

retakes control of Afghanistan, they will again turn that country into a safe haven for expanded al Qaeda operations. It would also lead to the return of an extreme Taliban regime that encourages horrendous acts like pouring gasoline into the eyes of girls who attempt to go to school.

Second, the immediate withdrawal of U.S. and NATO forces would weaken Pakistan's resolve to confront the Pakistani Taliban, the Afghan Taliban, and al Qaeda. The most promising development over the last year has been the Government of Pakistan's willingness to fight the growing menace of the Pakistani Taliban. In addition, very recently, the Pakistani government has also shown a willingness to confront elements of the Afghan Taliban. The capture of Mullah Bandar, the operational chief of the Afghan Taliban, and two Afghan Taliban shadow governors, demonstrates this progress. The withdrawal of U.S. forces from Afghanistan would sabotage those nascent efforts. Why should the Pakistani forces confront the Afghan Taliban if the U.S. walks away now?

There are no guarantees of success in Afghanistan and Pakistan. But, we do know that failure to confront al Qaeda would leave Americans constantly exposed to another attack like that perpetrated on September 11, 2001.

Madam Speaker, I support adoption of the FY10 Supplemental Appropriations bill.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4899, the Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2010. Overall, this legislation provides necessary war funding and essential support for our Nation's military—without arbitrary benchmarks or timetables that would tie the hands of our military commanders—and much needed assistance for several other emergency needs.

For the men and women in uniform fighting in the defense of freedom, this troop funding bill is long overdue. Although the President had requested emergency funding in February, House Democrats have finally brought a clean version of the Supplemental Appropriations bill after multiple and convoluted attempts to attach expensive and controversial items on the legislation.

Approving this clean supplemental quickly and getting it to our military leaders is a top priority. Inaction would force our commanders to begin making compromising budget decisions that could negatively affect our military readiness. It would also signal to our enemies a lack of resolve that could undermine our mission in several very dangerous areas of the world.

In addition to providing our troops with this necessary funding, the bill also contains \$162 million to support the victims of the Gulf oil spill. Although I own stock in Transocean, I did not place the funding for the oil spill in the legislation and do not consider it a conflict of interest to vote for this bill. All in all, this funding represents less than .3 percent of the entire funding contained in the bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, as a nation, we face challenges ranging from education shortfalls and growing energy needs to a slowly recovering job market. We cannot afford to escalate the Afghan war with a credit card. The mounting loss of life and widespread corruption gives no indication that more money and more boots on the ground will achieve success in Afghanistan.

We need success at home. The elements in the bill for veterans exposed to Agent Orange and for FEMA are a start. I cannot support a bill that spends \$37 billion in Afghanistan while denying \$10 billion for teacher jobs, \$1 billion for summer youth employment, \$5 billion for Pell grants, and \$701 million for border security. My votes signal in the strongest possible terms that this war must be wound down and not escalated.

Across Oregon, our priorities are helping small businesses, creating jobs, and supporting our schools.

We need to start making the right choices. This means drawing down from a costly war that Americans and Afghans want to end, and investing in a better, more productive future for our country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that the House suspend the rules, recede from the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 4899, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1120

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EARMARK RESCISSION, SAVINGS, AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5730) to rescind earmarks for certain surface transportation projects.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5730

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 Earmark Rescission, Savings, and Accountability Act".

SEC. 2. RESCISSION OF ALLOCATED PROJECT FUNDS.

(a) ISTEAA AND STURAA.—The unobligated balances available on December 31, 2010, under sections 1103(b), 1104(b), 1105(f), 1106(a), 1106(b), 1107(b), and 1108(b) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240) and subsections (c) and (d) of section 149 of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-17) are rescinded.

(b) TEA 21.—The unobligated balance available on September 30, 2011, under section 1602 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105-178) for each project for which less than 10 percent of the amount authorized for such project

under such section has been obligated is rescinded.

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAY SYSTEM CORRIDOR DESIGNATION.

Section 1117(d) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 161) is repealed and the designation made by that section shall no longer be effective.

SEC. 4. RESCISSION OF UNDESIGNATED HIGH PRIORITY PROJECT FUNDS.

Of the amounts authorized for fiscal years 2005 through 2009 in section 1101(a)(16) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109-59) to carry out the high priority projects program under section 117 of title 23, United States Code, that are not allocated for projects described in section 1702 of such Act, \$8,190,355 are rescinded.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than October 31, 2011, and not later than October 31 of each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report identifying each project authorized under section 1602 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105-178), sections 1301, 1302, 1702, and 1934 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109-59), and section 144(f) of title 23, United States Code, that has inactive funds or that has been completed in the previous fiscal year. Such report shall include, for each such project—

(1) the amount of funds authorized under such section;

(2) the unobligated balance of such funds; and

(3) a reference to the public law, section number, and project number under which such project was authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 5730, the Surface Transportation Earmark Rescission, Savings, and Accountability Act. The bill will eliminate a total of \$713 million in contract authority for 309 old transportation earmarks. In short, this bill will prevent our deficit from rising by another \$713 million.

In today's fiscal climate, we must be judicious in our spending. And my legislation follows the commonsense principle of use it or lose it.

Before I came to Congress, I owned several small businesses. One of my businesses was a small coffee and ice cream shop called Huckleberry's. With a shop that sells food, the use it or lose it principle is intrinsic. We would not buy more perishable foods than we would sell; otherwise, we were at a loss.

Every small business owner knows that when you are working on a tight budget, you cannot afford wasteful spending. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what these earmarks are. By targeting these earmarks, my legislation will deliver real savings.

H.R. 5730 is one step towards the ultimate goal of reducing our Nation's deficit. By rescinding unused earmark funds from over 20 years ago, we will be improving the way in which Federal funds are managed while proving our commitment to fiscal discipline.

In today's economy, it is essential that we manage taxpayer dollars well, especially with respect to transportation funding. We will never be able to adequately address the investment gap in transportation infrastructure if we do not curb unnecessary spending.

To promote responsible future funding, my bill also requires the Secretary of Transportation to submit an annual report that identifies each project authorized under TEA-21 in SAFTEA-LU that contains inactive funding or that has completed in the previous year. This provision will give Congress greater oversight, and with the identification of such projects, we may be able to implement more cost-saving measures in the future.

Mr. Speaker, many of these earmarks have been on the books since 1987, and it's high time we tell the States to use it or lose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, H.R. 5730. It rescinds \$713.2 million in contract authority for 309 projects from four prior Surface Transportation Authorization Acts. This rescission of contract authority will come from the following authorization bills: \$4.5 million for projects designated in the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987; \$263.5 million for projects designated in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991; \$441.4 million designated for projects in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century; and \$8.1 million authorized by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act, SAFETEA.

In total, H.R. 5730 rescinds approximately \$713 million in contract authority, which is a type of budget authority. However, this bill, like the bill sponsored by Mr. PERRIELLO last week, unfortunately will not have any impact on outlays or direct spending. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the budget deficit is defined as the amount by which the Federal Government's outlays exceed its total revenues. Because H.R. 5730 will not reduce the Federal Government's outlays, this bill, unfortunately, will not reduce the budget deficit. However, I believe it is smart for Congress to look at the projects it has funded in the past and take the projects that are no longer going to move forward off the books.

While I certainly applaud the gentleman from Colorado for this legislation, we need to go much further. Congress needs to do much more to reduce our ballooning national debt and the current budget deficit.

Last week the Office of Management and Budget projected that this year's

budget deficit will be \$1.5 trillion. If I told somebody 10 years ago or even 5 years ago that we would be facing a \$1.5 trillion deficit in 1 year's time, they wouldn't have believed it. By the end of the year, the Federal debt will represent 62 percent of our Nation's economy. Congress needs to step up and take immediate action to ensure our children and grandchildren are not buried under a mountain of debt.

I've also been asked by Ranking Member MICA to point out that none of the five Transportation and Infrastructure Committee bills being considered on the floor today were sponsored by members of the minority. Traditionally, 30 percent of the bills considered under suspension of the rules have been sponsored by members of the minority. However, of the 43 T&I committee suspension bills that have been considered this session, only four have been sponsored by members of the minority, and we certainly encourage the committee to try to work to improve this percentage back to its traditional 30 percent.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5730.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, while I support the overall intent of H.R. 5730, it appears that this bill also moves a political agenda, and, therefore, I rise in opposition.

Section 3 of the bill includes a repeal of Corridor 0-1 on the Appalachian Highway system located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District—my district. While H.R. 5730 aims to rescind unspent funds, there are simply no authorized funds associated with the 0-1 Corridor.

I have come to this floor on several occasions to speak in favor of deficit reduction. Section 3 of this bill does nothing to lessen the deficit.

Last month we lost a champion of the Appalachian Regional Commission, Senator Byrd. Senator Byrd was instrumental in capping the available miles in the Appalachian system. Section 3 is a feeble attempt to skirt that cap in hopes of moving this project to another district in the future.

Federal law provides metropolitan planning organizations with a role in the coordination of transportation improvements. I've received letters of op-

position from planning organizations, and I quote: "The ARC has indicated that completion of the system is a top priority."

Investment in the 0-1 Corridor has already occurred. In 2004, preliminary engineering was done. In 2006 and 2010, the project was added to the long-range plan. The planning organization actions indicate that it will advance the project when sufficient funds are available, and the current legislation enhances that possibility.

This scramble is nothing more than a political payout and a key sign of what is wrong in Washington. Repealing the Corridor 0-1 designation would impede critical safety improvements and puts the future of infrastructure development of Centre and Clearfield Counties in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposition of this flawed measure.

NORTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA REGIONAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,

Ridgway, PA, July 15, 2010.

Senator ROBERT CASEY,

U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CASEY: On July 1, 2010, the House passed H.R. 4899, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2010, which included Obey Amendment #2, a repeal of the Appalachian Development Highway Systems (ADHS) designation of Corridor 0-1 (Section 4172). The 0-1 Corridor was designated in TEA-21 (Section 1117(d)) and has been in place for the past 12 years. The mileage of the ADHS is legislatively capped and the inclusion of Section 4172 is an inappropriate attempt at removing mileage from one congressional district in hopes that the Appalachian Regional Commission will then vote to move the miles to another project.

In 1965 Congress authorized the construction of the ADHS and by the end of FY 2009, 2,694.6 miles of the 3090 mile system were completed or under construction. The ARC has indicated that completion of the ADHS remains a top priority. Given numerous safety issues identified along the 0-1 corridor, we believe it is imperative that you ensure the commitments made in TEA-21 are preserved and Section 4172 of H.R. 4899, as passed by the House, is not included in the final supplemental appropriations package.

It is widely known that ADHS projects would take years to complete and given the economic climate and strains on the Commonwealth's transportation budget, the residents along the 0-1 Corridor should not be put at a disadvantage for the gain of another region. This is an important and vital link in our overall transportation system in North Central Pennsylvania and we ask for your continued support. We appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

ERIC M. BRIDGES,
Executive Director.

CENTRE COUNTY METROPOLITAN
PLANNING ORGANIZATION (CCMPO),
State College, PA, July 21, 2010.

Re H.R. 4899, Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2010—Section 4172.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate, Hart Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: On July 1, 2010, the CCMPO was informed that the U.S.

House of Representatives recently approved H.R. 4899, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2010, which included an amendment repealing the Appalachian Development Highway System (ADHS) designation for Corridor O-1 in Centre and Clearfield Counties. Corridor O-1 was originally designated as part of the ADHS in June 1998, in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21).

Improvements in Corridor O-1 will address safety issues on existing roads connecting Interstate 99 and Interstate 80, and will facilitate economic development activities in the Moshannon Valley and central Pennsylvania. Preliminary engineering work on Corridor O-1 began in 1999 and proceeded in a timely manner until March 2004, when work was suspended on over 20 major highway projects in the Commonwealth because of funding constraints. At that time, a recommended preferred alternative had been identified, and the project was nearing environmental clearance.

In 2006, the CCMPO included Corridor O-1 as a high-priority "Project for Future Consideration" in its adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2030. On March 23, 2010, the CCMPO again designated Corridor O-1 as a "Project for Future Consideration" in its new LRTP 2040, which is scheduled for adoption in September 2010. The CCMPO's actions indicate that it intends to advance the project when sufficient funding is available, and the current ADHS designation enhances the possibility of funding being committed.

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) has indicated that completion of the ADHS is a top priority. Considerable investment has already been made in the ADHS system in Centre County, with only the I-99/I-80 Interchanges and the Corridor O-1 project yet to be finished. Pursuing these improvements in safety and the resulting economic development will fulfill the initial intention of the ADHS. We urge you to take action to ensure that the repeal of Corridor O-1's designation in Section 4172 of H.R. 4899 is not included in the final legislation, which will preserve the original commitment in TEA-21.

In late 2008, similar efforts were made to transfer the ADHS designation and associated system mileage from Corridor O-1 to another project in the Commonwealth. Although the CCMPO was aware of the 2008 efforts, we were not informed of the most recent action, which affects a key project within our jurisdiction. Federal law provides Metropolitan Planning Organizations with a role in the coordination of transportation improvements and the expenditure of federal funding for such improvements. A proposed action of this importance warrants early notification to the affected area, and the opportunity for discussion by the state and local officials represented on the CCMPO.

We also note that media reports about the passage of H.R. 4899 characterizing Corridor O-1 as a "stagnant" corridor are misleading. This project, like several other major highway projects across the Commonwealth, is only awaiting a commitment of funds in order to advance.

On behalf of the members of the CCMPO Coordinating Committee, we appreciate your past support for transportation projects of all modes in Centre County, and request your support in ensuring that Section 4172 of H.R. 4899 is not included in the final Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2010. We look forward to your response about this important issue.

If you have any questions or need additional information about this project, please

contact Thomas P. Zilla of the CCMPO staff at tzilla@ccmog.net.

Sincerely,

DANIEL D. KLEES,
Chair, CCMPO Coordinating Committee.

□ 1130

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I thank the gentlelady for sponsoring this legislation. I rise in support of it. As was mentioned, I am a cosponsor.

This would rescind contract authority for old transportation earmarks. I think we all recognize there are a lot of earmarks that go through this place that are never funded, and that's usually a good thing because often they are quite wasteful.

This bill also shines a spotlight on wasteful transportation earmarks in a number of bills, and it rescinds more than \$8 million in contract authority for SAFETEA-LU which we passed just a few years ago. Many of us will remember, SAFETEA-LU contained more than 6,000 earmarks, including the infamous earmark for the Bridge to Nowhere, but it also included bike paths, museums, hiking trails, visitor centers, streetscapes, and parking facilities worth more than \$700 million alone.

I would urge those who are looking to bolster their fiscal credentials by voting for this legislation to rescind contract authority for old earmarks to remember that in 2 days we'll be considering the T-HUD transportation bill, which contains about 500 new earmarks worth more than \$300 million, and if we are going back and saying, yes, earmarks are wasteful, we ought to recognize that in the same week we're doing this we're also considering a new appropriation bill with about 500 earmarks worth about \$300 million.

I will be offering a series of amendments, and if I'm allowed I'll offer that, if the majority allows me to do it, to strike some of these earmarks, and I hope that the same people who vote for this legislation will also vote to strike certain wasteful earmarks from that legislation as well.

We simply can't say all right we're for fiscal responsibility when we're rescinding old earmarks that haven't been spent or earmarked moneys and then a couple of days later approve a bill that has more than 500 earmarks worth about \$300 million that will take effect now.

So, anyway, I commend the gentlelady for bringing this to the floor. I urge my colleagues to vote for it. This is a good piece of legislation. Let's also remember when we're approving new earmarks we ought to have the same fiscal discipline.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I support this legislation. It is a small step for fiscal conservatism. I think it is very unfortunate, though,

that this debate comes right on the heels of the debate about the war supplemental, a more than \$55 billion bill on top of the hundreds of billions we've already spent for the war in Afghanistan.

A columnist in today's Washington's Post said, We are wading deeper into a long running, morally ambiguous conflict that has virtually no chance of ending well.

I think it's very sad that we're talking about spending mega-billions more on a war that has continued for over 9 years at this point and is not worth one more American life.

But I commend the gentlewoman from Colorado for bringing this legislation to the floor. As I said earlier, it's unfortunate that in the way we do the Federal accounting this will not reduce the deficit, but it is a step in the right direction, and we need to go further and actually cut total Federal spending by the \$713 million that procedurally we are saving here in this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Taxpayers For Common Sense Action that was written to Mr. OBERSTAR, chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

TAXPAYERS FOR COMMON SENSE,
July 27, 2010.

CHAIRMAN JAMES OBERSTAR,
House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OBERSTAR: Taxpayers for Common Sense, a non-partisan budget watchdog, strongly supports a small but important step to reduce the nation's yawning budget deficit: the inclusion of a provision in the Federal Aviation Administration authorization legislation that would rescind transportation earmarks that remain unobligated ten or more years after their authorization.

The Senate has already adopted an amendment to its version of the bill, introduced by Sen. Russ Feingold (D-WI), which indicates that chamber's support for this idea. A bill introduced by Rep. Betsy Markey (D-CO) (H.R.5730—Surface Transportation Earmark Rescission, Savings, and Accountability Act), builds upon the Senate provision and saves even more taxpayer dollars. Rep. Markey's proposal identifies more than \$713 million worth of unused earmarks that can be rescinded, most of which are more than ten years old. There may be an opportunity to rescind additional earmarks from previous appropriations bills, which would be worth pursuing as well.

We urge you will take this opportunity to save taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars and wipe these liabilities off the books. If you would like to discuss this issue further please contact me or Erich Zimmermann.

Sincerely,

RYAN ALEXANDER,
President.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5730, the "Surface Transportation Earmark Rescission, Savings, and Accountability Act," introduced by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. MARKEY).

The gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. MARKEY) has scoured the books of the Federal Highway Administration to identify funds that can be rescinded. This bill rescinds \$713.2

million of Federal-aid highway contract authority that is currently available for 309 Member-designated projects included in four prior surface transportation authorization bills. It takes this \$713 million off the table so that it cannot be used to increase spending in the future. Any savings from this bill will be used to reduce the deficit.

Specifically, the bill:

Rescinds all remaining highway earmarks designated in the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987 (STURAA) (P.L. 100–17): \$4.55 million for 2 projects;

Rescinds all remaining highway earmarks designated in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) (P.L. 102–240): \$263.543 million for 154 projects;

Rescinds all highway projects designated in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21) (P.L. 105–178) that have not obligated at least 10 percent of the funds authorized for the project: \$441.475 million for 152 projects; and

Rescinds all High Priority Project program funds authorized by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) (P.L. 109–59) that were not designated for use on a specific project: \$8.190 million for 1 project.

In addition, the bill establishes a process for tracking unspent project funds going forward, enabling Congress to identify projects that have inactive funds or that have been completed in the previous year.

Member-designated projects play an important role in the Federal-aid highway program. They provide constituents with a chance to weigh in directly with their elected officials on their community priorities, and allow Members an opportunity to support transportation safety and mobility improvements that may be overlooked by the State Department of Transportation.

Yet, it is also necessary to use a common-sense approach to dealing with projects that are complete or no longer viable. Many of the funds rescinded under this bill are from projects that are complete, but have excess remaining funds that cannot be used now that the project is finished. There is no reason for these remaining funds to stay on the books.

Other projects affected are those that show no likelihood of going forward, due to changing community priorities or other transportation needs. Rescinding funds from projects that are no longer viable is a practical approach to saving taxpayers' dollars.

Rescinding this \$713 million now prevents it from being used to increase spending in the future.

It has, unfortunately, become somewhat routine for appropriations bills to rescind contract authority to offset other spending. Such rescissions are included in appropriations acts because they are useful in offsetting other spending. Even if a contract authority rescission is "scored" as only reducing budget authority, not outlays, a budget authority offset is often all that is needed to facilitate additional spending in an appropriations bill.

In fact, the Senate Appropriations Committee has proposed to use a portion of the funds rescinded in this bill to offset spending in its version of the FY 2011 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

To the extent that this bill takes \$713 million off the table and makes that amount unavail-

able for rescission, or use, by some future appropriations bill, it will indeed result in "real" savings.

The gentleman's bill is in line with the High Priority Project reform principles issued by the bipartisan leadership of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in April 2009, which established an unprecedented level of transparency, accountability, and reform for surface transportation projects going forward.

These principles called for the repeal of funds from older projects that have not spent out. The gentleman's bill is an effective and thoughtful means of achieving this policy objective and will save the government money by eliminating unnecessary project designations.

H.R. 5730 is one step in a continuing effort to find savings within programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Other steps are also being taken. Last week, the House passed H.R. 5604, the "Surface Transportation Savings Act of 2010", introduced by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO), which rescinds \$107 million in highway safety and transit contract authority.

I applaud the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. MARKEY) for her initiative in bringing this measure forward and her commitment to sound fiscal policy.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5730.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I made an error in how I voted on rollcall 471, passage of H.R. 5730, the Surface Transportation Earmark Rescission, Savings, and Accountability Act.

I intended to vote against this legislation and I would like to make the record clear as to why. For 50 years, my community in Buffalo and Western New York has long struggled with the vestiges of economic decline. The public has also been denied proper access to Buffalo's waterfront. This bill would rescind funding that would directly improve public access to the waterfront and support our community's economic revitalization. Providing public access to the waterfront has been my top goal throughout my career as a public servant.

While I understand the frustration with project funding that was long ago authorized, yet remains unspent, and the need to focus on deficit reduction, I will continue to insist that the agencies responsible for the deployment of these funds advance these initiatives without further delay. It is for this very reason that I opposed and intended to vote against this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. MARKEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5730.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONGRATULATING COAST GUARD ACADEMY ON 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 258) congratulating the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Superintendent of the Coast Guard Academy and its staff for 100 years of operation of the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 258

Whereas the School of Instruction to the U.S. Revenue Cutter Academy was established at Fort Trumbull in New London, Connecticut, in 1910, which later became known as the Coast Guard Academy after the consolidation of the Life Saving Service and the Revenue Cutter Service in 1915;

Whereas the Coast Guard Academy moved to its present location along the banks of the Thames River in 1932;

Whereas in 1946, the former German Navy training vessel HORST WESSEL was acquired by the United States for use by the Coast Guard and renamed EAGLE, which today travels around the world each year;

Whereas for 100 years, the Coast Guard Academy has called New London, Connecticut, home, where it has trained and shaped the leadership of the Coast Guard;

Whereas today, the Coast Guard Academy is a highly competitive educational institution that attracts driven, committed leaders who go on to serve our Nation in the many diverse roles played by our Coast Guard;

Whereas the rigorous academic program of the Coast Guard Academy provides a holistic education that includes academics, physical fitness, character, and leadership, and that trains cadets in the multiple roles of the Coast Guard's multimission responsibilities;

Whereas the Coast Guard Academy is an integral part of the southeastern Connecticut community and its cadets participate in many community service projects throughout the region, working with school systems and serving as mentors for children;

Whereas the Coast Guard Academy is a vital link to the maritime legacy of Connecticut and our Nation, and an important part of our Nation's defense; and

Whereas in 2010, in honor of its 100th year in New London, Connecticut, the Coast Guard Academy will open its gates to the public for events highlighting this milestone, including concerts, art exhibits, an open house, and other events to allow Americans to learn more about this unique educational institution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) congratulates the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Superintendent of the Coast Guard Academy and its staff for 100 years of operation of the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut;

(2) honors the many men and women who have graduated from the Coast Guard Academy and served on behalf of our Nation over the last 100 years; and

(3) encourages all Americans to learn more about the Coast Guard Academy, its mission, and its long history of training the men and women of the Coast Guard.