

gasoline prices is justifiable grounds to open restricted areas for drilling and weaken protections that would ensure offshore drilling is done in a safe and environmentally responsible manner.

The cold reality, however, is that this bill will not bring relief to Americans suffering at the gasoline pump, and prosperous fishing and tourism industries—real job creators—based in Bristol Bay, southern California, the west coast of Florida, and Virginia will needlessly be placed at risk.

And for what? Approximately \$1.8 billion in new Federal revenue over 10 years. Not nearly enough to fund public transit or any other meaningful part of a transportation infrastructure bill.

And the revenue generated by drilling off Virginia's coast: \$40 million over 10 years. Our Governor says that's what's going to pay for his transportation plan. It pays for nothing. Billions in economic activity and tens of thousands of jobs would be put at risk for very little in benefits.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3408, PROTECTING INVESTMENT IN OIL SHALE THE NEXT GENERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL, ENERGY, AND RESOURCE SECURITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3813, SECURING ANNUITIES FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ACT OF 2012; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, AMERICAN ENERGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE JOBS ACT OF 2012

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 547 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 547

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 3408) to set clear rules for the development of United States oil shale resources, to promote shale technology research and development, 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, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of titles XIV and XVII of Rules Committee Print 112-14 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 3813) to amend title 5, United States Code, to secure the annuities of Federal civilian employees, 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 Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of title XVI of Rules Committee Print 112-14 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 7) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highway, public transportation, and highway and motor carrier safety 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. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of titles I through XIII and title XV of Rules Committee Print 112-14 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. General debate shall be confined to the bill, as amended, 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 Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 4. In preparing an amendment in the nature of a substitute to be adopted pursuant to this resolution, the Clerk shall retain the title and section designations as they appear in Rules Committee Print 112-14.

SEC. 5. In the engrossment of a measure addressed by the first or second section of this resolution, the Clerk is authorized to make technical and conforming changes to amendatory instructions.

SEC. 6. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 7, the Clerk shall—

(1) await the disposition of H.R. 3408 and H.R. 3813;

(2) add the respective texts of H.R. 3408 and H.R. 3813, as passed by the House, to H.R. 7, retaining the title and section designations as they appear in Rules Committee Print 112-14 to the extent possible;

(3) conform the title of H.R. 7 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 3408 or H.R. 3813, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(4) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(5) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 3408 or H.R. 3813, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.R. 7, H.R. 3408 or H.R. 3813 (as the case may be) shall be laid on the table.

SEC. 7. The chair of each of the following committees is authorized, on behalf of the respective committee, to file a supplemental report to accompany any of the following measures:

(a) Natural Resources, with respect to H.R. 3407, 3408, and 3410;

(b) Ways and Means, with respect to H.R. 3864; and

(c) Oversight and Government Reform, with respect to H.R. 3813.

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

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the efforts made to address our aging national infrastructure and chronic unemployment.

House Resolution 547 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3408, the Protecting Investment in Oil Shale the Next Generation of Environmental, Energy, and Resource Security, PIONEERS, Act; a structured rule for H.R. 3813, the Securing Annuities for Federal Employees, SAFE, Act; and general debate for H.R. 7, the American Energy and Infrastructure Act.

□ 1240

This rule makes 20 amendments in order for the PIONEERS Act. Of these, 13 are Democrat amendments; three are Republican; and then there are three bipartisan amendments. This rule also makes three amendments in order for the SAFE Act. However, over 80 percent of the amendments submitted to the Rules Committee are dealing with H.R. 7, so the bulk of the amendment debate will take place later this week. Finally, this rule sets the stage for robust debate on H.R. 7, the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act, the long-term surface transportation reauthorization.

In order to gather innovative ideas and input into the reauthorization proposal, in addition to the regular subcommittee and full committee hearings held here in Washington, Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman MICA and the committee conducted several bipartisan and, in some cases, even bicameral hearings at public forums around the country. In total, 14 field hearings were held in locations like Los Angeles and Chicago to Millington, Tennessee, and Maitland, Florida.

The previous transportation authorization, SAFETEA-LU, was enacted in 2005, and it expired on September 30, 2009. Since that time, surface transportation programs and activities have operated under a series of short-term extensions. The most recent of these extensions expires on March 31, 2012. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee put together a long-term reauthorization of highway, transit and highway safety programs that will provide much-needed certainty and stability to those charged with rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure and all who depend on it for their safe travel.

H.R. 7 authorizes approximately \$260 billion over 5 years for highway, transit, rail, safety, and other programs, which is consistent with current funding levels. It provides 5 years of stability for States to undertake major in-

frastructure projects and to provide lasting employment. It also allows States to spend their highway money on actual highway projects. By removing Federal requirements that currently force States to spend highway money on nonhighway activities, the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act ensures that our Nation's highways and bridges are repaired and properly maintained and that Federal dollars are spent on the most crucial infrastructure needs.

As opposed to past transportation efforts, this bill stops the annual raid on the general fund to bail out the highway trust fund, and is paid for by CBO-scored savings and revenues.

Significant savings are generated by the SAFE Act, which increases Federal employee pension contributions to 2.3 percent. It also increases pension contributions by Members of Congress to 2.8 percent. Revenues are also generated by the PIONEERS Act, which not only removes Federal barriers that block the production of our own U.S. energy resources, but also creates over 1 million new energy jobs.

Finally, unlike past transportation bills, including those overseen by both Republicans and Democrats, H.R. 7 contains no earmarks. To put that in perspective, the previous transportation law contained over 6,300 earmarks. The American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act also significantly reforms transportation policy in this country.

As families across the Nation tighten their own belts during these difficult economic times, they are reexamining their budgets to ensure no penny is wasted on unnecessary or duplicative expenses. Because your pennies are placed into the highway trust fund every time you fill up your car due to the Federal gas tax, it is in that same and necessary spirit that the American Clean Energy and Security Act reexamines the dozens of programs paid for by the highway trust fund to root out any duplication, waste, or inefficiency.

Currently, there are over 100 Federal surface transportation programs. Many were added over the last 50 years since the Interstate Highway System was created in 1956 in order to expand the scope of the original programmatic goals of our transportation system. The American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act reforms surface transportation programs by consolidating or eliminating approximately 70 programs that are duplicative or do not serve a Federal purpose.

By eliminating or consolidating these cookie-cutter programs that the Federal Government is certainly known for, stamping out a program that supposedly fits Florida and Montana and Maine and every other State equally and including the cities and counties within those communities, which is almost impossible to have one plan fits all, this eliminates many of those programs. It gives them the flexibility to create programs on their own,

similar to what the President just did by exempting many States from No Child Left Behind. Why? Because the States did a better job than the cookie-cutter approach done by that particular program.

By eliminating or consolidating these cookie-cutter programs, the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act helps to ensure that taxpayer dollars go to high-priority projects that have a direct connection to our economy. By eliminating requirements for States to spend highway funds on nonhighway activities, H.R. 7 permits States to fund those activities which they choose, but it allows States to also fund their most crucial infrastructure needs first. The bill also strengthens safety programs and gives States more flexibility to develop innovative safety initiatives that save lives.

In short, the bill seeks to return the focus of our highway funds to interstate commerce and safe travel, and it allows States to choose their own courses of action.

For those projects that are crucial for the safe and efficient movement of goods and people around our Nation, this legislation streamlines their delivery process or construction time by cutting the average highway construction completion time in half, from 14 years to 7 years.

The American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act cuts the bureaucratic red tape by allowing Federal agencies to review transportation projects concurrently, delegates project approval authority to the States, and establishes hard deadlines for Federal agencies to make decisions on permits and project approvals. The bureaucracy inherent in the approval and delivery process has proven to be the real hurdle, delaying long overdue improvements to highways, bridges, and other projects. H.R. 7 also expands the list of activities that qualify for categorical exclusions, an approval process that is faster and simpler than the standard process.

While cutting the project review process time in half, we are also ensuring environmental protections, such as those under the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, remain in place while making infrastructure improvements in a much more effective manner.

The American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act also reforms financing programs to increase private sector involvement in building infrastructure. For example, it funds the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, the TIFIA program, for low-cost interest loans at \$1 billion per year. It also incentivizes States to build upon the existing State Infrastructure Bank program by allowing States to seek out revenue-generating infrastructure projects that lack the capital to move from planning to pavement.

As these pressing State and local infrastructure needs are met, taxpayer exposure for future projects will lessen

as revenues generated by the State Infrastructure Bank-funded projects will be recycled back into the infrastructure bank for future projects. The American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act provides certainty to communities that infrastructure will be rebuilt, and it provides stability to those whose jobs depend on our commitment to rebuilding it.

Given the current economy, it seeks to safeguard valuable taxpayer dollars by cutting Washington red tape and by leveraging private sector dollars. It frees up States and local governments to make decisions that are in the best interests of their communities that they serve. It does all of this without a single earmark or a single tax increase, and it's all paid for.

Once again, Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and of the efforts made by the relevant committees to address the Nation's infrastructure and chronic unemployment. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Oh, my goodness, I don't even know where to begin. I first would like to publicly thank the Reading Clerk for his patience in slogging through the reading of this terribly complicated and confusing rule. I think the mere reading of this rule says it all, demonstrating how messed up this process is.

□ 1250

Madam Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER used to be fond of criticizing bills by saying, they wouldn't pass the "straight face" test. Well, let me tell you, I'm having trouble keeping a straight face right now, not when I look at this incredibly partisan, slapdash set of bills before us, not when I look at the awful, convoluted process that got us here.

Madam Speaker, this process is an absolute travesty. The Republican leadership took a thousand-page bill—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 Keystone pipeline, ANWR, offshore drilling, and cuts in Federal pensions. Even worse, they changed the rules in the middle of the game because yesterday morning, after everyone had submitted their amendments to the original single bill, Speaker BOEHNER decided to split it into three separate measures, and he said it was in the name of transparency. Transparency? Give me a break. It was more like the Valentine's Day massacre of transparency.

You know a bill is bad when the Competitive Enterprise Institute, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and the Natural Resources Defense Council are all opposed to how it's structured. Talk about strange bedfellows.

Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, a former Republican Congressman, called H.R. 7 "the most partisan transportation bill that I have ever seen," and "the worst transportation bill I've ever seen during 35 years of public service."

The chairman of the Transportation Committee calls this a bipartisan product. Madam Speaker, making Democratic amendments in order in and of itself and then defeating them doesn't make a bill bipartisan. Transportation bills, by their nature, have always been truly bipartisan, written together by the majority and minority. Republicans and Democrats in the past have not only worked in good faith on this bill, but they have put their differences aside and did their jobs. I should know. I served on the Transportation Committee during a Republican-controlled House in my first term, and I served as a conferee to the 1998 reauthorization bill.

Yet H.R. 7 abandons years of good-faith efforts by members of both parties to thoughtfully and responsibly craft a bipartisan transportation bill that reflects the priorities and vital importance of infrastructure investments across this country. H.R. 7 slashes investments in Federal highways by \$15.8 billion from current levels over the bill's duration. It does so at a time when our roads and bridges are crumbling before our eyes. This bill ignores that harsh reality. It guts transit funding by de-linking dedicated Federal funding from the highway trust fund and lumping it in with a smorgasbord of other transportation accounts that will be forced to compete for annual appropriations.

What's most egregious and irresponsible about this bill—worse than the hyperpartisanship, worse than the atrocious process—is that this bill will result in 550,000 job losses. We should be focused, Madam Speaker, on creating good jobs in manufacturing and construction—two sectors hardest hit with job losses—not kicking them while they're already down.

And like so many other bills, Republicans couldn't let an opportunity pass to help their friends at Big Oil. Oil companies are making more money, hand over fist, to the tune of tens of billions of dollars in record profits every year. Now we're seeing gas prices rise again. Yet Republicans continue to provide \$40 billion worth of taxpayer-funded subsidies to companies that don't need them and don't deserve them.

Last night in the Rules Committee, I tried to end taxpayer subsidies to Big Oil. But instead of asking ExxonMobil, BP, Chevron, Shell, and other Big Oil companies to pay their fair share while prices at the pump rise, the Repub-

licans doubled down for their corporate friends and blocked my amendment. I offered it three different ways last night, and all three ways were rejected, not even given the courtesy of consideration on this House floor. I will offer it again today, if the Rules Committee meets, but I have no doubt the other side will continue what they usually do: stand with Big Oil and continue to block my amendment.

Allowing more oil and gas drilling off our coasts and opening up the treasured Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling will do nothing to lower gas prices in the short term, let alone pay for this bill. At best, it will be years before any money would come from the new drilling areas.

And let's not forget the Keystone provision that's jammed in here that would automatically deem—I used the word "deem"—the environmentally harmful pipeline approved.

Oh, and then there's the provision to force Federal employees—who are currently under a 2-year pay freeze—to nearly triple their contributions to their Federal retirement accounts. The Republican leadership has, once again, found a way to take a swipe at Federal employees, even in a surface transportation bill.

This part is really confusing. The Republicans are using this attack on Federal employees to pay for the highway bill, but they are also, apparently—according to press reports—using the same revenue to pay for the payroll tax extension. Perhaps my friend from Florida—and I'm happy to yield to him—could explain to us how they expect to use the same pot of money to pay for two separate things.

Well, maybe we'll get an answer later on in the debate.

Madam Speaker, Democrats want a fully funded, commonsense transportation bill that puts people back to work. We want a bill that makes our roads and bridges safer, not more dangerous. We want a bill that is good for America. This is not that bill. This bill before us is nothing but red meat political propaganda at its worst. It simply makes no sense. It will not become law. We should scrap this bill and start over and do it the right way. That's the way we've always done it. We should do it in a bipartisan way, come together, and help to get a really good transportation bill that will put people back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In hearing what I heard in the Rules Committee last night and here on the floor this morning, it reminds me that people who have been here a long time love cookie cutters, and so many of the people that are opposed to this bill are opposed to it because they like cookie cutters. They like to say that this program works here and there and everywhere, as opposed to giving flexibility to the States.

Cookie cutters are used in education funding. They are used in Medicaid funding. They are used in this particular funding for transportation. And they're used to limit the flexibility of States who really know what their program is. It's far better for the District Five MPO in central Florida to put together a program, build it from the ground up, determine what their needs are and what modes of transportation they would like to have, build that program, send it up to the State, the legislature passes it, and it becomes law.

But no. Right now, there are so many different little programs that you have to put money into that you cannot devise your own program. You have to live within the constraints of a Federal Government that believes in cookie cutters. And it's sad.

So when you start talking about people who have been around for 35 years and they've never seen a program like this—no, because they love cookie cutters. They love it the way it is because it promotes the Federal Government making decisions for the States and local communities, as opposed to the local communities being able to develop their own programs.

So let me tell you what they did to Florida. In Florida, at one point in time, back in the times that we're talking about, we got 69 percent of our money back while States in other areas of the country, including the northeast, got maybe two times that amount of money. So the money and the funding and the flexibility were all non-existent. Why?

If I were on the take, I would have liked to have kept it the way it was, but when we begin flattening it out and giving every State a chance and returning more moneys back to the State and with that return also allowing them to make their own choices on how they would fund their transportation projects and what kind of needs they have, and being able to, with flexibility from the Federal Government, provide for those needs for local communities, there are a lot of people who say, I don't want to do it that way. Why? I love cookie cutters.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

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

I don't know what the gentleman is talking about. All I do know is this bill underfunds our highway and transportation system. It guts mass transit. It's not good for any State in this country. We deserve a better bill.

Also what I have learned is all of these new Members who came to Washington and say they want a more open process are giving us one of the most convoluted processes I think I have ever witnessed on this floor.

At this time, it is my privilege to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

We stand here today considering a rule that is a blatant manipulation of the legislative process, which we have been pretty proud of, frankly, since the beginning of time here. Process is very important in the legislative business; and while it may seem like cookie cutter, we all still revere Thomas Jefferson and his manual. That's just the way we are, I guess.

But breaking with longstanding, bipartisan tradition for the consideration of surface transportation bills, today's rule throws all notions of bipartisanship and transparency out of the window. As you've heard, it is the first transportation bill since Eisenhower was President that was not bipartisan, and it moves toward a transportation bill that has been widely condemned on both sides of the aisle and by almost everybody who knows about it in the United States.

Now, as you can see on this poster beside me, the Grand Old Pretzel's rating system tracks the legislative contortions that are being done by the Republican leadership as they pursue a hyperpartisan agenda. We launched this system to answer the calls of the American people: What in the world is going on there? No matter which party is in power, the American people demand a fair shot, not a rigged game.

The legislative acrobatics being done by the majority are really quite remarkable. I don't know anybody else on Earth who could have even thought of it. Their stunt work began late last week, as Mr. MCGOVERN pointed out, when we were fully expecting to come in on Monday and deal with a thousand-page transportation infrastructure bill, legislation that we knew already, because we'd heard so many complaints about it, that was cobbled together into Frankenstein's monster. It is made up of completely, believe me, completely unrelated and most times unvetted provisions that addressed almost every issue under the sun.

The Secretary of Transportation, as we all know who is our good friend, deplores this bill. He would like to see this bill fail.

However, before the Rules Committee convened last night, and that's not the first time this year, we were given last-minute notice that Frankenstein's monster was going to be disassembled and broken into three separate bills. This last-minute change would allow the majority to limit the number of germane amendments—300 were filed—and rule out of order commonsense attempts by Democrats to make some special interests, such as Big Oil—and Mr. MCGOVERN has fought this for years—pay their fair share instead of receiving billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies.

After forcing through these three bills, the majority plans to direct the Clerk of the House to stitch it back to-

gether. So the whole purpose of it is to try a sleight of hand. What shell game are we playing here? That's what we're up to, I'm afraid. So that gives the Senate a stitched-together bill which we had cut into three. I don't want anybody to miss this point. And they can take it or leave it. Or, I hope, have a better bill than this. That's what we're hoping for.

For inventing a way to pass as many Republican amendments as possible, and block as many Democrat amendments as possible, while still sewing this monster back again, I want to award the majority four Grand Old Pretzels, the coveted Quadruple Contortion.

The majority has truly achieved the remarkable. Unfortunately, their acrobatic achievements come at great cost to the House; and by pursuing a partisan agenda over transparency and bipartisanship, the majority moves forward alone, against the wishes of their colleagues and the American people.

And I certainly should mention that the President has said this bill will be vetoed by him. He again calls for us to work in a bipartisan manner, not to be throwing more people out of work but to create jobs with an infrastructure bill which is time honored and may be as cookie cutter as it gets but, by George, it works.

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I enjoyed watching "Moneyball." I enjoyed reading the book as well. In the book, they talk about fielding averages, players who don't make many mistakes. And in the book, Billy Beane said the talent for avoiding failure is not a great trait. In fact, the easiest way that someone can avoid making a mistake is just being too slow to get to the ball.

With all due respect, this administration and my good friends on the other side are simply too slow to get to the ball. The background or the basis of their arguments against this particular rule for this particular bill is they wish to fund transportation programs the old-fashioned way, which means we spend money we don't have. What we're trying to do with this particular bill is go outside of the box and find a way to actually pay for infrastructure improvements, a way to pay for our transportation needs, and to do it with energy development, like we all have a problem with escalating prices of gas at the pump.

For the most vulnerable of our society, we have a problem with them paying for heating oil. Economic development, business development demands a cheap source of energy, if it's going to happen; and we need to find a way to fund our infrastructure needs, and we are wrapping them all together by paying for it with economic energy development. Who can possibly be opposed to that?

Even the President of the United States, in one of his arguments for having a payroll tax increase, said the reason we need to do it is because we are paying too much money at the pump for gasoline, which I think is justifiable in his case. When President Obama came into office, the average cost of gasoline was \$1.79. Today, the average cost for a gallon of gasoline, not inflated prices, just same dollars, is \$3.28. That's an 83 percent increase in the cost at the pump since President Obama has been in office.

Now, we asked in the Rules Committee the other day, if we went back to the old-fashioned way of paying for transportation and just paid for it out of gas taxes, how much would we have to raise to fund this particular program? And the guesstimate at that time was around 20 cents a gallon—20 cents a gallon. Even if you had a small car, that's still two to three bucks a time every time you went to fill up. At that rate, nobody in the car can afford a Big Gulp. Basically, what we're trying to do on the Republican side is allow people to drive with good drinks on good roads. Our friends on the other side apparently want us to walk; or if we have good roads, you have to pay significantly more for it. That simply is wrong.

We have problems with heating oil in this country. The other side's approach to it is simply freeze in the dark. There is a better way of doing it; and this bill, these bills, try to accomplish that.

The other day we heard in the Rules Committee that there is no oil in ANWR. That comes as a great surprise to people who live in Alaska, which is maybe one of the reasons why the State Legislature of Alaska has asked us to please allow them to have access to their resources. The Native Americans who live near ANWR have asked us and begged us to please allow them to have job production by allowing them to be able to get to the resources of their area. And, indeed, if we had not usurped the control of the lands of those people, this would have happened well before that.

Even President Carter has suggested that this particular area in ANWR is where we should be developing our oil and gas resources, and that's specifically why it was put there. The fact that we haven't done it is nothing more than a dissatisfaction and a shame on us as the U.S. Congress.

I heard the other day that there is no plan for oil shale development. We have no technology to do it, even though Estonia has been doing it for over 100 years in a way that has minimal amount of water that's used. Last year, they produced 1.3 million barrels, meeting the European Union environmental standards.

My friends over in Germany who are trying to get away from nuclear are looking to Estonia and using their oil shale to supplement what they need. And we don't have the technology to go forward with that?

We are looking in the western States as a Saudi Arabia of oil shale. We have more energy potential in those three States than there is in Saudi Arabia, and all we are asking to do is be allowed to deal with it. In the 2000s, the professionals on the ground, they did the study. They charted the land. They held the town meetings, and they came up with a plan that this administration threw out the window, arbitrarily making a political deal to stop that. What we're asking is to go back to that as our starting foundation. What the professionals on the ground did, use that as our basis to start moving forward in this particular area.

I heard that the CBO said there's no money to be gained out of it, there's no energy from that.

□ 1310

What the CBO actually said is, of course, there is, but by scoring it—you're not going to score in the future—it's zero because you already know what's going to happen in the future. It is there, it is possible, and we can do it.

We want alternative energy. We certainly want more solar power, as long as you're not bailing out failed programs. We want more wind power, especially off the coast of Massachusetts. We just want to have every element—every element—of our energy portfolio developed, including what we have here in the United States. These bills do just that.

Let me figure out one last reason to do it. It's for kids. I live in a State where 70 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government. That means, quite simply, when we try to fund our education system, we cannot charge property tax on our land. When you stop, by arbitrary decisions of the Department of Energy, developing resources, we don't get income tax from high-paying jobs, we don't get severance tax, and we don't get royalty payments.

That means the 12 western States that have all the BLM lands grew their education funding over the last 3 years at a 35 percent rate. That's not bad. But every State east that has no BLM land that doesn't have these kinds of restrictions grew their education funding at 68 percent, almost two to one. That's the difference. That's the reality.

What we are doing when we stop energy development, it's hurting kids in the West—my kids. Their education opportunities are retarded simply because we do not allow the development of resources that are there, and that should be done.

Look, we're asking you simply to allow us to develop these lands and, in so doing, make it possible to have cheaper gas at the pump, make it possible to heat our homes cheaply, make it possible for energy development that goes on energy, cheap energy, and build infrastructure with it at the same time to develop our potential.

All I want you to do, Madam Speaker, is to follow the words that are printed above you on that wall where it simply says: "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, and see whether in our day and generation, we may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

It is time for us to do something worthy to be remembered by developing our resources, using it to pay for infrastructure, and for Heaven's sake, for once, Congress doesn't need to be too slow to get to the ball.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just make a couple of points to remind my colleagues of a few things. One is, this bill breaks the tradition of bipartisan action to rebuild our economy, to create jobs, and strengthen our economy. This bill, the Republican bill, kills 550,000 American jobs. It kills them. It cuts highway investments in 45 States and bankrupts the highway trust fund by \$78 billion.

I would like to include for the RECORD a statement by the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, talking about CBO's estimate, prediction that this would bankrupt the highway trust fund.

NEWS FROM THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, REP. NICK J. RAHALL, II—RANKING MEMBER

For Immediate Release: February 13, 2012.

BREAKING NEWS—CBO: REPUBLICAN SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROPOSAL BANKRUPTS HIGHWAY TRUST FUND—REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP'S BILL FALLS \$78 BILLION SHORT OVER TEN-YEAR PERIOD

WASHINGTON, DC.—According to a new analysis released this afternoon by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the Republican Leadership's surface transportation bill that the House is expected to act on later this week would bankrupt the Highway Trust Fund by 2016 and create a \$78 billion funding shortfall over a ten-year period.

"The Republican Leadership's partisan signature 'jobs' bill is not sustainable, and would lead America's transportation programs down a reckless path toward bankruptcy," said U.S. Representative Nick J. Rahall (D-WV), top Democrat on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. "There is no doubt we need to pass a long-term bill that creates certainty, but the only thing this bill does is make certain the Highway Trust Fund will go belly up even before the end of the bill."

New projections released today by CBO show the balance of the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund will go broke by fiscal year 2016 under the Republican Leadership's controversial plan. Over a ten-year period, the bill would create a \$78 billion funding shortfall in the Highway Trust Fund, adding greater uncertainty to the future integrity of surface transportation programs.

"Despite attempts by Republican Leadership to cobble together a hodgepodge of funding that included giveaways to Big Oil, cutting pensions for middle-class American workers, and a bailout from the General Fund, the bill is going to create a huge funding shortfall that will jeopardize the ability of States and local communities to move forward with construction projects down the

road," said Rahall. "Instead of working with Democrats in a bipartisan fashion to create jobs, Republicans are advancing a partisan proposal that will destroy 550,000 American jobs while putting the future of transportation programs in doubt."

CBO's analysis of H.R. 7, which is also available on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Democrats' Website at: <http://go.usa.gov/QET>.

I also want to point out to my colleagues both from Utah and Florida, under this bill, Utah would lose \$159 million over 5 years in highway funding according to the Federal Highway Administration. That, according to economists, is 5,531 jobs. In Florida, there would be a cut of \$880 million over 5 years compared to current law; and according to economists, that would destroy 30,637 jobs. Now granted, this thing is over 1,000 pages, so I could forgive my colleagues for not reading the fine print on the bill; but if they read the fine print and they were advocating these kinds of reductions for their States, let me just say I'm glad they're not my Congressmen.

At this point, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a tragic exercise. It's a waste of time, and here's why. This is probably the only chance for a jobs bill this year, but it destroys almost 600,000 jobs. This bill is the only chance for every State to start on its backlog of projects for roads and bridges and transit, but it has cuts for every State except for five States. This bill is the only opportunity for Federal funding for mass transit across the country, but the bill defunds the Federal allocation for mass transit funding that began with Ronald Reagan.

This bill is the only major piece of Federal legislation that has paid for itself with user fees, but this bill uses Federal employee pensions from hard-pressed middle-income workers to subsidize roads for almost 300 million Americans. This bill was the only chance this year for a bipartisan bill based on the long history of bipartisan Transportation and Infrastructure bills, but it is rife with poison pills that guarantee that it will be stillborn.

Historically, the Transportation and Infrastructure bill has been our most popular bill. Even before coming to the floor today, this bill has received thumbs down across the Nation. That's what it should get here, too.

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, I just want to remind the Members that this bill, H.R. 7, will also be allowed to be amended. It will require another rule. There's no previous question in here; we're not moving towards that. We're going to have the opportunity to amend that bill at a later date. So I did say that in my opening remarks. I just want to remind the Members.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I'm happy to yield to the gentleman

from Florida, or anybody, who can explain to me what's happening. I just got an email from the Rules Committee saying that the meeting on the transportation bill that was scheduled for 2 o'clock today to deal with hundreds of amendments that Members have offered has now been postponed subject to the call of the Chair. I'm wondering whether my friend from Florida or Utah or somebody could tell me whether they have any idea why the meeting was canceled and when it's going to be rescheduled.

I'm happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WEBSTER. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And the answer to that question is that this—different from the last Congress—this Congress allows amendments to bills, lots of them. There have been a huge amount of amendments filed to this H.R. 7, and it's going to take awhile to go through them to make sure they're germane and so forth. The meeting is coming. Don't worry about that. It's just not going to happen by 2 o'clock.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I just say to the gentleman, from my understanding, there's already been a cutoff for amendments, that people can't file new amendments as we speak. Or is the gentleman telling me something different?

Mr. WEBSTER. Yes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. We've passed the amendment deadline—

Mr. WEBSTER. I'm not talking about future amendments; I'm talking about the ones already filed. There are many, many amendments. In reviewing those, there's a process, and we're going to do that.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, I appreciate that.

Let me ask the gentleman this: yesterday, we were told—well, I'm reading right now news reports that one of the problems is that one of your offsets to the payroll tax cut, which is going after Federal workers' pensions, is the same offset that you have in the highway bill.

Is that the reason why this is being postponed, because the Republican leadership can't quite figure out how they're paying for any of this stuff?

Mr. WEBSTER. Not to my knowledge, no.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy making it very clear that this bill would be vetoed.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 7—AMERICAN ENERGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE JOBS ACT OF 2012

(Rep. Mica, R-Florida, and Rep. Duncan, R-Tennessee, Feb. 14, 2012)

The Administration strongly opposes the Rules Committee Print of H.R. 7, which includes H.R. 3408, the Protecting Investment in Oil Shale the Next Generation of Environmental, Energy, and Resource Security (PIONEERS Act) and H.R. 3813, the Securing Annuities for Federal Employees Act of 2012.

H.R. 7 does not reflect the historically bipartisan nature of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. The Administration has serious concerns with provisions in the bill that would make America's roads, rails, and transit systems less safe, reduce the transportation options available to America's traveling public, short circuit local decision-making, and turn back the clock on environmental and labor protections.

This bill would reduce safety throughout the Nation's transportation system by failing to make necessary investments in roads and bridges, limiting funding to State and local governments for highway safety, and repealing requirements that help ensure the safe handling of hazardous materials by railroads. The bill also fails to adequately improve transit safety in accordance with recommendations of the National Transportation Safety Board and legislation submitted by the Administration in December 2009.

H.R. 7 eliminates programs that ensure the Nation's metropolitan areas have sufficient resources to provide multiple transportation options to help reduce congestion. H.R. 7 also eliminates a thirty-year legacy of dedicated transit funding from the Highway Trust Fund. The bill allocates Federal funding for transit in a manner that undermines local decision making regarding the operation of local transit systems. This bill also reduces authorized funding levels for Amtrak and loosens the requirements on loan programs, putting taxpayer dollars at risk. In addition, the bill inappropriately targets funding towards systems that carry only a small number of the Nation's bus passengers. Finally, while the Administration appreciates that the bill does not contain earmarks, H.R. 7 eliminates funding for a number of discretionary grant programs, missing an opportunity to promote competition and innovation.

H.R. 7 would also significantly weaken environmental protections for transportation projects and undermine civic engagement in the decision-making process. The bill includes arbitrary timelines that deem an environmental and substantive review satisfactory regardless of a project's complexity and impact. The bill also limits judicial recourse of parties affected by transportation projects in a manner that undermines well-established judicial principles.

The Administration is committed to promoting safe and responsible domestic oil and gas production as part of a broad energy strategy that will protect consumers and reduce the Nation's dependence on foreign oil. Unfortunately, the bill includes pay-fors that open up pristine natural habitats not suitable for resource extraction and undermine prudent development of the Nation's oil and natural gas resources by opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to industrial development, mandating lease sales in new offshore areas with no Secretarial discretion for determining which areas are appropriate and safe for such exploration and development, and preempting a Bureau of Land Management environmental impact statement on oil shale extraction. Further, this bill seeks to circumvent a longstanding process for determining whether cross-border pipelines are in the national interest by mandating the permitting of the Keystone XL pipeline project despite the fact that the pipeline route has yet to be identified and there is no complete assessment of its potential impacts, including impacts on health and safety, the economy, foreign policy, energy security, and the environment.

The Administration is committed to working on a bipartisan basis on a surface transportation reauthorization bill that provides the necessary funding to modernize the Nation's surface transportation infrastructure,

increase transportation options, maintain and create good paying jobs, and ensure lasting economic competitiveness. Because this bill jeopardizes safety, weakens environmental and labor protections, and fails to make the investments needed to strengthen the Nation's roads, bridges, rail, and transit systems, the President's senior advisors would recommend that he veto this legislation.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I'm reminded of the Broadway play "Chicago," when one of the acts is "razzle dazzle them." With all due respect to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, all the razzle and all the dazzle is not working here. There are conflicts in terms of the offsets that are being used in trying to offset money both in this bill and in other legislations, and I think that that's indicative of the kinds of issues that are being brought before the floor here.

H.R. 7 takes \$44 billion out of the pockets of millions of middle class American workers over the next 10 years by slashing existing pension benefits and cutting employer retirement contributions for new, current, and retiring Federal workers. That's according to the Congressional Budget Office—again, new, current, and retiring Federal workers.

□ 1320

Over the weekend in my district, I heard from many Federal workers who are concerned about the kinds of proposals that are being brought forth to offset legislation by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The \$44 billion that I just talked about is in addition to \$60 billion that Federal workers are already contributing as a result of the existing 2-year pay freeze.

Although House Republicans would force Federal workers to contribute more than \$100 billion, given both proposals, toward deficit reduction—and now obviously transportation projects, and who knows how many times they're over-counting this—they have consistently refused to ask wealthy Americans to sacrifice even one penny toward these goals.

I am opposed to this H.R. 7, I'm opposed to this rule, and I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop attacking Federal workers.

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to engage the gentleman from Florida, the manager of the rule, in just a discussion if I could.

I don't have any problem with the rule—I don't think. The underlying legislation I've got a lot of difficulties with, which is why I filed or participated in the filing of many, many amendments, particularly on H.R. 7.

What causes me some angst is on page six, at the conclusion of section three of the rule, it indicates that after

general debate on H.R. 7 the Committee of the Whole will rise without motion and no further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House. Now, I think that you can't go to passage without a subsequent rule and you can't do a variety of other things. But my concern is, as a conspiracy theorist in training, that that line could produce a result—you're asking for us to vote on the rule today, but could produce a result where you don't bring a subsequent rule dealing with the amendments.

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

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. It's fraught with difficulty because, out of these 240 amendments that are out there to H.R. 7, I may have a different view on your rule today unless there is some assurance you're going to produce a second rule that is somehow going to resemble an open rule on these remaining amendments.

I yield to the gentleman for whatever response you choose to make.

Mr. WEBSTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would tell you this, I'm only here as the manager of this rule. No other position do I espouse or claim. However, I can tell you over my dead body the Rules Committee will not go forward unless we have reviewed those amendments and come back with a second edition that would allow for all of the things that you said in that particular statement out of that page.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Well, the gentleman is an honorable Member and I'm going to go with that, but I want the concern to be mentioned.

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

This gets more and more interesting. I share the gentleman from Ohio's concern, especially in light of the fact that the Rules Committee canceled their meeting today at 2 o'clock that was scheduled to go over all these amendments.

We have no idea what's going on. My guess is the leadership on their side has no idea what's going on. This process is so convoluted and it lacks transparency. I, quite frankly, think my colleagues should be ashamed of bringing this kind of a bill under this kind of process to the floor.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

So last year the oil industry made \$137 billion in the United States. This year, of course, heading to \$5 a gallon gasoline. They're tipping American drivers upside-down so fast that they'll probably make \$200 billion.

They've got to raise about another \$40 billion to pay for this transpor-

tation bill. They could take away the \$4 billion in tax breaks each year over 10 years, \$40 billion that they give to ExxonMobil. They really don't need that money. The taxpayers shouldn't have to pay twice, once at the pump and then once as taxpayers. So they could have solved all of this just by taking away the oil tax breaks.

But here's what they do: They say, one, we can drill for shale in Colorado and Wyoming. And we know that Shell Oil and the Department of Interior say that there is no commercially available technology. Two, they can drill in the Arctic refuge, but we know that there are no votes in the Senate to make it possible for that to happen. And three, their next proposal is to drill off of the beaches of California and Florida for oil—off the beaches. The Republicans are lining up themselves in these States to say I want to make the amendment to make sure we don't do that.

So, none of this is going to happen in terms of the revenues that they say they're going to generate. These are phantom revenues from phantom drilling that's never going to happen.

Moreover, they want to export the natural gas out of our country. Well, let me tell you what T. Boone Pickens says about this. This is what T. Boone Pickens says about exporting U.S. natural gas:

If we do it, we're truly going to go down as America's dumbest generation.

It's bad public policy to export natural gas. Why is that? Because natural gas in the United States is six times cheaper than in Asia, it's three times cheaper than in Europe. That's why our agriculture is doing so well, that's why manufacturing is coming back. The cost of a unit of production of any product in terms of the energy which is needed has plummeted. That's our advantage in coming out of the recession.

Finally, on the Keystone pipeline, why don't we keep the oil here in the United States? The Canadians want to take the oil, build a pipeline through the United States over our environmentally sensitive areas, bring it to Port Arthur, Texas, an export zone, and then send the oil to Asia and Latin America. Where's the American part of this? What do we get out of the Keystone pipeline? Nothing.

So I will have an amendment that says, if we build that pipeline—if we let the Canadians—that we keep the oil here in the United States because the oil should stay in the United States, the natural gas should stay in the United States. We shouldn't be pretending that we're going to be raising the revenues from these other places where they are just phantom revenues from phantom drilling, which is never going to happen.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. One hundred sixty days ago, the President of the United States came to this Chamber and put forward a plan to create jobs for our country. One of the ideas that he had to create jobs for our country was to put our construction workers back to work building schools and fixing roads and bridges so they could have money to spend in stores and restaurants and help the country. For 160 days, the majority ignored this idea. Now what they've done is brought this idea to the floor that is doomed for failure and won't work.

In the other body, Republicans and Democrats worked together and 80 Members have voted for a bill that in fact would put construction workers back to work, they're cooperating on it, and I think it has a great chance to pass and be signed by the President. But consistent with their principle that consensus is always to be avoided, the majority over here did something else. The "something else" is a bill that will actually kill jobs in the United States, and we should not support it.

But the way they did it I think merits some mention. Many on the other side were outraged when they thought the health care bill was going to be brought up when no one had read it and it wasn't going to be a straight up-or-down vote. What in fact happened was the health care bill was available to the public and the Members for 7 weeks—every word of it—and there was a direct up-or-down vote.

What we have here is a bill that's 1,000 pages long that almost no one has read and a procedure that avoids having an up-or-down vote on the bill. If you thought it was wrong in March of 2010—and it would have been, which is why we didn't do it—then it's wrong now. We should oppose the rule, oppose the bill, and work together to put Americans back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized and is advised that he has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, I would only remind the Members that there is nothing that leaves this Chamber without an up-or-down vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I take modest exception to my good friend from Florida. There will be no up-or-down vote on this package.

Now, service in Congress is often a roller coaster with highs and lows. Well, I've had highs and lows in my service in Congress, but this is one of the worst moments of the last 15 years.

At a time when our communities and our economy need us to rebuild and

renew America, we are faced with the worst transportation bill in history, ever. It is so bad that the majority party did not even have a hearing on any of the three pieces that they've broken the transportation package into. It reverses 20 years of bipartisan transportation reform. It eliminates a 30-year commitment for transit and road funding certainty that comes from the Reagan administration, it's out the window.

It is so bad that they aren't going to allow an up-or-down vote. The strategy they have is to have the pieces dealt with individually, and then, when they're done, if they somehow pass, and I hope they don't, then it's deemed passed.

Now, what's really sad is that this is not just a partisan bill; it's a bad partisan bill. Like my friend from Massachusetts, I served on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for 12 years, and most of that time, Republicans were in charge. But we never, ever had behavior like this—shutting people out, shutting down the process, not involving the public, and moving in the wrong direction.

It shatters a bipartisan coalition that I've been working on for years to develop support for resources and good policy. It's even so bad they get rid of the wildly popular Safe Routes to School program.

It's not worthy of the proud tradition of the T&I Committee or, for that matter, even the Rules Committee. It should be rejected.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Boone Pickens is right; It makes no sense to export our natural gas when manufacturing is coming back.

I join with Mr. LATOURETTE for an open rule. This is not a comprehensive rule and, as well, there's no oversight and regulation, and that means no environmental oversight. Minority contracting needs to be in place.

And if you want to do something, look at H.R. 3710, my deficit reduction, job creation, energy security bill. This is a bill that needs to go back to the drawing board and really do, as the President said, an infrastructure bill that will help all Americans, be paid for, and not take pensions off the backs of Federal employees.

With that, Madam Speaker, I ask for a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. I wasn't going to speak on the rule, but I heard my colleague from Oregon stand up and criticize the bill, criticize the process, and I needed to set the record straight.

This bill is the first bill that has come out of the committee on a partisan-line vote, but it's not because of Republicans. It's because Democrats refused to participate in the process.

When they were in the majority, Chairman Oberstar brought a bill to the committee and we unanimously supported it. There was a lot of stuff in there we didn't like, but we wanted to do it on a bipartisan basis, try to correct some of the problems. But we were unable to even move that bill to the floor because the majority, the Democrat majority, wouldn't even put that bill on the floor.

So it's not that Republicans didn't reach out to our colleagues across the aisle. We did. Chairman MICA and many members of the committee traveled the United States, had bipartisan hearings, had a bicameral hearing in California with Senator BOXER. So we reached out and reached out and reached out.

And the Democrats typically want to work together on the T&I Committee. I don't know; maybe their leadership told them they weren't allowed to work with us on this. But this bill is the biggest reform bill that's happened in the transportation industry, in transportation in this country since its inception of the highway trust fund in the 1950s.

We are consolidating programs that overlap and today are outmoded, so we've consolidated, eliminated some. We're compressing the timelines. Most Americans don't realize that it takes, on average, 13 to 15 years to build a highway in this country. We're compressing that to 7 to 8 years. We're going to have more roads built in this country because we are taking the reforms that are necessary.

This has gone on for far too long, and I'm really disappointed that my Democratic colleagues, all they want to do is raise taxes. They want to increase the regulation instead of making government work better, more efficiently, and get those dollars out there quicker that our communities need.

So I believe this is a significantly improved transportation bill than what we've seen at least 2 years ago, and it's something that I support wholeheartedly and would encourage my Democratic colleagues to take a close look and support it also.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule. I like some of the reforms in this bill. There are some reforms that have been overdue and are necessary.

The problem I have is that if this rule waives all points of order against the bill, the bill as I understand it—and nobody can inform me otherwise—is that it violates the Ryan budget, or the so-called House budget, that we passed. We don't know how much. It could be tens of billions, could be just under that, but it seems to violate the budget that we passed. That's why we're having to waive all points of order against the bill, and for that I voice my opposition for the rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire from the gentleman how many more speakers he has left, because we have a lot. We ran out of time, so I'm the last speaker.

Mr. WEBSTER. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Madam Speaker, this bill is awful, this process is awful, and I think it's beyond salvageable. I just want to talk about one thing in closing.

Madam Speaker, oil companies get taxpayer subsidies for oil injection, extraction, drilling, manufacturing, pricing, and inventory floors. They get taxpayer subsidies, while making tens of billions of dollars in record profits, and taxpayers continue to get fleeced with rising gas prices.

At the end of this debate, I will try to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to eliminate one of these subsidies for the Big Five oil companies. The Big Five oil companies do not need, they do not deserve this subsidy, and the American people don't deserve these rising gas prices.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous materials immediately prior to the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, this is a reasonable amendment. The American people are tired of getting gouged at the pump by these big oil companies that are making record profits and, at the same time, we continue with taxpayer subsidies to give them these handouts. Enough is enough.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Improvements to our infrastructure are waiting. Stable construction jobs are waiting. Unemployment lingers above 8 percent nationally and near 10 percent in central Florida.

A long-term reauthorization is necessary, not just another short-term extension like we have become so used to in this body. It streamlines and consolidates Federal transportation programs, cuts red tape and Washington bureaucracy, increases funding flexibility to the States and local government, better leverages existing infrastructure resources, and encourages more private sector participation in building our Nation's decaying infrastructure. It provides 5 years of certainty and stability with flat funding that is paid for without raising taxes.

The American Energy and Infrastructure Act is long overdue. We can't delay anymore. It's time to stop putting off until tomorrow what we should have done yesterday.

This bill eliminates the typical cookie-cutter approach that Washington has used over and over again to fund all kinds of programs, including transportation. This is a great policy that consolidates many programs, that allows States the flexibility to build their own programs. It allows local communities and NPOs to design a program of transportation that fits their needs.

□ 1340

It can only be done when we consolidate these programs and make the reforms found in this bill. 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. 547 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

(1) The amendment in section 2, to be offered by Mr. McGovern of Massachusetts or his designee, debatable for 10 minutes, is considered to have been printed at the end of part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying H. Res. 547.

(2) The amendment referred to in section 1 is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SEC. 1. DEDUCTION FOR INCOME ATTRIBUTABLE TO DOMESTIC PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES NOT ALLOWED WITH RESPECT TO OIL AND GAS ACTIVITIES OF MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 199(d)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting "(9 percent in the case of any major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)))" after "3 percent".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(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 of-

ferred 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 547, if ordered, and motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 2079, H.R. 3247, and H.R. 3248.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 181, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—229

Adams	Goodlatte	Nunes
Aderholt	Gosar	Nunnelee
Akin	Gowdy	Olson
Alexander	Granger	Palazzo
Amash	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Austria	Griffin (AR)	Pence
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Bachus	Grimm	Platts
Barletta	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Bartlett	Hall	Pompeo
Barton (TX)	Hanna	Posey
Bass (NH)	Harper	Price (GA)
Benishek	Harris	Quayle
Berg	Hastings (WA)	Reed
Biggert	Hayworth	Rehberg
Billray	Heck	Reichert
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hergert	Rigell
Black	Herrera Beutler	Rivera
Bonner	Huelskamp	Roby
Bono Mack	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Boren	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Brooks	Issa	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Rokita
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Buerkle	Jones	Roskam
Burgess	Jordan	Ross (FL)
Burton (IN)	Kelly	Royce
Calvert	King (IA)	Runyan
Camp	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Kingston	Scalise
Carter	Kinzinger (IL)	Schilling
Cassidy	Kline	Schmidt
Chabot	Labrador	Schock
Chaffetz	Lamborn	Schweikert
Coble	Lance	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Landry	Scott, Austin
Cole	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Latham	Sessions
Cravaack	LaTourette	Shimkus
Crawford	Latta	Shuster
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Davis (KY)	Long	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Dent	Lummis	Southerland
DesJarlais	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Dold	E.	Stivers
Dreier	Mack	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	Manzullo	Sullivan
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Terry
Ellmers	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Emerson	Matheson	Thornberry
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Fincher	McCaul	Tipton
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Turner (NY)
Flake	McCotter	Turner (OH)
Fleischmann	McHenry	Upton
Fleming	McKeon	Walberg
Flores	McKinley	Walden
Forbes	McMorris	Walsh (IL)
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Webster
Fox	Meehan	West
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Gallely	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Miller, Gary	Wittman
Garrett	Mulvaney	Wolf
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Gibbs	Myrick	Woodall
Gibson	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Noem	Young (AK)
Gohmert	Nugent	Young (IN)

NAYS—181

Ackerman	Butterfield	Conyers
Altmire	Capps	Cooper
Andrews	Capuano	Costa
Baca	Carnahan	Costello
Baldwin	Carney	Courtney
Barrow	Carson (IN)	Critz
Bass (CA)	Castor (FL)	Crowley
Berkley	Chandler	Cuellar
Berman	Chu	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Ciilline	Davis (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Clarke (MI)	Davis (IL)
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	DeFazio
Bonamici	Clay	DeGette
Boswell	Cleaver	DeLauro
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Deutch
Braley (IA)	Cohen	Dicks
Brown (FL)	Connolly (VA)	Dingell

Donnelly (IN)	Larsen (WA)	Ross (AR)
Doyle	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
Edwards	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Ellison	Levin	Ruppel
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Eshoo	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Farr	Loeb	Sánchez, Linda
Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe	T.
Finer	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Frank (MA)	Lujan	Sarbanes
Fudge	Lynch	Schakowsky
Garamendi	Maloney	Schiff
Gonzalez	Markey	Schrader
Green, Al	Matsui	Schwartz
Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)
Grijalva	McCollum	Scott, David
Gutierrez	McDermott	Sewell
Hahn	McGovern	Sherman
Hanabusa	McIntyre	Shuler
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Sires
Heinrich	Meeks	Slaughter
Higgins	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Himes	Miller (NC)	Speier
Hincheey	Miller, George	Stark
Hinojosa	Moran	Sutton
Hirono	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (CA)
Hochul	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Holden	Napolitano	Tierney
Healt	Neal	Tonko
Honda	Olver	Towns
Hoyer	Owens	Tsongas
Inslee	Pascarella	Van Hollen
Israel	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez
Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Visclosky
Jackson Lee	Perlmutter	Walz (MN)
(TX)	Peters	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Peterson	Schultz
Johnson, E. B.	Price (ME)	Waters
Kaptur	Polis	Watt
Keating	Price (NC)	Waxman
Kildee	Quigley	Welch
Kind	Rahall	Wilson (FL)
Kissell	Reyes	Yarmuth
Kucinich	Richardson	
Langevin	Richmond	

NOT VOTING—23

Becerra	Duffy	Payne
Blackburn	Guinta	Pitts
Campbell	Hartzler	Rangel
Canseco	Johnson (IL)	Renacci
Capito	Luetkemeyer	Serrano
Cardoza	Moore	Woolsey
Diaz-Balart	Pallone	Young (FL)
Doggett	Paul	

□ 1406

Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. WATERS, and Messrs. CUELLAR and MEEKS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Stated against:
Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 50 I was at an important hearing of the Health Subcommittee. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 2012, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to record my vote for rollcall No. 50. Had I been present I would have voted: rollcall No. 50: “nay”—On Ordering the Previous Question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 186, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

AYES—235

Adersholt	Goodlatte	Nugent
Akin	Gosar	Nunes
Alexander	Gowdy	Nunnelee
Amash	Granger	Olson
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Austria	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pearce
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Pence
Barletta	Grimm	Peterson
Bartlett	Guthrie	Petri
Barton (TX)	Hall	Pitts
Bass (NH)	Hanna	Platts
Benishek	Harper	Poe (TX)
Berg	Harris	Pompeo
Biggert	Hartzler	Posey
Billray	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Quayle
Bishop (UT)	Heck	Reed
Black	Hensarling	Rehberg
Blackburn	Hergert	Reichert
Bonner	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bono Mack	Huelskamp	Ribble
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rivera
Brooks	Hunter	Roby
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Buerkle	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Jones	Rokita
Calvert	Jordan	Rooney
Camp	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Canseco	King (IA)	Roskam
Cantor	King (NY)	Royce
Capito	Kingston	Runyan
Carter	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kissell	Scalise
Chabot	Lamborn	Schilling
Chaffetz	Lance	Schmidt
Coble	Landry	Schock
Coffman (CO)	Lankford	Schweikert
Cole	Latham	Scott (SC)
Conaway	LaTourette	Scott, Austin
Cravaack	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Crawford	Lewis (CA)	Sessions
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Culberson	Long	Shuster
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Simpson
Denham	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Dent	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Southerland
Dold	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Dreier	E.	Stivers
Duffy	Mack	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	Manzullo	Sullivan
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Terry
Ellmers	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Emerson	Matheson	Thornberry
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Fincher	McCaul	Tipton
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Turner (NY)
Fleischmann	McCotter	Turner (OH)
Fleming	McHenry	Upton
Flores	McKeon	Walberg
Forbes	McKinley	Walden
Fortenberry	McMorris	Walsh (IL)
Fox	Rodgers	Webster
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	West
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Westmoreland
Gallely	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Gardner	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Miller, Gary	Wittman
Gerlach	Mulvaney	Womack
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Gibson	Myrick	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Gohmert	Noem	Young (IN)

NOES—186

Ackerman	Boswell	Clarke (MI)
Adams	Brady (IA)	Clarke (NY)
Altmire	Braley (IA)	Clay
Andrews	Brown (FL)	Cleaver
Baca	Butterfield	Clyburn
Baldwin	Capps	Cohen
Barrow	Capuano	Connolly (VA)
Bass (CA)	Cardoza	Conyers
Berkley	Carnahan	Cooper
Berman	Carney	Costa
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Costello
Bishop (NY)	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Blumenauer	Chandler	Critz
Bonamici	Chu	Crowley
Boren	Ciilline	Cuellar

Cummings	Kaptur	Reyes	Bachus	Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)	Price (NC)	Schakowsky	Thornberry
Davis (CA)	Keating	Richardson	Baldwin	Duncan (SC)	Kissell	Quayle	Schiff	Tiberi
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Richmond	Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Kline	Quigley	Schilling	Tierney
DeFazio	Kind	Ross (AR)	Barrow	Edwards	Kucinich	Rahall	Schmidt	Tipton
DeGette	Kucinich	Ross (FL)	Bartlett	Ellison	Labrador	Reed	Schock	Tonko
DeLauro	Langevin	Rothman (NJ)	Barton (TX)	Ellmers	Lamborn	Rehberg	Schrader	Towns
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard	Bass (CA)	Emerson	Lance	Reichert	Schwartz	Tsongas
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger	Bass (NH)	Engel	Landry	Renacci	Schweikert	Turner (NY)
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Rush	Benishek	Eshoo	Langevin	Reyes	Scott (SC)	Turner (OH)
Donnelly (IN)	Levin	Ryan (OH)	Berg	Fahrenthold	Lankford	Ribble	Scott (VA)	Upton
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda	Berkley	Farr	Larsen (WA)	Richardson	Scott, Austin	Van Hollen
Edwards	Lipinski	T.	Berman	Fattah	Larson (CT)	Richmond	Scott, David	Velázquez
Ellison	Loeb sack	Sanchez, Loretta	Biggert	Pincher	Latham	Rivera	Sensenbrenner	Visclosky
Engel	Lofgren, Zoe	Sarbanes	Bilbray	Fitzpatrick	LaTourette	Roby	Sessions	Walberg
Eshoo	Lowe y	Schakowsky	Bilirakis	Flake	Latta	Roe (TN)	Sewell	Walden
Farr	Lujan	Schiff	Bishop (GA)	Fleischmann	Lee (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Sherman	Walsh (IL)
Fattah	Lynch	Schrader	Bishop (NY)	Fleming	Levin	Rogers (KY)	Shimkus	Walz (MN)
Filner	Maloney	Schwartz	Bishop (UT)	Flores	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Shuler	Wasserman
Flake	Markey	Scott (VA)	Black	Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher	Shuster	Schultz
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Scott, David	Blackburn	Fortenberry	Lipinski	Rokita	Simpson	Waters
Fudge	McCarthy (NY)	Sewell	Blumenauer	Fox x	LoBiondo	Rooney	Sires	Watt
Garamendi	McCollum	Sherman	Bonamici	Frank (MA)	Loeb sack	Ros-Lehtinen	Slaughter	Waxman
Gonzalez	McDermott	Shuler	Bonner	Franks (AZ)	Lofgren, Zoe	Roskam	Smith (NE)	Webster
Green, Al	McGovern	Sires	Bono Mack	Frelinghuysen	Long	Ross (AR)	Smith (NJ)	Welch
Green, Gene	McIntyre	Slaughter	Boren	Fudge	Lowey	Ross (FL)	Smith (TX)	West
Grijalva	McNerney	Smith (WA)	Boswell	Gallegly	Lucas	Rothman (NJ)	Smith (WA)	Westmoreland
Gutierrez	Meeks	Speier	Bostany	Garamendi	Luetkemeyer	Roybal-Allard	Southerland	Whitfield
Hahn	Michaud	Stark	Brady (PA)	Gardner	Lujan	Royce	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Hanabusa	Miller (NC)	Sutton	Brady (TX)	Garrett	Lummis	Runyan	Stark	Wilson (SC)
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)	Braley (IA)	Gerlach	Lungren, Daniel	Ruppersberger	Stearns	Wittman
Heinrich	Moran	Thompson (MS)	Brooks	Gibbs	E.	Rush	Stivers	Wolf
Higgins	Murphy (CT)	Tierney	Broun (GA)	Gibson	Lynch	Ryan (OH)	Stutzman	Womack
Himes	Nadler	Tonko	Brown (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	Mack	Ryan (WI)	Sullivan	Woodall
Hinche y	Napolitano	Towns	Buchanan	Gohmert	Maloney	Sánchez, Linda	Sutton	Woolsey
Hinojosa	Neal	Tsongas	Bucshon	Gonzalez	Manzullo	T.	Terry	Yarmuth
Hirono	Olver	Van Hollen	Buerkle	Goodlatte	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)	Yoder
Hochul	Owens	Velázquez	Burgess	Marino	Marchant	Sarbanes	Thompson (MA)	Young (AK)
Holden	Pallone	Visclosky	Burton (IN)	Gowdy	Marino	Scalise	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
Holt	Pascrell	Walz (MN)	Butterfield	Granger	Markey			
Honda	Pastor (AZ)	Wasserman	Calvert	Graves (GA)	Mateson			
Hoyer	Pelosi	Schultz	Camp	Graves (MO)	Matsui	Harris		
Inslee	Perlmutter	Watt	Canseco	Green, Al	McCarthy (CA)		Rigell	
Israel	Peters	Waxman	Cantor	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)			
Jackson (IL)	Pingree (ME)	Welch	Capito	Griffin (AR)	McCaul	Becerra	Johnson (IL)	Rangel
Jackson Lee	Polis	Wilson (FL)	Caputo	Griffith (VA)	McClintock	Campbell	Moore	Serrano
(TX)	Price (NC)	Wolf	Capps	Grijalva	McCormack	Doggett	Palazzo	Young (FL)
Johnson (GA)	Quigley	Woolsey	Capuano	Grimm	McCotter	Filner	Paul	
Johnson, E. B.	Rahall	Yarmuth	Carnahan	Guthrie	McDermott	Guinta	Payne	
			Carney	Gutierrez	McGovern			
			Carson (IN)	Hahn	McHenry			
			Carter	Hall	McIntyre			
			Hanabusa	Hall	McKeon			
			Hanna	Hanabusa	McKinley			
			Harper	Hanna	McMorris			
			Hartzler	Harper	Rodgers			
			Hastings (FL)	Hartzler	McNerney			
			Hastings (WA)	Hastings (FL)	Meehan			
			Hayworth	Hastings (WA)	Meeks			
			Heck	Hayworth	Mica			
			Heinrich	Heck	Michaud			
			Hensarling	Heinrich	Miller (FL)			
			Herger	Hensarling	Miller (MI)			
			Herrera Beutler	Herger	Miller (NC)			
			Higgins	Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary			
			Himes	Higgins	Miller, George			
			Hinche y	Himes	Moran			
			Hinojosa	Hinche y	Mulvaney			
			Hirono	Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)			
			Hochul	Hirono	Murphy (PA)			
			Holden	Hochul	Myrick			
			Holt	Holden	Nadler			
			Hoyer	Holt	Napolitano			
			Huelskamp	Hoyer	Neal			
			Huizenga (MI)	Huelskamp	Neugebauer			
			Hultgren	Huizenga (MI)	Noem			
			Hunter	Hultgren	Nugent			
			Hurt	Hunter	Nunes			
			Inslee	Hurt	Nunnelee			
			Israel	Inslee	Olson			
			Issa	Israel	Olver			
			Jackson (IL)	Issa	Owens			
			Jackson Lee	Jackson (IL)	Pallone			
			(TX)	Jackson Lee	Pascrell			
			Jenkins	(TX)	Pastor (AZ)			
			Johnson (GA)	Jenkins	Paulsen			
			Johnson (OH)	Johnson (GA)	Pearce			
			Johnson, E. B.	Johnson (OH)	Pelosi			
			Johnson, Sam	Johnson, E. B.	Pence			
			Jones	Johnson, Sam	Perlmutter			
			Jordan	Jones	Peters			
			Kaptur	Jordan	Peterson			
			Keating	Kaptur	Petri			
			Kelly	Keating	Pingree (ME)			
			Kildee	Kelly	Pitts			
			Kind	Kildee	Platts			
			King (IA)	Kind	Poe (TX)			
			King (NY)	King (IA)	Polis			
			Kingston	King (NY)	Pompeo			
				Kingston	Posey			
					Price (GA)			

NAYS—2

Harris

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra

Johnson (IL)

Rangel

Campbell

Moore

Serrano

Doggett

Palazzo

Young (FL)

Filner

Paul

Guinta

Payne

□ 1422

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 52, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

LANCER CORPORAL MATTHEW P. PATHENOS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3247) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Town and Country Commons in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the “Lance Corporal Matthew P. Pathenos Post Office Building,” on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

NOT VOTING—12

Becerra	Johnson (IL)	Rangel
Campbell	Moore	Serrano
Doggett	Paul	Waters
Guinta	Payne	Young (FL)

□ 1415

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN J. COOK POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2079) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Main Street in East Rockaway, New York, as the “John J. Cook Post Office,” on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 2, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—418

Ackerman	Alexander	Andrews
Adams	Altmire	Austria
Aderholt	Amash	Baca
Akin	Amodei	Bachmann