

Bass (CA) Green, Al
Bass (NH) Green, Gene
Becerra Grijalva
Berkley Guinta
Berman Gutierrez
Biggert Hahn
Bishop (NY) Hanabusa
Blumenauer Hastings (FL)
Bonamici Hayworth
Brady (PA) Heinrich
Braley (IA) Higgins
Brown (FL) Himes
Butterfield Hinchey
Capps Hinojosa
Capuano Hirono
Carnahan Holt
Carney Honda
Carson (IN) Hoyer
Carter Huelskamp
Castor (FL) Israel
Chabot Jackson Lee
Chandler (TX)
Chu Johnson (GA)
Cicilline Johnson (IL)
Clarke (MI) Johnson, E. B.
Clarke (NY) Kaptur
Clay Keating
Cleaver Kildee
Clyburn Kind
Cohen Kucinich
Connolly (VA) Langevin
Conyers Larsen (WA)
Cooper Larson (CT)
Costello Lee (CA)
Courtney Levin
Critz Lewis (GA)
Crowley Lipinski
Cuellar LoBiondo
Davis (CA) Loeback
Davis (IL) Lofgren, Zoe
DeFazio Lowey
DeGette Lujan
DeLauro Lujan
Deutch Lynch
Dicks Maloney
Doggett Markey
Dold Matsui
Doyle McCarthy (NY)
Edwards McCollum
Ellison Tsongas
Engel McGovern
Eshoo McNeerney
Farr Meeks
Fattah Michaud
Filner Miller (NC)
Fitzpatrick Miller, George
Frank (MA) Moore
Frelinghuysen Moran
Fudge Mulvaney
Garamendi Murphy (CT)
Gonzalez Nadler
Granger Napolitano
Neal Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Altmire Jackson (IL)
Cummings Lewis (CA)
Dingell Miller (FL)
Huizenga (MI) Sanchez, Linda
Issa T.

□ 1742

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:

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 387, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

GILA BEND INDIAN RESERVATION LANDS REPLACEMENT CLARIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2938) to prohibit certain gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 343, nays 78, answered “present” 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

YEAS—343

Ackerman DeLauro Kaptur
Adams Denham Kelly
Aderholt Dent Kildee
Akin DesJarlais Kind
Alexander Diaz-Balart King (IA)
Amodei Dicks King (NY)
Andrews Dold Kingston
Austria Kinzinger (IL)
Baca Duffy Kline
Bachmann Duncan (SC)
Bachus Duncan (TN)
Baldwin Ellison Lance
Barletta Ellmers Landry
Barrow Emerson Lankford
Bartlett Farenthold Larson (CT)
Barton (TX) Farr Latham
Bass (NH) Fattah Latta
Becerra Fincher Lewis (GA)
Benishek Fitzpatrick Lipinski
Berg Flake LoBiondo
Berkley Fleischmann Loeback
Berman Fleming Lofgren, Zoe
Biggert Flores Long
Bilbray Forbes Lowey
Bilirakis Fortenberry Lucas
Bishop (GA) Foxx Luetkemeyer
Bishop (UT) Franks (AZ) Lujan
Black Frelinghuysen Lungren, Daniel
Blackburn Fudge E.
Bonner Gallegly Mack
Bono Mack Garamendi
Boren Gardner Manzullo
Boswell Garrett Marchant
Boustany Gerlach Marino
Brady (PA) Gibbs Matheson
Brady (TX) Gibson McCarthy (CA)
Brooks Gingrey (GA) McCaul
Broun (GA) Gohmert McCollum
Brown (FL) Gonzalez McCotter
Buchanan Goodlatte McGovern
Bucshon Gosar McHenry
Buerkle Gowdy McIntyre
Burgess Granger McKeon
Burton (IN) Graves (GA) McKinley
Butterfield Graves (MO) McMorris
Camp Green, Al Rodgers
Campbell Green, Gene Meehan
Canseco Griffin (AR) Meeks
Cantor Grimm Mica
Capito Guinta Michaud
Capps Guthrie Miller (MI)
Capuano Gutierrez Miller, Gary
Cardoza Hahn Moore
Carnahan Hall Mulvaney
Carney Hanabusa Murphy (PA)
Carson (IN) Hanna Myrick
Carter Harper Neal
Cassidy Harris Neugebauer
Chabot Hartzler Noem
Chaffetz Hastings (FL) Nugent
Chandler Hastings (WA) Nunes
Clarke (MI) Hayworth Nunnelee
Clarke (NY) Heck Olson
Clay Heinrich Olver
Cleaver Hensarling Palazzio
Clyburn Herger Pallone
Coble Herrera Beutler Pascarell
Coffman (CO) Himes Pastor (AZ)
Cohen Hinchey Paulsen
Cole Hinojosa Pearce
Conaway Holden Pelosi
Connolly (VA) Huelskamp Pence
Conyers Hultgren Perlmutter
Cooper Hunter Peters
Costa Hurt Peterson
Courtney Israel Petri
Cravaack Issa Pitts
Crawford Jackson Lee Platts
Crenshaw (TX) Poe (TX)
Crowley Jenkins Pompeo
Cuellar Johnson (IL) Posey
Culberson Johnson (OH) Price (GA)
Cummings Johnson, Sam Quayle
Davis (IL) Jones Quigley
Davis (KY) Jordan Rahall

Rangel Sanchez, Loretta
Reed Scalise Thompson (PA)
Rehberg Schiff Thornberry
Reichert Schilling Tiberi
Renacci Schmidt Tipton
Reyes Schock Towns
Ribble Schrader Turner (NY)
Richardson Schwartz Turner (OH)
Richmond Schweikert Upton
Rigell Scott (SC) Walberg
Rivera Scott, Austin Walsh (IL)
Roby Scott, David Walz (MN)
Roe (TN) Sensenbrenner Wasserman
Rogers (AL) Sessions Schultz
Rogers (KY) Sherman Watt
Rogers (MI) Shimkus Webster
Rohrabacher Shuler West
Rokita Shuster Westmoreland
Rooney Simpson Whitfield
Ros-Lehtinen Sires Wilson (FL)
Roskam Smith (NE) Wilson (SC)
Ross (AR) Smith (NJ) Wittman
Ross (FL) Smith (TX) Wolf
Rothman (NJ) Southerland Womack
Roybal-Allard Stearns Woodall
Royce Stivers Woolsey
Runyan Stutzman Yoder
Ruppersberger Sullivan Young (AK)
Rush Terry Young (IN)
Ryan (WI) Thompson (MS)

NAYS—78

Amash Holt Paul
Barber Honda Pingree (ME)
Bass (CA) Hoyer Polis
Bishop (NY) Johnson (GA) Price (NC)
Blumenauer Johnson, E. B. Ryan (OH)
Bonamici Keating Sarbanes
Braley (IA) Kissell Schakowsky
Castor (FL) Kucinich Scott (VA)
Cicilline Langevin Serrano
Costello Larsen (WA) Sewell
Critz Lee (CA) Slaughter
Davis (CA) Levin Smith (WA)
DeFazio Lummis Speier
DeGette Lynch Stark
Deutch Markey Sutton
Doggett Matsui Thompson (CA)
Donnelly (IN) McCarthy (NY) Tierney
Doyle McClintock Tonko
Edwards McDermott Tsongas
Engel McNeerney Van Hollen
Eshoo Miller (NC) Velázquez
Filner Miller, George Visclosky
Frank (MA) Moran Waters
Grijalva Nadler Waxman
Higgins Napolitano Welch
Hochul Owens Yarmuth

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Chu LaTourette

NOT VOTING—9

Altmire Jackson (IL) Sanchez, Linda
Dingell Lewis (CA) T.
Hirono Miller (FL) Young (FL)
Huizenga (MI)

□ 1749

Messrs. LEVIN and WELCH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 388, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4480, DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-540) on the resolution (H. Res. 691) providing for consideration of

the bill (H.R. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have a previous noticed motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Walz of Minnesota 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 resolve all issues and file a conference report not later than June 22, 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for being here. I know his commitment to building infrastructure in this Nation is unquestioned. He's been a good friend and a gentleman on the committee.

I think what we're here for today, Mr. Speaker, is the American people deserve better from us. We have a need in this country that is obvious to everyone. The infrastructure in this country is crumbling: 70,000 deficient bridges; nearly half our highways in disrepair. And being a Member from Minnesota, that hot August day almost 5 years ago when the I-35W bridge fell into the Mississippi River is a stark testament of what we can do.

The Transportation Committee, by command of the Constitution, if you will, has always been there to build the post roads. This Nation has built canals, locks, dams, and ports. We've built railroads that connected the continent and spurred the industrial revolution. We've built an interstate highway system that made the American economy the envy of the world. We have possessed vision, we've possessed willpower, and we've done it in a manner that incorporated bipartisan support and, at the end of the day, compromise.

The last bill that passed, SAFETEA-LU, passed by a vote in this House in 2005 of 412-8; in the Senate, 91-4. The

previous bill, 2007, 297-86, and 88-5 in the Senate. In 1991, 372-47; the Senate, 79-8. In 1987, over the last 25 years, 350-73. We have the will. We simply need to exercise the political willpower to move this piece of legislation.

So this motion to instruct is very simple. A hundred days ago, the Senate passed their version. It received a vote of 74-22. It is a bipartisan bill.

Now, I will be the first to tell you the prerogative of the House to lead is sacred to us here. We need to have a say in this. We need to make sure that the people's House has their voice in things. The problem we have is we've been sitting in conference committee for 45 days with a deadlock and no end in sight.

So this motion to instruct, yes, it's a nonbinding sense of the House, but I would argue it's far more than that. This is a sense of the American public. They sent us here to do some basic work. They did not send us here to agree with each other on everything, but they did have that understanding that the glue that binds the Nation together is compromise. And there are a very few things that historically have been bipartisan. The transportation bill has been one of those.

So what this MTI asks is: rectify the differences and compromise to the point that we can get something on the floor and finish the work by June 22, this Friday. Then give us the opportunity to exercise the American will by having their Representatives discuss what needs to be there. If we can't come to a compromise, bring us the Senate bill and let's have the up-or-down vote. If it passes, we can move forward. If it doesn't, then we start and go on from there. But I have to tell you, we can't afford to kick this can down the road—and I would say the proverbial “crumbling road.”

The Chamber of Commerce has made the case:

Failure to keep up with infrastructure needs in the U.S. cost this economy \$2 trillion between 2008 and 2009.

Every year we do nothing, we spend over \$100 billion on idling tax. We waste 1.9 billion gallons of fuel yearly. That's 5 percent of our fuel needs. That's money going to foreign countries who hate us. They'll hate us for free. We can be more efficient. We cannot waste Americans' hard-earned dollars staring at the bumper in front of them. We can do it safely, and we can move our products to market faster; and we have that power.

I said it this morning. I'll continue to say it. Up above the Speaker's chair up there is the quote from Daniel Webster. How about we do something worthy to be remembered for. How about we come together and pass a bill that the people say, They did the peoples' work. They compromised.

It's not about getting what each of us wants. It's about getting what the American public needs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words from the gentleman from Minnesota. He is correct in that I am very much committed to trying to produce and pass a good transportation bill in this Congress. When the gentleman's party was in control of the House and the Senate and the White House a couple of years ago, they couldn't, for various reasons, pass the bill. And I certainly hope we can in this Congress.

For the past 3½ years, about half the time when I've come to the floor I've had some Members on both sides come up to me and say, When are we going to pass a highway bill? And this is my 24th year in this body and I have been involved actively with all of those bills that the gentleman from Minnesota mentioned, all of which passed by overwhelming margins. And as he said, the last highway bill that was passed in 2005 passed with only 8 votes in opposition.

I agree and I think all of the people on our side of the aisle agree in principle with Mr. WALZ's motion to instruct. We should focus our efforts on completing the conference report and delivering a bill to the President's desk before the surface transportation programs expire at the end of this month. Unfortunately, up until this moment, the Senate has not shown a sufficient willingness to address the House's top four priorities: streamlining project delivery; program consolidation; State funding flexibility; and equitable funding formulas not based on past earmarks.

When the average transportation project, Mr. Speaker, takes 15 years to complete, I cannot help but think there's something wrong with the current system. And as the gentleman from Minnesota mentioned, when the will is there, these projects can be completed in record time, such as the I-35 bridge in Minnesota after it collapsed.

Bureaucratic red tape is the main culprit, and much more must be done in the reauthorization bill to accelerate the process by which projects are approved. Every other developed nation is doing similar types of projects in a third or half the time that we are, and it is ridiculous that we are wasting so much money dragging these projects out for so many years. We can accomplish the goal of accelerating the process without harming the environment, but the Senate so far has shown more interest in catering to radical environmentalists than building infrastructure projects.

Program consolidation is another important reform that the House is pushing for in this bill. The Senate insists on including two new programs at the cost of \$3 billion a year that would allow the administration to play politics with the funding that should go directly to the States. At a time when the highway trust fund is going broke, we should focus our limited transportation dollars on consolidating programs and eliminating wasteful programs, not creating new ones. Funding