

Lipinski	Pelosi	Serrano
Loeb	Perlmutter	Sewell
Lofgren, Zoe	Peters	Sherman
Lowey	Pingree (ME)	Sires
Lujan	Polis	Smith (WA)
Lummis	Price (NC)	Speier
Lynch	Quigley	Stark
Maloney	Rangel	Stearns
Markey	Reyes	Sutton
Matsui	Richardson	Thompson (CA)
McClintock	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
McCollum	Rothman (NJ)	Tierney
McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Tonko
McGovern	Royce	Tsongas
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Meeks	Rush	Velázquez
Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
Miller (NC)	Ryan (WI)	Walsh (IL)
Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda	Walz (MN)
Moore	T.	Wasserman
Moran	Sanchez, Loretta	Schultz
Mulvaney	Sarbanes	Waters
Murphy (CT)	Schakowsky	Watt
Nadler	Schiff	Waxman
Napolitano	Schrader	Welch
Olver	Schwartz	Wilson (FL)
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
Pascarella	Scott, David	Yarmuth
Pastor (AZ)	Sensenbrenner	

NOT VOTING—15

Akin	Kucinich	Paul
Baldwin	Lewis (CA)	Runyan
Bilirakis	Marino	Shuler
Coble	Myrick	Slaughter
Filner	Neal	Towns

□ 2207

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. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 370, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, and 370. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall vote Nos. 360, and 369. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote Nos. 358, 359, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, and 370.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permissions granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 7, 2012 at 6:08 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 3261.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5883.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5890.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 2210

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Broun of Georgia moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to insist on provisions that limit funding out of the Highway Trust Fund (including the Mass Transit Account) for Federal-aid highway and transit programs to amounts that do not exceed \$37,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFALZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that our country is facing an unprecedented fiscal emergency. We're broke as a Nation. While a number of us believe that the Federal Government's spending must be limited from the very start, it's clear to most of us here that any spending that we do must be offset. We cannot continue to build debt for our children and our grandchildren.

In most cases, when we wish to increase spending, we are presented with a very difficult choice: whether to increase taxes, as some would have us to do, or reduce spending in other areas of the Federal Government. But the case before us today, the Federal highway system, is different from most Federal programs.

Much of the spending in the underlying bill is filtered through the highway trust fund, which was built on a unique principle of “user pays.” Unlike most government programs which rely on general tax revenues, the programs which provide for new roads and highway improvements are paid for by highway users through the 18.4 cents per gallon gas tax. It isn't a perfect system, but it was created with a built-in accountability measure in mind: that the highway trust fund may only give out in obligations the amount in which it takes in through gas tax revenues.

Until recently, this principle worked relatively well. But increasing construction costs, stricter federally mandated fuel efficiency standards, and a reluctance to increase the gas tax—especially during an economic downturn—have led to a decrease in the highway trust fund's purchasing power.

None of these problems should have been a surprise to Congress, Mr. Speaker, as many of them were direct results of actions taken by this body. Nevertheless, these obstacles should have led

us to some sort of congressional action in order to keep the highway trust fund—and the Federal highway programs as a whole—solvent.

So what did Congress do? Did we increase the gas tax? Did we reverse the fuel efficiency standards? Did we reorganize any of the programs or do anything to encourage the production of cheaper fuel here in the U.S.? No, absolutely not. When faced with the threat of bankrupting the highway trust fund in 2005, Congress did nothing to rein in spending or increase revenues. Instead, Congress passed the SAFETEA-LU law, which was the biggest, most expensive transportation authorization in history. Not surprisingly, by 2009, the highway trust fund was broke. Since then, we've passed three separate bailouts of the highway trust fund totaling nearly \$30 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that the bill which is currently in conference will only lead to more of the same of that deficit spending. My fear is supported by numbers from the Congressional Budget Office which show that for each of the next 2 years, there is a projected \$8 to \$9 billion gap between the likely revenues and the expected outlays within the highway trust fund.

It is important to note, however, that these estimates are developed using current budgetary conditions. This means that changes could be made during the conference which would prevent this shortfall from happening again.

One approach which has been embraced by many Members is to tie U.S. energy production to highway financing. On its face, this approach looks like a win-win solution to both drive down gas prices and allow for increased investment in transportation infrastructure.

While I support language to authorize the Keystone pipeline and other domestic energy projects, I must caution my colleagues about combining such initiatives to pay for a transportation authorization. There are many regulatory hurdles that these projects must cross, as well as litigation, before they come to fruition. I don't agree with these burdens, but they are a reality. Even in the best case scenario, it will be years before we see any profits from Keystone or any energy development that many of us would like to see us undertake.

Indeed, using potential energy production to pay for other priorities is not new in this body. In fact, the House has voted to allow development of the resources in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge more than 10 times since 1995. But as many of us know, policies that are passed here in the House, or even in both bodies, do not always take effect as intended.

While I agree that our Nation's infrastructure needs significant help, we simply cannot allow ourselves to spend billions of dollars that we simply don't have based on the promise of potential,

unrealized energy revenues. That's why I have brought this motion to the floor tonight.

My motion to instruct would restore the inherent limits which were built into the highway trust fund originally. It would ask that the conferees only obligate funds which are equal to what the Congressional Budget Office projects that the government will take in via the Federal gas tax over the course of fiscal year 2013.

If my language were added to the bill, it would return discipline to a broken program until either additional real revenue becomes available or policy changes are made which would relieve the pressure on the highway trust fund.

We are in a fiscal crisis, Mr. Speaker. As a House Member, when I evaluate legislation, I ask myself four questions. The first, is it right? Is it moral? The second, is it constitutional according to the original intent of the Constitution? The third, is it needed? And the fourth, can we afford it?

Given what the conferees are working with, I can't sign off on that last question. It is simply not affordable.

We cannot continue to create more debt. And I'm not the only one who feels that way, Mr. Speaker. In fact, likewise, just 2 days ago, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce sent a letter to House Members earlier this week expressing its fear of an "impending fiscal cliff." In part, the letter states that:

America is accelerating toward a fiscal cliff while at the same time Congress and the President are ignoring a growing long-run fiscal imbalance.

Mr. Speaker, it seems clear to me that passing the motion before us here today would be an important step towards reining in spending and allowing us to step back from the precipice on which we find ourselves, a precipice of total economic collapse of our Nation.

Unfortunately, as with every other issue, the debate over transportation spending has become "cuts for thee, but not for me." The time for such games has ended. My motion would attempt to rein in Federal spending and hold us to our honest limits for now. And if the best case scenario presents itself down the road, all the better.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1020

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Well, here we are in the dark of the night, voting on what is really, for the most part meaningless, which is a motion to instruct conferees, which is nonbinding. But in this case, since this might indicate the intent of the majority, should this motion prevail, this is a very significant discussion of the future of our country.

Now, the gentleman talked about runaway spending, and we have some substantial agreement there. I was the

lead Democratic sponsor on a balanced budget amendment which would force us to agree on ways to move toward fiscal responsibility, including both revenues, which that side denies, and expenditures.

But when we look at expenditures, we need to discriminate between consumption and investment. Investment is transportation and infrastructure, giving the United States of America a 21st century, competitive infrastructure system to compete with the rest of the world.

Our competitor nations get it. China's spending almost 10 percent of their gross domestic product on transportation investment so they can be more competitive, get their goods to market more quickly, more efficiently, more fuel efficiently, move their people more efficiently.

India, 5 percent. Brazil, 6 percent. United States of America, a little bit less than 1 percent—and the gentleman's amendment would cut it to zero for the next year. Yes, zero.

Now, how does that happen?

Well, the fact is that as we incur obligations to spend money on infrastructure, there's a tail, there's a lag. We only reimburse the States once the projects are finished. And it happens that, over the next year, the past obligations to which the Federal Government has committed, would equal the amount of money to which the gentleman would limit us, which would mean no new investment in transportation and infrastructure in this country, despite the fact we have 150,000 bridges on the Federal system that are at the point of collapse or need substantial rehabilitation.

We have 40 percent of the miles on the national highway system that don't just need an overlay; they need to be dug up. They need to be totally rebuilt. And a \$70 billion backlog on our transit system. That's the 19th and 20th century system, let alone a 21st century transit them.

And guess what? If we make these investments with the "Buy America" requirements, which many on that side of the aisle are opposed to, we would put millions to work in this country. So we are, on this side, fighting for more investment. There are many on that side fighting for reduced investment. But this motion would actually propose zero, zero investment for the next year in transportation and infrastructure in America, with the deteriorating system. And that's somehow fiscally prudent.

The gentleman talked about the Chamber of Commerce. Kind of interesting because actually I have a letter dated June 5, pretty recent, from the Chamber of Commerce:

Passing transportation reauthorization legislation is a concrete step Congress and the administration can take right now to support job, economic productivity without adding to the deficit. The Chamber strongly opposes the Broun amendment, the motion to in-

struct conferees, and urges you to vote against this effort to slash funding for highways, transit, and safety programs. The Chamber may consider including votes on or in relation to this Broun amendment to instruct in our annual how they voted score card.

That's good. I might end up at 5 percent or 10 percent because I am going to oppose it. A lot of time I'm kind of zero with the Chamber. So that's good. They get it.

There's a long list of businesses and others that are opposed to this amendment. They understand for America to compete in the modern 21st century world we need an up-to-date transportation system. We don't have it, and the 20th century system we have, the legacy of Dwight David Eisenhower, a Republican President, is falling apart.

At the levels the gentleman would mandate with this motion to instruct, according to the Congressional Budget Office, there would be zero new investment in the coming year. That is hundreds of thousands of jobs lost, opportunities lost.

Now, I understand that on their side of the aisle they're having a very robust debate—I didn't bring my poster tonight—about the issue of devolution. And devolution is a theory that the Federal Government shouldn't be involved in national transportation policy. It should be delegated to the 50 States, and they should be responsible for paying for it.

Well, guess what? We had that system until 1956. Dwight David Eisenhower and the surface transportation legacy he gave us with the national highway system. And I have a great poster—I wish I'd brought it—which is a great photo from the air of the new, brand new, spanking new, beautiful new Kansas Turnpike, 1956. And guess what?

It ends kind of abruptly, and you go, wow, what's that line? Why does it end there?

Well, that was a farmer's field in Oklahoma, because Oklahoma said, well, we'll build our section too. We'll have a new, coordinated thing. But they said, well, we don't have the money, and they couldn't do it. And it wasn't done until the Eisenhower bill was adopted and we had a national investment in a national transportation highway system.

They want to go back to the good old days, a 50-State system funded by the 50 States that's disconnected. So freight comes into L.A., which is going to all of the Western United States, well, even some of it further to the east, maybe, probably not all the way to Georgia, who knows. Some of it. And well, I guess California would have to pay for moving all the freight for the rest of the country. Well, maybe they're not going to do that, and maybe the other States aren't going to do that under this kind of new, bizarre theory of devolution.

We need a 21st century, efficient, competitive, world-class national transportation system. The bill that

the Senate passed won't get us there. I would vote for it. Won't get us there.

The bill that was proposed on the Republican side of the aisle, which they couldn't even get out of conference, would move us backwards. This bill would take us back to essentially, not quite even Third World status because Third World countries are investing more of their GDP in transportation and infrastructure than us. It would be Fourth World, formerly First World, vaulting over everybody else saying, hey, we're just going to let it fall apart. We're going to leave it up to the 50 States, and maybe they can get it together for a national system. Maybe they can't. This is nuts.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. To begin with, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and then I'll yield to my good friend, MO BROOKS from Alabama.

But prior to yielding to Mr. BROOKS, I want to say that my good friend, who I have utmost admiration and good feelings towards personally, my friend from Oregon is just factually incorrect. If this motion to instruct is indeed put into the conference report that, hopefully, they will get out, there will continue to be new investment in our infrastructure. The difference will be that we just won't create any more debt.

And the argument I got from my colleague on the other side just shows the very drastic difference in philosophy between my Democratic colleagues and me and many on our side, and that's that it seems to me that the philosophy of the Democratic party is that only government creates jobs.

The government doesn't make any money. They just take money from those who are creating jobs and spend it on whatever government decides that they want to spend it on. We spent a tremendous amount of money, which is going to wind up being over \$1 trillion in a stimulus package that our President gave us. And where are the jobs? He created some temporary jobs. Created even temporary infrastructure jobs, but our economy is no better.

The American people are asking, where are the jobs? Where's the stronger economy?

There is none. And there is none because the philosophy of my Democratic colleagues just simply does not work. Socialism has never worked under any socialist particular regime in the history of this Nation, and it's not going to work under the socialistic regime of Barack Obama and my Democratic colleagues.

I believe in transportation. It's one of the few truly constitutional functions of the Federal Government under the original intent. In our Founding Fathers' time they called it a postal road system.

□ 2230

But what I am against is creating more debt for my two grandchildren,

who are 6 and 7. Their names are Tillman and Cile Surratt, and they live in Oconee County, Georgia. What we are doing here in this body and what we've been doing in the 5 years I've been here is creating more debt that they and their children and their grandchildren are going to have to pay. They're going to live at a lower standard than we do today.

It's because of this philosophy of Big Government spending; it's because of a philosophy of government knows best for America; and it's a philosophy of government is going to take away from those who are producing and creating jobs and give it to government bureaucrats to try to tell us how to run our lives.

It has to stop. America is broke, and we have to stop this deficit spending. Where are the jobs?

We can create some part-time jobs. I'd like to see us have a transportation bill. I'd like to see us have a 10-year transportation bill based on highway trust fund spending—nothing else—and not going into debt any further. So the philosophy of my good friend from Oregon and his colleagues on the Democratic side is a philosophy of economic failure as a Nation, and we've got to stop it.

I would now like to yield 10 minutes to my good friend from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS. I support Representative BROUN's motion to instruct. Let me explain why.

For six decades, America has been the greatest Nation in history. We are blessed with a standard of living envied by the world, a military unmatched in history, freedoms that others can only dream of.

Why is America great? Because Americans before us sacrificed so that their children, their grandchildren, their country would enjoy a better future.

Our Founding Fathers exemplified America's spirit when they stated in the Declaration of Independence:

And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

In contrast, today's Washington abandons America's foundational principles. Today's Washington supports unsustainable spending binges that abandon our children and grandchildren and America's future.

Perhaps a refresher is needed to emphasize America's financial plight.

Mr. Speaker, let me first direct your attention to this deficit chart. As the chart reflects, America suffers from three consecutive, record-breaking, and unsustainable trillion-dollar deficits, and we are in the midst of a fourth trillion-dollar deficit that is projected for this year.

Think about that for a moment.

In fiscal year 2011, Washington borrowed 36 cents for every dollar it spent. No household or business could survive

borrowing 36 cents for it to operate. Similarly, no nation can survive that either. As a result, America blew through the \$15 trillion accumulated debt mark in November of last year. This year, America is going to blow through the \$16 trillion debt mark.

Mr. Speaker, the next chart reflects spending for FY 2010 and FY 2011. In FY 2010, the cost of America's debt service was \$196 billion. In FY 2011, the cost of America's debt service was \$221 billion. They're relatively small slices of those pies. However, in just 1 year, the cost to American taxpayers to service America's debt increased by \$25 billion.

To put that into perspective, \$25 billion is more than NASA's entire budget—and this is at record low interest rates. If America's creditors become as insecure as the creditors of Greece, Spain, Italy, and any number of other nations and if interest rates go up accordingly, America's debt service would jump to the \$800 billion-a-year range, making debt service more costly than our entire budget for national defense, our entire budget for Social Security, or our entire budget for Medicare. Consequently, if we had this small slice of the pie increase to \$800 billion a year, every other service provided by the Federal Government would have to shrink.

So that we are clear, reckless, out-of-control spending is the cause of America's deficits.

In fiscal year 2007, when NANCY PELOSI became House Speaker and when HARRY REID became the Senate Majority Leader, America spent \$2.7 trillion. In FY 2011, America spent \$3.6 trillion. In just 4 years, Federal Government spending went up \$900 billion—a 33 percent increase. Simply stated, there is no end in sight to Washington's reckless and irresponsible spending.

Mr. Speaker, if Washington does not gain wisdom and backbone, if Washington does not change its reckless spending habit, then there will be an American insolvency and bankruptcy. For emphasis, the question is not "if." The questions are "when?" and "how much damage will be done to our Nation from that insolvency and bankruptcy?" President Obama's Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mike Mullen, gave insight when he stated, "I think the biggest threat we have to our national security is our debt."

And he is right. Already, America's out-of-control spending threatens to force the firing of 700,000 national defense personnel starting in a mere 7 months, on January 1 of 2013. Let me emphasize that: threatened with 700,000 lost jobs. No enemy has ever undermined America's national defense so badly.

But it does not end with the decimation of America's national defense, which may leave America at the mercy of our enemies abroad. America's insolvency and bankruptcy risk the elimination of Social Security and Medicare, thereby breaching our obligations

to our elderly and leaving them impoverished and without medical care.

To summarize the danger to America, think back to the Great Depression in the 1930s and imagine how bad it would have been if then the Federal Government had been insolvent. As you do this, remember the result of the Great Depression—an ensuing war that killed tens of millions of men, women, and children worldwide.

All of this brings me to PAUL BROUN's motion to instruct. The transportation bill is a microcosm of what threatens America. We enjoy, roughly, \$37 billion in expected highway revenue, yet some in Washington seek to spend, roughly, \$51 billion. That's \$14 billion a year that we don't have.

Now, there are solutions to this budget gap that I could support. We could cut \$14 billion in foreign aid and spend it on American roads, but my colleagues across the aisle oppose that. We could cut welfare and stop paying \$14 billion a year to people to not work and instead pay \$14 billion a year to people to work on buildings and bridges, but my colleagues across the aisle oppose that. There are plenty of solutions out there, but simply borrowing another \$14 billion a year we don't have is not one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience support a transportation bill that spends, roughly, \$14 billion we don't have, thereby accelerating America on its path to insolvency and bankruptcy.

In that vein, I thank Congressman PAUL BROUN for filing his motion to instruct and for displaying the leadership America so sorely needs. Congressman BROUN is a man of principle. He has the intellect to understand the economic disaster that awaits America if Washington does not live within its means. More importantly, Mr. BROUN has the backbone to do something about it. It is an honor to stand with Congressman BROUN and to support his motion to instruct.

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

I appreciate and I certainly do respect the gentleman from Georgia, and he is a gentleman, but let's get a few things straight here.

We're not talking about government jobs. We're talking about private sector jobs. The Federal Government does not build bridges. The Federal Government does not restore the condition of our highways. The Federal Government does not build transit vehicles or invest in transit systems. What the Federal Government does is to invest with strong "buy America" provisions to the best low-cost bidders to make and restore these products to make America more competitive.

□ 2240

One of the things that underlays our system, the most basic thing—I mean, George Washington, he started to build canals; Abraham Lincoln, the transcontinental railway; Dwight David Ei-

senhower, the national highway system, which is now falling apart; and Ronald Reagan put transit into the highway trust fund, because we shouldn't neglect our urban areas and the needs of those people.

The effect of the Broun amendment would be zero new Federal expenditures beginning October 1 next year on transit highways and other investments in transportation in this country. You can't get around that. That's what they're proposing. Because we have past obligations and the way they've written, this would limit us to only pay for past obligations, not any new obligations.

They rattled on and prattled on a bit about the Obama stimulus. I voted against it. Why did I vote against it? Because 7 percent was transportation investment and 40 percent was tax cuts. And guess what? Those damn tax cuts didn't put anybody back to work, and they won't put anybody back to work in the future. That's all you guys want, is tax cuts. We need investment in our country. We need investment in moving people and goods. We need to compete with the world, and you don't want to do it. That's nuts.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak against this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I've been through this movie before as a member of the Budget Committee. This is not new ground. When it was first unveiled before us and I looked at the transportation provisions, I asked the Republican staff to pin down exactly the amount of money that is available. This essentially is what the Republican budget is, and it was not enough to meet the current obligations. It meant that there would be no new programming. And now we're bringing it to the floor with instructions to make sure that this is what the conference committee enacts.

Let us be clear. What my friend and colleague from Oregon pointed out is that this is an opportunity for us to empower the private sector. Republicans and Democrats alike have been visited time and time and time again—first of all, you could hear from people in your district that the Recovery Act kept businesses afloat, kept people working, made a huge difference in every State in the union. Even though I agree with my colleague from Oregon that it wasn't enough infrastructure, but the contractors, electrical contractors, unions, and pavers were thankful for it to help many of them not go out of business.

The list of people who oppose this amendment are not opposing it because our proposal is socialism. To the contrary. The Amalgamated Transit Union, the American Coal Ash Association, the American Concrete Pavement Association, the American General Contractors, the Laborers' Inter-

national, the Portland Cement Association, the Carpenters, and the U.S. Chamber oppose this because it would add to the depression that we have in the construction cycle in the United States right now. We would not be able to keep pace, and it would result in hundreds of thousands of jobs being lost.

We had a proposal that passed the Senate with 74 votes—half the Republicans—that would enable us to have two construction cycles. The Republicans, who could not get the votes to even have the courage to bring their proposal to the floor—it fell apart, having been brought to the Transportation Committee. And I am a proud alumni member of that committee. For the first time in history, it was a blatantly partisan bill that had never even had a hearing. They somehow got it out of committee, and they got it out of our Ways and Means Committee, but the support within the Republican Party completely fell apart before it came to the floor. They were afraid to have it voted on because it would have been defeated because it was bad for America. I had a list of 600 groups when I was arguing against it in our Ways and Means Committee that thought it was terrible policy.

We requested the Republican leadership to at least allow the Senate bill to be voted on, and they were afraid to do that. So we're in conference now merely because the Republicans just had a short-term extension, unwilling to allow this body—and I know there would be a number of my Republican friends who would have joined with us. Not a majority of Republicans, but enough that it would have passed comfortably, and we wouldn't be caught in this Never Never Land.

My good friend from Georgia is concerned that his two grandchildren will be facing debt. Well, the Republican budget would force us to increase the debt ceiling. It will force us to borrow in order to have more unfunded tax cuts, even while it undercuts investment in infrastructure. This was admitted by the Republican chair of the committee in our budget hearing yesterday. He admits that it's not going to balance any time in the foreseeable future, and that it will require the increase in the debt ceiling.

But there's a very different philosophy. It has nothing to do with socialism. My Lord, I thought that the John Birch claim that Dwight Eisenhower was a Communist or a socialist was discredited. The partnership we've had with the highway trust fund and investing in America's future is something that is the opposite of socialism. It is a public-private partnership that has involved people at all levels in government in things that made a difference.

I had a meeting today with 80 stakeholders primarily from the private sector, including environmentalists and unions and businesses and trade associations, who are apoplectic over the

prospect that this House would go on record to shut down all new investment for the next year and further undercut the opportunity of moving a bipartisan Senate bill to at least give us two construction cycles and move forward.

I agree that we need to be concerned about a debt burden, and independent analysis of why we've had an exploding debt includes unfunded tax cuts. Remember, Mr. DEFAZIO and I served here when the big fear was that we were going to pay off all government debt. What would the insurance companies do? What would the pension plans do if there wasn't government debt to invest in? This is part of the rationale for the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2002, because we were looking at a \$5.3 trillion surplus.

Well, they solved that problem. They solved it with tax cuts, primarily for people who need them the least. Yet, we have serious problems with increasing health care costs, and now they are trying to dismantle the Affordable Care Act, which would actually, over 20 years, start reining those costs in. They had not one, but two unfunded wars, which my colleague and I from Oregon opposed. There is the collapse of the economy.

It is interesting that Mr. Romney's adviser, when there was criticism of the Romney record in Massachusetts for debt and problems of job loss, said:

Well, you know, part of that is that's not really a good criterion, because a lot of those jobs were lost in Governor Romney's first year in office, and you shouldn't count those.

□ 2250

There is a certain merit to that, but if you use the Romney standard of not being accountable for the first year as Governor of Massachusetts, the problems with employment and the problems with the debt look much, much different, because this President inherited one of the worst situations in American history.

It is important that we focus on where we need to go forward. We actually had a much higher percentage of the gross domestic product in public debt immediately after World War II. It's much higher than the debt burden today.

How was that solved? Was it solved by cutting taxes to zero? No. They had much higher tax rates for 20 years until the Kennedy-Johnson tax cuts. They invested in America, as my friend from Oregon pointed out. They invested in education for returning veterans, they invested in the highway, the transcontinental highway fund, they invested in America's future.

That's what we should be doing now. The absolute worst thing, the worst thing would be to shut down investment this next year in transportation and infrastructure.

That's why companies from A to Z oppose this motion to instruct. I hope, instead, we pass the Senate bill, get 2 years of construction cycle, reject this

wrong-headed approach, and get on with the business of rebuilding and re-energizing America.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman. I would point out that the Senate, the proposed Senate bill, which we could pass tonight, if we call people back, or tomorrow, or next week if we stayed in town to work, but we have breaks every other week now—39 legislative days until the election. America doesn't have any problems. We don't need to be here. Right? Come on.

But the bottom line is the Senate bill would not create a penny of new debt and would fund current levels of investment, which are not what we need; but we could get by with that for 2 years until we figure out a way to make more robust investments.

The gentleman would reduce that investment to zero, zero, not exaggeration. That's the Congressional Budget Office—zero. No Federal spending for transit, no Federal spending for highways next year. That's hundreds of thousands, millions, probably a million jobs, probably 1.6 million, we would sacrifice on the altar of what? Again, back to the principle, investment consumption.

Certainly you can understand that on your side of the aisle. It's been a Republican tradition to invest in America, to invest in a more efficient transportation system for America, to make us more competitive in the world, to move our people and our goods more efficiently, to avoid importing foreign fuel and all the other things we have to do with an inefficient system. This would defy all that and say, no, United States of America, we're not going to invest in our national transportation system.

We're going to devolve that to the 50 States. We're going to go back to 1956 when one State decides to make an investment and the other State doesn't and the road ends at the border. I can't understand what this is all about.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oregon has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say my friends from Oregon are just factually incorrect. This would not cut out all new spending, and they are using scare tactics to promote their Big Government agenda.

I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, JEFF DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I want to thank my friend from Georgia for yielding to me tonight.

I think our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are in denial about deficits and debt. What it means—I put the debt clock right here in front for everyone to see, but if you can't see it, America is \$15.74 trillion in debt.

In fact, we've had over \$30 million added to the Nation's debt just since we have been talking this evening and the clock's running right now; \$50,000 per American citizen in this country is your share of the Nation's debt.

You know, back in July of 2010, my wife and I, we took our boys, it was after a campaign, and we went out across the Nation. In 17 days we went through 19 States, and we visited no less than 11 national parks. Now, this was after the \$1.2 trillion stimulus package passed by President Obama in the Democrat-controlled Congress.

But what did I see as I drove through the 19 States of this country's heartland? Where did I see the construction projects on the road, the \$1.2 trillion in deficit spending to get the jobs we never got?

I saw the construction happening, road construction happening on roads leading into national parks. I didn't see it on the interstate highways that would allow transportation of commerce around this land. I saw it in the national parks.

We're \$15.74 trillion in debt, and all the gentleman is asking to do is let's live within our means. Let's collect the highway tax, and let's just spend that. Let's not continue to perpetuate deficit spending. But, you know, we throw words around like "millions" and "billions" and "trillions" around this Nation, and we lose track of what a trillion is.

But let me just tell you, if we decided to get serious about paying back our Nation's creditors, and we did it at the rate of \$20 million a day, and we did that every day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year—and, ladies and gentlemen, listen up—if we did that every day of the year, from the time Jesus Christ was born until now, we have only paid back \$14.9 trillion of our debt, less than what we owe, at the rate of \$20 million a day, for 746,000 days that it's been.

Now it's time to get serious about what we're doing in this country with regard to revenue and with regard to deficit spending. This the fourth year in a row we will be in excess of a trillion dollars, spending a trillion dollars more than we're bringing in as a Nation. All we're doing on the Republican side is saying, you know what, it's time America lives within its means. It's time we have a balanced budget.

We need a balanced budget to the Nation's Constitution to require this body, which shows no fiscal restraint, require this body to live within its means just like we have to do at home in our family budgets and our small business budgets. It's time to get serious in this country about our Nation's debt and about what our deficit spending means.

Quit spending money for jobs we never got from the Obama stimulus package.

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

The language limits the funding out of the highway trust fund, including

the mass transit account for Federal aid highway and transit programs, to amounts that do not exceed \$37.5 billion, about a third of the cost of the continuing war in Afghanistan, which I would like to bring to a close. But the existing obligations of the Federal Government for past construction, we reimburse States once the project is done, transit project, highway project, bridge project, done, we reimburse them. We don't pay them in advance. Our current obligations for the next year are \$38.8 billion.

So, if we limit the outlays to \$37.5 billion, and we owe \$38.8 billion to the States when they deliver their completed contracts in the coming year, that means we would have negative spending on Federal investments in transportation and infrastructure.

While competitive nations around the world are investing dramatically to more efficiently move goods and people, we would spend less than zero.

I don't know how we spend less than zero, but that's what this amendment would do. You keep prattling on about the Obama stimulus. I voted against it. I was one of the few Democrats who did. I voted against it not because of investment in infrastructure, but because it didn't invest in infrastructure. The President talked about it. Larry Summers hated infrastructure.

□ 2300

Timmy Geithner hates infrastructure. Old-school Jason Furman, all his advisers, they hate it. Seven percent of the money we borrowed was invested in infrastructure. Seven percent of that \$800-some billion dollars. And guess what? I can justify that borrowing because I can say to my kids and my grandkids, We built that bridge, we built that transit system, we built that highway, and you're still using it, and it made America more competitive.

But over 40 percent was tax cuts. He adopted the Republican approach. How many jobs did the tax cuts create? Nada, zero, none. You guys want to do more tax cuts, and you don't want to do any investment. That's what this would lead us to. You want to continue the Bush tax cuts—all of them—and you want to invest less than zero in Federal infrastructure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I am not sure where my friend gets his mathematics from, but it's certainly not in reality.

I yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank the gentleman for offering his motion. We've heard all kinds of emotional stuff and language here. But let's just cut to the chase. This doesn't cut anything. It doesn't slash anything. This is a motion to instruct conferees in the transportation bill, the conferees on that legislation, to limit spending in the transportation legislation to the amount of money that's in the highway trust fund. It's as

simple as that. Here's the money that came in. All you can do is spend what you have.

Imagine that concept. Imagine government actually just following that simple concept. Here's what came in. That's all you can spend. If we'd been doing that, we wouldn't have this debt that Mr. DUNCAN so eloquently spoke about. We wouldn't have the problems we see. You can say all the things you want, but it is that simple. This is apple pie, this is baseball. This is as plain as it gets. This is what every family has to do. This is what every small business has to do. This is what every township has to do. This is what every village has to do, every county has to do, every city has to do, every State has to do. The only entity that doesn't have to do this is, Oh, by the way, that entity that happens to have a \$16 trillion national debt.

This is as simple as it gets. What you take in is all you can spend. You can't do what the politicians love to do: borrow from someone else. Borrow from some other program, which means you have to sell bonds to run up the debt. You can't do what politicians love to do: spend more than you have. You can only spend what you have.

And yet the other side says, This is terrible. This will ruin everything. This will make us Third World status. I'll tell you what will make us Third World status is a debt larger than our GDP. That's where Greece is. That's where they are. That's what will make us Third World status.

This is as simple and as plain as it can get, and I appreciate the courage of the gentleman to bring the motion forward to have this debate. This is a debate that we need to have in this country. If we can't even limit spending in this program to what comes in from the dedicated revenue, if we can't even do that, how are we ever going to cut spending elsewhere to get a handle on our deficit and our debt problem, if we can't even do this?

The American people get this. And you can try to confuse them with all the fancy language you've heard from the gentleman from Oregon—you can try to—but the American people get it.

I want to commend the gentleman for offering his motion, and I plan on supporting it tomorrow when we have a vote.

Mr. DEFAZIO. May I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Again, we're failing to discriminate between investment and consumption. The Republicans were all for consumptive tax cuts, i.e., give people the money, they'll spend it on consumer goods, that will somehow put people back to work, as opposed to investing in the future of our country. That's what I'm talking about here.

It's interesting that they're on the wrong side from the Chamber of Commerce, the Association of General Contractors, and other groups that are incredibly generous to them during the campaign season who think they're very wrongheaded with this amendment.

This isn't fancy language. I have the statistics from the Department of Transportation. Over the next year, the Federal Government is legally obligated for past construction projects authorized under law to pay \$38.8 billion to the States. This amendment would say we can spend no more than \$37.5 billion in the coming year. That means we cannot even meet our legal obligations for past construction which will be completed by October 1. That means an end to all Federal investment in transportation in this country on October 1 for the next year.

It's not fancy language. It's a fact. It comes from the Congressional Budget Office, which the Republicans control, and the Department of Transportation, which the Obama administration controls. It's pretty much the consensus in the business community, the Chamber of Commerce, the Association of General Contractors, and everybody else. This would mean an end to investment for 1 year. That's a minimum of 1.6 million jobs lost. It's an incredible lost opportunity for the future of our kids and grandkids.

You need to understand the difference between—you're supposedly the party of business. It's like people borrow money when they're in business if they have a good investment to make, if they can make their company more competitive. We can make our country more competitive if we invest in our transportation infrastructure. If we neglect it and people have to detour around the 150,000 bridges that are weight-limited and about to collapse like the one in Minnesota, if they have to detour around the 40 percent of the deteriorated national highway system, if people can't get to work or get killed like they did here in Washington, D.C., on a deficient mass transit system because we have a \$70 billion backlog, and all of these investments, when made by the private sector, for the private sector, and for the people of America, are made in America. And you would defer instead to more tax cuts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have the right to close, and I am going to reserve the balance of my time until the time to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. How much time do I have remaining?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. The gentleman from Oregon has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Again, I wish this wasn't the dark of the night because this is a debate America should and would like to have. I'll reiterate: the United States Chamber of Commerce, with whom I frequently disagree, strongly opposes the Broun motion. We

have a long list of groups, private sector business groups, who oppose this motion because this is not about government jobs. It's about private sector jobs. This is not about government gone wild.

I wish it had been different. I wish that the stimulus had been half as large and 100 percent invested in the infrastructure of this country. We would have put millions more people back to work, and we would be on the road to recovery today. But instead, in deference to three Senate Republicans, the President, who wanted to look bipartisan, gave in to six times as much money for tax cuts as investment in infrastructure. And you want to blame infrastructure for the debt and the deficit, or the Obama failed stimulus? No, guys, no. It's your policies. We implemented them. And they don't work. We need to invest in the underpinnings of the country.

When I was first elected to office, I served with a very, very conservative Republican, a guy named Bill Rogers on the Lane County Commission, and he would always say, Government's for two things. I'd say, What's that, Bill? He'd say, Roads and rope. Roads and rope. That is public safety and infrastructure.

And there has been bipartisan agreement since George Washington that the Federal Government has an obligation to more efficiently move goods and people in this country. That's a long time before the incredibly competitive 21st century and what we're dealing with today with our huge trade deficits and everything else. That was George Washington.

Abraham Lincoln, a Republic President: Build the transcontinental railway. Borrowed money to do it, by God. What do you know? And then, Dwight David Eisenhower, the National Highway System, National Defense Highway System. And Ronald Reagan: We need to invest in transit in our cities.

□ 2310

And you would turn back the clock to pre-George Washington and say the 50 States—we didn't have States then, but, you know, you guys are going to at least allow us to keep federalism and that intact. But "they should create somehow a Federal system. They should coordinate. They should raise the money. This is not an obligation of the Federal Government."

This is not imaginary. This is not play. It's not ideology. It's simple hard numbers and facts. The number you would allow for the next year is deficient to the previous obligations.

Now, I know you guys took us—and there are a number of you on that side who say, hey, it doesn't matter if the Government of the United States of America defaults. I think it does. I've been good for my debts. I think our country has got to be good for our debts. And I think we would be in a disaster if we weren't.

So you can say that. Oh, yeah, you know, it's meaningless. It's facts.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. This is reality. Invest in America. Why do you hate this country so much?

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was just charged by this gentleman for hating America, and I challenge those words, and I ask that his words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be seated, and the Clerk will report the words.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's demand is withdrawn.

The gentleman is recognized for the remaining 3 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for one second.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman for just one second.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, give me four, maybe.

I did not mean to direct the remark to you. It was a generic statement out of concern.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, the gentleman did obviously direct remarks towards me. He pointed at me when he said: "Why do you hate America so much?"

I love my country. I'm a U.S. marine. I'm trying to save my country from financial collapse. And that's what this is all about: stop spending money that we don't have.

We've got to finish the projects that we've already started, those that have already been approved and funded, before we start dipping into the general fund. It's estimated that we'll have a shortfall of \$8 billion to \$9 billion if this motion to instruct is not put in place.

We cannot afford the status quo. Their argument is to continue spending money, continue down a road that is going to cause a financial collapse of this Nation, in my opinion.

□ 2330

We need to create jobs. We need to get this country going economically. The policies of this administration have not worked. Policies that were put forward while NANCY PELOSI was Speaker of this House, with the stimulus bill and other big spending bills just have been essentially abject failures.

We cannot continue spending money that we don't have, and that's the reason I brought this motion forward, a motion to instruct the conferees to spend—continue transportation funding, continue building our transportation infrastructure, which I think is absolutely critical for economic development. But creating more debt is not the answer.

I resent being accused of hating America, and it angers me when I'm accused, personally accused by somebody that I thought was a friend. And

I'm going to try very hard not to take this personally. I will not carry a grudge because I know, from my heart, we can disagree on issues, and I don't take it personally. But when he pointed at me and accused me of hating America, that's the reason I asked for his words to be taken down.

And what I ask my colleagues in this House to do is look in their hearts, because we absolutely have to change the way this House, this Congress, this government is doing business. We cannot continue spending ourselves to oblivion, and that's the way we're headed.

We need to create jobs. We need to create a strong economy. This has not been about tax increases or tax decreases, as has been accused tonight. This is about spending money that we have, and no more.

I encourage my colleagues to please vote for this motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 2012 AT PAGE H3755

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 503 of H. Con. Res. 112, the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 2013, deemed to be in force by H. Res. 614 and H. Res. 643, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates set forth pursuant to the budget for fiscal year 2013. The revision is designated for the Health Care Cost Reduction Act of 2012, H.R. 436. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Budget Act). For the purposes of the Budget Act, these revised aggregates and allocations are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 101 of H. Con. Res. 112.