and inserting:

“(1) DISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—For the fiscal year 2004, the Secretary shall distribute the obligation limitation made available for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs under the heading ‘Federal-aid highways’ in the Transportation, Treasury, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2004 (division F of Public Law 108-199; 118 Stat. 291; 118 Stat. 1013), in accordance with section 110 of such Act.”; and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (2).

(d) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Obligation authority made available for fiscal year 2004 under section 2 of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003 as a result of the amendments made by this section, that is in addition to obligation authority previously made available for fiscal year 2004 under section 2 of such Act (117 Stat. 1110; 118 Stat. 478; 118 Stat. 627; 118 Stat. 698; 118 Stat. 876), shall remain available for obligation during fiscal years 2004 and 2005, or for additional fiscal years if so made available in a law enacted before the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) PAYMENT FROM FUTURE APPORTIONMENTS.—The Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003 (117 Stat. 1110) is amended—

(1) by striking section 2(c) (117 Stat. 1111; 118 Stat. 877);

(2) by striking section 3(c)(1) (117 Stat. 1112) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V, the Secretary of Transportation shall restore any funds that a State transferred under subsection (a).”; and

(3) by striking section 5(n) (117 Stat. 1119; 118 Stat. 483; 118 Stat. 632; 118 Stat. 703; 118 Stat. 881).

(f) SUPPLEMENTAL MINIMUM GUARANTEE.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—For fiscal year 2004, the Secretary shall allocate among the States amounts sufficient to ensure that each State's percentage of the total apportionments for such fiscal year pursuant to sections 2(a) and 5(c) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003 and amounts apportioned under this section shall equal the percentage listed for each State in section 105(b) of title 23, United States Code. The shares in such section shall be adjusted in accordance with section 105(f) of such title. The minimum amount allocated to a

State under this subsection for the fiscal year shall be \$1,000,000.

(2) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection for fiscal year 2004.

(3) ADMINISTRATION OF FUNDS.—Funds apportioned to a State under this subsection—

(A) shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned to the State under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code;

(B) shall be combined with funds apportioned to the State for the minimum guarantee program under section 2(a) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003; and

(C) shall be administered in the same manner as funds apportioned under section 105 of such title.

(4) OBLIGATION LIMITATION.—Funds apportioned under this subsection shall be subject to any limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

(g) CALCULATION OF ESTIMATED TRUST FUND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The amendment made by section 13(c) of this Act shall have no effect on the estimates of tax payments attributable to highway users in each State paid into the Highway Trust Fund for purposes of apportioning funds to States in fiscal year 2004 until enactment of a multiyear law re-authorizing surface transportation programs.

SEC. 13. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF TRUST FUNDS FOR OBLIGATIONS UNDER TEA-21.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9503(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking “October 1, 2004” and inserting “June 1, 2005”;

(B) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (I),

(C) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (J) and inserting “, or”,

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following new subparagraph:

“(K) authorized to be paid out of the Highway Trust Fund under the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V.”, and

(E) in the matter after subparagraph (K), as added by this paragraph, by striking “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part IV” and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V”.

(2) MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT.—Paragraph (3) of section 9503(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking “October 1, 2004” and inserting “June 1, 2005”;

(B) in subparagraph (G), by striking “or” at the end of such subparagraph,

(C) in subparagraph (H), by inserting “or” at the end of such subparagraph,

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph:

“(I) the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V.”, and

(E) in the matter after subparagraph (I), as added by this paragraph, by striking “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part IV” and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V”.

(3) EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 9503(b)(5) of such Code is amended by striking “October 1, 2004” and inserting “June 1, 2005”.

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 10 of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part IV is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(b) AQUATIC RESOURCES TRUST FUND.—

(1) SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACCOUNT.—Paragraph (2) of section 9504(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part IV” each place it appears and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V”.

(2) BOAT SAFETY ACCOUNT.—Subsection (c) of section 9504 of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “October 1, 2004” and inserting “June 1, 2005”, and

(B) by striking “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part IV” and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V”.

(3) EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS.—Paragraph (2) of section 9504(d) of such Code is amended by striking “October 1, 2004” and inserting “June 1, 2005”.

(c) ALL ALCOHOL FUEL TAXES TRANSFERRED TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.—Subparagraphs (E) and (F) of section 9503(b)(4) (relating to certain taxes not transferred to Highway Trust Fund) are each amended by inserting “before October 1, 2003, and for the period beginning after September 30, 2004, and” before “before October 1, 2005”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TRANSFERS TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—The amendments made by subsection (c) shall apply to taxes imposed after September 30, 2003.

(e) TEMPORARY RULE REGARDING ADJUSTMENTS.—During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003 and ending on May 31, 2005, for purposes of making any estimate under section 9503(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of receipts of the Highway Trust Fund, the Secretary of the Treasury shall treat—

(1) each expiring provision of paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 9503(b) of such Code which is related to appropriations or transfers to such Fund to have been extended through the end of the 24-month period referred to in section 9503(d)(1)(B) of such Code, and

(2) with respect to each tax imposed under the sections referred to in section 9503(b)(1) of such Code, the rate of such tax during the 24-month period referred to in section 9503(d)(1)(B) of such Code to be the same as the rate of such tax as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003.

(f) APPORTIONMENT OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.—Section 9503(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not apply to any apportionment to the States of the amounts authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 811, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, much has been said during the rule about the obvious need for this extension, and I will agree with those who say we need a finalization of the 6-year

bill; but this extension gives us time to allow the States to go forth with their construction, with their projects that are necessary, and to keep some stability in our continued efforts to improve the transportation system in this great Nation of ours.

I truly believe this will be the last extension. I have endeavored and will continue to work until we sine die to try to make a finalization of the 6-year bill. I want to make sure everybody understands that just because this is an 8-month extension, it does not mean we have to wait 8 months to get it done. If I can get it done next week, we are going to get it done. If I can get it done the week after that, if we are not here, I cannot do that, but if we can get it done during the lame duck, we can do it then. Or we can do it in February, March, April, May, June, July, or in that period of time. Whatever we have to do, we will do to continue to improve our transportation system in our great Nation.

May I suggest, respectfully, since some have spoken on this bill about the reauthorization, our committee has done its work. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), I see, is managing the bill today instead of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR). We are going to miss him. He is no longer going to be with us next year, but he has done his work as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Highways, Transit and Pipelines. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has done his work; the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) has done his work. We have done our work, and we have passed this legislation over to the other body.

Now, we can point a lot of fingers and we can say this guy, that person, this other person in the other body did not do it; but in reality there is a difference of philosophies. I personally will say that when we passed this bill in the House, I had \$375 billion. That is the number I would like to have. Well, a lot of us would like to have some things which we cannot achieve. We have agreed and we have worked with the other body, and we did reach a number that, to me, was a great victory, \$299 billion of contractual authority, \$284.3 as obligated dollars, real dollars, with policies and philosophies in the bill. We reached those agreements. But, unfortunately, on both sides of the aisle there are some people in the other body that desire more, and we were unable to reach that agreement because it was not there.

I would have liked to have had what we agreed to, because I think it was the appropriate way to go. It did not mean it would be the final number, but we did not and were not able to achieve that. Consequently, we are here for this extension. As they said in the rules debate, this extension is badly needed to continue the stability of our transportation system.

But I will commit to this House and to this Nation that this committee will

continue to work to finish this job and to work with the other body to arrive at a conclusion that I think is long overdue.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to this body that we are on the cusp of a disaster in transportation if we do not act soon. We are gathering in population more each day. We are importing more each day, we are exporting more each day, and we are becoming more congested each day. I am hoping that my State Governors, my State legislators, my State department of transportation and my mayors, all those people understand they too have to participate in solving this problem. It just cannot come from this body. They too must participate with ambitious and visionary ideas in helping to solve our transportation problems.

We all must work together. If we do not, we do not leave the appropriate legacy behind us so this country can continue to grow. I will say, Mr. Speaker, there are some in this country that do not want to improve the transportation system, because they realize if they do not improve upon it, then our ability to be competitive and to be the leaders of the free world will not occur. So I suggest to this body we must awaken the people and make sure they understand the effect upon them and they must respond and ask us, and, yes, their local legislators, their Governors, their mayors, and those people who lead them to say yes to participate together with us so we can solve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, this extension is necessary, and I urge passage of the extension.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation before us.

H.R. 5183, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, part V, continues the highway construction, highway safety, transit, motor carrier, and surface transportation research programs for 8 months of fiscal year 2005, expiring on May 31, 2005. Fiscal year 2004 is completed in this extension as well. The transportation programs under all previous extensions will be continued under this extension.

This is, we hope, the final short-term extension of the surface transportation programs' authorization. We have gotten extremely close to a fair and broadly accepted conclusion to the House-Senate conference on our multiyear authorization bill, but a stopgap measure is needed, once again, to give us time to finalize this deal.

This short-term extension is a "must-pass" bill. If Congress does not pass a bill and send it to the President today, new highway projects will be shelved, safety grants will not be provided to states, transit construction will be halted, and Federal enforcement of motor carrier safety regulations on the highways and at the borders will end.

H.R. 5183 provides more than \$30 billion in new funding authority, which reflects 8 months' worth—or two-thirds of the funding authorization levels the House approved for fiscal year 2005 in TEA LU, H.R. 3550.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 5183 today. It is vitally important that this bill be passed by both the House and Senate today, delivered to the President—the bill must be flown down to Florida—and signed before midnight tonight. Our economy cannot withstand the shutdown of the national surface transportation programs.

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

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 29, the bipartisan leadership of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure introduced H.R. 5183, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004. H.R. 5183 would extend our Nation's surface transportation programs for an additional 8 months, through May 31, 2005. While I fully support this extension, I am certainly not pleased that we need to consider such a measure once again. This is the fifth such extension we are considering since our highway and transit programs expired exactly 1 year ago.

Earlier this year, my colleagues in this body labored long and very hard to pass H.R. 3550. In writing TEA-LU, our committee considered the interests and needs of almost every single Member of this body.

□ 1115

We held dozens of hearings and we heard from many Members. We heard about their needs in their districts that they represent. Most importantly, we listened. We tried to accommodate the needs of every Member within the \$275 billion bill. All in all, I think that the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG), the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and myself on the Committee on Transportation and the Infrastructure did a good job. I believe we wrote a good bipartisan bill.

This body passed TEA-LU by a vote of 357-65. But now many, many months later, this measure is stalled in conference. Let me be clear, the leadership in this body has worked long and hard to negotiate an increase in the funding level from \$275 billion to \$299 billion. I believe that this is a good funding level. We would all like to have more, but democracy is compromise and we have all had to compromise.

My understanding is that most of my colleagues in this Chamber will accept the \$299 billion funding for this bill. The leadership of this body should be commended for their efforts. Unfortunately, the conference is still stalled due to opposition from some Members of the other body.

We simply cannot continue to allow our highway and transit programs to limp along, extension after extension. States and localities are bearing the brunt of this inaction. State DOTs are flatlining their capital budgets. Critical transportation projects are not getting completed. Congestion problems are getting worse.

However, hope springs eternal. I, for one, believe we can get it done. Much like Ronald Wilson Reagan, I am an eternal optimist. I also have faith in our democratic process, and I have faith in our leadership on the committee and in this body. We still have an opportunity to finish negotiations on the highway conference, but to do so I would urge the other body to put aside partisan differences and think about the Nation, and we simply need to get this job done. But for now I urge my colleagues to support the extension.

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

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. First of all, I want to say nothing but kudos to the leadership of this committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the subcommittee leadership. This committee has worked together as well as any committee in Congress, particularly during these hard times, on a bill that was entirely responsive to other Members and entirely responsive to the needs of the country.

We can keep extending bills. The problem is we cannot extend the need. The need just gets worse. Many of us are close to desperation now. We have done our work. Our leadership has tried desperately to get this bill out, and we are left with what looks like the sixth extension. The highway bill is about extensions, not bills. This is the first time that I have ever seen a White House that did not want a highway bill, that wanted to go into an election without a highway bill.

Members recognize we had some concerns here and we tried to work them out. I was a conferee, and I understand what those concerns were. My problem with the extension is we are extending with funding from 6 years ago. The problem with that is the need has grown larger and people want this bill because they want whatever new amounts the committees and the Congress can give them.

I will be frank; most of the money that comes to the District of Columbia does not have anything to do with the 600,000 residents of the District of Columbia. My desperation comes because the highway money for my district could just as well be put in the homeland security budget because it is going to go for tunnels and bridges which will get people out of here in the case of an event, and for well-traveled Federal roads which are used by literally millions of commuters and visitors every year. So operating at levels from 6 years ago puts us in a real trick bag. I ask that we finally get this bill out before the end of the year.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for his tireless work because this will be his last action on this legislation. I would like to thank my colleagues on the committee and the chairman of the committee for their work. If we ran things, we would have already completed a much more robust investment in our roads, bridges, highways and mass transit here in the United States, putting millions of people to work and beginning to deal with the backlog of projects.

Unfortunately, we not only have to deal with the House, the other body, the Senate and the White House; in this case the White House has been the big problem. What we are doing here today will mean no increase. This will be the second year in a row with no increase in transportation infrastructure spending, even with the accelerating rate of deterioration of our bridges, even with growing congestion, no new starts. This does not get anywhere near what we would consider a good push toward dealing with those problems and putting people back to work. But the White House has chosen this extraordinarily low number, \$256 billion. They would essentially underspend the highway trust fund. They collect gas tax from Americans and they would divert some of that money to other purposes by borrowing from it instead of fully investing it in roads, bridges, highways and mass transit. That means we are walking away from a lot of jobs. For every \$1 billion we invest in transportation, the estimates are that we create 47,500 jobs, not just direct construction jobs which are good jobs which cannot be outsourced out of the United States, but also spill over into communities, small businesses, equipment providers, suppliers; all those people would benefit dramatically.

If we were to adopt the numbers proposed by the Senate at \$318 billion, we would create nearly another 2 million jobs. We could use those jobs. It would also help the President, who is dragging his feet on this, to deliver on his promise of creating 2 million jobs, which he has not done yet and is unlikely to be able to accomplish before November except with the stroke of a pen and signing a bill and showing that he will create them in the future. But he is refusing to do that.

Unfortunately, there is hesitation with going forward with a more robust level and challenging the President. Someone spoke earlier about how the system works, and we have to deal with the Senate and White House, but we have the power to send something to the White House, allow him to veto it, and then override. The first vote I cast in the United States Congress was to override a much more popular President's veto of a highway bill, Ronald Reagan.

This is not only good for the transportation infrastructure, the economy,

just-in-time delivery, small businesses, construction workers, it would be of tremendous benefit to the entire economy.

In closing, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI). He has been a great mentor and friend to me. I will miss him. I am sure that we will take care of him when we do the highway bill next year. Although we do not know how much money we will have, but if we have lots of money, he will still do well, I am sure, and his State will do well.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all I thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for their hard work in pushing for the highest amount possible for our Nation's transportation system. I want to particularly thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) who I have enjoyed working with over the past 12 years. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

American transportation infrastructure is in need of sufficient additional funding, particularly as we struggle to finance the security upgrades needed to protect our transportation system from terrorist attack. Transportation projects are also a natural economic development tool which this Nation sorely needs. Department of Transportation statistics show that every \$1 billion invested in transportation infrastructure creates 42,000 jobs and \$2.1 million in economic activity. It also saves the lives of 1,400 people. We cannot ignore those numbers. Transportation funding is a win/win for everyone involved. States get to improve their transportation infrastructure which creates economic development, puts people back to work, enhances safety and improves local communities.

Unfortunately, we were unable to add a rail title to the bill, but that does not mean that our rail infrastructure is taken care of. We have dangerously underfunded rail security. It is surprising after what happened in Madrid that rail is not a priority in this administration.

By delaying the passage of much-needed legislation, we are doing a disservice to the driving population and the Nation as a whole. The States who are battling red ink want to see a bill passed. Construction companies laying off employees want to see a bill passed, and citizens waiting in traffic jams want to see a bill passed. If this Congress fails to pass a bill funding transportation, shame on us.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the importance of infrastructure investments to my home

State of New Jersey and our Nation cannot be overstated. More resources are desperately required to satisfy unmet needs, to improve livability, to alleviate congestion, to build safer roads, to upgrade and expand our mass transit system, to facilitate commerce, and create good-paying local construction jobs. Every \$1 billion invested in Federal highway and transit spending means over 40,000 jobs are created or sustained.

□ 1130

Why do we only have an extension on the floor today rather than a good 6-year bill, a full 6-year bill that can benefit all of our States? The administration has been one of the biggest roadblocks in our path. For months, the administration would stonewall on supporting the funding necessary to get a right-sized bill. Their original proposal actively ignored new needs, choosing to keep the status quo. They did not want to make the tough choices in an election year to do what is right. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), et cetera know what is right. They put a lot of hours into this legislation. Both sides of the aisle.

The President has been deafening in his silence on the importance of a highway bill. They choose to hold the highway bill hostage as a credit to their ideology of fiscal responsibility. That is a laugh. It is a joke. Everybody knows it is. This ignores the reality that we are running up record deficits. It ignores the reality that the interest we are paying on the debt, \$300 billion this year, is equal to the entire government outlay in 1974.

So it cannot really be an issue of fiscal responsibility. It is just politics, plain and simple. I support the extension because we need to keep the funding flowing to the States, or we will stop those projects right in their tracks. Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member OBERSTAR understand that we need to keep our States working. They have understood it too well. Our committee to its credit always works in a bipartisan manner. At one point, 74 members of our committee supported a bill which actually provided the level of funding that our own Department of Transportation recommended. Imagine that, actually passing a bill based on need, not politics.

We need to keep up with aging roads and bridges and transit systems. Rather than sitting in traffic, we need to get parents home after work on time to take care of their families. But leadership has held down the investment and is holding back trust fund dollars which would alleviate congestion. Folks are paying gas taxes, user fees, and not spending that money as we should. 1998 was a long way off, the last time we passed this legislation. This is terrible. But we need to do this to keep

the projects that are in the ground already working.

I welcome and congratulate the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for the fantastic job that he has done, not on our side of the aisle but for the United States Congress, not only for the people in his district but for all Americans; and we thank him today.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the full committee.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Here we are again doing an extension. In the famous words of President Reagan, there you go again, doing another extension. But, frankly, you might just call this a no-fault divorce. We tried. The other body tried. The two parties in the other body tried. They could not come to a meeting of the minds. They could not come to a meeting of the minds with the White House. The only body that has its act together is this body. The only group that has its act together is this Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. We have worked shoulder to shoulder and, may I say, kneecap to kneecap across the table to fashion a bill that is good for America, to move transportation ahead, that would address congestion and safety and mobility of all things in America.

We introduced that bill a year ago at a time when gasoline prices were \$1.34 a gallon. They are now consistently well over \$2 a gallon all across the country and that 70-plus cents of increase in fuel price, about 60 percent of it, 70 percent of it, is going overseas to OPEC. We are not getting any transportation benefit of that increase in fuel price. Not a penny of that increase in fuel price is going to fill pot holes, build new bridges, improve safety on our highways, build more bicycle lanes.

Incidentally, I must say to the chairman of our committee and ranking member, I thank the ranking member of the subcommittee for managing this bill. It is his last hurrah, if you will, on the House floor in a management position. But I was out on my bicycle doing what I thought was going to be a 20-mile ride this morning, and I got the message that this bill was being called up. It seems the leadership over here just sort of all of a sudden decides in a big rush, this is the time to do this thing without any advance notice. That is not particularly useful. In fact, I was dodging pot holes, cursing the road conditions as most travelers are doing.

But we need to do this. I want to take this opportunity to express my great appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois for his 2-decade tenure in this House, for the partnership that we

have had, on aviation, on surface transportation, on railroads, on water resource issues, everything that has affected this committee. He has really devoted his career to the work of this committee. The gentleman has absorbed the subject matter and made it a core of his service in the Congress. He has not only served his district well and his State well; he has served the Nation well. I salute the gentleman from Illinois on this, his last opportunity to manage a major transportation bill.

Perhaps there may be another opportunity. We never know. But it may be the last. One never knows what happens in this body. Winds blow. Conditions change. The barometer rises. The barometer falls. Something happens. It can all happen in the blink of an eye, and we could have a major bill back on the House floor yet before this Congress adjourns.

I regret, frankly, that we are here with an extension, that we are not here doing the TEA-LU bill that the chairman of the full committee and I and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and our committee staff and members have worked so hard to fashion, because we know that at \$375 billion, that is the level of investment America needs to move this country ahead, at a time when global mobility at home is a cornerstone of our global presence in international competition in the marketplace.

About 6 months ago, I visited China to speak at an aviation conference and traveled to the city of Laiwu, which is the home of a steel mill which is a part owner in an iron ore mine in my district. I traveled from Jinan 2 hours to Laiwu. Jinan is a city of 6 million people. Laiwu is a city of 1.2 million people. They have a six-lane divided, controlled-access superhighway connecting these two cities, the vanguard of the equivalent of our interstate highway system which China is planning to build in the next 15 years to invest well over \$200 billion in improving their mobility, their ability to move goods to market and people to their destinations; and they are doing it with the savings of the Chinese people who have a savings rate of over 60 percent.

They are investing \$200 billion in modernizing their ports, they are halfway through a \$100 billion airport modernization plan, and we are sitting here, standing here, advancing the cause of transportation by taking the 6-year-old TEA-21 and moving it incrementally forward and saying, sorry, folks, this is the best we can do. That is not right. This committee knows what is right.

Members of this committee have worked hard. They understand transportation problems. They understand what America needs. They understand the needs of mobility. They understand the needs of safety and investment in America. Yet because of ideological

hard-and-fast positions by the White House and divisiveness over in the other body, we cannot move the agenda ahead.

I say, let us pass this bill. Let us inch forward. Let us come back after this Congress has concluded its business and into the next Congress and do the right thing for America. Make the right investments. Let us move America ahead in the way we know it needs to move, keep our mobility, keep our marketplace production and productivity and reduce the cost of moving people and goods in America.

Exactly 1 year ago today we ended an era: The era in which our Nation's transportation policy was governed by legislation establishing a multiyear plan with the funding needed to implement the plan.

During the past year, our national transportation policy has gone forward in fits and starts, by extensions of a month or two.

Just over a year ago, on September 24, 2003, when this House was considering the first surface transportation extension bill, I stated: "I am afraid . . . we will be back here on this floor once again pleading for another extension of time to keep transportation programs from once again expiring. . . . I do not want to be back on this floor saying again what I said 6 years ago, time is running out." What I predicted then has repeatedly proven correct—we have had 5 additional extensions since that day. And here we are today pleading once again for a temporary extension of authorization for highway construction, highway safety, and public transportation funding.

Our inability to enact legislation to reauthorize surface transportation programs is caused by an administration guided by ideology rather than good transportation policy and by the unwillingness of the Republican leadership in Congress to let the people's branch of government work its will.

Analysis by the U.S. Department of Transportation shows that we need to invest \$375 billion to maintain and improve our aging infrastructure. On November 19, 2003, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure introduced H.R. 3550, authorizing that same amount—\$375 billion for the highway, transit, and transportation safety programs for the next 6 years. The T&L Committee marked up that legislation and unanimously voted it favorably to the House, but the Republican leadership blocked its consideration because of objections from the administration to the funding level. But that funding level was derived from the administration's own analysis, and the bill, included proposals to fully fund the investments. Nevertheless, our committee was prevented from moving the bill through the legislative process.

That 1-year delay has been costly to our Nation. AASHTO, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, estimated when the first extension was about to expire early this year that failure to enact a long-term reauthorization would mean a \$2.1 billion increase in project costs and a loss of more than 90,000 jobs that could have been created a long-term authorization bill.

Today, we continue our muddling through, debating on a measure that would temporarily extend funding authorization for another 8 months before the current extension expires at midnight. This is no way to do business, espe-

cially when we are dealing with costly, multiyear transportation projects that require long-term certainty in planning, development, and financing. I can only imagine what further damage we have now done, and at what new financial cost due to another year of inadequate funding levels.

The extension bill now before us provides some modest increase in the investment levels of a number of the highway and transit programs, other programs are less fortunate. Their funding is held constant at the FY 2003 levels. Moreover, the insistence on passing "clean" extension bills, Congress has not been able to modify or update current surface transportation programs and policies that are in need of such adjustment.

Overall, this bill would provide \$24.5 billion in contract authority for the 8 months ending on May 31, 2005, for highway programs. This is based on \$36.76 billion for the entire fiscal year 2005. Of these amounts, \$21.3 billion for 8 months is guaranteed. For transit programs, this bill would provide \$5.17 billion guaranteed funding for 8 months.

Despite the fact that the funding levels included in our original bill were derived from the Department of Transportation's highway and transit needs report, the administration has strongly opposed additional infrastructure investment. The President's budget to Congress flat-lined the highway and transit programs. The President's bill did not include one additional dollar for highway and transit investment, nor would it produce one additional job in the transportation construction sector, over the next 6 years.

But what's worse is the mess we have created in the last year. The lack of vision, the lack of a clear plan, the continual struggle to give States scraps from the table. We should do better.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for those words, particularly those kind words about myself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, allow me to thank the great leadership we have on this committee and the diligence with which they have led us and with which we have worked. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the members of the committee respect and honor their leadership. It makes for a very good committee.

Three in four Americans now believe that the Nation is facing a transportation capacity crisis. Our infrastructure desperately needs attention. There are 17 bridges in my district alone that are currently in critical condition. Yet in spite of this, we stand poised to shortchange the American people with another short-term highway extension.

If you poll any local, State, or transportation industry representatives, they will tell you that the transportation needs of this country will only be met by passing a fully funded 6-year bill, \$376 billion, but no less than \$319

billion. We did not pull these numbers out of the air. They are numbers from the administration's own Department of Transportation's research and assessment. Our leaders in this committee traveled this country looking at conditions to verify what we have been told by the administration.

It is ironic that the current argument is over funding levels. Yet the longer we delay in enacting a fully funded transportation bill, the costs associated with addressing our Nation's infrastructure will continue to rise. So just neglecting going through and doing what is right, we are going to cause ourselves to spend more money.

If the Republican administration can find time to place such a great emphasis on the reconstruction of other countries, surely priority should be given to our Nation's crumbling infrastructure and bringing the needed jobs. Our constituents are counting on us to do the right thing and we really should not let them down. We have cars collapsing on bridges. The highways are so bad until accidents are being caused. It is time for us to stand up and pass this bill and do something for our Nation and bring about good jobs.

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

First of all, I want to once again say that I appreciate the kind words the gentleman from Minnesota had to say about me. I would like to say that I learned a great deal from him over the course of my time here in the House of Representatives. Oftentimes I refer to him as Mr. Transportation, and I sincerely mean that. He probably knows more about transportation than anyone I have met in the 22 years I have been in the House of Representatives and he has certainly been enormously helpful to me in my career here. I also want to thank Chairman YOUNG and Chairman PETRI for including me as much as they have in the deliberations on this bill, through the subcommittee, the full committee, the House floor, and in the conference committee. I have really felt like a partner in this legislation. If I had been in the majority, I do not think that I could have been treated any better than I was by Chairman YOUNG and Chairman PETRI, and I sincerely appreciate that.

It has been very enjoyable working on this bill. I have been very pleased, as I say, with the participation that we have been given by the majority. There has been a lot of talk here today about this bill not becoming law and us not getting out of conference. I simply want to say, and I will preface this for the benefit of the few people who do not know, the Speaker of the House and I have a very good relationship and we have had for a long time. So I say that because I want to say that no one has worked harder to get this bill passed into law than DENNY HASTERT. I know that Chairman YOUNG has had many, many meetings with him.

□ 1145

I know that the Speaker has gone to the White House on countless occasions. I know he has talked to the Senators, the Senate conference committee members. I know that the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG); the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), ranking member; the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) have worked very hard on this bill. But I do not think they worked any harder on getting this bill passed than the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) has, and I want to make sure everyone understands that in this body. Yes, we have problems. Yes, the Republicans control the White House, the Senate, and the House. But as I know from Illinois, where the Democrats control the governorship, the Senate, and the House, sometimes when one party controls everything, they do not quite get along as well as they would have if they were in the minority. So I appreciate that. I understand that.

I would also like to say in conclusion that there have been people who have helped our staff and helped the Democratic side considerably. That is, people from the House Legislative Counsel, Dave, Curt, and Rosemary; from DOT, Megan, Brigham, Jim, Gary; from NHTSA, Scott, Brian, Marlene; from FTA, William, Kris, Rita; from FHWA, Ross, Sue, Carolyn, and Susan. And certainly, David and Ward on our staff here have put an awful lot of work into this bill.

I am still hopeful that when we get back from our recess during the course of the election period of time that we will be able to pass this bill so that I will still be here in the House of Representatives when this bill becomes law. I am for the extension. Let us move on it. Let us get back to work trying to be bring this bill to conference.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, this is a time that is always difficult for someone who has served with something for so long, but I will tell the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) we are going to miss him. We are going to probably see him. But as Members leave this body that have contributed to not only their districts but the Nation, it is a loss. We know that. I know he knows that. But I also respect his desire to go and do bigger and greater things. But I look forward to seeing him back on the Hill during this period of time in the near future so that we can communicate and work together on a cause that he has great feeling for, and that is transportation. And he can be assured that I will always be there to hear his wisdom, and he can be sure that I and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) are going to accomplish the goals along with our subcommittee

chairman on this transportation bill, I hope in the near future. If we cannot, it will be, not in the far future, but in the close future. So, again, I wish him God-speed and be well on his travels. We will miss him.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Surface Transportation Extension Act, which extends funding for vital highway and transit programs for eight months, through May 31, 2005. I want to thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for working to pass an extension that is fair and equitable. They have had to deal with the truly difficult task of coming to agreement on a multi-year transportation agreement and I commend them on the job they have done so far.

I am pleased to hear that this current extension has been made much more fair and equitable to all states through the use of current gas tax contribution data instead of the proposed use of outdated data. The use of outdated data would have meant that a number of states led by Texas would not have received the proper amount of funding due to them. This extension is now in line with the funding formula structure of the Federal-Aid Highway program as stipulated by TEA 21's Minimum Guarantee program that provides all states at least a 90.5 percent rate of return from each state's federal gas tax contributions through the core highway formula programs and High Priority Projects.

Had the outdated gas tax contribution data been used Texas would have stood to lose \$115.8 million in contract authority. Clearly, this simple issue of using current data could have been devastating to transportation projects in the state of Texas and would have been inequitable considering Texas's increased contribution to the federal Highway Trust Fund. Again, I commend Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for having the foresight to correct this inequity and ensure that states that contribute to the federal Highway Trust Fund are given a proper rate of return.

This extension provides an advance of \$21.3 billion in contract authority for federal-aid highway programs for the eight-month period. It also sets an obligation limit of $\frac{8}{12}$ of the obligation limit in the FY 2005 Transportation-Treasury appropriations measure, which should provide about \$24.5 billion over the eight-month period. This money is necessary as we continue vital highway construction projects that will benefit the American people.

This extension also suspends the Harry Byrd Rule, which prevents highway spending from exceeding gas-tax revenues. This year, the estimated receipts for the trust fund fell, which may have triggered a reduction in the apportionments to the states. By suspending the Harry Byrd Rule, the extension prevents states from receiving reduced allocations at a time when most states are in dire need of additional transportation funding.

As a body we must insist on a proper agreement for a long term transportation agreement because it is of such vital interest to our Nation. Investments in our Nation's surface transportation infrastructure create millions of family-wage jobs and billions of dollars of economic activity. Each \$1 billion of Federal funds creates 47,500 jobs and \$6.1 billion in economic activity. In addition, this investment in transportation infrastructure will increase

business productivity by reducing the costs of producing goods in virtually all industrial sectors of the economy. Increased productivity results in increased demand for labor, capital, and raw materials and generally leads to lower product prices and increased sales.

Because so much is literally riding on a transportation agreement for the 21st Century we must insist on a balanced surface transportation program that serves the mobility needs of our country in a manner consistent with key Democratic principles, including: economic growth, intermodalism, security, safety, continuity, equal opportunity, protecting our human and natural environment, rebuilding our transit and highway systems, encouraging alternative transportation, encouraging smart growth, encouraging advanced technology solutions, and protecting the rights of workers in transportation industries. While I am satisfied with this current extension I look forward to the day when we can pass a comprehensive and equitable transportation agreement that serves the 21st Century transportation needs of the American people.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 811, the bill is considered read for the amendment, and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5183 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly with an amendment increasing each number in the bill by 12.8485 percent.

Mr. DEFAZIO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes in support to his motion.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward motion within the parliamentary constraints of the House. Some might say, because we would ask the bill to be sent back promptly, that we are dooming it to death.

We have been waiting 11 months for a highway bill, 11 months since the last one expired. Give us 2 hours, and we will give them a lot more investment

and a lot more jobs. We can deliver this bill back within 2 hours. The House could pass a bill at the Senate levels this evening.

All across America that would make a big difference. Across the entire country, that would mean that we would have, if we adopted that level ultimately for 6 years, an increase of \$37 billion in spending. That is 1.7 million jobs; 1.7 million jobs could be created. We could begin to deal with the 161,000 bridges in this country that are structurally deficient, one in four. My own little State has a \$4.7 billion bridge problem.

We are trying to do our own part, as the chairman asked. We have raised registration and other fees. But we need a little bit of help because this is Interstate 5, the federal highway that goes between Canada, Mexico and includes Oregon, Washington, and California. There is some federal obligation, I believe, to help maintain that highway.

This has been a maddening process for those of us who care about transportation, who care about our failing bridges and the potholes and our congestion and the lack of new starts and mass transit, all those things. If we had our way, we would have significantly more investment, according to a unanimous vote of the committee on which I serve, bipartisan. We voted for the number which has been outlined by the President's own Department of Transportation, \$375 billion over 6 years. And even that would not take care of all the problems, but it would sure be a lot more to address them. But the President has taken a hard line at \$259 billion, far below the number passed by the House, way below the number passed by the Senate, and about one-third below the number recommended by his own experts. This is inexplicable. This is investment. This is paid for out of gas taxes, which each and every American pays every time they tank up their car. We owe them an obligation to make this investment, not to stick with the levels of that are now 6 years out of date under the old legislation but to look at something that will spend more, begin to deal more with the backlog, put more people to work. We could help the President deliver on his own promise. This would create 1.7 million jobs. The President could sign a bill which we could have back and have ready for consideration by five o'clock tonight. He could sign it tomorrow in the Rose Garden, and he could refute the claims of his opponent that he had lost 1.7 million jobs because he would just have signed a bill to create 1.7 million jobs.

For the life of me, I do not understand the reluctance at the White House to invest the people's tax dollars paid for every time they tank up their car in investment in the people's infrastructure, the infrastructure that will benefit not only individuals but businesses all across America who depend upon just-in-time delivery. Just-in-

time delivery is pretty hard when they have got to detour a truck over the Cascade Mountains in Oregon, down the far side and then back down again to I-5 because of failed bridges. And that is unique. That kind of thing takes place all across America. Trucks are detouring hundreds of miles out of their way, wasting fuel, wasting time, making us less efficient because the Federal Government says we do not have the money to catch up with this backlog on bridges.

Well, we do have the money. We are taxing the people. We should adopt a more robust level. We should deal with some of the problems and the disparities among the States, the whole issue that States give a whole bunch more in than they get back. But we cannot do that unless we have higher levels of funding. It is impossible.

And that is what this amendment does, very simply. It would bring the bill back later this evening, spending at the levels of the Senate bill, which would put over 6 years, if finally adopted, 1.7 million people to work, 20,000 people in my State, and begin to defray that backlog.

I would hope that we will pass this motion unanimously and make the investment that we need. And I think the President will sign it. I doubt very much he will see fit to veto the bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I would hope that we not pass this motion immediately. I understand the point that is being made, and it is perfectly reasonable. But the fact is that we are currently operating under a continuing resolution. It expires at midnight tonight, and if we do not get this measure through the Senate and to the President, who is down in Florida on other business, before that time, some of the money that would otherwise be spent on transportation, some of the jobs that would otherwise exist in the transportation sector will be lost.

And the motion is very short. It simply changes the numbers in the bill by 12 and a fraction percent. But, in fact, trying to figure out how that would work in practice and the consequences of it, it would be anything but short. This would endanger the ability to continue our transportation programs.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETRI. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

My staff says that they can do the computer runs and have the numbers within 2 hours, which would give us ample time to get the bill faxed before the President for signature before midnight tonight.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am not talking about the

mechanics of running the numbers. I am talking about the mechanics of operating the political machinery in order to get something that, in fact, would be passed by the Senate and signed by the President.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

I know my good friend from Oregon is a good soldier, and I understand what he is trying to do, but I hope no one takes it too seriously because this would kill this legislation that we have today for an extension of our highway program which would cost us about 150,000 immediate jobs, disrupt all State programs, all projects in districts and, in fact, create chaos. And there is a time problem because the reality is that this has to be signed by the President tonight or it does come to a halt. And so what we have to do now is pass this legislation, vote against this motion to recommit, pass this legislation and send it over to the Senate. And I am not speaking too broadly about the Senate because we do not control it, and I know I am not supposed to mention it. But the other body must also act. And then it has to get on an airplane and be flown to Florida because there is the big debate tonight. And he has to sign it. I am sure it is not a big deal with the President, but it is necessary for highway projects.

And just tongue in cheek, to the gentleman from Oregon, the way his motion to recommit is that each number in the bill would have to be raised 12.84, 12.85 percent, and that means that H.R. 5183 would no longer be H.R. 5183, it would be, I guess, 52.6 or something, and all the numbers in the bill, instead of section 22, it would have to be section 22.8 and on down the line.

I understand the reasoning why, but I do urge my colleagues to think very seriously about it. Let us keep the course. Vote against the motion to recommit and then pass this legislation so we can continue our transportation needs in this country, not to the degree we want but what is necessary at this time.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 5183, if ordered; the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 5149; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 4231.

Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loftgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
 McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Mussgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)

Pryce (OH)	Sensenbrenner	Thornberry
Putnam	Serrano	Tiahrt
Quinn	Sessions	Tiberi
Radanovich	Shadegg	Tierney
Rahall	Shaw	Towns
Ramstad	Shays	Turner (OH)
Rangel	Sherman	Turner (TX)
Regula	Sherwood	Udall (CO)
Rehberg	Shimkus	Udall (NM)
Renzi	Shuster	Upton
Reyes	Simmons	Van Hollen
Reynolds	Simpson	Velázquez
Rodriguez	Skelton	Visclosky
Rogers (AL)	Slaughter	Vitter
Rogers (KY)	Smith (MI)	Walden (OR)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Walsh
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Wamp
Ross	Smith (WA)	Waters
Rothman	Snyder	Watson
Roybal-Allard	Solis	Watt
Royce	Souder	Waxman
Ruppersberger	Spratt	Weiner
Rush	Stark	Weldon (FL)
Ryan (OH)	Stenholm	Weldon (PA)
Ryan (WI)	Strickland	Weller
Ryun (KS)	Stupak	Wexler
Sabo	Sullivan	Whitfield
Sánchez, Linda	Sweeney	Wicker
T.	Tancred	Wilson (NM)
Sanchez, Loretta	Tanner	Wilson (SC)
Sanders	Tauscher	Wolf
Sandlin	Taylor (MS)	Woolsey
Schakowsky	Taylor (NC)	Wu
Schiff	Terry	Wynn
Schrock	Thomas	Young (AK)
Scott (GA)	Thompson (CA)	Young (FL)
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	

NOES—8

Flake	Jones (NC)	Stearns
Franks (AZ)	Oxley	Toomey
Hensarling	Paul	

NOT VOTING—15

Boehlert	Diaz-Balart, M.	Meeks (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Harman	Nethercutt
Cannon	Harris	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)	Saxton
Diaz-Balart, L.	Meek (FL)	Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1230

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5183.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will resume. There was no objection.

WELFARE REFORM EXTENSION ACT, PART VIII

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5149.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5149, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 482]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Cummings	Hoekstra
Ackerman	Cunningham	Holden
Aderholt	Davis (AL)	Holt
Akin	Davis (CA)	Honda
Alexander	Davis (FL)	Hooley (OR)
Allen	Davis (TN)	Hostettler
Andrews	Davis, Jo Ann	Houghton
Baca	Davis, Tom	Hoyer
Bachus	Deal (GA)	Hulshof
Baird	DeFazio	Hunter
Baker	DeGette	Hyde
Baldwin	Delahunt	Inslee
Ballenger	DeLauro	Isakson
Barrett (SC)	DeLay	Israel
Bartlett (MD)	DeMint	Issa
Barton (TX)	Deutsch	Istook
Bass	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Beauprez	Dingell	Jackson-Lee
Becerra	Doggett	(TX)
Bell	Dooley (CA)	Jefferson
Berkley	Doolittle	Jenkins
Berman	Doyle	John
Berry	Dreier	Johnson (CT)
Biggert	Duncan	Johnson (IL)
Bilirakis	Dunn	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (NY)	Ehlers	Jones (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Emanuel	Jones (OH)
Blackburn	Emerson	Kanjorski
Blumenauer	Engel	Kaptur
Blunt	English	Keller
Boehner	Eshoo	Kelly
Bonilla	Etheridge	Kennedy (MN)
Bonner	Evans	Kennedy (RI)
Bono	Everett	Kildee
Boozman	Farr	Kilpatrick
Boswell	Fattah	Kind
Boucher	Feeney	King (IA)
Boyd	Ferguson	King (NY)
Bradley (NH)	Filner	Kingston
Brady (PA)	Flake	Kirk
Brown (OH)	Foley	Kleczka
Brown (SC)	Forbes	Kline
Brown-Waite,	Ford	Knollenberg
Ginny	Fossella	Kolbe
Burgess	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Burns	Franks (AZ)	LaHood
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Burton (IN)	Frost	Langevin
Butterfield	Gallegly	Lantos
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	Larsen (WA)
Calvert	Gerlach	Larson (CT)
Camp	Gibbons	Latham
Cantor	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Capito	Gillmor	Leach
Capps	Gingrey	Lee
Capuano	Gonzalez	Levin
Cardin	Goode	Lewis (CA)
Cardoza	Goodlatte	Lewis (GA)
Carson (IN)	Gordon	Lewis (KY)
Carson (OK)	Granger	Linder
Carter	Graves	Lipinski
Case	Green (TX)	LoBiondo
Castle	Green (WI)	Lofgren
Chabot	Greenwood	Lowey
Chandler	Grijalva	Lucas (KY)
Chocola	Gutierrez	Lucas (OK)
Clay	Gutknecht	Lynch
Clyburn	Hall	Majette
Coble	Hart	Maloney
Cole	Hastings (WA)	Manzullo
Collins	Hayes	Markey
Conyers	Hayworth	Marshall
Cooper	Hefley	Matheson
Costello	Hensarling	Matsui
Cox	Herger	McCarthy (MO)
Cramer	Herseth	McCarthy (NY)
Crane	Hill	McCollum
Crenshaw	Hinchey	McCotter
Crowley	Hinojosa	McCrery
Cubin	Hobson	McDermott
Culberson	Hoefel	McGovern

McHugh	Porter	Smith (WA)
McInnis	Portman	Snyder
McIntyre	Price (NC)	Solis
McKeon	Pryce (OH)	Souder
McNulty	Putnam	Spratt
Meehan	Quinn	Stark
Menendez	Radanovich	Stearns
Mica	Rahall	Stenholm
Michaud	Ramstad	Strickland
Millender-	Rangel	Stupak
McDonald	Regula	Sullivan
Miller (FL)	Rehberg	Sweeney
Miller (MI)	Renzi	Tancred
Miller (NC)	Reyes	Tanner
Miller, Gary	Reynolds	Tauscher
Miller, George	Rodriguez	Taylor (MS)
Mollohan	Rogers (AL)	Taylor (NC)
Moore	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Moran (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Thomas
Moran (VA)	Rohrabacher	Thompson (CA)
Murphy	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Murtha	Rothman	Thornberry
Musgrave	Roybal-Allard	Tiahrt
Myrick	Royce	Tiberi
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Tierney
Napolitano	Rush	Toomey
Neal (MA)	Ryan (OH)	Towns
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Turner (OH)
Ney	Ryun (KS)	Turner (TX)
Northup	Sabo	Udall (CO)
Norwood	Sánchez, Linda	Udall (NM)
Nunes	T.	Upton
Nussle	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen
Oberstar	Sanders	Velázquez
Obey	Sandlin	Visclosky
Olver	Saxton	Vitter
Ortiz	Schakowsky	Walden (OR)
Osborne	Schiff	Walsh
Ose	Schrock	Wamp
Otter	Scott (GA)	Waters
Owens	Scott (VA)	Watson
Oxley	Sensenbrenner	Watt
Pallone	Serrano	Waxman
Pascarell	Sessions	Weiner
Pastor	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Paul	Shaw	Weldon (PA)
Payne	Shays	Weller
Pearce	Sherman	Wexler
Pelosi	Sherwood	Whitfield
Pence	Shimkus	Wicker
Peterson (MN)	Shuster	Wilson (NM)
Peterson (PA)	Simmons	Wilson (SC)
Petri	Simpson	Wolf
Pickering	Skelton	Woolsey
Pitts	Slaughter	Wu
Platts	Smith (MI)	Wynn
Pombo	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Pomeroy	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Boehlert	Diaz-Balart, M.	Meeks (NY)
Brady (TX)	Gephardt	Nethercutt
Brown, Corrine	Harman	Ros-Lehtinen
Cannon	Harris	Tauzin
Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)	
Diaz-Balart, L.	Meek (FL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1239

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS NURSE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT OF 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4231, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by