

ENERGY PRICES

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when President Obama was inaugurated in January 2009, the average nationwide price for a gallon of gasoline was \$1.84. The 2012 March nationwide average has been \$3.89 or higher, reflecting a 110 percent increase. Keep in mind that every penny increase in the price of gasoline costs the U.S. economy \$1 billion and American consumers \$4 million per day.

Now, last week, Secretary of Energy Steven Chu, while testifying in front of a House committee, was asked to grade his performance on American gasoline prices. He graded himself an "A"—an "A," America—when the price at the pump for American families has gone up over 110 percent.

I'm sorry, Secretary Chu, America doesn't grade on a curve. We give your performance and the performance of the administration's handling of energy in America the grade of "F."

FISCAL YEAR 2013 BUDGET

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, we all have our own ideas on how we should balance the budget, but missing in today's debate is a bipartisan approach to solve our Nation's fiscal problems. No one party has the answers. We can do this not through a Republican- nor a Democratic-proposed budget, unless we are willing to demonstrate bipartisanship.

That's why I'm opposing both the Republican and the Democratic proposals. These are not an answer to our Nation's fiscal problems. Instead, the Simpson-Bowles approach reflected in the Cooper-LaTourette substitute is the preferred approach that we need to follow.

Last night's votes and today's votes will once again demonstrate that the Congress is tone deaf. It's time to put our economy back on a path to fiscal sustainability and pass the Simpson-Bowles measure that last night fell far short. I suggest we cut \$4 trillion from the deficit over 10 years with spending cuts and tax reform to ensure solvency of entitlements such as Medicare and Social Security. It's time that we act in a bipartisan fashion.

OBAMACARE DESERVES AN "F" GRADE

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 2-year anniversary of the President's health care law's going into effect, and as a former teacher, I think it's important that we look at

and see how it makes the grade. I believe that if you compare it to the matrix of its failed promises that it deserves an "F."

They said that it would create jobs. It didn't. In fact, CBO says 800,000 people will lose their jobs because of it.

They said it would lower costs. It hasn't. Premiums have increased by over \$2,000 per individual.

They said that Americans would be able to keep their own plan and their own doctor. The administration's own estimates say that over 20 million Americans could lose employer-sponsored health care as a result of it.

Is it constitutional? I believe it's not. It's time to have grade A health insurance here in America, one that increases accessibility and affordability. That's what House Republicans are advancing, and that's what Americans deserve.

□ 0910

HAPPY 100TH ANNIVERSARY TO THE JUNIOR LEAGUE OF CHICAGO

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, for 100 years, women in the Chicago area have been improving the world around them through the Junior League of Chicago. This summer, the Junior League will mark its centennial anniversary, and I join the current and past volunteers of this wonderful organization in celebrating its many contributions. In fact, from 1976 to 1978, I served as president of the Junior League and am eternally grateful for the opportunity this great organization gave me to work with the Head Start program in Chicago. It was the beginning of many wonderful and fulfilling years of public service.

Mr. Speaker, since Lucy McCormick Blair Linn founded the organization in 1912, the Junior League of Chicago has contributed more than 10 million hours of volunteer service. They have treated scarlet fever, funded epilepsy research, and launched what later became the Chicago Children's Museum. These are just a few of the examples over 100 years of service.

Today, I applaud the Junior League and wish its volunteers another 100 years of success.

A BUDGET FULL OF ENERGY

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today, House Republicans will stand up to business as usual in Washington and vote for a budget that will help our economy grow, guarantee the promise of Medicare for everyone, and put forth a true all-of-the-above energy strategy in America.

Now, compare this to President Obama's budget, one filled with more

of his failed tax-and-spend policies, one in which he called for over \$45 billion in new taxes on energy production. With prices surging at the pump—more than doubling since President Obama took office—it's unconscionable that he would want to further burden America's small businesses and families who are already struggling.

America sits on top of the largest amount of total recoverable energy resources in the world, including oil, natural gas, and coal. That's 1.3 trillion barrels of oil equivalent. Just imagine if we developed them as part of a real all-of-the-above strategy. Job creation would surge, gas prices would fall, and America would be one step closer to energy independence.

HOMES FOR HEROES ACT

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say thank you to the many persons who supported the Homes for Heroes Act that passed the day before yesterday. This is an important piece of legislation that will place a person in HUD whose sole responsibility it is to monitor homelessness among our veterans. We believe that in solving the homelessness problem, we can also solve a lot of other problems that they have.

I would like to thank all of the persons on the committee, especially my chairman of the committee, Mr. BACHUS; my ranking member, Mr. FRANK; Ms. WATERS, who has helped me for years with this legislation. I would like to thank Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. GUTIERREZ, the chair and ranking member of the subcommittee. I would also thank Mr. CANTOR, because I did have a chance to visit with him about this, and he helped to promote this legislation. Ms. PELOSI, of course, is a big supporter of our veterans, as is the case with Mr. HOYER.

Also, one additional person that was very helpful, Mr. HENSARLING. He and I had a great conversation about this, and he was very supportive and mentioned it in open mic at one of our hearings. So I thank everyone. Our veterans are better served.

God bless the United States of America and thank God for our veterans.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 600 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 600

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4281) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and

other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of March 29, 2012, providing for consideration or disposition of a measure extending expiring surface transportation authority.

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

Mr. WEBSTER. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the potential it holds for a bipartisan, bicameral agreement for a long-term transportation reauthorization bill.

House Resolution 600 provides for a closed rule for prompt consideration of H.R. 4281, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012.

H.R. 4281 simply calls for a 90-day extension of current transportation legislation at existing funding levels. Without the extension, critical transportation programs around the country will begin to shut down Saturday night at midnight. The Federal Government will no longer be able to collect the user fees necessary to maintain the highway trust fund, and eventually it would be unable to pay obligations that have already been incurred for construction projects. Most importantly, according to recent reports, a shutdown Saturday would immediately furlough 3,500 Federal employees and put up to 130,000 highway projects at risk.

A 90-day extension is no one's ideal scenario; but at this juncture it appears necessary, necessary not only to avoid the calamity that comes from current legislation's expiration, but also necessary for the continued potential for a long-term reauthorization. With passage of this extension, a long-term reauthorization remains within reach.

The transportation bill passed out of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has many laudable provisions. It streamlines and consolidates Federal transportation programs, cuts red tape and Washington bureaucracy, and increases funding flexibility to States and local governments, better leverages existing infrastructure resources, and encourages more private sector participation in rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure. It provides 5 years of certainty and stability with flat funding that is paid for without raising taxes.

I'm sure that the authors and proponents of the Senate bill can point to a menu of laudable policy provisions within their bill as well.

With this extension, we don't give up on the likelihood of the best of both bills being reconciled, and long-term certainty and stability can be provided to those tasked with rebuilding our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

To be sure, however, the task at hand remains avoiding expiration of the existing authorization this Saturday night. I don't have to reiterate the consequences that loom if we do not act. As the Chamber of Commerce wrote in a letter to the Members earlier this week: "An extension is not the best course of action, but it must be done."

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the potential this short-term extension holds for coming together in a bipartisan, bicameral way for a long-term authorization of our Nation's transportation programs.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, where do I begin? This is one more opportunity lost, one more opportunity squandered by this Republican-controlled House.

We are just days away from the expiration of the laws that authorize our surface transportation programs, and yet here we are debating a politically charged, unnecessary, and partisan bill that just kicks the can down the road a few months.

Last month, this House began, but could not finish, consideration of the most partisan drafted—possibly the only partisan drafted—highway reauthorization bill in history. Let me repeat that. The House could not complete consideration of the Republican bill, a Republican bill that would have been considered a joke if it weren't such a serious breach of responsibility.

This is like a bad soap opera. Just when the twists and turns can't get more fantastical and crazy, someone comes up with an even zanier idea just

to keep the plot lines moving along. I'm waiting for the mysterious twin brother to show up.

□ 0920

The plotline here is that the Republican leadership keeps manufacturing ways not to do the simple thing, the right thing, and that is to pass the Senate bill, the 2-year bill that passed the Senate 74-22, clearly and overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion.

It's refreshing and a bit strange when the Senate can put their ideological differences aside and actually pass a decent bill. It's not every day that Senator BARBARA BOXER and Senator JAMES INHOFE agree on a bill, but that's what happened with the Senate bill.

Now, I'm not going to stand here and say that the Senate bill is the bill I would have drafted. To the contrary, I want a 5-year reauthorization that is fully funded, a bill that results in real jobs and a bill that invests in important areas like public transit.

While the Senate bill lasts for only 2 years, it is a good start and it is much better than the Republican proposal we have here today. For my colleagues who have a short memory, let me recap where we were last month.

The Republican leadership took a 1,000-page bill, undoubtedly the most partisan transportation bill in Congressional history, and made it worse. They took a bill that was written in secret and jammed through the Transportation Committee and inserted unrelated and controversial provisions like the Keystone pipeline, ANWR, offshore drilling, and cuts in Federal pensions. Even worse, they changed the rules in the middle of the game. Specifically, after everyone had submitted their amendments to the original single bill, Speaker BOEHNER decided to split it into three separate measures, which meant that many of the amendments could not be considered in the way that they were originally drafted.

Now, of course the Republicans quickly realized that they didn't have the votes for that bill and yanked it from the floor. It must have been pretty embarrassing because it's been over a month since they gave up on that bill.

And what has the Republican leadership been doing over the last month? Negotiating with House Democrats to reach a bipartisan compromise? Talking with the Senate on ways to properly reauthorize these programs and bring jobs back to the economy? Of course not. Over the past month, the Republican leadership has been sitting around pointing fingers and complaining that they can't move the transportation bill, even though Republicans are in control of this House.

It's the end of March, and Republicans can't get their act together to get a real transportation bill passed. You call that leadership? Give me a break.

Leadership is about governing. Leadership is about doing what's right. Honestly, Mr. Speaker, there's no leadership here.

Shame on this leadership for bringing us here today. Shame on this leadership for putting the American jobs on the line just because they cannot manage their own internal politics. That's right. By refusing to pass the Senate bill today, Republicans are putting American jobs on the line.

With the economy slowly recovering and with more than 2.7 million construction and manufacturing workers still out of work, why do Republicans want to play Russian roulette with this important jobs bill?

We should not be in this position today. This is a manufactured crisis, a crisis that is a product of a lack of leadership, a crisis that is a product of a lack of bipartisan cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, we had an opportunity to consider the Senate bill today, but the Rules Committee, mislabeled by some as the most open Rules Committee in decades, blocked that bill from consideration.

That's right. This new majority put this bill on the floor, sight unseen, and without any markup or hearing. They waived their own 3-day layover rule, and this is a closed rule. In fact, I can't even seem to find a CBO score for this bill. And this is the open process my colleagues on the Rules Committee are so proud of.

This is a completely closed rule. I offered the Senate bill as an amendment to this rule last night so that Members could have an opportunity to vote on it today, not in place of the Republican bill, but as a stand-alone amendment.

Speaker BOEHNER is fond of saying, let the House work its will, but apparently the Republicans on the Rules Committee do not believe in that philosophy because they blocked my amendment on a party-line vote. Why did they block my amendment? As the chairman of the Rules Committee is fond of usually saying, because they could.

Now, I will try one more time to offer the Senate amendment. Congressman TIM BISHOP introduced H.R. 14, the exact same language as the Senate-passed bill. If this House defeats the previous question, Congressman BISHOP will be able to offer his amendment to the Republican bill, not in place of, just alongside the Republican bill. The House, like Speaker BOEHNER promised, would then be able to work its will.

Now, it's clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Republican leadership is more concerned with political victories than with legislating. It is clear that the Republican leadership would rather score cheap political points with their right-wing base than promote and create jobs in America.

President Clinton was fond of saying, The perfect can't be the enemy of the good. There's a perfectly good bipartisan Senate bill that would pass this

House overwhelmingly if the Republican leadership decided to bring it up. But no, the Republican leadership would rather play chicken with people's jobs on the line instead of actually legislating, let alone legislating in a bipartisan way.

It is clear that when the far right wing of the far right wing opposes something, the Republican leadership crumbles like cheap asphalt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in 2005, the Congress passed SAFETEA-LU, which is the last transportation reauthorization bill that was long term. There was, under the Democratic-controlled House, a bill proposed by the chairman that never made it to the floor, and because it didn't make it to the floor—my, my, my, how we've forgotten. It was only a couple of years ago. But it didn't make it. It expired. SAFETEA-LU expired in 2009, September 30, and there was a bill, never got marked up, never happened.

So what happens instead? Well, let's see. Number 1, Democrats did a 1-month extension. Number 2, there was a 1.5-month extension. Number 3, there was a 2.5-month extension. Number 4, there was a 1-month extension. Number 5, there was a 9-month extension. Number 6, there was a 2-month extension.

So, I'm not sure what you're talking about, but as far as lack of leadership, we are a long way from having that many extensions. We're a long way from having done what was done in the previous Congress.

I would suspect that we have an opportunity here, and that opportunity, the way to avoid a shutdown of the Nation's transportation programs this Saturday night, is to pass this extension. The only way we can get to that is pass this rule which allows for us to consider that extension.

The only way we can keep ourselves from having 3,500 Federal employees furloughed is to pass this extension. The only way we can keep 130,000 projects that are highway projects from being at risk is to pass this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me respond to my friend.

The difference is that we have an overwhelmingly bipartisan compromise that has passed one of the Chambers here, the Senate. This is the choice we have: Do we do these short-term extensions so that cities and towns and States can't plan, or do we take this bipartisan compromise that the Senate has put together so that there's some certainty for our cities and towns and for our States?

I mean, that's the difference. What's happening here is that there is an internal fight within the Republican Party. The right wing is battling with the extreme right wing, and they can't agree with each other because you have people in the Republican Party who don't believe in the public sector.

So, as this economy is struggling to get back on its feet and we see some recovery, more and more every month, we could actually help that recovery. We could move things along. We could create more jobs if we were to act in a different way today.

But, instead, the right wing and the extreme right wing are having a fight within the Republican Party, so the Republican House leadership is paralyzed. That's not leadership. That's just irresponsible.

At this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and he is absolutely right. The passage of this rule and its approach is not the only way to avert a shutdown. And, in fact, the bill moving forward here is precisely the wrong approach because, sadly, what's going to happen is it's going to bifurcate the construction cycle.

There is work going on around the country that people want to move forward, and the approval of a 90-day extension means that people cannot plan for the entire construction cycle. If they take the gentleman's suggestion and approve the bipartisan Senate bill, there will be certainty, not just for this construction cycle, but the next year's construction cycle.

It's frustrating to watch our friends on the other side of the aisle play chicken. Remember the FAA shutdown where the Republicans in the House refused to accept a bill that passed the Senate overwhelmingly, 89 votes for the FAA? Instead they choose to leave town, putting out of work 70,000 construction workers and laid off 4,000 others in the FAA.

□ 0930

We don't have to play this sort of infrastructure chicken.

Later today, we are going to consider the worst budget for transportation in anybody's memory. The Republican budget that will be decided later today calls for a 46 percent reduction in transportation funding. There isn't enough money in the Republican budget to even pay for the areas that are already obligated.

I developed this, in a friendly way, in the Budget Committee, and they had to agree. There are \$6.5 billion more in actual outlay, contracts, roads, bridges, and transit projects that we're committed to than they would pay for.

It's sad that we've reached this point. I hope the House rejects this rule which will allow Mr. BISHOP to present the Senate bill for an up-or-down vote. The Republicans are afraid that actually there will be dozens of their Members that will join us in a bipartisan vote.

It's a pipe dream that somehow we're better off cutting the construction cycle in half, not allowing people to plan, that somehow we'll come together and merge the worst transportation bill in history that would overturn 21 years of transportation reform

and the agreement of President Reagan that we would dedicate money for transit, that we throw this out to the House bill that was so bad they wouldn't even have a hearing on it.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I served for a dozen years on the Transportation Committee. I've worked with the Transportation Committee with Republican and Democratic chairs. This is an embarrassment that the process is not working. It doesn't have to be partisan and limited. We have two high-level commissions that call for more investment and reform.

The best approach is to vote on the Senate bill today, which I'm confident will pass, which is why they don't want to bring it to a vote, and then come together to work as we get past this election "Gong Show" process and be able to strike what truly is a grand bargain when we have all the moving pieces at the end of the year, when we're not staring down the barrel of goofy election politics, and people will actually be able to work on what's in the best interest of America.

What's in the best interest of America is rejecting this assault on transportation and dealing with rebuilding and renewing the country.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the other side at least letting me know what they did over the last 2 years. They bifurcated the construction projects. They did it six times. At least now we know that they have knowledge of what they did during those times when they only gave, in some cases, 1-month extensions.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT), my colleague.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Florida and fellow Rules Committee member to allow me to speak today on behalf of this.

It's interesting to stand up here and listen to what comes across from the other side. They talk about the FAA bill. That's a bill that while they were in control of this area, since 2007, there was not a reauthorization of that bill until this year, until the 112th Congress came into power. We now have a 4-year reauthorization of the FAA bill that sat over on the other side while they had control of this House since 2007. There's been no action other than just temporary fixes. The same goes now with this bill today in regards to transportation.

They want you to believe that the Senate passed this great bill out of the Senate, a 2-year fix. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, a 2-year fix in this industry is like nothing at all.

In speaking with developers and road construction folks in my State, they said a 6-month extension is as good as a 2-year extension, and basically all it does is keep their doors open. They don't hire new folks; they don't go out

and purchase new equipment; they don't go to Caterpillar up in Peoria, Illinois, and buy more equipment. What they told me was that when the Senate came back out with an 18-month and 2-year extension, they canceled major equipment orders in Peoria, Illinois. They canceled those orders because there's no reason for them to invest millions of dollars in equipment on a 6-month, an 18-month, or a 2-year extension.

We should be standing here talking today about a 5- to 7-year extension of the highway bill. That's what we should be talking about. That gives those builders some certainty.

We talk about certainty. The other side talks about it at great length, but what certainty did they show when they had control of both houses, the Senate and the House, and the President? What did they show for an accomplishment, other than short-term fixes that have nothing to do with certainty? The construction industry hires based upon certainty, how far they can look out.

A major road builder that I talked to said: "Listen, RICH, it's just not going to work that way."

Mr. Speaker, what they're saying to us is that for them to spend money to hire new workers, they need to have some certainty that they're going to have a 5- to 7-year window to start building upon, not a 6-month fix, not an 18-month fix, not a 2-year fix.

Once again, the builders I'm talking to are saying that on these short-term fixes, all it does is keep the status quo alive. It allows them to keep the employees that they have, but they will not invest in new equipment, and they're not going to invest in hiring new employees because it's a short-term fix for them, not a long-term fix.

We had the opportunity to do a pay-for, and I agree with my friend from Worcester when we talk about we should have a pay-for 5- to 7-year transportation bill, not a short-term fix. But if we don't do a short-term fix today—you heard my colleague from Florida talk about what's going to happen on Sunday—all projects stop as we know it. That's not what this House should do. We need to pass the 90-day extension. We need to support this rule and pass the bill so we can eliminate uncertainty, not what we have today.

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

I want to thank my colleague on the Rules Committee for making, I think, a very strong case why we should reject the 90-day extension and pass a 2-year extension for this reason: because 90 days means nothing.

He diminishes the impact of 2 years. Most people I talk to would have preferred 2 years to 90 days. Here's the difference. We have a democratically controlled Senate that worked out a deal with Republicans. BARBARA BOXER and JIM INHOFE came together. They are very opposite individuals when it comes to politics, but they came together.

Here, the Republicans are fighting Republicans. Democrats have been locked out of this entire process.

Let's get real here. Let's be honest with the American people. The budget that you all are going to vote for later this afternoon decimates highway and road and bridge funding, which basically destroys, I think, the basis for a strong infrastructure program in this country. You're not here trying to argue about a better bill. You're trying to figure out a way to give States less, to give cities and towns less. That would undercut a lot of the projects that are being contemplated all across this country that will not only put people back to work but make us more economically secure. That's what this is all about. It's about trying to come up with an even lousier transportation bill than the one that you brought to the House floor.

At this point, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, and I oppose the motion to move the previous question.

I am growing more and more deeply concerned that our Republican colleagues simply don't get it. They do not understand that their ideological crusade to "starve the beast" has only resulted in starving the American worker.

Here we are today taking up the third version of the Republican kick-the-can infrastructure plan down the road in a single week, the third version in a week.

□ 0940

If that's not a complete failure of leadership, I don't know what is.

We are a mere 2 days away from the expiration of our highway programs, and they have their hands over their ears, desperate not to hear common-sense solutions like the bipartisan Senate highway bill.

Since the beginning of the 112th Congress, we have witnessed time and time again their "my way or the highway" approach to governing. As a result, job creation is suffering; working families across the Nation are suffering; the construction industry is in the middle of the construction season, and it's suffering because House Republicans want to score political points with their ideological base rather than solve real-world problems with real-world solutions.

This week, the House Republicans were forced to remove two short-term highway extension bills from floor consideration because they would rather dig deeper into the conservative ranks of their caucus than reach across the aisle to discuss solutions for the American worker. Sadly, this is nothing new. They have been doing this for the past 15 months. We have lurched from self-created crisis to self-created crisis. I've counted at least five over the last 15 months. Yet they wonder why the

American public's perception of Congress is at an all-time low.

Meanwhile, I've sponsored H.R. 14, the Senate highway bill, which is a bipartisan path forward that makes meaningful reforms and provides certainty to States. I am proud to be offering this bipartisan legislation in order to refocus the discussion on jobs and economic opportunities rather than that of the Republican message this week of tearing down Medicare and protecting the 1 percent at the expense of middle class families.

As of today, House Republicans have yet to put forward a credible highway reauthorization that puts Americans back to work. Their only attempt, H.R. 7, the Boehner-Mica authorization, was called the worst highway bill ever by Secretary of Transportation LaHood, a former distinguished Member of this body, a Republican. It was drafted in the dark of night without any Democratic input. It removed transit from the highway trust fund. It broke a 30-year bipartisan cooperation to fund transit, and it couldn't attract a single Democratic vote nor even a majority of Republican votes.

Over in the Senate, MAP-21 passed overwhelmingly with a bipartisan majority and is fully paid for, something House Republicans seem unable to come close to achieving. The MAP-21 pay-fors are less controversial than those contained in the House Republican bill. The Senate has estimated that MAP-21 will save 1.8 million jobs and will create up to 1 million more jobs. That's almost 3 million jobs wrapped up in this legislation. During a weak economic recovery that is looking for a jump-start, this is the kind of legislation we need to be passing.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. House Republicans had their chance to address our infrastructure needs with H.R. 7. Instead, they chose to pander to their base and chase ideological extremes. I am sorry to say their effort was an utter failure. MAP-21 has the support of Senate Democrats, Senate Republicans, House Democrats, and the administration.

It is time that the House Republicans got on board with job creation instead of fighting it. Americans want jobs and safe roads and bridges. The Senate passed the biggest jobs-creating bill in this Congress by an overwhelming bipartisan majority. We have the chance to do the same thing. Let's move H.R. 14, and let's put this country back to work.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let's just set the record straight. The other side says that this wasn't a bipartisan process.

First of all, the first hearing was held in the ranking Democrat member's

hometown and district in West Virginia. We went from sea to shining sea, all the way to Los Angeles, in order to accommodate a bicameral, unprecedented bipartisan hearing in Los Angeles. Again, the comments that are made here do not reflect the reality. In the committee, we took 100 Democrat amendments, and we accepted about 20 of them. In addition to when we drafted the legislation, 60 percent of the recommendations of the Democrats were in the draft that came before the committee. Yet there is this stuff about it not being bipartisan.

Then the Republicans can't get it done. These are the people who cannot get it done. They controlled the House; they controlled the Senate; they controlled the White House during this entire process. They couldn't even get it to committee. They could not get the bill to committee. It passed a subcommittee.

So we have passed it. They've made bipartisanship in this committee a one-way street, and it wasn't that way before. They will close down major projects across this country if we don't pass this extension. Why are we here for this extension for 90 days? Because we offered 90 days to begin with, and they said, No, we won't do 90 days because we want to keep things stirred up. So we said, Well, what do you want? They said 60 days. Okay. In the spirit of bipartisanship, we'll go 60 days. So then they rejected that. Some of the Democrats threw each other under the bus, so to speak; and here we are at 90 days again.

So, folks, let's get the facts straight and the reality straight. Republicans want America to work and our infrastructure to be built.

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

Let's get the facts straight. Let's talk about this great bipartisan process.

All we're asking for today is to have an alternative to be voted on—one substitute. That's it. That's all we've been asking for; and we've been told, no, you can't. It's your way or the highway. That's not bipartisanship.

As for all of these great bipartisan amendments, let's everybody be clear on one thing: that not one single amendment has been considered to the transportation bill on this House floor. Not one single amendment has been allowed. You yanked the bill when, I guess, some of the extreme right wing of the extreme right wing got upset on your side for whatever reason, also because there were a lot of moderates who realized that the bill that you brought to the floor would bankrupt the highway trust fund, that it was bad policy for this country, and that it was not going to help rebuild our infrastructure.

So the only bipartisan proposal we have before us right now, which is not perfect but which is the only bipartisan product, is the Senate bill, which passed 74–22.

At this time, I would be happy to yield 1 minute to the ranking member of the Transportation Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I asked for this time only because the chairman referred to opening these hearings in my hometown of Beckley, West Virginia, which he did, and I appreciate that very much and the many other hearings he held across the country. Yet the question is, you have to learn from these hearings, and you have to incorporate that which you learn from these hearings into the bill that you end up finally writing, and I'm not sure that was done from what the gentleman heard from my home State.

In addition, which the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to, as to the bipartisanship of the other body, we all know in this town and across the country how hard it is to get that other body to agree on anything. Even if it were a resolution saying, "I love Mother," it's hard to get 60 votes over there for anything. Yet they got 72 votes for a bipartisan transportation bill. They got half of the Republican Members of that other body to support a bipartisan transportation bill. We have tried, as the gentleman from Massachusetts knows, to bring that up in the Rules Committee, to make it in order.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. RAHALL. I and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) have tried and tried and tried to bring that up and on the floor of the House. Yet we get turned down at every turn in the road. At every corner in the road, we get turned down in our efforts to bring up the bipartisan Senate transportation bill. It is not very often that you will find such a measure produced by that other body. Yet they've done it this time, and we cannot get it brought up to the floor of this body.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, pass the extension.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to refrain from trafficking the well while a Member is under recognition.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), I just want to point out something for my colleagues here.

One of the reasons many of us prefer the Senate bill to even the House bill that you brought to the floor and then split up and then yanked from the floor is that the Senate bill sustains approximately 1.9 million jobs on an annual basis. The House Republican bill destroys 550,000 jobs compared to the current funding level. So what you had brought to the floor and then you yanked was a job killer.

At this point, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, the ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee, Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This is really a discussion about the future of transportation in America, and there is a very basic difference.

The Republicans are being hung up because there is a substantial portion of their caucus that believes—truly believes—there is no Federal interest, that we should not have a national transportation policy and that it should be devolved to the States.

□ 0950

Well, that's what this looks like when you devolve to the States. Kansas Turnpike, 1956, Oklahoma said they'd build their section. They didn't. They were launching cars into Amos Switzer's cornfield for the next 8 years. This was about the failure of a 50-State transportation policy. They are being hung up by enough people on their side to hold up this bill by those who believe that this is the way the country should look in the future.

Now, we want jobs. Even if they could move their H.R. 7—which they can't because of this faction—they would cut funding by 20 percent. We've got 150,000 bridges on the Federal system, the National Highway System, that need repair or replacement. Forty percent of the pavement needs substantial redoing, not just resurfacing. There is a \$70 billion backlog on our legacy transit systems—that's our 20th century system—and there's no money in this for a 21st century system.

And this is their vision. Their vision, it's one of two visions. Cut 20 percent. The Ryan budget actually would cut transportation by 35 percent from current levels. Or the Flat Earthers who say there's no Federal interest in a national transportation system. One of those three things is going to come out from their side; a 20 percent cut, a 35 percent cut, or no program.

We have an alternative. Let's vote on the Senate bill. When you can get 22 Republican Senators to vote to extend the program for 2 years—and we had one gentleman say, Oh, 2 years is nothing, no equipment orders. Well, guess what. I have a list here—and it's just the beginnings of a list—of seven State DOTs who have contacted the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials saying a 90-day delay will cost jobs; 40,000 jobs in North Carolina, and on down the list. Nevada, Maryland, Michigan, Rhode Island, West Virginia, and New Hampshire have all reported in about projects they're going to delay or cancel if we do another 90-day extension and we don't do the 2-year bill. The 2-year bill is enough certainty for these projects to move forward. No, it's not optimal. We need a real 5-year bill, but we don't need a 5-year bill that guts or destroys the program. But those are the alternatives you are offering us here.

Just give us one vote, just one vote. Let us vote on the Senate bill, which passed as a true bipartisan bill. This is not a bipartisan bill. The gentleman from Florida is a good friend. But look, we did not sit down and look at this bill and review it. It was presented to us.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, again, I will go back over this list because we must have forgotten it since I presented it a few minutes ago.

The Democrats, when they were in control, passed a 1-month extension back on October 1, 2009; 1 month, no amendments; 1.5 months a little bit later, no amendments; 2.5 months, no amendments; 1 month, no amendments; 9 months, no amendments; 2 months, no amendments.

I'm not sure what they're talking about, Mr. Speaker. Pass the extension.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that, I would yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment is going down, but there are people still unemployed. Right now we have a Senate bill on transportation, and many don't understand what that means. There is a wide gamut of highways and mass transit and infrastructure ready to be signed by the President of the United States so that millions of Americans can go to work, and this body won't allow us to vote for a bill that has already passed the Senate.

Higher funding levels to be able to build, build, build. More jobs, 1.9 million annualized. Buy America, do I love it. Buy America, making sure that we buy the products right here in America so that not only are we building with American workers but are also supplied by them. Providing guaranteed transit funding for all of America. The crumbling transit infrastructure, we're providing for it. And in Houston, Texas, we need those moneys, and we need the operational moneys.

So here's my point: Unemployment is going down. The President is moving forward on employing and empowering Americans. And they won't put the Senate bill, the bipartisan bill, on the floor.

Today we need to vote for the jobs here in America. I ask for a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. WEBSTER. Could I inquire of Mr. MCGOVERN how many more requests for time he has?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I have the ranking member of the committee and myself.

Mr. WEBSTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it's my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member of the Transportation Committee.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that the extension the majority is

bringing to the floor this morning is too long, and it will do nothing but continue the uncertainty that States and businesses—small businesses, I might add—have faced since the expiration in the last long-term bill in August '09, 2½ years and eight extensions ago.

Uncertainty is what we are continuing by the passage of this extension today, uncertainty among the small business community in this country. They need the certainty with which to plan contracts.

This happens to be the springtime of the year, the time when contracts are let and when jobs are planned and when people need to know if they're going to be working or not—not 90 days from now. This is the contracting season with the work usually done during the summer and then concluded by the fall, and the bottom lines are added up.

We have already heard stories of small businesses that have had to cut back from 80 percent of their budget to 40 percent or less because they don't know what the Congress is going to do in terms of a long-term transportation bill. To elaborate on what my colleague from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) had said, the impacts on our State DOTs of endless extensions and the inability to plan for current and future transportation needs are very real, very real. And here are just a few of the examples:

North Carolina has delayed projects totaling \$1.2 billion, affecting 41,000 jobs;

Nevada and Maryland each report 4,000 jobs are at risk due to projects being delayed;

Michigan has only let 35 percent of its projects, or \$180 million below its normal activity level, and it's delayed several large construction projects;

Rhode Island has delayed \$80 million worth of projects and planning for needed safety and structural improvements of a major interchange;

My home State of West Virginia reports that an extension would result in a 10 percent cut in programs, affecting over 1,200 jobs, and the State of West Virginia may be forced to shut projects down or delay payments to contractors to manage cash flow;

New Hampshire, Mr. Speaker, will not award contracts on \$60 million in projects that were recently bid, affecting 1,800 job years, and will delay \$115 million in bond issuance for the construction of two exits; and

Illinois estimates that the uncertainty posed by stopgap funding measures means that 4,500 jobs could be lost and that ongoing uncertainty will increase contractor risk and cause higher bids for construction projects.

Without congressional action on the Senate bill, many States in the Northeast and Midwest stand to lose an entire construction season. That would be a devastating blow to many States as they slowly recover from the worst construction downturn since the Great Depression.

While millions of construction jobs and much-needed infrastructure projects hang in the balance, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spent weeks driving in circles. They have at least been consistent and embraced this theme of uncertainty in their own internal deliberations.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close and will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 14, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act. This is the House companion to the bipartisan Senate transportation bill that passed in the other body 74-22.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives is not working for the American people. At a time when jobs should be the most important priority of this Congress, we have a leadership that talks about everything but jobs. And when it comes to jobs, nothing could be more important than passing a transportation bill.

□ 1000

The Republicans brought a terrible bill to the floor—so terrible, they couldn't even force their own Members to vote for it. They had to pull it. And now we're in this period of delay, delay, delay; kick the can down the road, kick the can down the road.

And what makes this situation unique, I would say to my friend from Florida, as compared to previous years, is that we actually have a bipartisan bill that has passed one of the Chambers—a bipartisan bill in the Senate that passed overwhelmingly, 74-22—authored by BARBARA BOXER and JIM INHOFE, two polar opposites of the political spectrum. They could come together.

They came together and put the American people first. They put jobs first. It wasn't about ideology. It wasn't about getting it perfect for either of them. And yet here we are, still fighting over the most ridiculous things and bringing the most inconsequential piece of legislation to the House floor when we should be focused on passing bills like this.

I'm told we need to do this because we're going on another recess. God forbid we stay here and actually work on something that will be meaningful for

the American people. This bill is so important to our economy that, quite frankly, it's worth us staying here a few extra days and getting this thing done. Instead, we're going to kick the can down the road for 90 days. Next week nothing will be done. We'll come back, and then what? Then what will happen?

Essentially, what we're doing here is we're telling the American people that we're not putting them first. We're not putting jobs first. For the life of me, I can't understand why this Congress, this leadership, which claims to be open, won't even give us a vote. We can't even get a vote on the Senate bill. If you want to vote against the Senate 2-year extension and vote instead for your 90-day extension, fine. But let us have an opportunity to vote on something that will mean something to our communities, that will put people back to work. Why are you denying us this vote? I have yet to hear anybody say why we can't have a vote on this. We had no amendments debated on this House floor on the transportation bill. We ought to have this debated.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so a little democracy can happen here in the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. WEBSTER. The situation we find ourselves in is certainly not ideal. I've been a strong proponent of a long-term reauthorization of Federal transportation programs. Recently, reauthorizations haven't been that long-term. But that's more often than not, also. The goal everyone is seeking is a long-term reauthorization. I hear that, the necessity of it, from all transportation officials all over the country, including my own State and in my own district.

Without the ability to plan over the course of several years—not 3 months, not 17 months—that lack of certainty has increased the operating costs. It increases cost uncertainty, and that is the death knell for critical infrastructure projects in this economy.

As my colleagues have noted, transportation reauthorization bills are typically bipartisan affairs. Unfortunately, we don't have a bipartisan, bicameral agreement on a viable long-term reauthorization yet. But the passage of this brief extension gives us the opportunity to once again bring both sides to the table to try to work out a collaborative effort and a collaborative solution to this problem. I think that's what the American people want. It's our responsibility to make sure that happens, and this is the last chance to do it before the current legislation expires at midnight on Saturday.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 600 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 14) to reauthorize Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 3 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate

vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 178, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—237

Adams	Bonner	Chaffetz
Aderholt	Bono Mack	Coble
Akin	Boustany	Coffman (CO)
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Cole
Amash	Brooks	Conaway
Amodel	Broun (GA)	Cravaack
Austria	Buchanan	Crawford
Bachmann	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Bachus	Buerkle	Culberson
Barletta	Burgess	Davis (KY)
Bartlett	Burton (IN)	Denham
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Dent
Bass (NH)	Camp	DesJarlais
Benishkek	Campbell	Diaz-Balart
Berg	Canseco	Dold
Biggert	Cantor	Dreier
Bilbray	Capito	Duffy
Bilirakis	Carter	Duncan (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Cassidy	Duncan (TN)
Blackburn	Chabot	Ellmers

Emerson	Kline	Rigell	McGovern	Quigley	Sires
Farenthold	Labrador	Rivera	McIntyre	Rahall	Slaughter
Fincher	Lamborn	Roby	McNerney	Reyes	Smith (WA)
Fitzpatrick	Lance	Roe (TN)	Michaud	Richardson	Stark
Flake	Landry	Rogers (AL)	Miller (NC)	Richmond	Sutton
Fleischmann	Lankford	Rogers (KY)	Miller, George	Ross (AR)	Thompson (CA)
Fleming	Latham	Rogers (MI)	Moran	Rothman (NJ)	Thompson (MS)
Flores	LaTourette	Rohrabacher	Murphy (CT)	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Forbes	Latta	Rokita	Nadler	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Fortenberry	Lewis (CA)	Rooney	Napolitano	Rush	Tsongas
Fox	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Neal	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Franks (AZ)	Long	Ross (FL)	Olver	Sánchez, Linda	Velázquez
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Royce	Owens	T.	Visclosky
Galleghy	Luetkemeyer	Runyan	Pallone	Sarbanes	Walz (MN)
Gardner	Lummis	Ryan (WI)	Pascarell	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Garrett	Lungren, Daniel E.	Scalise	Pastor (AZ)	Schiff	Schultz
Gerlach	Manzullo	Schilling	Pelosi	Schrader	Waters
Gibbs	Marchant	Schmidt	Perlmutter	Schwartz	Watt
Gibson	Marino	Schock	Peters	Scott (VA)	Waxman
Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Schweikert	Peterson	Scott, David	Welch
Gohmert	McCauley	Scott (SC)	Pingree (ME)	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Goodlatte	McClintock	Scott, Austin	Polis	Sewell	Woolsey
Gosar	McCotter	Sensenbrenner	Price (NC)	Sherman	Yarmuth
Gowdy	McHenry	Sessions			
Granger	McKeon	Shimkus			
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Shuler			
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Shuster			
Griffin (AR)	Rodgers	Simpson			
Griffith (VA)	Meehan	Smith (NE)			
Grimm	Mica	Smith (NJ)			
Guinta	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)			
Guthrie	Miller (MI)	Southerland			
Hall	Miller, Gary	Stearns			
Hanna	Mulvaney	Stivers			
Harper	Murphy (PA)	Stutzman			
Harris	Myrick	Sullivan			
Hartzler	Neugebauer	Terry			
Hastings (WA)	Noem	Thompson (PA)			
Hayworth	Nugent	Thornberry			
Heck	Nunes	Tiberi			
Hensarling	Nunnelee	Tipton			
Herger	Olson	Turner (NY)			
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	Turner (OH)			
Huelskamp	Paulsen	Upton			
Huizenga (MI)	Pearce	Walberg			
Hultgren	Pence	Walden			
Hunter	Petri	Walsh (IL)			
Hurt	Pitts	Webster			
Issa	Platts	West			
Jenkins	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland			
Johnson (IL)	Pompeo	Whitfield			
Johnson (OH)	Posey	Wilson (SC)			
Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)	Wittman			
Jones	Quayle	Wolf			
Jordan	Reed	Womack			
Kelly	Rehberg	Yoder			
King (IA)	Reichert	Young (FL)			
King (NY)	Renacci	Young (IN)			
Kingston	Ribble				
Kinzinger (IL)					

NAYS—178

Ackerman	Conyers	Himes
Altmire	Cooper	Hinchey
Andrews	Costa	Hinojosa
Baca	Courtney	Hirono
Baldwin	Critz	Hochul
Barrow	Crowley	Holden
Bass (CA)	Cuellar	Holt
Becerra	Cummings	Honda
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Berman	Davis (IL)	Israel
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Kaptur
Bonamici	Deutch	Keating
Boren	Dicks	Kildee
Boswell	Dingell	Kind
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Kissell
Braley (IA)	Donnelly (IN)	Kucinich
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Langevin
Butterfield	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Capps	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Capuano	Eshoo	Lee (CA)
Cardoza	Farr	Levin
Carnahan	Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Carney	Frank (MA)	Lipinski
Carson (IN)	Fudge	Loebach
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Lofgren, Zoe
Chandler	Gonzalez	Lowe
Chu	Green, Al	Lujan
Cicilline	Green, Gene	Lynch
Clarke (MI)	Grijalva	Maloney
Clarke (NY)	Gutierrez	Markey
Clay	Hahn	Matheson
Cleaver	Hanabusa	Matsui
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Cohen	Heinrich	McCollum
Connolly (VA)	Higgins	McDermott

Black	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Costello	(TX)	Sanchez, Loretta
Engel	Mack	Speier
Filner	Meeks	Towns
Jackson (IL)	Moore	Woodall
	Paul	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—16

□ 1029

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

Messrs. PEARCE and ROKITA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Stated for:

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 146 I was inadvertently detained in a meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 146 for H.R. 4281, I was detained because of meeting with constituents to allow the Senate Transportation bill to come to the Floor to save jobs and support new construction for transportation and infrastructure. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 146, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1030

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4281.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 600, I call up the bill (H.R. 4281) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 600, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4281

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012”.

(b) **RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS.**—The Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the amount apportioned or allocated for a program, project, or activity under this Act in fiscal year 2012 by amounts apportioned or allocated pursuant to the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (title I of Public Law 112-30) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.

(c) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—

Sec. 1. Short title; reconciliation of funds; table of contents.

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

Sec. 101. Extension of Federal-aid highway programs.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

Sec. 201. Extension of National Highway Traffic Safety Administration highway safety programs.

Sec. 202. Extension of Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration programs.

Sec. 203. Additional programs.

TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 301. Allocation of funds for planning programs.

Sec. 302. Special rule for urbanized area formula grants.

Sec. 303. Allocating amounts for capital investment grants.

Sec. 304. Apportionment of formula grants for other than urbanized areas.

Sec. 305. Apportionment based on fixed guideway factors.

Sec. 306. Authorizations for public transportation.

Sec. 307. Amendments to SAFETEA-LU.

TITLE IV—HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXTENSION

Sec. 401. Extension of trust fund expenditure authority.

Sec. 402. Extension of highway-related taxes.

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 111 of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (Public Law 112-30; 125 Stat. 343) is amended—

(1) by striking “the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” each place it appears and inserting “the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”;

(2) by striking “ $\frac{1}{2}$ ” each place it appears and inserting “ $\frac{3}{4}$ ”; and

(3) in subsection (a) by striking “March 31, 2012” and inserting “June 30, 2012”.

(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Section 111(c)(3)(B)(ii) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 343) is amended by striking “\$319,500,000” and inserting “\$479,250,000”.

(c) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS UNDER TITLE V OF SAFETEA-LU.**—Section 111(e)(2) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 343) is amended by striking “the period beginning on October 1,

2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(d) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—Section 112(a) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 346) is amended by striking “\$196,427,625 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “\$294,641,438 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) **CHAPTER 4 HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.**—Section 201(a)(1) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking “\$235,000,000 for fiscal year 2009” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “\$235,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$176,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(b) **HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—Section 201(a)(2) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking “and \$54,122,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “and \$81,183,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(c) **OCCUPANT PROTECTION INCENTIVE GRANTS.**—Section 201(a)(3) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking “\$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2006” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “\$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011, and \$18,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(d) **SAFETY BELT PERFORMANCE GRANTS.**—Section 201(a)(4) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking “and \$24,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “and \$36,375,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(e) **STATE TRAFFIC SAFETY INFORMATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS.**—Section 201(a)(5) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking “for fiscal year 2006” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and \$25,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(f) **ALCOHOL-IMPAIRED DRIVING COUNTERMEASURES INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM.**—Section 201(a)(6) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking “\$139,000,000 for fiscal year 2009” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “\$139,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$104,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(g) **NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.**—Section 201(a)(7) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking “and \$2,058,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “and \$3,087,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(h) **HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.**—Section 201(a)(8) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking “for fiscal year 2006” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and \$21,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(i) **MOTORCYCLIST SAFETY.**—Section 201(a)(9) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking “\$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2009” and all that follows through the

period at the end and inserting “\$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$5,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(j) **CHILD SAFETY AND CHILD BOOSTER SEAT SAFETY INCENTIVE GRANTS.**—Section 201(a)(10) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking “\$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2009” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “\$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$5,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(k) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—Section 201(a)(11) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking “and \$12,664,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “and \$18,996,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) **MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS.**—Section 31104(a)(8) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(8) \$159,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(b) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—Section 31104(i)(1)(H) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(H) \$183,108,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(c) **GRANT PROGRAMS.**—Section 4101(c) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “2011 and \$15,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “2011 and \$22,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking “2011 and \$16,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “2011 and \$24,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”;

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking “2011 and \$2,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “2011 and \$3,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”;

(4) in paragraph (4) by striking “2011 and \$12,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “2011 and \$18,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(5) in paragraph (5) by striking “2011 and \$1,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “2011 and \$2,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(d) **HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.**—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “2011 and \$7,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “2011 and \$11,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(e) **NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.**—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and up to \$14,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.” and inserting “and up to \$21,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

(f) **OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.**—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by striking “2011 (and \$500,000 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and \$1,500,000 to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012)” and inserting “2011

(and \$750,000 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and \$2,250,000 to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012”).

(g) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1744) is amended by striking “2011 and \$500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and \$750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”

(h) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 4144(d) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1748) is amended by striking “March 31, 2012” and inserting “June 30, 2012”.

(i) WORKING GROUP FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES TO ENHANCE FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS.—Section 4213(d) of SAFETEA-LU (49 U.S.C. 14710 note; 119 Stat. 1759) is amended by striking “March 31, 2012” and inserting “June 30, 2012”.

SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS.

(a) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS RESEARCH PROJECTS.—Section 7131(c) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1910) is amended by striking “2011 and \$580,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and \$870,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”

(b) DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.—Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking “2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking “2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”

TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR PLANNING PROGRAMS.

Section 5305(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012” and inserting “2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012”.

SEC. 302. SPECIAL RULE FOR URBANIZED AREA FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5307(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting “SPECIAL RULE FOR FISCAL YEARS 2005 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JUNE 30, 2012.—”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A) by striking “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting “MAXIMUM AMOUNTS IN FISCAL YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JUNE 30, 2012.—”; and

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking “2011 and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012” and inserting “2011 and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012”.

SEC. 303. ALLOCATING AMOUNTS FOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.

Section 5309(m) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting “FISCAL YEARS 2006 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JUNE 30, 2012.—”; and

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (A)(i) by striking “2011 and \$100,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and \$150,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (B) by striking “2011 and \$7,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and \$11,250,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C) by striking “2011 and \$2,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and \$3,750,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking “2011 and \$5,000,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and \$7,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(ii) in clause (i) by striking “for each fiscal year and \$1,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “for each fiscal year and \$1,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(iii) in clause (ii) by striking “for each fiscal year and \$1,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “for each fiscal year and \$1,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(iv) in clause (iii) by striking “for each fiscal year and \$500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “for each fiscal year and \$750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(v) in clause (iv) by striking “for each fiscal year and \$500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “for each fiscal year and \$750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(vi) in clause (v) by striking “for each fiscal year and \$500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “for each fiscal year and \$750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(vii) in clause (vi) by striking “for each fiscal year and \$500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “for each fiscal year and \$750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(viii) in clause (vii) by striking “for each fiscal year and \$325,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “for each fiscal year and \$487,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(ix) in clause (viii) by striking “for each fiscal year and \$175,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “for each fiscal year

and \$262,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking clause (vii) and inserting the following:

“(vii) \$10,125,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking “and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking “and not less than \$17,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “and not less than \$26,250,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(E) in subparagraph (E) by striking “and \$1,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “and \$2,250,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

SEC. 304. APPORTIONMENT OF FORMULA GRANTS FOR OTHER THAN URBANIZED AREAS.

Section 5311(c)(1)(G) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(G) \$11,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”.

SEC. 305. APPORTIONMENT BASED ON FIXED GUIDEWAY FACTORS.

Section 5337(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(g) SPECIAL RULE FOR OCTOBER 1, 2011, THROUGH JUNE 30, 2012.—The Secretary shall apportion amounts made available for fixed guideway modernization under section 5309 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012, in accordance with subsection (a), except that the Secretary shall apportion 75 percent of each dollar amount specified in subsection (a).”.

SEC. 306. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FORMULA AND BUS GRANTS.—Section 5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following:

“(G) \$6,270,423,750 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “\$113,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$113,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$56,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “\$113,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$85,125,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking “\$4,160,365,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$4,160,365,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$2,080,182,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “\$4,160,365,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$3,120,273,750 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking “\$51,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$51,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$25,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “\$51,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$38,625,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”; and

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking “\$1,666,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$1,666,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$833,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,”

and inserting “\$1,666,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$1,249,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”;

(E) in subparagraph (E) by striking “\$984,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$984,000,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$492,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “\$984,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$738,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”;

(F) in subparagraph (F) by striking “\$133,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$133,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$66,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “\$133,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$100,125,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”;

(G) in subparagraph (G) by striking “\$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$465,000,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$232,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “\$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$348,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”;

(H) in subparagraph (H) by striking “\$164,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$164,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$82,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “\$164,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$123,375,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”;

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking “\$92,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$92,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$46,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “\$92,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$69,375,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”;

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking “\$26,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$26,900,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$13,450,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “\$26,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$20,175,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”;

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking “in fiscal year 2006” and all that follows through “March 31, 2012,” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and \$2,625,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”;

(L) in subparagraph (L) by striking “in fiscal year 2006” and all that follows through “March 31, 2012,” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and \$18,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”;

(M) in subparagraph (M) by striking “\$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$465,000,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$232,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “\$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$348,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”; and

(N) in subparagraph (N) by striking “\$8,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, \$8,800,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$4,400,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “\$8,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and \$6,600,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”.

(b) CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.—Section 5338(c)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(7) \$1,466,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”

(c) RESEARCH AND UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTERS.—Section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “and 2010, \$69,750,000 for fiscal year 2011, and \$29,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “through 2011, and \$33,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—

“(A) RESEARCH.—Of amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012, the Secretary shall allocate for each of the activities and projects described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (1) an amount equal to 47 percent of the amount allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each such subparagraph.

“(B) UNIVERSITY CENTERS PROGRAM.—

“(i) OCTOBER 1, 2011, THROUGH JUNE 30, 2012.—Of the amounts allocated under subparagraph (A)(i) for the university centers program under section 5506 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012, the Secretary shall allocate for each program described in clauses (i) through (iii) and (v) through (viii) of paragraph (2)(A) an amount equal to 47 percent of the amount allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each such clause.

“(ii) FUNDING.—If the Secretary determines that a project or activity described in paragraph (2) received sufficient funds in fiscal year 2011, or a previous fiscal year, to carry out the purpose for which the project or activity was authorized, the Secretary may not allocate any amounts under clause (i) for the project or activity for fiscal year 2012 or any subsequent fiscal year.”

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 5338(e)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(7) \$74,034,750 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”

SEC. 307. AMENDMENTS TO SAFETEA-LU.

(a) CONTRACTED PARATRANSIT PILOT.—Section 3009(i)(1) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1572) is amended by striking “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”

(b) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 3011 of SAFETEA-LU (49 U.S.C. 5309 note; 119 Stat. 1588) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(5) by striking “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012” and inserting “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”; and

(2) in the second sentence of subsection (d) by striking “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”

(c) ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 3012(b)(8) of SAFETEA-LU (49 U.S.C. 5310 note; 119 Stat. 1593) is amended by striking “March 31, 2012” and inserting “June 30, 2012.”

(d) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 3040(8) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1639) is amended to read as follows:

“(8) \$7,843,708,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30,

2012, of which not more than \$6,270,423,750 shall be from the Mass Transit Account.”

(e) PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS FOR NEW FIXED GUIDEWAY CAPITAL PROJECTS.—Section 3043 of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1640) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,”; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,” and inserting “2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.”

(f) ALLOCATIONS FOR NATIONAL RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.—Section 3046(c)(2) of SAFETEA-LU (49 U.S.C. 5338 note; 119 Stat. 1706) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012, in amounts equal to 47 percent of the amounts allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each of paragraphs (2), (3), (5), and (8) through (25) of subsection (a).”

TITLE IV—HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXTENSION

SEC. 401. EXTENSION OF TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “April 1, 2012” in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting “July 1, 2012,”; and

(2) by striking “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II” in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012.”

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II” each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012,”; and

(2) by striking “April 1, 2012” in subsection (d)(2) and inserting “July 1, 2012.”

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Paragraph (2) of section 9508(e) of such Code is amended by striking “April 1, 2012” and inserting “July 1, 2012.”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on April 1, 2012.

SEC. 402. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY-RELATED TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Each of the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “March 31, 2012” and inserting “June 30, 2012”:

(A) Section 4041(a)(1)(C)(iii)(I).

(B) Section 4041(m)(1)(B).

(C) Section 4081(d)(1).

(2) Each of the following provisions of such Code is amended by striking “April 1, 2012” and inserting “July 1, 2012”:

(A) Section 4041(m)(1)(A).

(B) Section 4051(c).

(C) Section 4071(d).

(D) Section 4081(d)(3).

(b) EXTENSION OF TAX, ETC., ON USE OF CERTAIN HEAVY VEHICLES.—Each of the following provisions of such Code is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”:

(1) Section 4481(f).

(2) Subsections (c)(4) and (d) of section 4482.

(c) FLOOR STOCKS REFUNDS.—Section 6412(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “April 1, 2012” each place it appears and inserting “July 1, 2012”;

(2) by striking "September 30, 2012" each place it appears and inserting "December 31, 2012"; and

(3) by striking "July 1, 2012" and inserting "October 1, 2012".

(d) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS.—Sections 4221(a) and 4483(i) of such Code are each amended by striking "April 1, 2012" and inserting "July 1, 2012".

(e) EXTENSION OF TRANSFERS OF CERTAIN TAXES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9503 of such Code is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "April 1, 2012" each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting "July 1, 2012";

(ii) by striking "APRIL 1, 2012" in the heading of paragraph (2) and inserting "JULY 1, 2012";

(iii) by striking "March 31, 2012" in paragraph (2) and inserting "June 30, 2012"; and

(iv) by striking "January 1, 2013" in paragraph (2) and inserting "April 1, 2013"; and

(B) in subsection (c)(2), by striking "January 1, 2013" and inserting "April 1, 2013".

(2) MOTORBOAT AND SMALL-ENGINE FUEL TAX TRANSFERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (3)(A)(i) and (4)(A) of section 9503(c) of such Code are each amended by striking "April 1, 2012" and inserting "July 1, 2012".

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—Section 201(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4607–11(b)) is amended—

(i) by striking "April 1, 2013" each place it appears and inserting "July 1, 2013"; and

(ii) by striking "April 1, 2012" and inserting "July 1, 2012".

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on April 1, 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, first I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, we know why we're here. We are here to pass a responsible extension so that people across America can go to work, that we can finish a long-term transportation bill, and that we can be responsible stewards of the trust which the taxpayers and the citizens of America sent us here for.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, March 29, 2012.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA: I am writing concerning H.R. 4281, the "Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012," which is scheduled for floor consideration this week.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code. Title IV of this bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by extending the current Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority and the associated Federal excise taxes to June 30, 2012. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the

appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4281, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, March 29, 2012.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4281, the "Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012." The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure recognizes the Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 4281, and I appreciate your effort to facilitate consideration of this bill.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on this bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 4281 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Again, I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I look forward to working with the Committee on Ways and Means as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, the pending legislation before this body today, at the eleventh hour, as a result of a tortuous process—excuse me, it's not been a process at all, but rather a series of stalled starts, retreats, and the failure by the Republican leadership to seize upon a reasonable solution to reauthorizing our Nation's transportation surface programs.

At first, the Speaker stated this was a jobs bill. Almost as soon as the words were out of his mouth, he countered himself by saying that investing in America's infrastructure has nothing to do with jobs at all. Nothing to do with jobs at all.

What came about then was a scheme to produce a 5-year reauthorization bill coupled with that universal House Republican answer to all ills, which is to open up ANWR to drilling, drill, baby, drill, and then attempt to pay for some of the proposal on the backs of working-class Americans.

The surface transportation portion, H.R. 7, proposed to slash \$15.8 billion in highway funding to the States, destroying 550,000 American family-wage jobs over the coming years. Investment in roads, highways, and bridges would retrench in all but five States.

The Republican leadership also proposed to shift public transit revenue to

highways and then bail out transit with a one-time transfer of \$40 billion from the general fund, while robbing middle class Americans to pay for the shuffle.

This is an idea that would make even the most hardened con artist green with envy. It is a shell game. It's a shell game, but it has no place in the hallowed Halls of Congress. It is a shell game, and it is a sham.

But it was not Democrats who took this ill-advised proposal down; it was Republicans. Over the course of 6 weeks, they caucused, they corralled, and they contorted themselves in trying to obtain 218 votes to pass H.R. 7. And they could not, which brings us to this week, when the Republican leadership decided to bring up a 90-day extension bill under suspension of the rules in the form of H.R. 4239.

But when this legislation was called up on Tuesday, it was done so as a 60-day extension. The House debated this measure. I asked for a vote, and the vote was postponed. As far as I know, that request for a vote is still pending, even as we debate a different bill now.

Then another curious thing happened. According to the publication Transportation Weekly yesterday, and I quote:

After more discussion among themselves, Republican leaders order Mica to reintroduce the 60-day version of his extension as a stand-alone bill, which can then be considered by the Rules Committee.

That bill is H.R. 4276.

The Transportation Weekly article yesterday then noted, and I quote again:

After still more discussion among themselves, Republican leaders order Mica to reintroduce the 90-day version of the extension as a stand-alone bill, which can then be considered by the Rules Committee as well.

Confused? Anybody confused?

That bill is now H.R. 4281, which we are currently debating. Who knows what we'll be debating the next hour.

And yet, during the course of last and this week, the Republican leadership could have scheduled the bipartisan, non-controversial, Senate-passed bill for consideration by this body. It could have been brought up any time by the Speaker, passed by this body in a bipartisan fashion, signed into law.

I make these points to illustrate the fast and loose means by which the Republican leadership has been dealing with an extremely serious matter. Instead they're spinning their wheels in pursuit of the ill-conceived H.R. 7, which slashes investments in Federal aid to highways by \$15.8 billion from current levels at a time when more spending is needed to address structurally deficient bridges and maintain our highway system.

H.R. 7 reduces highway funding to all but five States.

H.R. 7 guts America's commitment to transit by a sleight-of-hand move that siphons away a portion of gas taxes which are dedicated to transit funding and instead proposes to fund

transit with general revenue funds which is offset on the backs of workers.

H.R. 7 contains a bogus pay-for by linking opening up ANWR and changes in OCS oil and gas leasing, which only produce \$4.3 billion over a 10-year period.

H.R. 7 continues to send American dollars and jobs overseas through the inclusion of a "Buy America Light" requirement that does not fully cover transit rolling stock, Amtrak, and the Federal railroad loan program, while failing to crack down on DOT's waiver authority.

H.R. 7 places a roadblock on public participation in reviewing transportation projects by limiting and, in certain cases, outright waiving NEPA.

And H.R. 7 eliminates OSHA protections for hazmat workers and allows bad actors to continue to receive hazmat compliance exemptions.

So this body could have considered and passed the other body's bipartisan bill, which passed that body by a vote of 74-22. That's half of the Republican Members in the other body, and we know how difficult it is to get that other body to get 60 votes to cut off debate on any resolution or any bill. Even one saying "I love Mother" would be hard to pass in that other body. Yet, for a transportation bill, they came up with 72 votes.

That bill continues current funding levels, sustaining approximately 1.9 million jobs. The States will receive \$3.8 billion more in highway construction funding than H.R. 7 over the course of 2 years.

The Senate bipartisan bill eliminates many of the gaping loopholes in current law by American requirements, loopholes that are being exploited by foreign competitors like China, who are stealing American jobs.

The Senate bipartisan bill does not contain poison pills like H.R. 7, such as provisions to strip OSHA requirements for hazmat workers and efforts to finance highway construction on the backs of middle class workers.

I would note, Mr. Speaker, that we have tried, we have tried by every means available to us on this side of the aisle, to have this Senate-passed bill brought up for consideration in the House, and not just through procedural motions. Yesterday, Representatives DEFAZIO, CORRINE BROWN, TIM BISHOP, and myself submitted that measure to the Rules Committee, asking them to make it in order as an amendment to the pending measure so we could vote on it today. We were denied.

Instead, we are on the floor today with the Republican leadership proposal to kick the can down the road for another 90 days so they can try to convince their conference to support something they have not been able to do over the last 6 weeks.

□ 1040

The fact of the matter is we need to be investing more, not less, if we are to keep pace with China, India, and our

other international competitors. Today China spends 9 percent of its GDP per year on infrastructure. India spends 5 percent. The U.S. only invests 1.9 percent.

While our competitors are moving forward, the inability of the Republican leadership to reach out across party lines to House Democrats to address this bill is leaving America stuck in a ditch and putting American businesses at a disadvantage with companies around the world.

In 2008, a blue ribbon commission established as a result of the last multiyear surface transportation bill reported that the Federal Government must invest a minimum of \$62 billion a year just to maintain the Nation's roads and bridges in their present inadequate condition.

This bill comes nowhere close to that. Instead, it leads America down the opposite path. President Lyndon B. Johnson once said: "In large measure, America's history is a history of her transportation."

I say let us seize the moment and move forward without procedural gimmicks, without partisan brinksmanship, and do what is right for America, for the American worker, for American families, and for American values.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, and then I would like to yield 2 minutes to the chair of the Highway Subcommittee, Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, let's just deal with the facts. The fact is that the Democrats had six amendments—1 month, 1.5 months, 2.5 months, 1 month, 9 months, and 2 months—when they controlled the House of Representatives and the Senate by huge majorities, and the White House. They couldn't even get it through committee. They could not get it through committee. These are the facts.

LIST OF TRANSPORTATION EXTENSIONS

Extension #1: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 1-month from 10/01/2009 to 10/31/2009.

Extension #2: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 1.5-months from 11/01/2009 to 12/18/2009.

Extension #3: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 2.5-months from 12/19/2009 to 2/28/2010.

Extension #4: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 1-month from 3/01/2010 to 3/28/2010.

Extension #5: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 9-months from 3/29/2010 to 12/31/2010.

Extension #6: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 2-months from 1/01/2011 to 3/04/2011.

Extension #7: A Republican controlled House passed extension with a duration of 7-months from 3/05/2011 to 9/30/2011.

Extension #8: A Republican controlled House passed extension with a duration of 6-months from 10/01/2011 to 3/31/2012.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that Chairman MICA has performed great leadership of the Transportation and

Infrastructure Committee, and he has tried in every way possible to work with everybody he possibly could. His task has been made much more difficult by the rule prohibiting earmarks. And as he just mentioned, the other side couldn't bring a bill out of committee and to this floor, a highway bill, in the last Congress when they controlled the House, the Senate, the White House, and still allowed earmarks. So we're in a very difficult situation at this point, and that's why we're here today asking for this 90-day extension.

H.R. 4281 extends the surface transportation programs through June 30 at funding levels consistent with fiscal year 2012. The transportation appropriations bill passed in November. This extension is clean and does not add any policy provisions. Without this extension, the transit and highway safety programs are set to expire this Saturday. This legislation will allow these programs to continue to operate as the spring construction season kicks off.

If Congress fails to pass this extension by Saturday, it will cost the highway trust fund about \$1 billion a week in lost revenue and put the brakes on 134,000 highway projects and 5,700 transit projects across the Nation. States that seek to be reimbursed for their Federal aid for highway and transit projects would be unable to receive Federal funds for the work they have completed. The Federal Highway Administration would furlough 3,500 of their employees, and work on environmental permits and project approvals for new construction projects would come to a screeching halt. Over 280,000 construction workers, Mr. Speaker, working on highway and bridge projects today could lose their jobs if Congress cannot pass this extension.

This country simply cannot afford a loss of such a magnitude during our tenuous road to economic recovery. Time magazine has a cover article this week describing our recovery as the wimpy recovery, and it's based primarily on pent-up demand.

We need to pass this extension so that we can work toward completing and finalizing H.R. 7, our long-term authorization reform bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished ranking member on our Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This could or should be the most important jobs-creating bill in America, investing in our Nation's infrastructure, making our Nation more competitive in the international economy, more efficiently moving goods and people. The current system, a legacy of the 1950s, is falling apart.

The Republicans are telling us that this 90-day extension will be good for America. It will not be good for America because we have a better option before us. A bill passed by the United

States Senate, a bipartisan bill, with 22 Republican Senators, half the Republican Senators supporting that bill, which would give us more funding without creating deficit and create more jobs than their pie-in-the-sky bill, H.R. 7, which they can't even get out of their own caucus here, because their own caucus is split.

There are a number of Republicans who do not believe we should have a national transportation system. They want to devolve it back to the States, go back to the pre-1950s.

The Speaker was forced to say to his caucus:

We are not making the claim that spending taxpayer money on transportation projects creates jobs. We don't make that claim, and we won't make that claim. What makes this a jobs bill is that it removes government barriers that are getting in the way of economic growth.

That's not what all the people engaged in rebuilding the Nation's infrastructure think. They think investment equals jobs. If we do this 90-day extension, the Association of General Contractors says that States will cut back from 50 percent to 40 percent of their planned projects because of the uncertainty created by this 90-day extension. We're going to lose half of the proposed projects this construction season around America, tens of thousands of jobs, needed investment because they've got a bunch of bozos in their caucus that don't believe we should have a national transportation system. They're fighting among themselves.

Give us a vote. Let us vote on the Senate bill.

It doesn't create deficit. It does create jobs. It does give us the investment we need.

The gentleman who spoke just before me, the gentleman from Tennessee, who is a good friend, under the bill they're trying to pry out of their caucus, which the Secretary of Transportation called the worst transportation bill in history—and by the way, the Secretary is a Republican and served in this House for more than a decade. He says it's the worst bill ever in terms of policy and lack of investment. In the case of the gentleman from Tennessee, their H.R. 7, if they could get it out of caucus—and they can't—it would cost his State \$444 million over 5 years. That's lost investment. That's more than 10,000 jobs lost.

We have an opportunity today to take up a 2-year bill and provide certainty not only for construction jobs and for engineering jobs, but for people who manufacture construction equipment, for people with Made in America requirements who construct transportation equipment, our buses, our light rail, our streetcars, all the things that need building and replacing just for the existing system, let alone beginning to have a vision of building out a 21st century system. Our competitor nations around the world are doing it.

They are so dyspeptic on their side, they're arguing over whether or not

the Federal Government should be involved in transportation. That's nuts. We settled that debate 60 years ago when Dwight David Eisenhower said this doesn't work. We have States building turnpikes that end in farmers' fields because the adjoining State couldn't afford to build their section of the turnpike. He said we need a coordinated national transportation policy.

We have an opportunity to improve on the one we have today by passing the Senate bill that does do some streamlining, it does do things that will help us spend the money more efficiently, and it maintains current levels of spending instead of reductions, and it does not have the uncertainty of a 90-day bill that is going to cost us half of the proposed projects this construction season.

Give us that chance. Let us have that vote. What are you afraid of? Are you afraid it might pass?

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is appropriate that Members of my conference be referred to as bozos. I think that we have dedicated Americans, ladies and gentlemen, who serve this country and the Congress well.

The gentleman who just spoke on September 23, 2009, said:

Don't play politics with investments in our infrastructure, don't play politics with the economy, don't play politics with people's jobs, don't bring America to a screeching halt on October 1 and walk away from your obligation to extend this program.

Mr. Speaker, when they controlled the House in huge numbers, they could not pass that extension, nor could they pass, I'm told, any extension free-standing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1050

Mr. RAHALL. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I still agree with that quote. We shouldn't play politics. It has never been a partisan issue. You've made it into a partisan issue, and that quote was when you were opposing a 90-day extension and when I was saying don't play politics by opposing a 90-day extension at that point in time. But we're too far down the road. We didn't have an alternative then. We have an alternative now. Pass the Senate bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MICA. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member on the House Education and the Workforce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Americans all over the country know that our economy is improving, that the unemployment num-

ber is coming down, that people are finding jobs, that small businesses are doing better; but it's a very fragile recovery. That infrastructure bill that is waiting in the Senate, which was passed 74-22, is key to continuing the economic growth in this country for businesses, for families, and for people seeking jobs who have been laid off for a very long time.

But now what we see here today is a conscious decision. Rather than give the Obama administration and President Obama any help with the continuing growth in the economy, which these jobs would mean if we had a long-term extension of the highway bill for all across America, they've decided that they'll do a short-term extension. This is a party that has complained about uncertainty in the economy, about uncertainty in the business community—with a 90-day extension. Cities, counties, and State governments are going to have to rethink what they contract for—with a 90-day extension. There are those in the leadership who have already said, And then we'll need another 90 days. This construction season will be gone for equipment manufacturers, for engineers, for construction workers, all across the country in our local communities, who are in desperate need of infrastructure improvement.

But they've made a decision that they're going to fight President Obama with the jobs that belong to middle class Americans all across the country—jobs that people need today to feed their families. They've made a decision: inject uncertainty. Those contracts and those jobs won't be met, and that will somehow be a victory for the Republicans in the House, but it will be a disaster for American families, for American workers, and for American businesses.

This kind of cold-blooded, political calculation to use the jobs of the American working people as political cannon fodder for your agenda in order to defeat the Obama administration is outrageous.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. It should be rejected by your party, and it should be rejected by my party because, when you put American people's lives and their well-being and their family incomes and the economic growth in our communities on the line for this kind of partisanship, you should stop it. You should stop it.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, you should stop banging the gavel, because this is a critical issue for the American people, for their families, for their livelihoods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is no longer recognized.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield, at this time, 2 minutes to the

chair of the Railroads Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. I wish the gentleman from California would have shown that kind of passion when the stimulus bill was passed 2 years ago and had come to the floor and said that the stimulus bill should be an infrastructure bill. There was only a very, very small portion—I think about \$68 billion of that \$800 billion stimulus package—that went to the infrastructure of this country. Where was the gentleman when that outrage was happening?

If you want real stimulation—and we believe this stimulates the economy in that this helps put concrete on our roads and repairs our bridges and puts people to work—this bill will do that, a 5-year bill. An 18-month bill is not going to put any kind of certainty out there. I correct myself. It will create certainty. The certainty is that it will bankrupt the trust fund in less than 2 years. Our bill that we've been trying to pass here, a 5-year bill, that's what the people back in the States want.

To the gentleman from Oregon, I'm surprised. He has been a long-time member of the T&I Committee and knows that a long-term transportation bill is better for the States, that it's better for the folks who build roads and employ people, and that that's what we need here. That's what we're trying to get at.

Mr. RAHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I will not yield to the gentleman from West Virginia. I know the gentleman has plenty of time, and he can respond on his time.

This 90-day extension is a clean extension. It gives us the time to work on a 5-year bill. As I said, members on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee know that a 5-year bill is something that would put certainty out there to the folks in the States—to the folks who are going to buy trucks, who are going to hire people, who are going to expand their businesses to build and rebuild these bridges and roads throughout the country. It doesn't make any sense to do an 18-month extension, which is basically what the Senate's bill does, and along the way bankrupt the trust fund.

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

Mr. MICA. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SHUSTER. Our 5-year bill has significant reforms in it that will shorten the timeframe to build a highway. We all sit around here and we talk about streamlining government. That's what this bill does. It eliminates departments and consolidates departments in transportation, and it shortens the timeline of 14 to 15 years down to 7 to 8 years.

Now, it's tough to quantify the savings, but we all know that time is money. All of us have seen these projects that go on year, after year, after year. They balloon and they have

cost overruns. This bill is going to solve a lot of those problems, so we need to pass this 90-day extension in order to be able to continue to work on a real solution to our infrastructure.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the bill he is promoting, H.R. 7, means to his home State of Pennsylvania a cut of \$948 million, and it destroys some 32,983 good-paying jobs. For fiscal year 2016, in the State of Pennsylvania, the level of funding will be less than that for fiscal year 2004. That's what H.R. 7 would mean to the gentleman's home State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. You would not yield to me. I will not yield to you.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes now to the gentleman from Missouri, a valued member of our committee, Mr. CARNAHAN.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I rise today in strong opposition to yet another lame, shortsighted extension of our surface transportation system.

I thank NICK RAHALL and PETER DEFAZIO for their staunch support of a real transportation-jobs bill.

This kick-the-can-down-the-road extension fails—it fails—to make progress in rebuilding America just at the time when our construction season is starting off this year. Our States and our local governments need certainty to invest, to plan, to build America's infrastructure; and this ninth—yes, ninth—short-term extension only extends the uncertainty this Congress has repeatedly created.

In a bipartisan fashion, by a vote of 74-22—rare in the Senate these days—they passed a responsible 2-year, 2 million jobs bill that is a better path for the American people and the economy. This includes an estimated 36,500 jobs in my home State of Missouri. The construction sector and especially our building trades have been particularly hard-hit by this recession, with 1.9 million jobs lost at the depth of the recession. Currently, there are 1.4 million unemployed construction workers. Let's put them back to work.

I sit on the Transportation Committee where, 6 weeks ago, the Republican majority passed out a completely partisan transportation bill for the first time in history. Their bill would kill over a half a million jobs and cut investments in 45 States and in the District of Columbia, and it was dead on arrival in this House. So it is no surprise that here, 6 weeks later, we have not seen any action on the floor, because there is no support for their job-killing proposal. Now we're delaying again with yet another extension instead of taking up a true compromise passed by our colleagues in the Senate.

□ 1100

I was proud to be an original cosponsor when the Senate bill was introduced in the House as H.R. 14, and it's

time the House take up that bipartisan bill. Let's pass it. Let's send it to the President.

Infrastructure is a national and urgent priority, and this body needs to start treating it that way. Infrastructure is one of the few areas where virtually everyone except the isolated, out-of-touch Republican majority agrees on what we need to do.

From the Chamber of Commerce to the AFL-CIO to everyone's transportation leaders back home, let's pass this bipartisan bill. Let's send it to the President's desk before the current transportation programs expire. It will bring the certainty that State and local governments need, that our construction industry, that our building trades are yearning for, are hungry for. They are hungry to go back to work.

I call on my colleagues to reject yet another short-term extension and pass H.R. 14, a 2-year, 2 million jobs bill to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and put Americans back to work.

Mr. MICA. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

I dispute the gentleman from West Virginia's figures. Are we going to spend less? Yes, quite possibly. But we have to live within our means. And by streamlining, I believe we'll spend that money out, and we'll create more jobs by streamlining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) at this time, a valued member of our committee and the sponsor of H.R. 14, the other body's bipartisan transportation bill, which is twice as good as H.R. 7.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me see if I have this right. Our Republican colleagues are telling us that we should forget about the 15 months that have passed since they started crafting the highway bill. They're telling us we should forget about the last 6 weeks during which time their bill, H.R. 7, imploded and the bipartisan MAP-21 bill passed the Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support. Now they're telling the American people that they simply need 3 additional months to find the money and shape a policy—an effort that thus far has eluded them—that can garner a majority of votes in the House and overcome the 60-vote threshold in the Senate and be signed by the President of the United States.

It gets better. On the very same day that they make this outrageous argument, they will vote for a Republican budget that slashes investment in transportation infrastructure by 46 percent, a 46 percent reduction in investment in infrastructure.

Now, if they're serious about this vote, if they're serious about seeing this destructive level of funding enacted into law, how can we take them seriously when they talk about a 5-

year bill? They talk about certainty. How can we give the American people or the construction industry or construction workers certainty when they say, Just give us 90 more days and we'll craft a 5-year bill, but in the meantime, we want to cut highway funding by 46 percent? These don't line up. No reasonable person can take that seriously.

To make it even worse, at the end of today, we're going to adjourn the House for 2 weeks. Asking for a 90-day extension, but in the first 2 weeks of that 90-day extension, they're going to adjourn the House and go home. And they're going to do that while construction workers are wondering where their next paycheck is coming from. They're wondering how they're going to be able to provide for their families. This is unconscionable.

If Republicans want 90 more days, we should stay here and work through the issues with the bipartisan Senate bill MAP-21, H.R. 14, here in the House as the basis for these discussions. We know we can get it through the Senate; and I am confident that if Republicans are released by their leadership to vote for it, they'll vote for it here in the House.

Let's pass H.R. 14.

Mr. MICA. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from West Virginia has 9 minutes. The gentleman from Florida has 23 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes at this time to the distinguished gentlelady from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the ranking member on our Economic Development and Public Buildings Subcommittee.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The American people will be puzzled by why we can't get out what has traditionally been the most popular bill, the transportation bill. And they will hope that we're not on a road to the 20-plus extensions that we had with the FAA bill. It won't do to say, like two kids: You did it, too; therefore, we can do it.

None of us should have done it.

But in any case, we know we don't have to do it this time because the Senate has passed a bill that we could pass as well. So we know the compromise can happen because they've passed a bill with more than two-thirds of their own house, including many Republicans, signing on.

Compromise is possible if you believe in compromise, and I'm afraid that this bill shows that we have a majority that does not. They are on record saying that they must have 218 votes from their caucus alone. That says to the American people, we need to pass a bill that will have only people from our party voting for it. But, the Senate has passed a bill with both parties compro-

missing. Which is the party that does not believe in compromise? You always have to compromise.

There is not a whole lot of difference in the amount of money in these bills; \$52 billion per year for the House, \$54 billion per year for the Senate.

The problem is poison pills. The problem is not treating the transportation bill as it has always been treated, as a bipartisan bill. The problem is not caring that you are effecting the recovery if you pass a series of 90-day bills.

We should be speeding the recovery instead of hanging, clinging to a bill that would kill half a million jobs.

It's time to compromise. This side is holding out its hand for a compromise. We need colleagues on the other side to hold out theirs.

Mr. MICA. I am going to continue to reserve the balance of my time and will close at the appropriate time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I just want to reiterate the point I made earlier. Outside of a minority of their caucus, I believe a majority of the United States House of Representatives believes that Federal investment—using taxpayer dollars without creating deficit—that Federal investment and rebuilding our national infrastructure, the 150,000 bridges on the National Highway System that need substantial repair or replacement—the steel that goes into those bridges is made in America. The workers are American workers. The engineers are American engineers. The \$60 billion backlog in our existing transit systems, let alone giving Americans more fuel-efficient transit options, \$60 billion. Buses made in America, light railcars made in America, these are manufacturing jobs, engineering jobs, high-tech jobs. These are not just construction jobs.

The construction industry, itself, is devastated with double-digit unemployment. Passing this 90-day extension, according to the Association of General Contractors, a very Republican-leaning organization—80 percent of their political contributions go to the Republicans, so they are not partisan to our side of the aisle—they say that it is going to mean the States will go to a 40 or 50 percent reduction in their projects this summer because they are not assured beyond that 90 days that they're going to get their Federal reimbursements. Many States, unlike this body and unlike the Federal Government, have constitutional balanced budget requirements, something we should have nationally. But that's a debate for another day.

The point is that this temporary extension does cost us jobs, and the bill we'll vote on later today, the Ryan budget, would actually reduce transportation investments by 56 percent from current levels, which isn't even dealing with the already deteriorated infrastructure and is not putting people back to work.

□ 1110

So there's this kind of a mixed message on their side. They say, Well, just do the 90 days and then we'll do H.R. 7. Well, H.R. 7 will reduce spending and cost half a million jobs.

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

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The budget they're going to vote on later today would reduce spending by 56 percent on transportation. That is mind-boggling in the face of what confronts our Nation, the challenges around the world, and the need for jobs.

There are people on their side of the aisle that just say, The government can't create jobs. They're hung up on this semantic thing. No, the government isn't creating the jobs. The government is investing taxpayer dollars without borrowing to let out private contracts to the lowest and best bidders to build these projects with all products made in America—the strongest Made in America requirement.

So you can't tell me those things don't create jobs. Those are investments. They create jobs. Consumption and tax cuts don't create jobs. They want more tax cuts instead of investment in America. That is so wrong.

Let us vote on the bipartisan Senate bill. If 22 Republican Senators can support that bill, which would give us 2 years of stability, we ought to have a chance to vote on it in this House.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. GERRY CONNOLLY.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my friend from West Virginia.

Madam Speaker, America's commuters and businesses want us to speed up transportation improvements. However, the House Republicans have offered only a speed bump. We face a transportation crisis, with bridges and roadways crumbling, millions of Americans stuck in gridlock, and transit improvements languishing.

We've known that the transportation authorization lapses on March 31, severely jeopardizing projects and jobs in every one of our States. The transportation vote today is nothing more than a 3-month Band-Aid. The Republican plan was rejected on a bipartisan basis because it disinvests in America, cutting \$361 million in my home State of Virginia alone.

America needs a real transportation plan: a plan that ensures that States and localities don't shut up projects this Sunday; a plan that creates jobs, putting the hard-hit construction industry back to work. Thankfully, there is such a plan. It's bipartisan. This month, the Senate passed a 2-year transportation plan by a vote of 74-22, including half of the Republicans present.

I urge Republican leadership to bring forward the bipartisan Senate bill. It's time to get America moving again.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield the customary 1

minute to the Democratic leader in the House of Representatives, the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his tireless efforts on behalf of America's workers and for his attempts to bring to the floor a bipartisan transportation bill, as has been the custom in our House and as we do have the opportunity to do by taking up the Senate bill.

The bill in the Senate has bipartisan support—74, plus one who was absent but voting for the bill. Seventy-five Members of the Senate support that legislation. It is bipartisan. It creates jobs. It is worthy of our support.

It has the cosponsorship of the chair and the ranking member of the committee, from Chairwoman BARBARA BOXER to Ranking Member INHOFE, a wide array of philosophical thinking, and all of it coming together around a bipartisan initiative.

The American people have a right to know why the Republicans in the Senate, the Democrats in the Senate, the President of the United States, and the House Democrats all support this bipartisan bill while the Republicans in the House are odd man out. It calls to mind when there was an odd man out on the payroll tax cut in December, when all the parties had come together in a bipartisan way.

But what is dangerous about what is happening here today is that this initiative, this kick-the-can-down-the-road, this my-way-or-no-highway-bill attitude is costing jobs. I'm sure that they have been reviewed—41,000 in North Carolina; 4,500 in Illinois; 4,000 in Maryland; and the list goes on and on—just because of the delay and the uncertainty that is injected into the system. This costs the taxpayers more, and small businesses suffer because they cannot proceed with contracts and the rest to go forward. And it is a job-loser, as I mentioned.

So this has nothing to recommend it except to be explained by the fact that the Republicans can't even bring their own transportation bill to the floor and pass it. Their own transportation bill is not a good bill, but at least it would take us to conference. They can't vote for their own bill. I don't know how it happens that they have a bill that they can't support.

But in addition to not being able to support their own bill—and it's interesting that the budget and transportation are on the floor at the same time—they have this bill, and yet in the budget that they are going to be voting on today, they have cut transportation funding in half: from \$90 billion to \$46 billion. That's \$44 billion worth of jobs, promotion of commerce, improving the quality of life of the American people, building the infrastructure of America, and that means mass transit and all the rest of that. Cut that in half. Oh, and by the way, give a tax break of over \$300,000 to the wealthiest people in America. Wealthy

people get off fine. Middle class people pay. Small businesses pay. The taxpayer pays. Job-seekers and workers pay the price.

So I think it's really important to understand what the bipartisan National Governors Association has said:

A string of short-term extensions will only increase uncertainty for State and local governments and the private sector.

So, again, I call the House back to its bipartisanship on this legislation. The distinguished chairman, Mr. MICA, has been part of that bipartisanship in the past, and now they come up with a bill that the Republican Secretary of Transportation says is a job-loser and is dangerous to public safety. It's the worst bill he's seen in his 35 years of public service, and his public service has been in this field. Again, it departs from bipartisanship.

So I urge my colleagues to not aid and abet the Republicans in going down this path that is not a good one, but to urge them to bring up the Senate bill. It can go to the President's desk today, putting people back to work immediately.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 23 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. I guess it's not very popular on his side of the aisle. He doesn't seem to have many speakers coming over. I haven't noticed many members of his committee to speak in favor of this extension today.

I am prepared to close. I would take some time from the distinguished chairman, if he'd be willing to yield me some of his time.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. That's about all we're getting out of H.R. 7, too.

Madam Speaker, if the other side were serious about creating jobs, they would have worked in a bipartisan fashion in this body, as the other body did, to build a bill that could pass both bodies of the Congress and be signed into law. As the distinguished Democratic leader has just said, everybody is on board except the leadership of the House of Representatives on the Republican side.

Just as this Congress has done so many times before—and I have been in this body over three decades, involved in every transportation bill we've done over that time—every transportation bill we've done has been in a bipartisan fashion, passing this body by overwhelming margins.

□ 1120

Instead, today's leadership in this House has plowed full speed ahead writing a partisan proposal that is aimed at appealing to ideological spectrums of their party. Last month, Teamsters general president James Hoffa wrote in a letter:

How do eliminating OSHA protections for hazmat workers improve this Nation's crumbling roads and bridges? How do loopholes in "Buy America" protections put hundreds of thousands of construction workers back on the job?

Last month in a letter addressed to the Speaker of this body, the general president of the Laborers International Union, Terry O'Sullivan, wrote:

The House must return to the principles of sound governance and bipartisanship that has historically characterized consideration of the Surface Transportation Act.

He further noted:

The offsets used to pay for this bill are also irresponsible. Slashing the pay and retirement security of the hardworking Federal and postal employees is neither honest nor fair. It is an unacceptable attack on the hardworking people who provide essential services for veterans and Native Americans, process our mail, keep our skies safe, our parks clean, and help protect us from threats, both foreign and domestic.

As has already been noted, one of our key business groups in this country, the Associated General Contractors, has stated the following:

The majority of the work is supposed to go out in spring and get done by the fall. Instead of spending 60 or 70 percent of their budgets, our small businesses are going to cut back to 50 to 40 percent to make sure they have some cash in the fall.

That comes from one of the major business groups in this country responsible for putting people to work and responsible for getting our economy moving again. I urge that we take up the bipartisan Senate-passed bill and reject this extension.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time to close.

Madam Speaker and my colleagues, I think it might be time right now, Madam Speaker, that we call the Capitol Physician to come to the House floor. I think we should call the Capitol Physician because there appears to be on the other side a mass case of loss of memory, and I think that we need to clear up just a few facts in what has been said here.

Now, we have the gentlelady from California who happened to be the Speaker of the House. As I recall, the other side controlled the House by a huge margin, the Senate by a significant margin—most of the time I think it was 60 votes where you could do anything—and they controlled the White House for those 2 years. They could have done anything they wanted to do. President Obama, in fact, sent Secretary LaHood to Mr. Oberstar and me—I was the ranking Republican, he was the chair—and cut the knees right out from the Democrats and said he wasn't doing a long-term bill, he was doing an 18-month bill, which really sent a death signal to transportation and infrastructure projects.

In fact, the other side would be in the majority probably and I would be the ranking member if they had just done what they could have done. Then they tell you that we can't pass a bill. Well, let's deal with the facts. They six times

had to do extensions. Not one extension was freestanding. In fact, one time they could not even pass the extension with the House, the Senate, and the White House. In March of 2010, they actually closed down programs.

Madam Speaker, we may need the House Physician because there are multiple cases of amnesia, and we need to remind folks about the facts and what they have forgotten.

Even in the extensions, I offered first a 90-day extension, and I know Speaker BOEHNER talked to the Senate and the other leaders and said we'll do a 90. No, we want to do a 60-day extension, they said. Then some of the Democrats felt like they were thrown under the bus, and the 60-day extension that they asked us to do, they couldn't get the votes for, they came down and spoke against yesterday.

Madam Speaker, there's something wrong here. I think we really need to get the Capitol Physician involved because the amnesia is very, very serious on the other side. They had earmarks. The last bill was passed with 6,300 earmarks. They had earmarks. They had control. They couldn't even pass a free-standing bill and get it to the full committee. So, again, I think the amnesia is pretty rampant on the other side.

I don't want this to be delayed any further because I want Americans to go back to work.

We offer here today a long-term bill that will put people who want jobs in this country back to work without earmarks and without tax increases. The end of the era of the biggest gorilla walking off with the most bananas is over, and we will pass responsible legislation, and we will get it done.

As the Cable Guy said, Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to "Git-R-Done."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, today I voted against H.R. 4281, the Surface Transportation Extension Act. I oppose this legislation not because I oppose transportation funding—on the contrary—but because we can and should pass a better-funded and longer-term bill.

The unemployment rate in the construction industry is nearly double the national average. Over the past year, I have met with many of my constituents who work in the construction industry, including construction workers, designers, managers, engineers, contractors, and developers. The one thing they have all shared is that another short-term extension will not bring enough certainty to the industry to encourage the types of project development and job creation that our country needs.

I object to H.R. 4281 because there is a better bill we can pass right now. I am a co-sponsor of H.R. 14, or MAP-21, which is identical to the bill that passed the Senate with an overwhelming bipartisan majority, 74-22. MAP-21 would fund our transportation and infrastructure needs for two years. If the Republican leadership would allow that bill to come to the floor, we could pass it today. Instead, they have elected to play political games and pass a bill that promotes an unpredictable transportation future.

I can't support a 90-day extension that will bring another funding battle at the end of June, during the heart of our construction season in Illinois. This attempt to "kick the can down the road" will delay projects and risk 4,500 jobs in our state alone. We need to move forward with legislation that will provide our state, local communities, and small businesses the stability and predictability they need. A short-term extension will do nothing to alleviate concerns about future funding and will not reduce unemployment.

Businesses and employees need the increased certainty that MAP-21 will provide. We owe it to our constituents to oppose a short-term extension in favor of that bipartisan, commonsense legislation that will protect and promote our economic and transportation needs.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 4281, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012. I am opposing this measure because it is merely a 3-month extension, as opposed to a long-term reauthorization. States and municipalities need time to adequately plan their transportation projects, and these piecemeal extensions will not offer the certainty needed to see these projects through.

It has been more than a month since House Republicans reported their seriously flawed bill, and they do not have the votes to pass it. I have served on the Transportation Committee for 20 years, and up until now, the committee has worked in a bipartisan fashion to produce a sound and commonsense transportation policy.

Instead of voting on another extension, we should be considering the bipartisan Senate transportation bill. While I would prefer a longer reauthorization, the 2-year bipartisan Senate bill will provide the kind of investment in infrastructure and job creation that is desperately needed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 600, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 266, nays 158, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—266

Adams	Berg	Brooks
Aderholt	Biggert	Broun (GA)
Akin	Billbray	Buchanan
Alexander	Billirakis	Bucshon
Amodei	Bishop (GA)	Buerkle
Austria	Bishop (NY)	Burgess
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Burton (IN)
Bachus	Black	Calvert
Barletta	Blackburn	Camp
Barrow	Bonner	Canseco
Bartlett	Bono Mack	Cantor
Barton (TX)	Boswell	Capito
Bass (CA)	Boustany	Capps
Bass (NH)	Brady (TX)	Carson (IN)
Benishak	Braley (IA)	Carter

Cassidy	Israel	Price (GA)
Chabot	Issa	Quayle
Chaffetz	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Chandler	(TX)	Reed
Coble	Jenkins	Rehberg
Coffman (CO)	Johnson (IL)	Reichert
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Connolly (VA)	Jones	Rigell
Costa	Kelly	Rivera
Cravaack	King (IA)	Roby
Crawford	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Crenshaw	Kingston	Rogers (AL)
Culberson	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Davis (KY)	Kissell	Rogers (MI)
Denham	Kline	Rohrabacher
Dent	Kucinich	Rokita
DesJarlais	Labrador	Rooney
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Donnelly (IN)	Lance	Roskam
Dreier	Landry	Ross (FL)
Duffy	Lankford	Royce
Duncan (SC)	Latham	Runyan
Duncan (TN)	LaTourette	Ruppersberger
Ellmers	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Scalise
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Schilling
Fincher	Loebach	Schock
Fitzpatrick	Long	Schrader
Fleischmann	Lucas	Scott (SC)
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Forbes	Lummis	Scott, David
Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel	Sessions
Fox	E.	Sewell
Franks (AZ)	Lynch	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Shuler
Gallely	Marchant	Shuster
Garamendi	Marino	Simpson
Gardner	Matheson	Smith (NE)
Garrett	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Gerlach	McCauley	Smith (TX)
Gibbs	McCotter	Smith (WA)
Gibson	McHenry	Southerland
Gingrey (GA)	McIntyre	Stearns
Gohmert	McKeon	Stivers
Goodlatte	McKinley	Stutzman
Gosar	McMorris	Sullivan
Gowdy	Rodgers	Terry
Granger	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Graves (GA)	Mica	Thornberry
Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)	Tiberi
Green, Gene	Miller (MI)	Tipton
Griffin (AR)	Miller, Gary	Tsongas
Griffith (VA)	Mulvaney	Turner (NY)
Grimm	Murphy (PA)	Turner (OH)
Guinta	Myrick	Upton
Guthrie	Neugebauer	Van Hollen
Hall	Noem	Walberg
Hanna	Nugent	Walden
Harper	Nunes	Walsh (IL)
Harris	Nunnelee	Walz (MN)
Hartzler	Olson	Webster
Hastings (WA)	Palazzo	West
Hayworth	Pastor (AZ)	Westmoreland
Heck	Paulsen	Whitfield
Hensarling	Pearce	Wilson (SC)
Herger	Pence	Wittman
Herrera Beutler	Peterson	Wolf
Hochul	Petri	Womack
Hoyer	Pitts	Woodall
Huelskamp	Platts	Yoder
Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)	Young (AK)
Hultgren	Polis	Young (FL)
Hunter	Pompeo	Young (IN)
Hurt	Posey	

NAYS—158

Ackerman	Cicilline	Dingell
Altmire	Clarke (MI)	Doggett
Amash	Clarke (NY)	Dold
Andrews	Clay	Doyle
Baca	Cleaver	Edwards
Baldwin	Clyburn	Ellison
Becerra	Cohen	Engel
Berkley	Conyers	Eshoo
Berman	Cooper	Farr
Blumenauer	Costello	Fattah
Bonamici	Courtney	Flake
Boren	Critz	Fleming
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Frank (MA)
Brown (FL)	Cuellar	Fudge
Butterfield	Cummings	Gonzalez
Campbell	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Capuano	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Cardoza	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Carnahan	DeGette	Hahn
Carney	DeLauro	Hanabusa
Castor (FL)	Deuth	Hastings (FL)
Chu	Dicks	Heinrich

Higgins	McGovern	Sarbanes
Himes	McNerney	Schakowsky
Hinche	Michaud	Schiff
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)	Schmidt
Hirono	Miller, George	Schwartz
Holden	Moore	Schweikert
Holt	Moran	Scott (VA)
Honda	Murphy (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Serrano
Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Sherman
Jordan	Neal	Sires
Kaptur	Olver	Slaughter
Keating	Owens	Speier
Kildee	Pallone	Stark
Kind	Pascrell	Sutton
Langevin	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Larson (CT)	Peters	Tierney
Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)	Tonko
Levin	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Visclosky
Lipinski	Reyes	Richardson
Lofgren, Zoe	Richardson	Richmond
Lowey	Richmond	Ross (AR)
Luján	Ross (AR)	Rothman (NJ)
Maloney	Rothman (NJ)	Roybal-Allard
Markey	Roybal-Allard	Rush
Matsui	Rush	Ryan (OH)
McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Sánchez, Linda
McClintock	Sánchez, Linda	T.
McCollum	T.	Sanchez, Loretta
McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta	

NOT VOTING—7

Filner	Meeks	Towns
Jackson (IL)	Paul	
Mack	Rangel	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1155

Ms. WILSON of Florida changed her vote from “yea” to “nay”.

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, SHULER, and ISRAEL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 147, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). Pursuant to House Resolution 597 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 112.

Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) kindly take the chair.

□ 1155

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, with Mrs. BIGGERT (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 28, 2012, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112-423 by the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 78, noes 346, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

AYES—78

Andrews	Grijalva	Olver
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Pallone
Becerra	Hahn	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Hinche	Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL)	Hirono	Price (NC)
Capuano	Holt	Richardson
Carson (IN)	Honda	Rothman (NJ)
Chu	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (MI)	(TX)	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kaptur	T.
Clyburn	Kildee	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kucinich	Scott, David
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Deutch	Markey	Tonko
Doyle	McCollum	Velázquez
Edwards	McDermott	Waters
Ellison	McGovern	Watt
Farr	Miller (NC)	Waxman
Fattah	Moore	Welch
Frank (MA)	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Nadler	Woolsey
Green, Al	Napolitano	

NOES—346

Ackerman	Blackburn	Castor (FL)
Adams	Bonamici	Chabot
Aderholt	Bonner	Chaffetz
Akin	Bono Mack	Chandler
Alexander	Boren	Cielline
Altmire	Boswell	Coble
Amash	Boustany	Coffman (CO)
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Cole
Austria	Braley (IA)	Conaway
Baca	Brooks	Connolly (VA)
Bachmann	Broun (GA)	Cooper
Bachus	Buchanan	Costa
Baldwin	Bucshon	Costello
Barletta	Buerkle	Courtney
Barrow	Burgess	Cravaack
Bartlett	Burton (IN)	Crawford
Barton (TX)	Butterfield	Crenshaw
Bass (NH)	Calvert	Critz
Benishak	Camp	Crowley
Berg	Campbell	Cuellar
Berkley	Canseco	Culberson
Berman	Cantor	Davis (CA)
Biggert	Capito	Davis (KY)
Blibray	Capps	DeFazio
Bilirakis	Cardoza	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Carnahan	DeLauro
Bishop (NY)	Carney	Denham
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Dent
Black	Cassidy	DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart	Kline	Richmond
Dicks	Labrador	Rigell
Dingell	Lamborn	Rivera
Doggett	Lance	Roby
Dold	Landry	Roe (TN)
Donnelly (IN)	Langevin	Rogers (AL)
Dreier	Lankford	Rogers (KY)
Duffy	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (MI)
Duncan (SC)	Larson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Rokita
Ellmers	LaTourette	Rooney
Emerson	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen
Engel	Levin	Roskam
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Ross (AR)
Farenthold	Lipinski	Ross (FL)
Fincher	LoBiondo	Royce
Fitzpatrick	Loeback	Runyan
Flake	Long	Ruppersberger
Fleischmann	Lowey	Ryan (WI)
Fleming	Lucas	Sanchez, Loretta
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Sarbanes
Forbes	Luján	Scalise
Fortenberry	Lummis	Schiff
Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Schilling
Franks (AZ)	E.	Schmidt
Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Schock
Gallegly	Maloney	Schrader
Garamendi	Manzullo	Schwartz
Gardner	Marchant	Schweikert
Garrett	Marino	Scott (SC)
Gerlach	Matheson	Scott (VA)
Gibbs	Matsui	Scott, Austin
Gibson	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (NY)	Sessions
Gohmert	McCaul	Sewell
Gonzalez	McClintock	Sherman
Goodlatte	McCotter	Shimkus
Gosar	McHenry	Shuler
Gowdy	McIntyre	Shuster
Granger	McKeon	Simpson
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Sires
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Smith (NE)
Green, Gene	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)
Griffin (AR)	McNerney	Smith (TX)
Griffith (VA)	Meehan	Smith (WA)
Grimm	Mica	Southerland
Guinta	Michaud	Speier
Guthrie	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Hall	Miller (MI)	Stivers
Hanabusa	Miller, Gary	Stutzman
Hanna	Miller, George	Sullivan
Harper	Mulvaney	Sutton
Harris	Murphy (CT)	Terry
Hartzler	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (CA)
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Thompson (MS)
Hayworth	Neal	Thompson (PA)
Heck	Neugebauer	Thornberry
Heinrich	Noem	Tiberi
Hensarling	Nugent	Tierney
Herger	Nunes	Tipton
Herrera Beutler	Nunnelee	Tsongas
Higgins	Olson	Turner (NY)
Himes	Owens	Turner (OH)
Hinojosa	Palazzo	Upton
Hochul	Paulsen	Van Hollen
Holden	Pearce	Visclosky
Hoyer	Pelosi	Walberg
Huelskamp	Pence	Walden
Huizenga (MI)	Perlmutter	Walsh (IL)
Hultgren	Peters	Walsh (MN)
Hunter	Peterson	Wasserman
Hurt	Petri	Schultz
Israel	Pitts	Webster
Issa	Platts	West
Jenkins	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland
Johnson (IL)	Polis	Whitfield
Johnson (OH)	Pompeo	Wilson (SC)
Johnson, Sam	Posey	Wittman
Jones	Price (GA)	Wolf
Jordan	Quayle	Womack
Keating	Quigley	Woodall
Kelly	Rahall	Yarmuth
Kind	Reed	Yoder
King (IA)	Rehberg	Young (AK)
King (NY)	Reichert	Young (FL)
Kingston	Renacci	Young (IN)
Kinzing (IL)	Reyes	
Kissell	Ribble	

NOT VOTING—7

Filner	Meeks	Towns
Jackson (IL)	Paul	
Mack	Rangel	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.