

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material on H.R. 6052.

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

There was no objection.

SAVING ENERGY THROUGH PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1304 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6052.

□ 1408

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6052) to promote increased public transportation use, to promote increased use of alternative fuels in providing public transportation, and for other purposes, with Ms. DEGETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6052, the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008.

The purpose of the bill, very simply stated, is to promote energy savings for all Americans by increasing use of public transportation throughout this country, a fact that has been a need, let us say, that has been driven home dramatically by \$4 a gallon oil and gasoline prices since Memorial Day, and I thank the Speaker and majority leader for making time for us to bring this bill to the House Floor.

Basic law of economics is that the price of gas is a two-part equation: Supply and demand. Demand is a critical factor in the cost of oil, and decreasing demand is one of the most immediate ways we can attack the high cost of gasoline prices. And our fellow citizens understand this. They are making choices. They have been making choices for several years.

Over the last 3 years, in particular, there has been growth of 1 million new riders a day on public transportation systems across America, for 375 million new transit trips nationwide last year, a total of 10.3 billion transit trips throughout the country.

There was a time when New York City accounted for 60 percent of all transit trips in the United States, but no longer. In the last 3 years, New York's share of transit ridership nationwide has slipped to 38 percent, not

because New Yorkers are riding transit less; they are riding more. But more Americans have found their way to public transportation, and increasingly in droves since the skyrocketing price of gasoline.

Transit systems throughout the United States have found every new transit project, every new light rail project has more than tripled its original projections of ridership nationwide.

Innovative cities like Denver under then-Mayor Wellington Webb, said: Ride our transit system free in the center city. Keep your pollution out of the center city. Ride the transit system free. And it has been an enormous boost and benefit to the city of Denver.

I can and I will cite some very specific ridership improvements in my own State. In Minneapolis, the Hiawatha light rail, 20 years in the waiting, finally was constructed; ridership opened, and 9 months later, 10 months ahead of schedule, they achieved their 10 millionth rider. Dramatic improvements.

Seattle, Dallas-Fort Worth, San Francisco all have similar increases in transit ridership. The Charlotte Area Transit System recently opened a new light rail line. They have increased ridership 34 percent from February of last year to February of this year.

CalTran, the commuter rail line that serves the San Francisco Peninsula and Santa Clara Valley, set a record for average weekday ridership in February of this year with a 9.3 percent increase over last year.

The South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, my good friend, the ranking member, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) knows well, posted a rise of more than 20 percent ridership from Miami, Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach in March and April of this year as compared to last year.

Americans are making the choice. They have decided. We need to help them with that choice. And the bill before us will make a huge step in that direction.

This legislation provides substantial support for States and public transportation agencies increasing incentives for computers to make their choice to ride transit: 1.7 billion, 2 years for transit agencies that are reducing transit fares or expanding the services to meet the needs of growing transit commuters. We increase the Federal share for clean fuel and alternative fuel transit bus, ferry, and locomotive related equipment or facilities, helping transit agencies become more fuel efficient.

□ 1415

In fiscal years 2008 and 2009, the increased Federal share for these activities will go from 90 percent to 100 percent of the net capital cost of the project.

We also provide authority to extend the Federal transit pass benefit program which has operated over the past

few years on a pilot basis in the National Capital Region and in a few selected areas throughout the country. After evaluating the transit pass program, the U.S. Department of Transportation recommended that it be expanded nationwide. We do that in this legislation. There was an executive order signed by President Clinton in 2000 that launched this initiative. It was supported in the SAFETEA legislation. The 3-year pilot program under our legislation would be substantially expanded nationwide.

The Department of Transportation says that expanding this program will implement their own department recommendation by giving more Federal employees incentives to choose transit options. And we also create a pilot program to allow the funding expended by private providers of public transportation for van pools to acquire the vans to be used as their non-Federal share for matching Federal transit funds in five community pilot projects. Under current law, only public funds can be used as the local match. This pilot program will induce private funds to participate in the van pooling initiative.

I would observe we had a very successful van pooling program in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area in the mid-1980s when companies like 3M, Control Data, and Minneapolis Honeywell bought the vans for their employees and provided a fuel subsidy and encouraged their employees to join together. The vans were full. The program was successful. It cut down on congestion in the greater metropolitan Twin City area, and reduced cost for all of the riders. We should do that nationally, and we provide further authority to make that change and to take that initiative.

There are other provisions in this bill that are important, and I will submit those for the RECORD, but I want to close this part of my remarks with an observation by Paul Weyrich in a very thoughtful publication, Free Congress Foundation. "Does Transit Work: A Conservative Reappraisal." It begins, "The first recorded example of mass transportation was the movement of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden. At that time, 100 percent of the population was moved at once in a single trip; a record never equaled since." Then he says, "According to most studies of mass transit, it has gone straight downhill from there."

Well, we are on the way up and we are going to lift mass transit and speed its acceptance and its use by the public with the legislation that we bring before you today.

Toward that purpose, I express my great appreciation to the gentleman from Florida, the ranking member, Mr. MICA, for the partnership he has engaged in with us and for the thoughtful, constructive suggestions he has made every step of the way. I appreciate very much the gentleman's participation.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6052, the "Saving Energy

Through Public Transportation Act of 2008". This bill promotes energy savings for all Americans by increasing public transportation use in the United States.

As gas prices have skyrocketed past \$4 per gallon since Memorial Day, everyone is talking about how we need more oil. I thank the Speaker and the Majority Leader for scheduling today's bill, H.R. 6052, so that we can also talk about using less.

Let us all remember the basic law of economics that the price of gas is a two-part equation: supply and demand. Demand is a critical factor in the cost of oil, and decreasing demand is one of the most immediate ways that we can tackle the high cost of gas.

Americans understand this. They are making choices today that are decreasing our global demand for oil. We're seeing record ridership on public transportation all across the country, as well as decreases in the number of miles traveled in cars, SUVs, and pickup trucks. Without doubt, many Americans are making these choices based on the economic hardship caused by the high price of gas. However, in my discussions with constituents in my district and people across the country, Americans are also considering transit alternatives because they're sick and tired of knowing that our great nation imports 60 percent of its oil, much of it from the Persian Gulf.

As a result, across America, public transportation has experienced a renaissance in big cities, suburban communities, and small towns. In 2007, Americans took more than 10.3 billion trips on public transportation, the highest level in 50 years. In the first quarter of 2008, commuters took more than 2.6 billion transit trips nationwide, an increase of 3.3 percent over the first quarter of 2007.

Now that the price of gas has surpassed \$4 a gallon, even more commuters are choosing to ride the train or the bus to work rather than drive alone in their cars. Public transit systems in metropolitan areas are reporting increases in ridership of five, ten, and even 15 percent over last year's figures. Light rails saw the largest jump in ridership with a 10 percent increase to 110 million trips in the first quarter. Some of the biggest increases in ridership are occurring in many areas in the South and West where new bus and light rail lines have been built in the last few years.

In Denver, for example, ridership was up eight percent in the first three months of 2008 compared with last year, and Minneapolis, Seattle, Dallas-Fort Worth, and San Francisco all reported similar increases. The Charlotte Area Transit System, which recently opened a new light rail line, has increased ridership more than 34 percent from February 2007 to February 2008. Caltrain, the commuter rail line that serves the San Francisco Peninsula and the Santa Clara Valley, set a record for average weekday ridership in February with a 9.3 percent increase over 2007. The South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, which operates a commuter rail system from Miami to Fort Lauderdale and West Palm Beach, posted a rise of more than 20 percent in ridership in March and April as compared to the same time last year.

Madam Chairman, Americans are proving that riding transit is an easy, immediate, and important part of the solution to decreasing our demand for foreign oil. However, meeting this impressive new demand for public transportation services is no small task for our tran-

sit agencies. With these record-breaking numbers of commuters riding transit, many of our nation's transit systems are busting at the seams. In addition, the cost of fuel and power for public transportation providers has sharply increased, compounding costs of serving all of these new transit riders.

Currently, public transportation reduces gas consumption by 1.4 billion gallons a year (3.9 million gallons per day), which equates to more than 33 million barrels of oil. It's equal to 108 million fewer cars filling up year.

Although those fuel savings are incredible, we can do better, and we must.

H.R. 6052 provides much needed support to states and public transportation agencies and also increases incentives for commuters to choose transit options, thereby reducing their transportation-related energy consumption and our nation's reliance on foreign oil.

To increase public transportation use across the United States, H.R. 6052 authorizes \$1.7 billion in funding over two years for transit agencies nationwide that are temporarily reducing transit fares or expanding transit services to meet the needs of the growing number of transit commuters. It is important to note that the funds authorized by this bill will be distributed to States and local communities in the same manner as they currently receive Federal transit urban and rural formula funds. However, in an effort to provide transit choices to smaller urban and rural areas, which may not currently have any transit service, this bill specifically increases the relative share of the transit funds that will be going to the rural areas.

H.R. 6052 also increases the Federal share for clean fuel and alternative fuel transit bus, ferry, or locomotive-related equipment or facilities, thereby assisting transit agencies in becoming more fuel efficient. In fiscal years 2008 and 2009, the increased Federal share for these activities is 100 percent of the net capital cost of the project.

H.R. 6052 also extends the Federal transit pass benefits program to require that all Federal agencies offer transit passes to Federal employees throughout the United States. Current law requires that all Federal agencies within the National Capital Region implement a transit pass fringe benefits program and offer employees transit passes.

Data from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority covering the first three years of the National Capital Region transit pass program show that more than 15,500 automobiles were eliminated from roads in the Washington, DC area as a result of Federal employees shifting their travel mode away from single occupancy vehicle ("SOV") use to public transportation use for commuting to work. DOT estimated the energy savings from this mode shift included the reduction of more than eight million gallons of gasoline for each of the three years that they studied. DOT also studied the results of a nationwide pilot program and found that, within the three agencies, 11 percent of the participants shifted their travel mode away from SOV use to public transportation use for commuting to work, again producing marked energy savings.

The Department of Transportation has determined that both the National Capital Region transit benefits program and the nationwide pilot program produce marked energy and emissions savings, congestion reductions, and

cleaner air, and recommends that the transit pass benefits program be extended to Federal employees nationwide. This provision will implement the Department's recommendation by providing more Federal employees the incentives to choose transit options, thereby reducing their transportation-related energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil.

H.R. 6052 also creates a pilot program to allow the amount expended by private providers of public transportation by vanpool for the acquisition of vans to be used as the non-Federal share for matching Federal transit funds in five communities. Under current law, only local public funds may be used as local match; this pilot program would allow private funds to be used in limited circumstances. The Department of Transportation will implement and oversee the vanpool pilot projects, and will report back to Congress on the costs, benefits, and efficiencies of the vanpool projects.

Finally, H.R. 6052 increases the Federal share for additional parking facilities at end-of-line fixed guideway stations. This provision increases the total number of transit commuters who will have access to those facilities.

Public transportation use in all of its forms—bus, rail, vanpool, ferry, streetcar, and subways to name a few—saves fuel and reduces our dependence on foreign oil. As such, increasing public transportation use by providing incentives for commuters to choose transit options is a priority of this Congress.

Given the price of gas, Americans are more focused on the costs of commuting than at any time in recent history. And they want choices. We need to provide them. With passage of this bill, we have an opportunity to provide transit choices that will change the way that Americans travel.

The impact of such changes on our nation's dependence on foreign oil would be extraordinary. According to a recent study, if Americans used public transit at the same rate as Europeans—for roughly 10 percent of their daily travel needs—the United States could reduce its dependence on imported oil by more than 40 percent, nearly equal to the 550 million barrels of crude oil that we import from Saudi Arabia each year.

That's the difference this bill can help make.

I strongly support H.R. 6052, the "Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008", and urge my colleagues to do the same.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, June 3, 2008.

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OBERSTAR: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to the consideration of H.R. 6052, the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008, which was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on May 14, 2008.

In the interest of expediting consideration of H.R. 6052, the Oversight Committee will not separately consider this legislation. The Oversight Committee does so, however, with the understanding that this does not prejudice the Committee's jurisdictional interests and prerogatives regarding this bill or similar legislation.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the

Oversight Committee should H.R. 6052 or a similar Senate bill be considered in conference with the Senate. I also request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Report on H.R. 6052 or in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman.

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

Washington, DC, June 3, 2008.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
*Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Govern-
ment Reform, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN WAXMAN: I write to you regarding H.R. 6052, the "Saving Energy through Public Transportation Act of 2008".

I appreciate your willingness to waive rights to further consideration of H.R. 6052, notwithstanding the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Of course, this waiver does not prejudice any further jurisdictional claims by your Committee over this legislation or similar language. Furthermore, I agree to support your request for appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform if a conference is held on this matter.

This exchange of letters will be placed in the Committee report and inserted in the Congressional Record as part of the consideration of H.R. 6052 on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, M.C.
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I want to thank our chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, my Democrat counterpart, Mr. OBERSTAR, for his work on this piece of legislation that does deal with some of the issues that we are facing right now and follows some of the discussions that we have had on the floor relating to energy and energy conservation.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has a very small piece of the puzzle, but it is nonetheless an important piece and we have tried to exercise our jurisdictional responsibility in coming forth with this, again, small piece of the puzzle.

This bill does provide for expansion of some of the transit grants around the country, and I think that there are some beneficial provisions for those in rural areas, suburban areas, and for much of the public that relies on public transportation.

This bill further does allow sort of an unprecedented ability to use some of the money traditionally used for projects to assist some of the local transit authorities that are suffering now with high fuel costs. Just like the average family is suffering with high fuel costs, transit agencies have also

experienced the same problem. They are cutting back on services, sometimes when people really need to have an option and don't have that option, by cutting out routes, and that has been announced even in my area. So I think we are doing a responsible thing.

This is a 2-year authorization. It is an expansion of the authorization of \$1.7 billion that does give some of the folks on my side some hiccups, but it is authorization, it is not appropriation and each Member is going to have to judge their support or opposition based on the final product. But I have joined Chairman OBERSTAR in support of this authorizing bill. I think again it fills our small piece of the puzzle.

I did want to take just a minute or two, I didn't get a chance to speak on the rule or on the energy legislation that was before the House earlier, and there was quite a bit of banter. And some people were bashing the President and this administration for not having a plan. In fact, someone said he didn't recall a plan, which is kind of funny.

I am very fortunate to have outstanding staff, but this summer I also have some outstanding interns. They come from all over the country to Congress, and I have gotten some from my district and elsewhere. So you have a little more staff to do research rather than just keep on the track that we are on here every day. I said wasn't there a Bush plan? And all be darned, there was a Bush energy plan. So I had a little research done on that.

Lo and behold, very shortly into his term, it was May 17, 2001, the President of the United States, George Bush, just a few months into office, he set two major priorities, one being education. You remember on 9/11 he was in a Florida classroom talking about his plan to improve education. But even before that, in May as one of his first priorities, he announced his plan. He announced his plan actually in the home State of the chairman, in St. Paul, Minnesota. On that day when he announced it he said, "If we fail to act, our country will become more reliant on foreign crude oil, putting our national energy security into the hands of foreign nations, some of whom do not share our interests."

On that same day when he announced his plan, he said regarding part of his plan, "We will underwrite research and development into energy-saving technology. It'll require manufacturers to build more energy-efficient appliances. We will review and remove obstacles that prevent business from investing in energy-efficient technologies."

Furthermore, President Bush said, "The second part of our energy plan will be to expand and diversify our Nation's energy supplies. America today imports," and now this is May of 2001, "America today imports 52 percent of all of our oil. If we don't take action, those imports will only grow. As long as cars and trucks run on gasoline, we will need oil, and we should produce more of it at home."

The President called for burning coal more cleanly, expanding nuclear power, and drilling for new oil in new places, that included the Arctic area in Alaska. The President said that is banned now, but the President said it can be done safely.

Listen to this one. This is the President in St. Paul. "ANWR can produce 600,000 barrels of oil a day for the next 40 years. What difference does 600,000 barrels a day make? Well, that happens to be exactly the amount we import from Saddam Hussein's Iraq. We're not just short of oil; we're short of the refineries that turn oil into fuel. So while the rest of our economy is functioning at 82 percent of capacity, our refineries are gasping at 96 percent of capacity."

That was part of the President's plan, and how prophetic could you be. This was before 9/11. This was in May of 2001, announcing his plan.

I can't take up all of the time, but I have Mr. Gephardt's response: Congress will take action to stop them. Mr. KERRY vowed to filibuster, and the Sierra Club is already running ads against it. Those were some of the responses.

It is interesting how quickly we forget that there have been plans, and those plans could have made a big difference.

Here today we are trying in a bipartisan fashion to make a small difference to give some of our Federal employees outside the Capital Beltway the opportunity to have the same transit advantages and payments that we give within the Beltway to Federal employees outside, expand some of the grants for transit, and also help some of those transit operations that are suffering like the American family is with cutbacks because of high fuel costs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to just remind my good friend that the bill before us is not ANWR or the other subjects. It is about moving people more efficiently with lower costs and lower energy consumption. I think we do ourselves service by sticking to the subject matter at hand.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) who as chair of the Surface Subcommittee has held 22 hearings on the future of transportation in America and has done a superb service for the Nation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman of the full committee for his outstanding work over the many years for transit. How prophetic many of his positions have been. I remember during the last reauthorization fighting to just get a tiny bit more for transit. We didn't get what we wanted and said we would need, but we did get a little more, despite a particular opposition from a number of Republican Senators.

We are loving our transit systems to death today. Americans of necessity, or with changes in life-style, are flocking

onto mass transit at record rates, rates not seen in half a century in the United States of America. That's the good news.

The bad news is so many Americans are flooding onto our transit systems, the most in 50 years, that our transit systems are having to curtail service and cut routes. There is something very wrong with this picture.

At the very time that the American people are demanding an alternative because they can't afford the \$4.50 a gallon for their car or they are tired of the congestion and commute, which have not yet been effectively dealt with because of our lack of investment in other infrastructure, they are turning to transit as an alternative.

But transit is confronted with, if it is a bus, a doubling of the cost of diesel. And other modes that are electrically driven have seen their energy costs go up. But beyond that, the rate of utilization, the people crushing on, are wearing the equipment out even faster and we haven't been keeping up with the replacement cycle because of the under-investment in the system.

I was talking to someone who came in from Rockville today. They said you wouldn't believe how packed it was. I said I think we are going to have to adopt the Japanese system where we hire little guys with white gloves to start pushing people onto our Metro cars, or our MAX cars in Oregon, because there are so many people who want to get on, we have to utilize what isn't enough capacity.

So this bill is the first, little, baby, incremental step to giving some assistance to those transit agencies who want to give assistance to an American public that is hurting because of failed energy policies.

I am not going to re-debate the energy policies with the gentleman from Florida, but that was an incredibly creative recapitulation of the failed energy policies of the Bush-Cheney administration over the last 6 years.

□ 1430

So we need now to deal with some of the results of those failures.

And we've debated other bills to help provide relief to the American consumers there. But here we have to provide relief and help to our transit agencies who are going to extend a hand to our American commuters and families. Unfortunately, this is, as yet, only a promise. It's an authorization. And the budget is a little tight around here unless you're one to fund a war with emergency funding. The President won't declare a transit emergency, I don't think. Maybe we can get him to do that. But we need to get some funding and flesh out the bones of this bill.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) 2½ minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been sitting down here and listening for about a couple of hours to

the debate on the whole question of energy, and I would like to, from my perspective, tell you what I have gleaned from this debate.

First of all, Americans are suffering. That is a fact. The price of gasoline is too high. Another fact is that everything that is associated or has anything to do with transportation is being affected, and the prices are going up for groceries, for everything. And the American people are suffering.

I'm very concerned about the future of our economy if we don't get more oil and gas to market.

Now, a while ago, the chairman of the previous committee said that we're importing 61 percent of our oil, up from about 48 percent some time ago. This was the chairman on the Democrat side. I would agree with that. We are importing 61 percent, up about 13 percent from what we did a couple of years ago. The reason is we're not drilling enough here in America. We're not producing enough in America, and we're buying it from Saudi Arabia, from Venezuela and other parts of the world.

We need to move towards energy independence, and if we don't, I predict we're going to have severe, severe economic problems over the next few years. We could have a major economic recession or depression if we don't get control of our energy prices because it's going to spread into every other area of our lives. And the American people, I think, sense that. And that's why I said to my colleagues, Go home and talk to your friends and neighbors at the gas station and ask them, Do you want to get the gas prices down, or do you want to make sure that we don't drill in America, that we're more concerned about environmental concerns than we are of taking care of our economy?

Obviously we want a better economy or better environmental situation. We want to go to alternative fuels. We want to do all of those things. Clean air, clean water. But at the same time, we don't want the entire economy of the United States to go down the tubes. And unless we get that energy independence by drilling here at home, that's a very real risk. We could have a real severe economic downturn.

Fact: Prices are too high. Fact: It's hurting our entire economy. Fact: We have enough oil and gas in oil shale to make us energy independent if we get it out of the ground and out of the ocean into the market. Fact: 68 percent of oil well explorers are small companies. That's been brought out here today. And 87 percent of gas producers are small businesses. We talk about these permits. Why would they not want us to drill? It's their livelihood.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Why would these oil producers and gas producers not want to drill?

So I think it's a bogus argument to say, Hey, they're holding these permits

and not drilling. They want to make money, and if they don't drill, they're not going to make money.

In fact, 97 percent of the Continental Shelf and 94 percent of onshore areas are exempt from drilling, and the oil's there, the gas is there, and the coal shale is there; and we're not doing a darn thing about it, and we are arguing about it. There has to be a bipartisan move to solve this problem. It ain't gonna solve itself, and the American people continue to suffer.

So I would like to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let's sit down and work this out because if we don't, everybody is going to suffer, and this blame game ain't solving anything.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Chair of the Subcommittee on FEMA and Economic Development and other related subjects, the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I owe the chairman and the ranking member many thanks for today's bill. I appreciate that you have worked together on it, and I appreciate that you have brought forward the only available remedy for driving down \$4-a-gallon gas.

Sometimes, Madam Speaker, the remedy is so obvious that we can't see it. But who has made us see it are the American people because they have found that remedy, and they are leading the way. That's why this bill is on the floor today, notwithstanding the leadership of a chairman, who for a long time has wanted to pass this bill.

I have great respect for our ranking member. But the fact is that wherever you stand on offshore or in Alaska, this is the only way to have an effect tomorrow. And that is what the American people are saying: Don't tell me about digging. Don't tell me about drilling. Tell me that I can get to work tomorrow. There is only one "tomorrow" remedy, and that is this public transportation remedy.

Moreover, we know what to do. What makes me want to cry is the Federal Government has done it to a fare-thee-well with incentives right here in the national Capital area where more than half of the Federal presence is located for decades because we've been giving financial incentives to Federal employees to hop on the metro and to hop on buses to get to work instead of taking to the roads. And boy, they've done it.

That's why I thank this House for last year authorizing a bill that will help us take care of the capital costs because Federal employees have hopped the metro and bus so that they've broken down our own metro.

But Madam Chair, small communities and a lot of others don't have their metro, their subway. Guess what they are doing? They are hopping on buses. They are crowding on buses. They understand there is only one way to defeat gas prices tomorrow, and that is public transportation.

I am very pleased that this bill leads by example because what we have done for a long time in the national Capital region in offering incentives to Federal employees will now be available to Federal employees countrywide. Everywhere in the United States Federal employees will get this incentive. When you consider that we're talking about more than a million employees, we're going to have an effect there.

If you need any further proof, look at what the American people have done in leading us to this point. This is 2008. In less than a year, they have already dropped 100 million miles that they were driving before that. Where have those miles gone? The same people have taken more than 85 million more trips on public transportation. There's the proof. The proof is that people have voted in the best way to do it, crowd the trains, make it happen. Now we're going to make it possible so that they don't have to crowd, so that we're partnering with local jurisdictions, in fact, to help them to do it.

We say to the American people today, we hear you, we're following you with this bill.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Madam Chairman, as the gas prices continue to rise, the most effective and immediate way to offer relief is to provide incentives for mass transit use. According to a study published by the American Public Transportation Association, public transportation use saves an annual 1.4 billion gallons of gasoline, almost 4 million gallons per day. Factoring in the national average of gas at \$4 a gallon, it saves consumers nearly \$16 million a day in gas costs.

Now, I support our public transportation system, and I'm pleased to support an extensive grant program to help expand transit use across the country. But I am disappointed in this bill because it only requires that Federal employees be offered transit benefits. While I support expanding the current transit benefit program, all Americans should have this benefit.

Now, more than a month ago, Congressmen LIPINSKI and BIGGERT and I introduced bipartisan legislation, the Creating Opportunities to Motivate Mass-transit Utilization to Encourage Ridership Act, the Commuter Act of 2008. Our legislation offers employers a 50 percent tax credit for all transit benefits provided to employees. And under its provisions, employees would receive up to \$1,380 in free mass-transit funds this year, with the employer receiving a \$690 tax credit.

According to Forbes, the average gasoline costs in the ten worst commuter cities is \$6.35 per day. Should businesses take advantage of this incentive, they would save their employees \$1,600 per year. As family budgets tighten, an extra \$1,600, or if there's two commuters, \$3,200 would really

ease burdens of health care and education. Such a benefit should also include Americans who are not lucky enough to have a Federal job.

I support H.R. 6052, but I'm surprised that this bill stands for the principle that if the taxpayer already pays your salary, we will help you more. But what if you're not lucky enough to have a government-paid position? Under this bill, you're out of luck. But under our bipartisan Commuter Act, you would have this benefit, too.

To help commuters, we should pass the bipartisan Commute Act to help all communities to really lower the gas bill of the United States and not just offer assistance to people already paid by the Feds.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman made a thoughtful observation, and I'm sure the gentleman is aware that there already is a tax exemption in Federal code for private sector employers and employees. But that doesn't apply to the Federal government or to other governmental agencies because they don't have a tax. So the transit benefit for Federal employees is a matter that we could do within the context of the current bill.

In the longer term, next year, when we consider the longer-term authorization, the gentleman's suggestion would be an appropriate matter for consideration. We will have better figures which we're requesting now from public agencies for those matters.

Mr. KIRK. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KIRK. The gentleman is a very good chairman of the Transportation Committee. I know he wants to go in the right direction. I just wish we had gotten exactly where he wants to go a little faster today, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I wish we could have, too, but we didn't have good numbers to see what those costs might be.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a representative of the beautiful Sonoma Valley.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I want to thank Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. MICA for this piece of legislation because, Madam Chairman, it's going to take a big change in how we do business if our country is going to meet our energy demands for the future.

While the Republicans in Congress and President Bush chant "drill, drill, drill" to appease, it appears, their big oil buddies, the truth is we can't drill our way out of this problem. What we need is a commonsense solution, solutions like the bill before us today. H.R. 6052 won't solve all of our problems, but it does start the process of getting people to change their habits and get out of their cars by providing them options of transportation that allow them to get to where they're going without driving solo in their cars.

It's steps like this that can make a big difference because public transportation is going to play a huge role in solving our energy problems. It will also make a difference in what is going on in our environment. It will help communities not have to build more and more roads, and it will get people where they're going in a very efficient way.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, to support the expansion of public transportation.

□ 1445

Mr. MICA. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the T&I Committee, the gentleman from beautiful southwest Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my friend, the ranking member, and I thank the committee.

I think this is a good bill. I rise in support of it, but I want to emphasize that this is really just a short-term relief in what we need to do. We have to do a whole lot more, and we could do a whole lot more.

This will provide short-term relief in public transit for those who use it, but short of a comprehensive policy that involves short-term solutions, mid-term and long-term, this isn't going to get us anywhere near to what we need to do to solve our energy problems.

I want to focus on one issue. I mean, clearly, we have to increase supply, and it can be done in an environmentally responsible way. We've shown that in my State of Louisiana.

We should lift this moratorium on the Outer Continental Shelf, and that's one way that we can really move things forward quickly.

I would emphasize that, in the cumulative debate that's gone on today, there's been some misinformation because Louisiana delegations, in a bipartisan way over the years, over the last decade-and-a-half, have fought to open the Outer Continental Shelf and provide Outer Continental Shelf revenue-sharing so that the States could also get some of this revenue to rebuild their infrastructure. This is a sensible way. We have fought for this, and we've been blocked by the other side consistently in this.

I also want to point out with regard to the use-it-or-lose-it issue, it's very expensive, and companies cannot even get the permitting to assess with seismic what we know to be these reserves or what we think are reserves. We don't have definite information. A lot of that information is 10, 20, 30 years old, if we even have information.

I would say that it costs somewhere between \$1 and \$5 million just to get the permit to do seismic. Then you have to get the lease. That's another anywhere from \$11 to over \$200 million to secure these leases. Then you go into seismic, and that can be very expensive. And those cumulative costs continue to add. By the time you actually get to a point where you can drill

a well where you have known reserves, you're talking years down the line, and typically, it is not unusual for the costs to be up in billions, \$1.5 billion.

That's why it's important to lift this moratorium. Let's move forward. Let's have a comprehensive energy policy that's not only focused on supply and increasing exploration and production in an environmentally sensitive way, but also focuses on renewables and alternatives, nuclear and the others.

Mr. OBERSTAR. How much time remains on both sides, Madam Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has 11¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, a long-time proponent of and advocate for and practitioner of public transportation, a man who saves 8 barrels of oil a year by consuming 86,000 calories on his bike.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy as I appreciate his leadership.

It's interesting for us to hear from some of our friends on the other side of the aisle, my good friend from Florida, recounting sort of the history of the Bush administration leadership on energy. I have a slightly different recollection of that.

One of the first things this administration did when they came to power was to create 7 years ago a secret task force. They never really fully released what was going on or why, but we know that it was dominated by representatives of the industry. And the Secretary of Energy in March of 2005 indicated that 95 percent of the objectives of the task force were completed. And then 35 months ago, on the floor of the House, we passed their big picture energy bill when they controlled everything, House, Senate, White House, and it was going to envision great changes for all American families.

Well, all American families have had some significant changes since the Republican energy bill was passed. Most significant is that gasoline prices have gone from \$2.49 a gallon to over \$4 a gallon. The changes about altered conservation, for instance, have come over the objections of our friends in the Republican party. Remember, for years, they made it illegal even to study increasing CAFE standards, and lo and behold, now George Bush is claiming credit for what we forced him to do for the first time in 30 years, increasing those fuel standards. But even if we give him credit for going to 35 miles to the gallon standard, it took George Bush longer to get to that 35 miles to a gallon than it took Jack Kennedy to get Americans to the moon.

This legislation is part of a comprehensive approach. You've seen it come to pass from our first days in Democratic control in this Congress, where we provided more incentives for new sources of energy, where we've worked to shift incentives from mas-

sive oil companies who didn't need our tax dollars. Remember, George Bush said they didn't need subsidies at \$50 a barrel. Well, Big Oil didn't need it at \$100 per barrel or \$140, but that shift to alternative energy support was resisted by the administration and by my Republican colleagues.

We have systematically moved forward in areas to give more choices to Americans. I heard my friend from Louisiana talk about how it costs money to explore the 68 million acres already available to them. Gee, ExxonMobil spent \$36 billion last year, not in alternative energy, that was \$10 million, but to buy back their own stock.

Let's get a grip. It's time for us to move forward with choices that will make a difference. This legislation will make a difference for every community, rural and urban, around the country. I urge its adoption.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time at this time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. We have several speakers, Madam Chairman, who have not arrived yet, and does the gentleman from Florida have other speakers?

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I'm in the same situation that the gentleman from Minnesota is.

Mr. OBERSTAR. If the gentleman will yield back the balance of his time, we will yield the balance of our time.

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

Well, again, I have to compliment Mr. OBERSTAR, and folks have to look at what we're doing here this afternoon. This is the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. We can't solve all the energy issues. We have a very small piece, and we're trying to take care of that small piece here today.

We don't get into some of the other issues that have been raised, but I must say that I'm going to be going back to Florida tomorrow, and I'll be talking to folks. And you know, it doesn't take you long to talk to folks at home and have them get your attention. And they are getting our attention by saying, what are you doing about \$4 a gallon gasoline, what are you doing about energy costs that are soaring, what are you doing about the price of food and other things that are being affected by energy costs.

The people who are on a limited income, God bless them. I don't know how they're making it, or a fixed income, with the prices that they see both at the pump, at the store, in their lives. They want answers.

I'm sorry that some of the other committees are not acting and the Congress is not acting like the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, because when I go home I have to tell them that how things are left in their Congress was that we took care of a small piece. We provided transit grants for those Federal employees

working outside of the Beltway. We provided additional grants through eight transit companies who are hurting because of increased fuel costs and trying to expand transit service that people are becoming reliant on now because of the high cost of fuel. But I can't tell them that I've done anything about supply, that, again, the supply has been cut off.

I even agree with the child that's crying in the gallery. People are not happy about this. They want a response from this Congress, and this Congress has the ability to act to increase the supplies so we're not reliant on reliable friends like Venezuela, the sheiks and leaders in the Middle East, and that dependable source of energy, Nigeria.

Folks, that isn't going to cut it for an answer when we get home, and this isn't complicated. It's a question of Economics 101. This is a question of supply and demand. Right now, in the short-term, we need to increase supply. If we had worked together over the past 7 years from that introduction by President Bush some 7 years ago, one of his first plans—and I cited his roll-out statements, and let me just read also what he said on May 17.

President Bush said: "Too often, Americans are asked to take sides between energy production and environmental protection—as if people who revere the Alaska wilderness do not also care about America's energy future; as if the people who produce America's energy do not care about the planet their children will inherit. The truth is energy production and environmental protection are not competing priorities. They're dual aspects of a single purpose—to live well and wisely upon the earth. Just as we need a new tone in Washington, we also need a new tone in discussing energy in the environment, one that is less suspicious, less punitive, less rancorous. We've yelled at each other enough. Now it's time to listen to each other and act."

Again, these are the words of our President before 9/11 on the energy issue.

You know, again, if you want to look at the RECORD, and I will be glad to submit for the RECORD how many Republicans and how many Democrats opposed each of the proposals, all that's history, folks. What the American people want is now us to act as the President said 7 years ago.

So, today, Mr. OBERSTAR and I don't bring an answer to the whole energy problem. We bring our little piece. We ask the rest of the Congress, I ask the rest of the Congress, to come forth and to act, and that needs to be done because when we get home, those people are going to ask you, what did you do about the high cost of energy, the high cost of food, the businesses that are closing, the lives that are being impacted by high energy costs, and we need to be able to give them an answer.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. We do have a speaker on the transit subject, and I'm very

pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. I'd like to thank the chairman for yielding and thank him for his leadership on this subject.

In urban States such as mine in Rhode Island, we have more and more of our consumers getting caught in traffic jams. The air quality is increasingly poor, and still, people are having trouble affording to fill their gas tanks with gas. And this is a tsunami of problems, both with their paying for their gas, trying to get to work, and the traffic jams, and breathing in the poor air quality.

□ 1500

It seems to me adding this \$1.5 billion for mass transit solves all three of these problems: One, it gets cars off the road; two, it allows us to get our air cleaned up; and three, it helps these consumers be able to save money that they would otherwise put into their gas tank. And in doing so, it reduces our demand on foreign oil.

So, really, to reference what some of my colleagues have said, this is part of the approach to this problem, and I think it's well worth our taking into account. That is why I support this legislation.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER, with great appreciation, and thank him for making it possible for us to bring this bill to the floor today.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

JIM OBERSTAR is one of the most knowledgeable people in America on energy issues and on transportation issues. And the two, of course, are closely related. I want to thank him for his leadership and for his service. We are fortunate, as an American people, to have him chairing this critically important committee.

There is no stronger proponent of rail service and mass transit than JIM OBERSTAR. That service has never been more important than it is today. His vision and his service have put this country in a place where we now have the opportunity to make additional investment which is critically needed so that the demand for mass transit resulting from the cost of gasoline and energy products can be met by our mass transit system. And I thank him for his leadership.

This bill, as well as the other two bills considered on this floor today on drilling and market speculation, is a clear recognition by this House majority that America's energy policy cannot be one dimensional.

We've heard a lot of finger pointing on the floor today, and finger pointing is relatively easy. The fact of the matter is we all need to come together. I don't just mean Republicans and Democrats and the Congress of the

United States, but all 300 million of us in this country need to come together and understand that we have 3 percent of the world's oil supply and 25 percent of the demand. It does not take a great mathematician to understand, therefore, that simply drilling for new product will not solve our problem. That is not to say by any stretch of the imagination that that should not be done.

These bills, taken together, and when combined with other actions taken by the majority on energy, are a clear reflection of the alternative to the Republicans' sole focus on drilling, to the exclusion of alternative and renewable sources of energy.

Let no one be mistaken: Democrats do not oppose further drilling, discovery and production of product, period. All we are saying, as I will explain in more detail shortly, is that the oil and gas companies should utilize the 68 million acres—that's 68 million acres—currently available to drill on which contain, according to experts, over 100 billion barrels of oil. And we use about 7.5 billion a year in this country, so that is approximately 14 years of oil. That's what the experts tell us, not Democrats and Republicans, the experts tell us are available on these untapped resources currently available, currently leased. I would tell my friends that, not only that, but they contain hundreds of millions of cubic feet of natural gas.

Now, as to Chairman OBERSTAR's bill: It promises Americans relief from our \$4 per gallon gas prices. Tomorrow? No. Next week? No. Next month? No. Very frankly, we have been too long delaying our investment in alternative energy sources and alternative transportation modes. But it does promise that in the future we will have the capability both to provide mass transit for our people, and to provide for the alternative to lower demand which, therefore, should lower prices as well.

It authorizes \$1.7 billion over the next 2 years to provide grants to mass transit authorities to reduce public transit fares and will help transit agencies deal with escalating costs. That is a rational response to increased demand.

In just the first 3 months of this year, Americans took almost 85 million more trips on public transit than in the same period the year before. Surely all of us in this body, faced with 85 million additional trips, will want to respond in a way that provides capacity to accommodate that growth.

Public transit reduces America's oil consumption as well as carbon dioxide emissions. Thankfully, the administration has, very late, come to the conclusion that, yes, global warming is a problem. Unfortunately, for 7-plus years of this administration they denied it was a problem, but coming to the right conclusion late is always timely.

In addition, the legislation on market speculation that was introduced by Chairman PETERSON and Congressman

VAN HOLLEN is an effort which I hope every Member of this body will support to address this issue, record high gas prices, from another angle.

Oil producers are telling us they believe that a large portion of the price is related to speculation. Can I guarantee they're right? No, I cannot. Am I an expert on this issue? I am not. But I do know that they have said that is the case. If it is the case, it's incumbent upon us to find out, because if it is, and we can reduce prices for the consumer at the pump, they expect us to do so and we want to do so.

The Bush administration, of course, insists that the spike in gas prices is not attributable to market speculation. That may be why the commission that is supposed to oversee this has not acted as vigorously as they otherwise might. George Soros, a very successful investor, has said this: "The crude oil market has been significantly affected by speculation."

The legislation that we will vote on shortly simply directs the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to use its full authority and emergency tools to curtail excessive speculation and other practices distorting the energy market. Why would any Member of this body vote against asking this commission to look at that issue to determine whether or not there is validity? If there is not, presumably the commission will so find.

Finally, about Chairman RAHALL's bill, let me simply say this: What could make more common sense than saying to the oil and gas companies that they should drill or pursue drilling on the 68 million acres of Federal land currently under lease or simply lose those leases? After all, they are leased for the purposes of us producing more product. If they lie fallow and are not being worked, not being investigated, not being explored, not being tapped, then the American consumer finds a dwindling or short supply. And what happens in that context? Prices go up. And yes, oil companies make record profits, but consumers lose. This bill simply says to the oil companies, be diligent in the development of what you have or lose the lease to someone who will pursue the discovery and production of oil.

Democrats believe that we need to find product. I mentioned the 68 million acres that you've heard a lot about, that's a lot of acres. But there is an additional 23 million acres in Alaska, 22 million of which is under congressional set-aside for oil production and discovery. Nine hundred thousand acres have already been leased for that purpose. And experts tell us there is more oil there than there is in the Alaskan Wildlife Refuge, but our Republican friends continue to focus on the Alaskan Refuge.

Let no one be mistaken: The oil companies have many acres to look at onshore and offshore. According to the Minerals Management Service and the Bureau of Land Management, these 68 million acres on land and waters, 74

percent of which we have already leased, are not producing oil and gas.

Our Republican friends have also charged that we're keeping the best lands out of the hands of oil and gas companies. That is not the case. They can say it again and again and again and again, but it's not the case. In fact, 81 percent—I hope all of my colleagues hear this, and I hope the American public will read the RECORD—81 percent of estimated oil and gas resources on Federal lands and the Outer Continental Shelf are presently available for development. And here, perhaps, is the most important fact: These resources are equal, as I said, to 107 billion barrels of oil and 658 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. That is 10 times the amount of economically recoverable oil that could be produced from opening up the Arctic Wildlife Refuge and more than 14 years of current U.S. oil consumption.

Finally, Madam Chairman, let me say that there is no silver bullet, we all understand that; to pretend otherwise would be dishonest. We need to be honest with the American public. Unfortunately, for over a quarter of a century we have had mostly administrations or Republican control of the House and the Senate which essentially said that drilling more oil and not looking for alternatives was the policy they wanted to pursue.

When we got here, we passed an energy bill that focuses on alternatives. If we only have 3 percent, we have 25 percent of the demand, you can bet your sweet life that those who have the oil all over this world are going to say to us, you pay us what we tell you to pay us. And not until we pursue policies—which this administration has failed to do, which this Republican leadership failed to do—not until that time will we be able to say to our friends and, indeed, some not so friendly, we're not going to pay your price because we have alternatives. We have mass transit provided by JIM OBERSTAR. We have alternative energies provided by the bill that we passed. We are expecting electricity—which the Republicans oppose—to be produced by alternatives. We have renewable fuel standards passed in this House, sent to the Senate.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, we have taken significant steps last year, we're taking significant steps today, and we will continue to take significant steps so that America will be energy independent. That's in the best interest of our national security, our economic security and, indeed, it is critically important for our global health.

The bills we are considering on this House floor today are key components of a comprehensive energy strategy that seeks to provide Americans with relief at the gas pump while we wean our Nation from its dangerous addiction to foreign oil. The President said we're addicted to foreign oil. And yet there was a meeting on energy in 2001,

just after the President became the Chief Executive, and they convened oil company executives to tell us, what should our policies be? One of my colleagues said, well, whatever they said—because the meetings were secret—their policies failed. Perhaps. Perhaps they failed. One cannot inevitably draw that conclusion, however, because those same companies, 7 years later, are making the greatest profits they have made in the history of their companies. Perhaps their policies failed, or perhaps their policies led to success.

Ladies and gentlemen, we need to pursue mass transit and invest in expanding it so we can meet the demand of our consumers and of our citizens and of our energy independence.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership. And I urge my colleagues to vote for all three of these critically important bills. Are they the sole solution? They are not. Are they the only solution? They are not. Are they the solutions that we will take and then stop? They are not. But they are a step, each and every one of them, in the right direction. Let's take those steps today.

I urge my colleagues to support these three bills.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

I just want to say that we have a very severe problem in this country on our energy supplies. In the short term, there are a series of ways that we might save ourselves some money on the gas prices, and those ways include driving less, driving slower, carpooling, and using public transportation where it is available.

□ 1515

And I have to commend the chairman for bringing so quickly to the floor this important legislation, which provides a substantial increase in moneys, authorization, at least, for public transportation, which is already in place in our smaller metropolitan areas and even in our rural areas, so that we can enhance the public transportation available for people—what is already available—and take care of people who are making that move toward using a bit more public transportation.

In the longer term, which is speaking about the 10-year kind of time frame, whereas the short term is in the first year or so, in the longer term, living closer to where we work so you don't have to commute so far, doing the research and development on renewable energy sources, drilling wherever it's open for leases, and I say that's in the

longer term because everybody agrees that it will take, even in the best of circumstances, 5 years to bring new leased areas to production and more likely 10 years to bring those new leased areas to production, that and changing over our whole vehicle fleet, our whole vehicle fleet, which will take a considerable period of time, to using much more fuel-efficient vehicles, those are the longer-term ways that we can get out of this problem.

And by far the fastest way to immediately have an effect is the elimination of speculation. There has been much testimony before our committees that speculation is a very significant portion of what is going on right now. The speculative activity in the oil market has quadrupled in just the last few months, 3 or 4 months, and that would be the fastest and most effective way.

My friend the ranking member from Florida has pointed out that we need to increase supply. Well, yes, it would be possible to increase supply. But remember, as the majority leader said here a few minutes ago, we in America have 5 percent, somewhat less than 5 percent, of the planet's population. We are now consuming 25 percent of the oil produced on this planet today, and we in America have only 3 percent of the reserves. You can't drill your way out of this problem because we do not have the reserves.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) 2 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota and as well his ranking member, who I hope is recognizing the importance of the work that we are doing here today, and, of course, the Members that have spoken.

Madam Chairman, I rise today to support the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008 and also to speak to the manager's amendment that incorporates my language that speaks specifically to encouraging, I hope insisting, that stakeholders, whether they be cities and counties or various transit agencies, engage the public in the question of promoting public transportation.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has shared a recent study that states that if Americans use public transit at the same rate as Europeans for roughly 10 percent of their daily travel needs, the United States could reduce its dependence on imported oil by more than 40 percent, nearly equal to the 550 million barrels of crude oil that we import from Saudi Arabia.

Right as we speak, Houston, Texas, the fourth largest city in the Nation, is beginning to grow its mass transit system. It started by the advocacy of many of us, including our former mayor Lee P. Brown, which required,

because of the restraints here in Washington and the difficulties of our being able to get consensus, it was started by our own tax dollars. The 7½ mile transit system that was started at least 3 or 4 years ago has now become one of the fastest new starts in America and is located in my congressional district shared with my fellow colleague in the Ninth Congressional District. What it says is that new starts should be increased in months to come. And as we look to expanding opportunities for transit systems and reducing our use of oil, it is important as well that we look to collaborative efforts on efficient transportation systems.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, let me ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and I hope to get time on the manager's amendment.

Madam Chairman, thank you, and thank you Chairman OBERSTAR for your efforts on energy conservation with H.R. 6052—"Saving Energy through Public Transportation Act of 2008." The Transportation and Infrastructure has once again produced legislation that will help Americans save money and develop new modes of transportation.

The primary objective of this legislation is to reduce the United States dependence on foreign oil by encouraging more people to use public transportation. The Transportation and Infrastructure has shared a recent study that states if Americans used public transit at the same rate as Europeans—for roughly 10 percent of their daily travel needs—the United States could reduce its dependence on imported oil by more than 40 percent, nearly equal to the 550 million barrels of crude oil that we import from Saudi Arabia each year.

Rising gas prices have only added to this country's economic downturn. When we add this cost into our troubled housing markets, soaring food prices, and a war without a clear end—the importance of this legislation becomes even more apparent.

I urge transportation systems such as Houston METRO to work in greater coordination with their local community to ensure that routing lines make not only economic sense, but practical sense as well.

Community involvement is essential, which is why I offered an amendment that would state that "public transportation stakeholders should engage local communities in the education and promotion of the importance of using public transportation in cities and counties; and in the planning, development, and design of transportation routing lines."

I am pleased that my amendment was incorporated into the manager's amendment. However, I am disappointed that all the language was not incorporated—leaving out the key portion of community involvement in planning, development, and design of transportation routing lines.

I still support this measure and I sincerely hope that our local public transportation agencies take the communities' use into account as well as their thoughts on what routes would add value and which routes may actually do more harm than good. It is our residents who utilize the mass transit systems not the planning boards.

In my district of Houston, Texas, many residents utilize the public transit system to allevi-

ate congestion as well as to control cost. I believe it is imperative that we have full community involvement in the discussions surrounding outreach, planning, design of mass transit.

Our parents who are trying to hold one child, guide another, balance their bags and get to work; it is our elderly who need extra time to get onto trains and buses; and our youth who are trying to get back and forth to school and activities—these are the people who can and will utilize public transportation. The incentives are there for commuters but they should be examined with community involvement so the right message is sent.

This act will add value to our public transportation by:

Authorizing \$1.7 Billion of Capital and Operating Funds for Transit Agencies to Reduce Fares and Expand Transit Services. This section authorizes \$850 million (General Fund) for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009 to allow public transit agencies to reduce transit fares and expand transit services. These funds will allow transit agencies to provide incentives for commuters to choose transit options, thereby reducing our nation's transportation-related energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil, as well as decreasing its greenhouse gas emissions. These funds will be distributed under current law urban and rural transit formulas. The Federal share for these grants is 100 percent and funds will only be available for a two-year period.

Increasing the Federal Share for Clean Fuel and Alternative Fuel Transit Bus, Ferry, or Locomotive-related Equipment and Facilities from 90 percent to 100 percent. The bill increases the Federal share for the alternative fuel vehicle-related equipment from 90 percent to 100 percent of the net project cost for fiscal years 2008 and 2009.

Extending Transit Benefits to All Federal Employees. The bill establishes a nationwide Federal transit pass benefits program and requires all Federal agencies in the United States to offer transit passes to Federal employees.

Requiring the Department of Transportation (DOT) to Establish Specific Guidance for Implementing the Nationwide Transit Pass Benefits Program. The guidance will ensure that Federal agencies have the necessary administrative procedures to ensure that Federal employees properly use the program. It also requires the Department of Transportation (DOT), the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Energy to implement a nationwide three-year pilot transit pass benefit program for all qualified Federal employees of those agencies.

Establishing a Vanpool Pilot Program. The bill establishes a two-year pilot program to allow the amount expended by private providers of public transportation by vanpool for the acquisition of vans to be used as the non-Federal share for matching Federal transit funds in five communities. The provision requires the private providers of vanpool services to use revenues they receive in providing public transportation, in excess of its operating costs, for the purpose of acquiring vans, excluding any amounts the providers may have received in Federal, State, or local government assistance for such acquisition. The Department of Transportation will implement and oversee the vanpool pilot projects, and will report back to Congress on the costs, benefits,

and efficiencies of the vanpool demonstration projects.

Increasing the Federal Share for Additional Parking Facilities at End-of-Line Fixed Guideway Stations. The bill increases the Federal share for additional parking facilities at end-of-line fixed guideway stations to increase the total number of transit commuters who have access to those stations.

Therefore Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 6052, which seeks to address energy conservations through public transportation.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6052, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Page 3, after line 25, insert the following:

(10) Public transportation stakeholders should engage and involve local communities in the education and promotion of the importance of utilizing public transportation in cities and counties and in the planning, development, and design of transportation routing lines.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, this is an important debate. It's a little piece of the big national debate that's going on now. Mr. OBERSTAR and I lead the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. We came forward with this measure. This measure is within our jurisdiction, as I said earlier, and it is just a small piece of the puzzle.

Many Members come to me on my side of the aisle and ask me how I am going to vote, and I am going to support this legislation. It does increase the authorization. That's a fairly substantial piece of change by any estimate, \$1.7 billion over 2 years, and it does make some significant changes in policy, in opening up authorization to spend money to help transit companies and agencies that are suffering like the American public is suffering with high fuel costs, and I think that's a good thing. It expands some services for mass transit, which is also a good thing. And it also expands from just within the beltway to other Federal employees the benefits of using public transportation, and that's a good thing too.

This is general debate, and we have gotten into general debate, and I have heard the distinguished majority leader speak and he quoted George Soros. I don't use him as a quote too much or rely on him for my opinion seeking, but I did just happen to have some sources that quote the American public and their opinion.

The Los Angeles Times Bloomberg Poll said when all registered voters are asked whether they support increased exploration for oil and natural gas, 68 percent respond in the affirmative, and that was just within the last 2 days. Rasmussen reports, according to them, 67 percent of the American people support oil drilling off the Nation's coasts and 64 percent think it will lower gas prices. Now, they seem to get it. The other committees with jurisdiction and the rest of Congress don't seem to get it.

Now, don't tell me you can't do it. I mean this is an incredible institution

and can do anything. We represent the greatest ingenuity, the greatest people that ever walked the face of the Earth. God blessed this Nation so much, and we are the custodians of coming here and doing things.

Now, Mr. OBERSTAR and I on a Monday introduced a piece of legislation. We worked together on it, and within the same week on a Thursday night, we had the President of the United States at 7 o'clock at night sign the legislation as is. So we can do these things that the American people want.

Now, 1 week from tomorrow, people are going to try to celebrate Independence Day in this great country, this great country for which so many people made so many sacrifices, and I have to go back home and tell them I increased transit grants for Federal employees outside the beltway and I also helped transit agencies who are suffering like they are to pay their fuel bill, but I don't have an answer for them. That's not what they want to hear, folks. This is the Congress of the United States, and we can and we must do better.

I have been here going on my 16th year, not as long as Mr. OBERSTAR. He knows transportation inside and out and he's an expert renowned on a whole host of issues, but the good thing about being here just half as long as he is that you hear some of these things.

First, we're going to solve this problem; we'll tax it. So what do they do? They say, windfall taxes for the oil companies that are taking advantage. Windfall taxes, that's it. So first we'll tax it.

Well, that didn't work. People come up to me, did you ever hear of a time when you tax something and the price goes down for consumers? Duh. Well, that didn't work.

So now there's speculation; so we'll get 'em. We'll regulate. We're going to regulate those speculators. That'll take care of it.

Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MICA. Oh, good. So I can tell this story, Madam Chairman.

This reminds me of sitting on a committee coming here, and this took over some time. We always hear about high drug prices, and I sat on the committee, and everyone was railing about the price of vaccination drugs. So we dragged in the drug companies to sit them down, and I remember this guy who represented a drug company, and this was an investigative hearing. And he showed a little vial, and he said, this vial of vaccine, this medicine, only costs about \$2 to produce. So we hammered him. It only cost \$2 to produce, but he said that the liability on it was reaching \$30, so \$30 and increasing.

So then we dragged in the insurance company. "You're charging them \$30 for this vaccine?" We hammered them. So they left.

And then the next thing we knew was we weren't producing any vaccine in the United States because no one would insure it. So the next hearing we held—remember this, now, folks—the next hearing we held was on its now being produced in Great Britain and we had some bad batches. Well, we hadn't sent enough FDA inspectors over to inspect the batches there.

Folks, these aren't the answers: additional taxation, additional regulation, chasing business off our shores. And the same thing isn't going to happen with energy. The American people get it. I just read the poll. It doesn't take a lot, folks. They know if you increase the supply, the price will go down. And we have the capability of doing that. We built the Alaska pipeline in 3 years.

Next Friday is Independence Day. It's going to be a sad Independence Day because instead of America's being independent, we will be dependent on energy. That's affecting all of us, and it's not right.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I listened with great interest to the gentleman's ruminations on a wide range of subjects. I won't comment on those that reach beyond the subject matter at hand, our transit bill. I do reaffirm my appreciation for his partnership in bringing this bill to the floor.

This is an important piece of legislation. In the larger scheme of the billions of dollars, \$125 billion a year, that we need to be investing in all levels of government in our surface transportation system, this \$1.7 billion is a relatively small step, but it moves us in the direction of a mode shift in transportation to 10 percent of all trips by transit. If we made just that little step in America, we would save the equivalent of all the oil we import from Saudi Arabia. That is what we can do. It's within our grasp now. We don't need a research program. We don't need a man-on-the-moon program. We just need the funding to invest in what is already at hand: solid, responsible, reliable, effective transportation systems for the public to use instead of getting in their private vehicle.

□ 1530

Had the administration in 2003 concurred in a \$375 billion transportation program for the next 6 years, as its own Department of Transportation recommended, and as Mr. YOUNG, then-chairman of the committee, and I introduced, we would have been far better positioned today than we are now.

Instead, that administration proposed only a \$5.5 billion funding flat out over the 6 years for transit. We wound up with \$10 billion in the SAFETEA legislation over the 5 years of the legislation. But we have to do far better than that, and this bill moves us in the right direction.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 6052, the Savings Energy

Through Public Transportation Act of 2008, H.R. 6052.

As gas prices continue to skyrocket to over \$4 a gallon, commuters are increasingly abandoning their automobiles in favor of public transportation. New Jersey's public transit agency, NJ Transit, is breaking ridership records for the sixth consecutive year, with over 900,000 trips per weekday on its trains, buses, and light-rail vehicles. In the first 3 months of this year, public transit trips nationwide increased by 85 million over last year's numbers. Amtrak set record highs for its service with over 25 million users last year. This increase in use not only takes cars off our overburdened roadways, it conserves energy, decreases our greenhouse gas emissions, and helps our economy.

However, mass transit agencies are also suffering from soaring gas prices, increased demand for their services, and decreased operating budgets. Transit agencies are paying 44 percent more for diesel fuel than they were at the beginning of this year, and almost half of bus operators and more than two-thirds of rail operators have increased their fares.

The Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008 would help State and local mass transit authorities meet the increase in demand and allow them to provide a cost-effective alternative to driving. This legislation would authorize \$1.7 billion in grants for mass transit agencies to upgrade and expand their transit services without having to further increase their fares.

By taking public transportation the average American household could save \$6,251 and help reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 4,800 pounds per year. However, commuters need affordable, reliable access to public transportation if they are to utilize these benefits. This bill would help make public transit more available to commuters, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Saving Energy through Public Transportation Act.

My constituents are struggling to pay rising gas prices caused in part by wild speculation in oil markets. By providing greater access to public transportation we can reduce the demand for oil and help lower the price of gasoline. With increased use of public transit, we can reduce greenhouse gas emissions and strengthen the economy by removing congestion from our already crowded roads.

I would like to thank Chairman OBERSTAR for including the "Capital Cost of Contracting" pilot program in this bill. Congressman MIKE ROGERS and I have long supported this program.

The provision makes it easier for employers and communities to offer vanpool services by leveraging their investment with Federal transit funds. By doing this, we can lower the cost of joining a vanpool and increase services nationwide. It is estimated that full adoption of this program could triple vanpooling across the Nation. This would conserve over 500 million gallons of fuel per year and greatly reduce harmful emissions. I appreciate the inclusion of this provision in the bill and applaud Chairman OBERSTAR for his determined efforts to provide public transit to more Americans.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6052, the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act.

At the onset I want to commend the bipartisan leadership of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their efforts in getting this measure to the floor. The legislation before us is a good bill; one that will provide a much needed hand up to our Nation's transit agencies as they work to meet record demands for public transportation services.

Dallas Area Rapid Transit Agency, or DART, headquartered in my congressional district and one of the best transit agencies in the country, fully supports this bill. Similar to other agencies around the country, DART ridership is setting records, as more north Texans recognize the immense value transit offers.

In May, DART had its busiest month ever, providing 10.3 million trips. North Texans are flocking to transport by rail in record numbers as ridership by light and commuter rail is up 5.4 percent and 7.1 percent respectively over 2007 numbers. During the first 7 months of 2008, DART has witnessed a dramatic 33.8 percent increase in its vanpool ridership.

The agency has acted aggressively to accommodate the increased demand. The agency is utilizing a new super light rail vehicle to increase passenger capacity.

The agency now has a record 145 vans in operation for vanpool commuters and has reached its budget maximum. My transit agency could benefit immediately from the tools provided under H.R. 6052.

H.R. 6052 will help transit agencies expand services and reach more people as it authorizes \$1.7 billion dollars for capital and operating funds for transit agencies; increases the Federal cost share for alternative fuel transit buses; extends transit benefits to all Federal employees; establishes a vanpool pilot program; and increases the Federal cost share for commuter parking facilities so more people may have access to commuter stations.

Madam Chairman, without question, there is a need for an overall expansion of transit programs across this country. However, in order for this to happen, there must be a realignment of infrastructure investment priorities and increased support at the local, State, and Federal levels. H.R. 6052 is a step in the right direction as it highlights importance of transit expansion across the Nation.

Public transit takes drivers off the road; uses one-half the fuel of private automobiles; and saves working families billions annually in transportation costs. Studies show transportation costs are the second largest household expense behind housing costs.

Nationally, for every dollar a working family saves on housing, it spends 77 cents more on transportation costs.

While public transit remains an option for some—for poor and working families, public transit exists as a means for economic survival.

So with that said Madam Chairman, I would merely like to reiterate my strong support for H.R. 6052 and urge my colleagues to vote "yes" in giving transit agencies across the country, and the millions of people they service, a hand up today. This sound, bipartisan piece of legislation is deserving of passage.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Chairman, the run-up in gas prices is squeezing families and sending them in search of cheaper alternatives to driving.

As a result, our public transit authorities are also feeling the pinch as rising fuel costs and record ridership strain their systems.

Almost half of bus operators and two-thirds of rail operators have been forced to raise their fares.

Today, we are considering H.R. 6052, the Saving Energy through Public Transportation Act, which provides grants to mass transit systems to reduce fares and expand services for commuters.

Using public transportation saves the average household more than \$6,000 a year and reduces dangerous carbon dioxide emissions that contribute to global warming.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to get on the bus and support this bill.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Chairman, I would like to recognize Chairman OBERSTAR and Chairman DEFAZIO for their exceptional leadership on this critical transportation issue.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 6052, the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008, and urge swift passage of the measure.

This bipartisan bill goes a long way in improving public transportation.

By creating incentives for transit agencies to reduce fares and expand services, H.R. 6052 makes public transportation a more attractive option for commuters.

But this bill also provides relief to many of our transit agencies who are struggling with operational costs.

I've heard from agencies in my district, like Roaring Fork Transportation Authority, who have seen an increase in ridership, yet face the problem of record fuel prices.

They are begging for more resources just to stay afloat.

So I support the additional \$200 million that this bill authorizes for formula grants to rural areas.

Additionally, I applaud Chairman OBERSTAR for including a fuel provision in the Manager's Amendment, which will help our transit agencies deal with their fuel costs.

With their increased ridership, they need help now more than ever.

I believe H.R. 6052 will reduce our dependence on foreign oil by encouraging more people to use public transportation.

Public transit is a critical piece of cutting greenhouse gases.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6052

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In 2007, people in the United States took more than 10.3 billion trips using public transportation, the highest level in 50 years.

(2) Public transportation use in the United States is up 32 percent since 1995, a figure that is more than double the growth rate of the Nation's population and is substantially greater than the growth rate for vehicle miles traveled on the Nation's highways for that same period.

(3) Public transportation use saves fuel, reduces emissions, and saves money for the people of the United States.

(4) The direct petroleum savings attributable to public transportation use is 1.4 billion gallons per year, and when the secondary effects of transit availability on travel are also taken into account, public transportation use saves the United States the equivalent of 4.2 billion gallons of gasoline per year (more than 11 million gallons of gasoline per day).

(5) Public transportation use in the United States is estimated to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 37 million metric tons annually.

(6) An individual who commutes to work using a single occupancy vehicle can reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20 pounds per day (more than 4,800 pounds per year) by switching to public transportation.

(7) Public transportation use provides an affordable alternative to driving, as households that use public transportation save an average of \$6,251 every year.

(8) Although under existing laws Federal employees in the National Capital Region receive transit benefits, transit benefits should be available to all Federal employees in the United States so that the Federal Government sets a leading example of greater public transportation use.

(9) Increasing public transportation use is a national priority.

SEC. 3. GRANTS TO IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SERVICES.

(a) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) URBANIZED AREA FORMULA GRANTS.—In addition to amounts allocated under section 5338(b)(2)(B) of title 49, United States Code, to carry out section 5307 of such title, there is authorized to be appropriated \$750,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009 to carry out such section 5307. Such funds shall be apportioned in accordance with section 5336 (other than subsections (i)(1) and (j)) of such title but may not be combined or commingled with any other funds apportioned under such section 5336.

(2) FORMULA GRANTS FOR OTHER THAN URBANIZED AREAS.—In addition to amounts allocated under section 5338(b)(2)(G) of title 49, United States Code, to carry out section 5311 of such title, there is authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009 to carry out such section 5311. Such funds shall be apportioned in accordance with such section 5311 but may not be combined or commingled with any other funds apportioned under such section 5311.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding sections 5307 and 5311 of title 49, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may make grants under such sections from amounts appropriated under subsection (a) only for one or more of the following:

(1) If the recipient of the grant is reducing, or certifies to the Secretary that, during the term of the grant, the recipient will reduce one or more fares the recipient charges for public transportation, those operating costs of equipment and facilities being used to provide the public transportation that the recipient is no longer able to pay from the revenues derived from such fare or fares as a result of such reduction.

(2) If the recipient of the grant is expanding, or certifies to the Secretary that, during the term of the grant, the recipient will expand public transportation service, those operating and capital costs of equipment and facilities being used to provide the public transportation service that the recipient incurs as a result of the expansion of such service.

(c) FEDERAL SHARE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of the costs for which a grant is made under this section shall be 100 percent.

(d) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under this section shall remain available for a period of 2 fiscal years.

SEC. 4. INCREASED FEDERAL SHARE FOR CLEAN AIR ACT COMPLIANCE.

Notwithstanding section 5323(i)(1) of title 49, United States Code, a grant for a project to be assisted under chapter 53 of such title during fiscal years 2008 and 2009 that involves acquiring clean fuel or alternative fuel vehicle-related equipment or facilities for the purposes of complying with or maintaining compliance with the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) shall be for 100 percent of the net project cost of the equipment or facility attributable to compliance with that Act unless the grant recipient requests a lower grant percentage.

SEC. 5. TRANSPORTATION FRINGE BENEFITS.

(a) REQUIREMENT THAT AGENCIES OFFER TRANSIT PASS TRANSPORTATION FRINGE BENEFITS TO THEIR EMPLOYEES NATIONWIDE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3049(a)(1) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (5 U.S.C. 7905 note; 119 Stat. 1711) is amended—

(A) by striking “Effective” and all that follows through “each covered agency” and inserting “Each agency”; and

(B) by inserting “at a location in an urbanized area of the United States that is served by fixed route public transportation” before “shall be offered”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3049(a) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 7905 note; 119 Stat. 1711) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (F) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively; and

(B) in paragraph (4) by striking “a covered agency” and inserting “an agency”.

(b) GUIDANCE.—Section 3049(a) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 7905 note; 119 Stat. 1711) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) GUIDANCE.—

“(A) ISSUANCE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary of Transportation shall issue guidance on nationwide implementation of the transit pass transportation fringe benefits program under this subsection.

“(B) UNIFORM APPLICATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The guidance to be issued under subparagraph (A) shall contain a uniform application for use by all Federal employees applying for benefits from an agency under the program.

“(ii) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—As part of such an application, an employee shall provide, at a minimum, the employee’s home and work addresses, a breakdown of the employee’s commuting costs, and a certification of the employee’s eligibility for benefits under the program.

“(iii) WARNING AGAINST FALSE STATEMENTS.—Such an application shall contain a warning against making false statements in the application.

“(C) INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—The guidance to be issued under subparagraph (A) shall contain independent verification requirements to ensure that, with respect to an employee of an agency—

“(i) the eligibility of the employee for benefits under the program is verified by an official of the agency;

“(ii) employee commuting costs are verified by an official of the agency; and

“(iii) records of the agency are checked to ensure that the employee is not receiving parking benefits from the agency.

“(D) PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.—The guidance to be issued under subparagraph (A) shall contain program implementation requirements applicable to each agency to ensure that—

“(i) benefits provided by the agency under the program are adjusted in cases of employee travel, leave, or change of address;

“(ii) removal from the program is included in the procedures of the agency relating to an employee separating from employment with the agency; and

“(iii) benefits provided by the agency under the program are made available using an electronic format (rather than using paper fare media) where such a format is available for use.

“(E) ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES.—The guidance to be issued under subparagraph (A) shall contain a uniform administrative policy on enforcement and penalties. Such policy shall be implemented by each agency to ensure compliance with program requirements, to prevent fraud and abuse, and, as appropriate, to penalize employees who have abused or misused the benefits provided under the program.

“(F) PERIODIC REVIEWS.—The guidance to be issued under subparagraph (A) shall require each agency, not later than September 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 3 years thereafter, to develop and submit to the Secretary a review of the agency’s implementation of the program. Each such review shall contain, at a minimum, the following:

“(i) An assessment of the agency’s implementation of the guidance, including a summary of the audits and investigations, if any, of the program conducted by the Inspector General of the agency.

“(ii) Information on the total number of employees of the agency that are participating in the program.

“(iii) Information on the total number of single occupancy vehicles removed from the roadway network as a result of participation by employees of the agency in the program.

“(iv) Information on energy savings and emissions reductions, including reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, resulting from reductions in single occupancy vehicle use by employees of the agency that are participating in the program.

“(v) Information on reduced congestion and improved air quality resulting from reductions in single occupancy vehicle use by employees of the agency that are participating in the program.

“(vi) Recommendations to increase program participation and thereby reduce single occupancy vehicle use by Federal employees nationwide.

“(6) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than September 30 of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 3 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report on nationwide implementation of the transit pass transportation fringe benefits program under this subsection, including a summary of the information submitted by agencies pursuant to paragraph (5)(F).”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the amendments made by this section shall become effective on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. CAPITAL COST OF CONTRACTING VANPOOL PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Transportation shall establish and implement a pilot program to carry out vanpool demonstration projects in not more than 3 urbanized areas and not more than 2 other than urbanized areas.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 5323(i) of title 49, United States Code, for each project selected for participation in the pilot program, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal share provided by a recipient of assistance for a capital project under chapter 53 of such title to include the amounts described in paragraph (2).

(2) CONDITIONS ON ACQUISITION OF VANS.—The amounts referred to in paragraph (1) are any amounts expended by a private provider of public transportation by vanpool for the acquisition of vans to be used by such private provider in the recipient’s service area, excluding any amounts the provider may have received in Federal, State, or local government assistance for such acquisition, if the private provider enters into a legally binding agreement with the recipient that requires the private provider to use all revenues it receives in providing public transportation in such service area, in excess of its operating costs, for the purpose of acquiring vans to be used by the private provider in such service area.

(c) PROGRAM TERM.—The Secretary may approve an application for a vanpool demonstration project for fiscal years 2008 through 2009.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report containing an assessment of the costs, benefits, and efficiencies of the vanpool demonstration projects.

SEC. 7. INCREASED FEDERAL SHARE FOR END-OF-LINE FIXED GUIDEWAY STATIONS.

Notwithstanding section 5309(h) of title 49, United States Code, a grant for a capital project to be assisted under section 5309 of such title during fiscal years 2008 and 2009 that involves the acquisition of real property for, or the design, engineering, or construction of, additional parking facilities at an end-of-line fixed guideway station shall be for 100 percent of the net capital cost of the project unless the grant recipient requests a lower grant percentage.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 110-734. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110-734.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. OBERSTAR:

Page 3, after line 23, insert the following:

(9) Public transportation stakeholders should engage and involve local communities in the education and promotion of the importance of utilizing public transportation.

Page 3, line 24, strike “(9)” and insert “(10)”.

Page 4, line 10, after "apportioned" insert " , not later than 7 days after the date on which the funds are appropriated."

Page 4, line 21, after "apportioned" insert " , not later than 7 days after the date on which the funds are appropriated."

Page 5, line 5, after "Secretary" insert "within the time the Secretary prescribes".

Page 5, line 7, after "transportation," insert "or in the case of subsection (f) of such section 5311, intercity bus service,".

Page 5, line 9, after "transportation" insert " , or in the case of subsection (f) of such section 5311, intercity bus service,".

Page 5, line 14, after "Secretary" insert "within the time the Secretary prescribes".

Page 5, line 16, after "service," insert "or in the case of subsection (f) of such section 5311, intercity bus service,".

Page 5, line 18, after "service" insert " , or in the case of subsection (f) of such section 5311, intercity bus service,".

Page 5, after line 19, insert the following:

(3) To avoid increases in fares for public transportation, or in the case of subsection (f) of such section 5311, intercity bus service, or decreases in current public transportation service, or in the case of subsection (f) of such section 5311, intercity bus service, that would otherwise result from an increase in costs to the public transportation or intercity bus agency for transportation-related fuel or meeting additional transportation-related equipment or facility maintenance needs, if the recipient of the grant certifies to the Secretary within the time the Secretary prescribes that, during the term of the grant, the recipient will not increase the fares that the recipient charges for public transportation, or in the case of subsection (f) of such section 5311, intercity bus service, or, will not decrease the public transportation service, or in the case of subsection (f) of such section 5311, intercity bus service, that the recipient provides.

(4) If the recipient of the grant is acquiring, or certifies to the Secretary within the time the Secretary prescribes that, during the term of the grant, the recipient will acquire, clean fuel or alternative fuel vehicle-related equipment or facilities for the purpose of improving fuel efficiency, the costs of acquiring the equipment or facilities.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 8. NATIONAL CONSUMER AWARENESS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall carry out a national consumer awareness program to educate the public on the environmental, energy, and economic benefits of public transportation alternatives to the use of single occupancy vehicles.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2009. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1304, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

The amendment clarifies that transit agencies may use these new grants to offset the increased cost of fuel to transit agencies. Every penny additional to the cost of diesel and gasoline fuel, public transportation faces a cost of \$7.6 million.

The amendment clarifies that intercity bus service is an eligible activity

under the bill. The intercity bus provision was included in the version of the bill that passed the House last year, but through a drafting error, was left out when we reintroduced it. We correct that mistake.

Many transit agencies, rural and small urban centers alike, contract with intercity bus providers for more mobility. So it's important that these services are eligible for the new grants created by this bill.

We clarify that transit agencies may use the new transit grants to offset the increased cost of maintenance as they struggle to cope with recordbreaking ridership increases. I have been to transit agency maintenance centers and found very skilled workmen welding new pieces of steel in the support structures of buses that have rusted out over years of use.

Transit buses are now, on average, 12 to 14 years. They should be replacing them every 7 to 8 years. We are seeing a million miles of ridership on a bus a year. They need to upgrade and improve and continue their maintenance.

Many transit agencies are reporting surges in ridership and, at the same time, difficulty maintaining existing services because of higher fuel prices. So we are providing funding to all those transit agencies to respond to their current needs.

I want to thank several of our colleagues for agreeing to have their amendments incorporated into the manager's amendment to expedite consideration of the bill: The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) whose amendment helps transit fleets become more fuel efficient by providing more funding for clean fuel or alternative fuel vehicle-related equipment or facilities; the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) whose amendment creates a national consumer awareness program to educate the public on environmental, energy, and economic benefits of public transportation; and the Jackson-Lee amendment that clarifies that public transportation stakeholders should engage and involve local communities in the education and promotion of public transportation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. I claim the time in opposition, but I do rise in support of the manager's amendment. I particularly find most attractive in this measure the provision that would allow grant funding to subsidize increased full costs for some of our transit systems in the country.

My support is not based on some lobbyist from a transit agency in New York or Washington or Orlando. My support is based on probably a little lady whose face I have never seen, but she wrote me and said, Mr. MICA, she said, They are going to cut one of the routes and I have no other way to get

to work, and I am a constituent in your district. They are going to cut off those routes because of the higher fuel cost.

So the reason I support this is because someone in my district is being dramatically affected. It may not be a big deal here in Congress, but I can assure you in that lady's life, if she can't get to work and make a living, it's a big deal to her. So that is why I support this manager's amendment and this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I have no further speakers on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110-734.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman the designee of the gentleman from Virginia for purposes of offering the amendment?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. MCGOVERN:

Page 7, after line 12, insert the following:

(b) BENEFITS DESCRIBED.—Section 3049(a)(2) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 7905 note; 119 Stat. 1711) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: " , except that the maximum level of such benefits shall be the maximum amount which may be excluded from gross income for qualified parking as in effect for a month under section 132(f)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986."

Page 7, line 13, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

Page 12, line 6, strike "(c)" and insert "(d)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1304, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chairman, first of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Florida for their hard work on this important legislation. I am offering an amendment, along with my colleague from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS). He has been a very important collaborator in this effort.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Davis-McGovern amendment. Like the underlying legislation, the purpose of this amendment is to reduce energy consumption by promoting public transportation. This amendment seeks to equalize the current transportation fringe benefit offered to Federal employees who commute to work via public transportation

with the current benefit for those who drive to work by themselves.

Currently, \$220 per month in pretax benefits can be offered to Federal employees who drive to work and pay for parking, while those who opt to take a train, bus, or other form of public transit are only eligible for \$115 a month. This disparity has had the reverse effect of what the transportation fringe benefit was geared to do, and that is to take commuters out of their personal automobiles by incentivizing them to use public transportation.

Madam Chairman, this bipartisan amendment will do much more than get people to use public transportation. With fewer people driving to work, less gasoline is consumed, less wear and tear is done to our roads and bridges, and less emissions are released into the air. As Congress seeks ways to combat climate change and become energy independent, one of the best ways to make an immediate impact is by offering cleaner, greener commuting options for our workforce.

According to the current estimates, Americans save \$340 million a year in fuel costs as a result of the transit benefit. Increasing the transit benefit will result in a corresponding increase in that savings. As we look for ways to provide relief from skyrocketing fuel prices, the transit benefit is a proven part of the solution.

I ask my colleagues to support the Davis-McGovern amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. I yield myself 1 minute.

I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). As has been explained, this does provide the Federal employee transportation benefit program, which has been so successful, is expanded in its usage, and for that, I think that our side agrees, and this is a bipartisan amendment and has our full support.

On behalf of Mr. DAVIS, I urge adoption of that.

I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Chairman, I would like to reserve the remaining time to the coauthor of this amendment, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I rise today in strong support of the Davis-McGovern amendment to the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008. This amendment will increase the cap on the monthly amount available to Federal employees nationwide who ride mass transit. For calendar year 2008, this would increase the reimbursement for Federal employees who ride mass transit from \$115 per month to \$220 per month.

At a time when transportation costs are escalating, with no end in sight,

this amendment will have a positive impact on the lives and well-being of the Federal workforce. In addition, it will help promote the use of mass transit by Federal employees nationwide.

For the National Capital Region, this benefit should have a significant impact on the commuting habit of Federal employees. An estimated 165,000 Federal employees currently participate in the Federal transit benefit program. We are hopeful that this amendment will encourage additional employees to leave their cars at home and commute using mass transit, resulting in less traffic on our region's already congested roadways.

As an added incentive, employees using Metro would also have the option of using this added benefit to pay for parking at mass transit stations because employees who ride Metro use the same SmarTrip card to pay for both rail service and mass transit parking.

As a Member of Congress representing the National Capital Region, I have spent a lot of my career trying to find ways to promote the use of mass transit in our workforce. I believe this amendment will be an important step forward in both areas.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It's a "two-fer," supporting the Federal workforce and promoting energy conservation through the increased use of public transportation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Would the gentleman from Florida yield a minute of his time?

Mr. MICA. May I inquire as to how much time we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 4½ remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MICA. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do so simply to express my support for the amendment, on which Mr. MICA and I have agreed, but also to point out that in the body of the bill there are protections and safeguards for the proper use of the transit pass authority provided in the additional funding increase in the monthly limit for the transit benefit. There have been reports of abuse of transit passes in the past year. An investigation by the Office of Inspector General revealed that there are some abuses.

We have provided protection against such abuses in the base of the bill underlying this legislation. I wanted to point that out for those who may have been concerned to assure that the committee has taken appropriate steps to assure that transit passes are used by the person for whom intended and for the purpose for which intended.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield our remaining time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

□ 1545

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN and my friend from Virginia. This is really important for us, to be able to start equalizing the playing field. I think there is nothing at this point in the game that is more critical than giving people transportation choices. I appreciate the long-term interest and advocacy that you have had in terms of doing this. I think it is an important step to make sure that commuters across the country are treated in a fair and equitable fashion.

I am hopeful that the body will embrace this, that we will be able to deal with it in an aggressive sense, both in terms of the Ways and Means Committee, that we can work with our colleagues to find ways in the Tax Code to make the adjustments that are necessary to cushion the commuter cost of transit users, as well as people who use their vehicles; that we deal with some people who have extraordinary costs because of the long distances commute, and I think there are ways that we can adjust this.

I would beg their indulgence for one modest potential adjustment, and that is while this moves forward to make a difference for people who are commuting, I would hope there would be some way we could work together to also include equity for people who burn calories instead of fossil fuel, because as yet, the Tax Code and the policies do not provide equity for Mr. OBERSTAR's friendly, favorite people, the cyclists, although we have passed that three times through the House this year previously. Being able to put cycling communities along with transit and auto communities will make a big difference in the long run.

I appreciate this leadership and look forward to working with them to make progress in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MAHONEY OF FLORIDA

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110-734.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. MAHONEY of Florida:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 8. EXCEPTION TO ALTERNATIVE FUEL PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENT.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142) is amended—

(1) by striking "No Federal agency" and inserting "(a) REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no Federal agency"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not prohibit a Federal agency from entering into a contract to purchase a generally available fuel that is not an alternative or synthetic fuel or predominantly produced from a non-conventional petroleum source, if—

“(1) the contract does not specifically require the contractor to provide an alternative or synthetic fuel or fuel from a non-conventional petroleum source;

“(2) the purpose of the contract is not to obtain an alternative or synthetic fuel or fuel from a nonconventional petroleum source; and

“(3) the contract does not provide incentives for a refinery upgrade or expansion to allow a refinery to use or increase its use of fuel from a nonconventional petroleum source.”.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1304, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MAHONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR for bringing this bill, the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008, to the floor today.

Madam Chairman, 232 years ago, this country fought to gain its political independence. Today, as we approach Independence Day, it is time that we must fight for energy independence.

Madam Chairman, as we all know, Americans are suffering because of high gas prices. But some of the recent proposals we have seen in the past week are political opportunism at its worst. Take the proposal to end the moratorium on offshore drilling. Not only could drilling imperil Florida's \$65 billion tourist industry, but there is insufficient oil to meaningfully address demand.

In 2007, the Energy Department found that drilling off the coast would not add to domestic production before 2030, and that the impact on gas prices would be insignificant. Further, the U.S. proven reserves are approximately 2 percent of the world's supply, yet we continue to be the number one consumer of oil in the world, consuming about 25 percent of the world's production. So anyone who stands here and says we are going to drill our way out of this problem is not being honest with the American public. It is time to get real, and it is time to take action now.

While there are no easy answers, there are significant steps that we can take to stabilize gas prices.

First, I am a proud cosponsor of the Responsible Federal Oil and Gas Lease Act of 2008, and I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation. At a time when gas prices are skyrocketing, oil and gas companies should not be allowed to stockpile leases and they should be required to drill on the leases they own. They should use it or lose it.

Second, Congress needs to investigate the impact of speculation in the commodities market and the impact that has on the price of oil. It is time to know whether energy speculators are gaming the system to make money at the expense of hard-working Americans.

Third, we must continue to bring alternative energy to the country and to Florida. Recently, the farm and energy bills have set the stage for Florida to become the biofuels capital of America. We must continue to invest in cellulosic ethanol so we can become energy independent.

Fourth, we must recognize that the reckless fiscal policies of this administration have racked up a \$6 trillion debt and this debt is ravaging the value of the dollar. In the past 6 years, this has contributed to a 40 percent devaluation of the dollar, and the fact that oil is a dollar-indexed commodity, the American people now know that when the value of the dollar goes down, the price at the pump goes up. The American people can no longer afford these reckless policies and this reckless deficit spending, and this Congress must make it stop.

Lastly, we need to reduce the barriers to importing Canadian oil, which is why I am offering my amendment today which would clarify language in section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 so that it does not apply to Canadian oil.

I appreciate the hard work that my colleagues Congressman BOREN and Congressman LAMPSON have already done on this issue. For those of you who don't know, section 526 prevents the U.S. Government from purchasing an unconventional fuel whose carbon footprint is higher than a conventional fuel. Canada has vast supplies of natural gas and has the world's second largest proven reserves of oil in the world, and Canada is the largest supplier of crude oil and refined products to the United States, supplying approximately 13 percent of total U.S. imports.

My amendment will clarify that section 526 does not preclude Federal agencies from purchasing generally available fuels, and that includes fuel from Canada's oil sands, refined using existing commercial processes. Through my amendment, we can address both a national energy supply issue and a national security issue. After all, who would you rather import oil from; our good friends up north in Canada, or from the Middle East?

The time has come for real solutions, not rhetoric. Today's actions take important steps to help us stop skyrocketing gas prices and put us on the road to energy independence. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Let me say that the only problem that I have with this amendment as offered from my colleague from Florida is the amendment does not go far enough in correcting or addressing all of the problems caused by section 526 of the energy bill that prohibits the Federal Government from using coal derived, oil shale and other non-petroleum-based alternative fuels regardless of existing procurement rules or what is actually cost efficient or practical.

I am not going to vote against his amendment, but I do have some concerns I wanted to express against the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the proponent of the amendment has expired. The gentleman has the only time remaining. The gentleman will need to close and yield back the balance of his time.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, the reference was made by my other friend from Florida that there was a related provision that passed last week on a 429-1 vote. I confess to being the one person who voted against that. I had some concerns about how that was framed.

I went back and did some research and concluded that my "no" vote was ill-advised, although it wasn't determinative, and I wanted to indicate that I personally support what is being proposed here. I think it is a reasonable compromise to deal with issues that need to be taken, and I appreciate my friend's courtesy in allowing me to do my mea culpa while you wait for your other speaker.

Mr. MICA. I yield myself such time as I may consume just to point out, again, I am not going to object. I have concerns. I would like to have gone further.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from Florida for giving me a moment to speak on this bill.

We have had examples here all day today of the fact we are not going to be able to pass any meaningful energy legislation in this week before we go home for the 4th of July holiday. It is not just Republicans who are saying this. I want to point out the fact that in today's Politico, the story is headlined: "Pelosi's Pump Pain. Aggressive Pre-Recess Plan Goes By the Wayside."

I would like to introduce this, without objection, into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. FOXX. "Speaker Nancy Pelosi hoped to send House Democrats home for the Fourth of July recess with a series of votes that would show they're

serious about easing the pain at the pump.”

That obviously is not going to be done. We are passing bills here today that deserve the “Emperor’s New Clothes Award.” Somebody has to stand up and say the emperor has no new clothes, because the bills that we are being asked to vote on are shams. We are not doing anything to help average, hardworking Americans who are paying over \$4 a gallon for gasoline as a result of the Democrats’ control in the last 18 months of this Congress.

This is a sham. This is for show. They are going to go home and say they did something, but they did nothing to help the average working American, and it is time that people said so. We don’t need to be allowing this sham to continue without being able to talk about it.

It says here “nothing has gone according to plan. The price-gouging bill failed to garner the two-thirds support necessary to pass.” Even Democrats are speaking against the bill. They are talking about how it is going to hurt gas-producing States and the gas-producing people are opposed to it, the Democrats are.

So nothing that is going on here is really going to help those of you who are paying over \$4 a gallon for gasoline in this country. All we are doing is letting the Democrats put on a show that says that they are reducing the price of gasoline, when they are not.

PELOSI’S PUMP PAIN—AGGRESSIVE PRE-RECESS PLAN GOES BY WAYSIDE
(By Patrick O’Connor)

Speaker Nancy Pelosi hoped to send House Democrats home for the Fourth of July recess with a series of votes that would show they’re serious about easing the pain at the pump.

Their wish list included legislation giving the federal government more authority to crack down on price-gouging by oil companies and smaller vendors, a bill requiring energy producers to relinquish any land not currently being tapped for oil or gas production, and a measure creating new restrictions for commodity traders whose speculation has driven up the price of oil.

But nothing has gone according to plan. The price-gouging bill failed to garner the two-thirds support necessary to pass. An accounting issue forced leaders to put off for a day the so-called “use it or lose it” measure. And the legislation to curb speculation is now caught up in a member fight over the proper path forward—a fight that exposes the misgivings some Democrats have about this activist agenda.

So instead of a barrage of legislation aimed at knocking back the Republicans’ gas price assault, Democrats will settle for a measure giving local transit agencies \$850 million in each of the next two years to reduce prices and add routes, as well as a symbolic vote calling on President Bush to crack down on “excessive” commodity speculation.

The Democrats’ stumbles come as congressional Republicans continue to push aggressively for more domestic oil and gas production on the Outer Continental Shelf and in Alaska’s Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as well as for an ambitious plan to turn coal shale beneath the High Plains into natural gas.

Republicans claim an amendment—offered by Pennsylvania Rep. John E. Peterson—to

open offshore drilling sites 50 miles off the coast has enough support to survive a committee vote on the Appropriations panel.

The committee postponed consideration of the measure on which Peterson planned to offer his amendment, but Chairman Dave Obey (D-Wis.) told members Tuesday he plans to bring it up when lawmakers return from the weeklong Fourth of July recess.

As the Democrats struggle to hold together support for the existing offshore drilling ban, they find themselves coming apart on another energy issue: what to do about oil speculators.

Some Democrats, such as Agriculture Committee Chairman Collin Peterson of Minnesota and Rep. Bob Etheridge of North Carolina, would like party leaders to advance a modest measure that gives federal regulators more resources to crack down on “excessive” speculation in the United States and abroad.

“I’m not, at this point, sold that speculation is the reason these prices are going up,” Peterson said.

Others, such as Connecticut Rep. Rosa DeLauro and Maryland Rep. Chris Van Hollen, the Democratic Party’s campaign chief, have urged the speaker to go further by making substantive changes to the current laws, members and aides said.

Add to that a jurisdictional squabble between Peterson’s Agriculture Committee and members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee—including Michigan Democratic Rep. Bart Stupak—who have been working on this issue for years, and Pelosi faces a major internal challenge in bringing this legislation to the floor.

The speaker met with these and other members for more than an hour Wednesday morning. They were joined by Michael Greenberger, a law school professor at the University of Maryland and a former director of trading and markets at the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, who has testified before Congress that speculators are driving up the price of oil.

But the participants who emerged from that meeting suggested the various committees of jurisdiction will begin looking at this legislation before leaders craft a compromise.

“I think the consensus is that this needs to be done very carefully,” said House Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer (D-Md.).

“We’re going to focus on the actual legislation and try to come to a consensus,” Peterson said.

Pelosi told reporters Wednesday that she expects legislation on the floor sometime next month, before lawmakers leave for the summer and for their respective nominating conventions.

Some Democrats wanted to vote on a modest bill this week to give themselves cover before the recess, aides said.

A number of conservative Blue Dog Democrats were also grumbling that party leaders were planning to put them in a bad spot politically with these aggressive oversight measures, aides said. Pelosi met with a number of these members Wednesday, but the speculation issue was only one of the topics discussed.

In the meantime, both parties continued their finger-pointing over the gas prices and the policies that might have an effect on them.

On Wednesday, the Department of the Interior questioned Democratic claims that energy producers could pump oil or gas on 68 million acres of land that has already been leased. This talking point became a common refrain last week; Democrats argued that the lease-holding oil companies could produce 4.8 million barrels of oil and more than 44 million barrels of natural gas each day under the current contracts.

“The views contained in the report [issued by Democrats on the House Natural Resources Committee] are based on a misunderstanding of the very lengthy regulatory process,” wrote C. Stephen Allred, the assistant secretary of the Interior for Land and Minerals Management, who favors increased oil and gas exploration. “The existence of a lease does not guarantee the discovery of, or any particular quantity of, oil and gas.”

In his letter—which came at the request of Republican Rep. Don Young of Alaska—Allred further argued that a lengthy permitting process creates a lag for energy producers to extract fossil fuels from this land.

In a statement issued in response to the letter, House Natural Resources Committee Chairman Nick J. Rahall (D-W.Va.) called it “a diversion from the simple fact that there are 68 million acres of leased land not producing any oil and gas.”

Rahall said that the administration’s argument about the slow permitting process undercuts its arguments for lifting the offshore drilling ban; a long permitting process, he said, would slow any benefit to be gained from offshore drilling, too.

“Roughly 80 percent of the oil and gas under federal waters are in areas already open for leasing. They should focus on that before trying to grab any more of our public lands,” Rahall said.

The fight over gas prices also has a personal component.

Pelosi has staked her speakership, in part, on aggressive environmentalism to limit human contributions to global warming. This puts her at odds with those in her caucus who are more sympathetic to the oil and gas industry. That dynamic forces her to tread lightly inside the party, but it does not prevent her from issuing lofty challenges in the name of the environment.

“We are in the battle of this generation,” Pelosi told reporters Wednesday. “We’re ready to make the fight. We are united behind it.”

THE CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

THE CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

THE CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 110-734.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. REICHERT: Page 14, at the end of line 8, insert the following: “or at a park-and-ride lot that serves a fixed route commuter bus route that is more than 20 miles in length”.

□ 1600

THE CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1304, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Chairman, as we all know, skyrocketing gas prices and the pain they cause is one of the most daunting issues facing this Congress and our Nation.

Today in the State of Washington, the price per gallon of regular gas was \$4.34, while a month ago it was \$4.02 and a year ago it was \$3.11 in the State of Washington. It is hard to believe we are now in the position to yearn for the days of \$3 gasoline.

My constituents are looking for some form of relief, an option to paying outrageous prices to fill up their cars only to sit in gridlock traffic. Mass transit offers relief; however, mass transit does not succeed if the public is not convinced that it is a convenient alternative to driving their cars.

The Transportation Research Board studied the accessibility of transit services to suburban commuters, and has identified strategies that improve customer acceptance and the use of transit services. The study found that acceptance and use of transit services are clearly influenced by the availability, convenience, and the cost of commuter parking at rail stations and at park-and-ride lots for commuter buses.

Increasing commuter bus park-and-ride availability directly increases transit ridership in these routes. According to Sound Transit, a local transit agency in my district, once parking lots are 80 percent full at commuter bus stations, the public perceives them to be completely full and they continue to drive by, bypassing an opportunity to ease the pain of high gas prices in an environmentally friendly way.

Expansion of these facilities incentivizes transit systems and the communities they serve by increasing their suburban park-and-ride lot capacity and increases the use of transit.

Like every community, people in the Puget Sound region of Washington State are parking their cars and taking transit more often. In my district alone, the number of people who rode Sound Transit's buses and trains in 2007 increased by nearly six times the nationwide increase.

A few bus ride examples. In the first quarter of 2008, the express bus service connecting two suburbs of Seattle, Lynnwood, Washington and Bellevue, Washington, grew by more than 31 percent over the first quarter of 2007. Ridership on Sound Transit service between Everett, Washington and Bellevue, Washington is up 24 percent. And between Federal Way, another suburb of Seattle, and the Microsoft campus in Redmond, it is up 12 percent. Those are some great examples of mass transit working in my district.

I urge you to support my amendment. My amendment will simply allow bus park-and-ride lots the same Federal funding as commuter rail park-and-ride lots receive in this bill.

Join me in giving Americans a choice on how they go to work, go to the gro-

cery store, or move about town other than painfully paying at the pump to fill up their cars. This amendment will ease congestion, help the environment, and save commuters from high gas prices.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition to the amendment, though I do not intend to oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. First, a point of order, Madam Chairman.

I observed the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) ask unanimous consent to include an article in the RECORD. That request must be made in the House under the rules of procedure, not in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The gentlelady's request will be covered by general leave.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I have no objection to it, but I just want the procedure to be proper.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington was very thoughtfully expressed and explained, and I commend the gentleman on his statement, very thoughtfully done, to increase the Federal share for parking facilities that serve commuter bus routes.

The Transportation Research Board has addressed this issue and evaluated the accessibility of transit services to suburban commuters, and they have found that acceptance and use of transit services are clearly influenced by the availability, convenience, and cost of commuter parking at transit stations and park-and-ride lots, quoting from the report.

States that have successful long-distance suburban-to-central business district commuter bus operations found that increasing the use of commuter bus services and park-and-ride facilities is directly influenced by the availability of those park-and-ride services.

Increasing the Federal share to 100 percent would create additional incentives for transit systems to build more of these facilities to serve the communities, and I really appreciate the initiative of the gentleman.

In his reference to Microsoft, I know that Microsoft in past years has purchased in the range of 13,000 fares a year for its employees to ride the Sounder and other transit options in Seattle. It is very commendable of a company to engage in that kind of service to its workers, to encourage them to get to work in a better frame of mind, to help the environment, and to serve the public need.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my good friend from Florida, the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. MICA.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman so much, that we have a distinguished member of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee offering this well thought out amendment. It is going to clearly provide availability, convenience, and assist the cost of making eligible again these bus end-of-the-line parking facilities. Well thought out. There was a gap here, and I am glad the gentleman from Washington filled that so adequately, and we support the amendment.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and look forward to moving forward on this amendment. I think it balances a potential inequity.

But I would hope that as we move forward to reauthorization, that the folks on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, that we might be able to look at more Federal flexibility for the land that is used with these park-and-ride items, because in many cases they are frozen in time. We have inflexible Federal rules about what can be used for that land, and they have a habit of not being at the end of the line. So if we can in the future be able to use them as an anchor for community development and redevelopment where people can live and work at that point, rather than having to drive vast distances to get there in the first place, these facilities can leverage significant redevelopment opportunity, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and be able to reduce the operating cost for the lines.

So I have no objection to this proposal as it goes forward, but I would hope that we would be creative as we move to reauthorization that we don't freeze in arbitrarily what local communities can do with transit agencies and the Federal Government to be able to leverage them to get more out of it in the long run so we don't have to unnecessarily force people to drive to use it in the first place.

Mr. OBERSTAR. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The gentleman is an alumnus of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, a refugee who has been taken in by the Ways and Means Committee; and he will be most welcomed at further hearings of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee to elaborate on this very thoughtful proposal that he has set forth. We welcome that contribution as we shape the next transportation legislation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy as I appreciate the leadership of the committee. One cannot get back to the committee often enough. And I would look forward to working with you and with the gentleman from Washington to make sure that we get the most out of these resources.

Mr. REICHERT. In conclusion, I would just like to thank the chairman

and ranking member for their support, and the gentleman's kind suggestions and thoughtful suggestions. I would urge passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HODES

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 110-734.

Mr. HODES. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. HODES:
Page 5, after line 19, insert the following:

(3) If the recipient of the grant is establishing or expanding, or certifies to the Secretary within the time the Secretary prescribes that, during the term of the grant, the recipient will establish or expand commuter matching services to provide commuters with information and assistance about alternatives to single occupancy vehicle use, those administrative costs in establishing or expanding such services.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1304, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. HODES. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. HODES. Madam Chairman, I rise in support today of my carpool promotion amendment.

First, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Committee and the ranking member for introducing this important bill to encourage the use of public transportation in this country.

Public transportation obviously needs to be part of a forward thinking 21st century energy strategy. However, in my home State of New Hampshire, many of my constituents live in rural areas where they don't have access to public transit, and many in my district have to commute by car 20 or 30 miles or more just to get to work.

Today, in intraday trading, oil hit a record of \$140 a barrel, and gas prices are over \$4 a gallon for regular gas in New Hampshire. The people I represent are struggling. Many drive more than an hour to work. And we have seen carpooling begin to increase in New Hampshire.

With an extremely limited public transportation network, except for city bus service in the cities of Manchester and Concord, often the only option for alternative transportation is carpooling, and the opportunities are often limited for that.

Since the average local commuter is spending more than \$2,000 a year in gas

just to drive to work, if a driver shares his car with just one other occupant and those carpoolers share the cost of gas, obviously they cut their costs for gas in half.

Now, New Hampshire Department of Transportation has introduced a great program called Ride Share. They work with the New Hampshire Regional Planning Commissions and employers to encourage ride sharing, and they have implemented a Statewide ride sharing program. The program is dedicated to finding an alternative way for commuters to travel to and from work.

These days, our highways and byways are increasingly gridlocked; and many of those cars stuck in gridlock, and all you have to do is go outside this building to see the kind of gridlock that Washington is famous for, and many of the cars that are sitting there are single occupant vehicles. Driving alone is not only expensive, but it also contributes to increased traffic congestion and air pollution.

To help commuters cut costs and to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution, New Hampshire Ride Share uses geographical computer matching to provide commuters with information and assistance about ride sharing and alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle, which can include carpools, van pools, buses and trains. Right now, two other States, Missouri and Michigan, have introduced similar programs.

The amendment that I have propose will help provide additional funding for programs like Ride Share across the country. We have seen in one month a tripling of interest in participation in ride sharing in some parts of New Hampshire, and we need to see more.

With the record high gas prices, rising food prices, the mortgage crisis, and the credit crunch, families across our Nation are feeling the economic squeeze. Commuters across our Nation are suffering under the strain of record gas prices, and they have to sacrifice more of their paycheck just to earn one.

This amendment provides a real-time way to help commuters save money, reduce air pollution, and increase efficiency. It is a win-win all around. I urge my colleagues to adopt this important amendment to help commuters across our Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, we are pleased to support the gentleman from New Hampshire's amendment. And it will also, I think, encourage commuters to find other ways other than single occupancy vehicles to get to and from work. He has the support of the American Association of Commuter Transportation.

Again, it is a small piece in the larger puzzle. We only have jurisdiction, as I said earlier, over transportation issues; we can't resolve all the other problems we have with energy. But I commend the gentleman, and our side supports the amendment and urges its adoption.

□ 1615

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HODES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida, and I yield the balance of my time to the chairman of the Transportation Committee.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I rise in support of the amendment which I am certain arises out of the experience of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation which has a program helping commuters find alternatives to riding alone. The State of North Carolina has created RIDE NC to do the same thing.

I just want to observe that this bill pending before the House now is the 110th bill reported from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to the House, 110th bill in the 110th Congress. We have completed action on 63 bills and resolutions including 29 bills enacted into law; in addition to that, eight concurrent resolutions and 26 House resolutions. That's a remarkable record of bipartisan participation for which I express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida. On all of these, we've had bipartisan support.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I don't want to take the time, but we are concluding debate on this amendment, the Hodes amendment. I urge its adoption. I urge those who feel it is appropriate to support the measure, as I said it does have an increased authorization, not appropriation, of \$1.7 billion. It does expand some of the transit grants to transit agencies that are hurting across the country. It does expand the transit benefits that are now restricted to those within the Beltway to Federal employees outside.

It does not solve the problem. It is a small piece of the solution, and I have been pleased to work with Mr. OBERSTAR in a bipartisan fashion to do our small part.

I must conclude, however, by saying that the House and the Congress can do a better job. My side of the aisle does not control the Congress this time. We have heard that there is a larger energy plan. We need to bring that energy plan forward.

I didn't have the time that the majority leader had in his remarks, and this isn't a blame game situation nor should it be. People are suffering in this country with \$4-plus a gallon gas. I just saw this \$5.25, which must be from California. That's not why our constituents sent us here. They sent us here to solve problems. In the same bipartisan spirit that Mr. OBERSTAR and I are bringing forward this little piece, we need a much larger piece.

A week from tomorrow is Independence Day, and that is a day we should be celebrating, not lamenting that we are not independent of foreign oil. We can work our way out of this. We can't tax our way out, we can't regulate our way out, but we have the means of moving forward and increasing the supply and lowering the price for the American people. We haven't done this, this Congress hasn't done this, and I am sorry that I have that to report at the end of my remarks, both in favor of the Hodes amendment and in favor of this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MAHONEY OF FLORIDA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 421, noes 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

AYES—421

Abercrombie	Brady (PA)	Courtney
Ackerman	Brady (TX)	Cramer
Aderholt	Braley (IA)	Crenshaw
Akin	Broun (GA)	Crowley
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Cubin
Allen	Brown, Corrine	Cuellar
Altmire	Brown-Waite,	Culberson
Andrews	Ginny	Cummings
Arcuri	Buchanan	Davis (AL)
Baca	Burgess	Davis (CA)
Bachmann	Burton (IN)	Davis (IL)
Bachus	Butterfield	Davis (KY)
Baird	Buyer	Davis, David
Baldwin	Camp (MI)	Davis, Lincoln
Barrett (SC)	Campbell (CA)	Davis, Tom
Barrow	Cantor	Deal (GA)
Bartlett (MD)	Capito	DeFazio
Barton (TX)	Capps	DeGette
Bean	Capuano	Delahunt
Becerra	Cardoza	Dent
Berkley	Carnahan	Diaz-Balart, L.
Berman	Carney	Diaz-Balart, M.
Berry	Carson	Dicks
Biggert	Carter	Dingell
Bilbray	Castle	Doggett
Bilirakis	Castor	Donnelly
Bishop (GA)	Cazayoux	Doyle
Bishop (NY)	Chabot	Drake
Bishop (UT)	Chandler	Dreier
Blackburn	Childers	Duncan
Blumenauer	Christensen	Edwards (MD)
Blunt	Clarke	Edwards (TX)
Boehner	Clay	Ehlers
Bonner	Cleaver	Ellsworth
Bono Mack	Clyburn	Emanuel
Boozman	Coble	Emerson
Bordallo	Cohen	Engel
Boren	Cole (OK)	English (PA)
Boswell	Conaway	Eshoo
Boucher	Conyers	Etheridge
Boustany	Cooper	Everett
Boyd (FL)	Costa	Fallin
Boyd (KS)	Costello	Farr

Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Richardson
Feeney	Linder	Rodriguez
Ferguson	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)
Filner	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)
Flake	Loebsock	Rogers (MI)
Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe	Rohrabacher
Fossella	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Foster	Lucas	Roskam
Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Ross
Frank (MA)	E.	Rothman
Franks (AZ)	Lynch	Roybal-Allard
Frelinghuysen	Mack	Royce
Gallely	Mahoney (FL)	Ruppersberger
Garrett (NJ)	Maloney (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Gerlach	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)
Giffords	Marchant	Salazar
Gilchrest	Markey	Sali
Gillibrand	Marshall	Sánchez, Linda
Gingrey	Matheson	T.
Gohmert	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Gonzalez	McCarthy (CA)	Sarbanes
Goode	McCarthy (NY)	Saxton
Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)	Scalise
Gordon	McCollum (MN)	Schiff
Granger	McCotter	Schmidt
Graves	McCrery	Schwartz
Green, Al	McDermott	Scott (GA)
Green, Gene	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Grijalva	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Gutiérrez	McHugh	Serrano
Hall (NY)	McIntyre	Sessions
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Sestak
Hare	McMorris	Shadegg
Harman	Rodgers	Shays
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Shea-Porter
Hastings (WA)	McNulty	Sherman
Hayes	Meek (FL)	Shimkus
Heller	Meeks (NY)	Shuler
Hensarling	Melancon	Shuster
Herger	Mica	Simpson
Herseth Sandlin	Michaud	Sires
Higgins	Miller (FL)	Skelton
Hill	Miller (MI)	Slaughter
Hinchee	Miller (NC)	Smith (NE)
Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Hirono	Miller, George	Smith (TX)
Hobson	Mitchell	Snyder
Hodes	Mollohan	Solis
Hoekstra	Moore (KS)	Souder
Holden	Moore (WI)	Space
Holt	Moran (KS)	Speier
Honda	Moran (VA)	Spratt
Hookey	Murphy (CT)	Stark
Hoyer	Murphy, Patrick	Stearns
Hulshof	Murphy, Tim	Stupak
Hunter	Murtha	Sullivan
Inglis (SC)	Musgrave	Sutton
Inslee	Myrick	Tanner
Israel	Nadler	Tauscher
Issa	Napolitano	Taylor
Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)	Terry
Jackson-Lee	Neugebauer	Thompson (CA)
(TX)	Nunes	Thompson (MS)
Jefferson	Oberstar	Thornberry
Johnson (GA)	Obey	Tiahrt
Johnson (IL)	Oliver	Tiberi
Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz	Tierney
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Towns
Jones (NC)	Pascrell	Tsongas
Jordan	Pastor	Turner
Kagen	Paul	Udall (CO)
Kanjorski	Payne	Udall (NM)
Kaptur	Pearce	Upton
Kennedy	Pence	Van Hollen
Kildee	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Kind	Peterson (PA)	Walberg
King (IA)	Petri	Walden (OR)
King (NY)	Pickering	Walsh (NY)
Kingston	Pitts	Walz (MN)
Kirk	Platts	Wamp
Klein (FL)	Poe	Wasserman
Kline (MN)	Pomeroy	Schultz
Knollenberg	Porter	Waters
Kucinich	Price (GA)	Watson
Kuhl (NY)	Price (NC)	Watt
LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Waxman
Lamborn	Putnam	Weiner
Lampson	Radanovich	Welch (VT)
Langevin	Rahall	Weldon (FL)
Larsen (WA)	Ramstad	Westmoreland
Larson (CT)	Rangel	Whitfield (KY)
Latham	Regula	Wilson (NM)
LaTourette	Rehberg	Wilson (OH)
Latta	Reichert	Wilson (SC)
Lee	Renzi	Wittman (VA)
Levin	Reyes	
Lewis (CA)	Reynolds	

Wolfe	Wu	Young (AK)
Woolsey	Yarmuth	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Calvert	Forbes	Rush
Cannon	Fortuño	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Smith (WA)
Doolittle	Keller	Tancredo
Ellison	Lewis (KY)	Weller
Faleomavaega	Norton	Wexler

□ 1645

Messrs. NUNES, ISSA and Ms. GRANGER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. NORTON, Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 465, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. ELLISON, Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 465, I was stuck in traffic trying to get to the vote and I ran out of time. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The CHAIRMAN. There being no other amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROSS) having assumed the chair, Ms. DEGETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6052) to promote increased public transportation use, to promote increased use of alternative fuels in providing public transportation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1304, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WALDEN OF OREGON

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. In its present form, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Walden of Oregon moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6052 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly, in the form to which perfected at the time of this motion, with the following amendments:

Page 5, after line 19, insert the following:

(c) USE OF FUNDS FOR MEETING FUEL-RELATED NEEDS OF SCHOOL BUS TRANSPORTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If school bus transportation services within the urbanized area or State to which funds are apportioned under subsection (a) have been adversely impacted by increased fuel costs, and if any school districts within the urbanized area or State are considering or have implemented service cuts in school bus transportation as a result of increased fuel costs, the recipient of the apportioned funds shall immediately make such funds available to the Governor of the State in lieu of using the funds for the purposes described in subsection (b).

(2) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Governor of a State who receives funds under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) allocate the funds to school districts within the State that have been adversely impacted by increased fuel costs and are considering or have implemented service cuts in school bus transportation; and

(B) provide that such funds be used for operating and capital costs in providing school bus transportation service in order to reduce or eliminate cuts in such service as a result of increased fuel costs.

(3) PRIORITY.—The Governor of a State shall give priority to the allocation of funds under paragraph (2) to school districts in rural and suburban areas where school buses travel greater distances in transporting students.

Page 5, line 20, strike “(c)” and insert “(d)”.

Page 5, line 23, strike “(d)” and insert “(e)”.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue reading.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let me say I have a long history of supporting mass transit in the urban areas of my State, including light rail development and bus transportation systems. I've received State-wide recognition for this work.

Unfortunately, there are no light rail routes, and few successful bus routes, in rural Oregon and in most of my district. In fact, the most important public mass transit in most of rural Oregon and, indeed, across most of rural America is a bright yellow school bus, like this one, that safely transports American children to and from school each day.

No one in America is immune from the impact of record-high gas prices, but for those of us from rural areas, the impact has been particularly severe not only on farms, families and small businesses, but also on our local governments that are struggling to pay sky-high fuel prices to maintain basic services.

Before you know it, our public school doors will open, and millions of our children will return to school, many of them on that familiar yellow school bus.

Yet all across this country, school superintendents are struggling mightily to figure out exactly how they'll afford to operate those school buses and to get our children to school.

Newspapers are filling with accounts of school districts and how they're going to respond to the cost of fuel. Some districts, including one just a few miles from here in Maryland, are considering reducing bus services and forcing children to walk up to 2 miles to school. Some schools are even discussing going to 4-day school weeks in order to reduce fuel consumption.

As profound as this problem is in urban and suburban area, it is even worse for those of us from rural communities where school buses must travel long distances to pick up and drop off children.

This is what the Yakima Herald-Republic in Washington State had to say just 5 days ago: “Some of the surrounding districts in rural areas feel the pinch from increased costs a bit more because their buses have to travel farther to transport students. The Mt. Adams School District, which has about 1,000 students, is the third-largest district in the State with an area of 1,325 square miles. The district's 10 buses still travel more than 200,000 miles in a year.”

All the way across the country in Franklin County, Virginia, the Roanoke Times reports that “a school official advised the board of supervisors Tuesday that the division could face an extra \$690,000 in added fuel costs.”

Yet, today we have before us a bill that does absolutely nothing, nothing to lower the price of gasoline or diesel and nothing to help our schools, our school districts, and to help them pay for the bus transportation costs they're incurring.

Instead, it proposes to increase subsidies for public transit systems that reduce their fares and expand taxpayer-funded travel perks for Federal employees.

What's even worse is that existing Federal law would actually prohibit the funds authorized under this bill from being used to provide assistance to struggling school districts. Let me repeat that. This law, and the law on the books, don't allow the use of these funds for our school systems.

As the school year approaches, it's time to get our priorities right and to take care of our kids first.

My motion to recommit would fix this problem by sending this bill back to committee with instructions that they revise it, to specifically provide that in an area where school bus services are being cut back because of high fuel prices, that the funds under this bill shall be used first and foremost to help restore those school bus services, and that preference shall be given to rural and suburban areas where school buses have to travel greater distances to transport our children.

If the Democratic leadership's going to refuse to even allow a vote on pro-

posals to increase domestic energy supplies so that we can lower gas prices for all Americans, then the least we can do is try to soften the blow for our Nation's schools, our school bus system and our children.

As currently drafted, this bill does not do that. We have a chance to fix it. We have a chance to help our school districts, particularly those in rural areas.

Now, the majority will undoubtedly try to rally their Members against this motion, but I ask, given that Congress is recessing tomorrow, what's wrong with sending this bill back to committee where the staff can review the amendment over the break and the full committee can carefully consider the importance of helping local schools cope with their busing needs and report this bill back in 10 days?

Or you can reject this on some sort of procedural grounds, and leave local schools in the lurch, and literally put our school children on the shoulder of the roadways, dodging traffic on their way to and from school this fall.

When schools start closing a day a week early, when parents can't figure out how to get their children to and from school, Americans will look back on this moment and see who stood with our rural and suburban schools and with our children and who stood against them.

This is a reasonable motion to recommit. The committee clearly has the time to take this up. It is of no disservice to the committee or this process to say our first priority in this House, if we're not going to allow greater access to American fuel, is to at least take care of America's school children and their busing needs.

Every paper in your district is probably writing about this issue or will be as skyrocketing fuel costs cost them the ability to run their bus routes. You can smirk and you can laugh, but this reality is coming to us here and now.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Minnesota opposed to the motion?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Yes, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in the introductory paragraph of the motion, to strike the word “promptly” and substitute therefor the word “forthwith.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oregon yield for that request?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I ask unanimous consent.

□ 1700

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oregon yield for the making of that request?

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. To my friend and the Chair of the Transportation Committee, I would be happy to agree to the unanimous consent request provided that you and your side would also agree to allow us to add a proposal to reduce gas prices for struggling American families. Specifically, would the gentleman agree to add to the bill either the No More Excuses Energy Act, H.R. 3089, or at a minimum, the proposal to allow the deep ocean oil exploration, H.R. 6108, the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I made a unanimous consent request dealing with the motion of the gentleman, not the extraneous items the gentleman has now proposed.

If the gentleman is serious about his motion to recommit, we're serious about accepting it where it's forthwith and bringing that language immediately back to the House.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. While I appreciate the gentleman's position, clearly there is an opportunity for the committee to consider this and other issues related to transportation, so I would object.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Did the gentleman object? I could not hear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objection is heard.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Then the gentleman is not serious about this motion, and this is a sham motion.

Under the language "promptly," we would not be able to consider this legislation again until well after the 4th of July recess of the Congress, which the gentleman fully understands.

The substance of the motion is well-intentioned. However, under title 23 and title 49 of the U.S. Transportation Code, school buses are specifically not eligible for public funds out of the Highway Trust Fund, nor would they be under the provisions of the bill that is before us.

Since the gentleman from Oregon objects to accepting his language and making that change in Federal law to make school buses eligible, then I would suggest that he come back to the committee at an appropriate time, we're going to continue hearings—we've had 22 hearings already in the Surface Transportation Subcommittee last year and this year on the future of transportation—and make the case for such a provision to be included in the authorization that we will have next year. We would certainly be delighted to hear the gentleman's case for this provision and to perfect it. But as it stands, this "promptly" simply kills the transit expansion funding that we provide in the underlying bill.

Therefore, because the gentleman objected to my unanimous consent request, I say the motion is not offered in good faith, not offered with good intentions. It is a sham motion, and we should defeat it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, were the gentleman's words in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot render an advisory opinion.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Is it in order to call a Member's motives in question, Mr. Chairman?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not issue advisory opinions.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and motions to suspend the rules with respect to H.R. 6377, H.R. 6251, and House Resolution 1098.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 221, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

AYES—199

Aderholt	Davis, David	Hunter
Akin	Deal (GA)	Issa
Alexander	Dent	Johnson (IL)
Bachmann	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, Sam
Bachus	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones (NC)
Barrett (SC)	Donnelly	Jordan
Barrow	Drake	Keller
Bartlett (MD)	Dreier	King (IA)
Barton (TX)	Duncan	King (NY)
Biggert	Ehlers	Kingston
Bilbray	Ellsworth	Kirk
Bilirakis	Emerson	Kline (MN)
Bishop (UT)	English (PA)	Knollenberg
Blackburn	Everett	Kuhl (NY)
Blunt	Fallin	LaHood
Boehner	Feeney	Lamborn
Bonner	Ferguson	Lampson
Bono Mack	Flake	Latham
Boozman	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Boustany	Fossella	Latta
Brady (TX)	Foster	Lewis (CA)
Broun (GA)	Fox	Linder
Brown (SC)	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Ginny	Galleghy	Lungren, Daniel
Buchanan	Garrett (NJ)	E.
Burgess	Gerlach	Mack
Burton (IN)	Giffords	Manzullo
Buyer	Gillibrand	Marchant
Camp (MI)	Gingrey	Marshall
Campbell (CA)	Gohmert	Matheson
Cantor	Goode	McCarthy (CA)
Capito	Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)
Carter	Granger	McCotter
Castle	Graves	McCrery
Chabot	Hall (TX)	McHenry
Childers	Hastings (WA)	McHugh
Coble	Hayes	McIntyre
Cole (OK)	Heller	McKeon
Conaway	Hensarling	McMorris
Crenshaw	Herger	Rodgers
Cubin	Hobson	McNerney
Culberson	Hoekstra	Mica
Davis (KY)	Hulshof	Miller (FL)

Miller (MI)	Rehberg	Smith (NJ)
Mitchell	Reichert	Smith (TX)
Moran (KS)	Renzi	Souder
Murphy, Tim	Reynolds	Stearns
Musgrave	Rogers (AL)	Sullivan
Myrick	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Neugebauer	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Nunes	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
Paul	Roskam	Tiberi
Pearce	Royce	Turner
Pence	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Peterson (PA)	Sali	Walberg
Petri	Saxton	Walden (OR)
Pickering	Scalise	Walsh (NY)
Pitts	Schmidt	Wamp
Platts	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Poe	Sessions	Whitfield (KY)
Porter	Shadegg	Wilson (NM)
Price (GA)	Shays	Wilson (SC)
Pryce (OH)	Shimkus	Wittman (VA)
Putnam	Shuler	Young (AK)
Radanovich	Shuster	Young (FL)
Ramstad	Simpson	
Regula	Smith (NE)	

NOES—221

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Nadler
Ackerman	Gordon	Napolitano
Allen	Green, Al	Neal (MA)
Altmire	Green, Gene	Oberstar
Andrews	Grijalva	Obey
Arcuri	Hall (NY)	Olver
Baca	Hare	Ortiz
Baird	Harman	Pallone
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Bean	Herstatt Sandlin	Pastor
Becerra	Higgins	Payne
Berkley	Hill	Perlmutter
Berman	Hinchev	Peterson (MN)
Berry	Hinojosa	Pomeroy
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Hodes	Rahall
Blumenauer	Holden	Rangel
Boren	Holt	Reyes
Boswell	Honda	Richardson
Boucher	Hooley	Rodriguez
Boyd (FL)	Hoyer	Rohrabacher
Boyda (KS)	Inglis (SC)	Ross
Brady (PA)	Insee	Rothman
Braley (IA)	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Brown, Corrine	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Jackson-Lee	Ryan (OH)
Capps	(TX)	Salazar
Capuano	Jefferson	Sánchez, Linda
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	T.
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Carney	Jones (OH)	Sarbanes
Carson	Kagen	Schakowsky
Castor	Kanjorski	Schiff
Cazayoux	Kaptur	Schwartz
Chandler	Kennedy	Scott (GA)
Clarke	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kilpatrick	Serrano
Cleaver	Kind	Sestak
Clyburn	Klein (FL)	Shea-Porter
Cohen	Kucinich	Sherman
Conyers	Langevin	Sires
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Skelton
Costa	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Costello	Lee	Snyder
Courtney	Levin	Solis
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Space
Crowley	Lipinski	Speier
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Spratt
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Davis (AL)	Lowey	Stupak
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Mahoney (FL)	Tanner
Davis, Lincoln	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
Davis, Tom	Markey	Taylor
DeFazio	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Delahunt	McCollum (MN)	Tierney
DeLauro	McDermott	Towns
Dicks	McGovern	Tsongas
Dingell	McNulty	Udall (CO)
Doggett	Meek (FL)	Udall (NM)
Doyle	Meeks (NY)	Van Hollen
Edwards (MD)	Melancon	Velázquez
Edwards (TX)	Michaud	Vislosky
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Walz (MN)
Emanuel	Miller, George	Wasserman
Engel	Mollohan	Schultz
Eshoo	Moore (KS)	Waters
Etheridge	Moore (WI)	Watson
Farr	Moran (VA)	Watt
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Waxman
Filner	Murphy, Patrick	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Murtha	

Welch (VT) Wolf Wu
Wilson (OH) Woolsey Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Calvert Gutierrez Tancredo
Cannon Lewis (KY) Weldon (FL)
Doolittle Miller, Gary Weller
Forbes Rush Wexler
Gilchrest Smith (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1721

Messrs. KIRK and LINDER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 322, noes 98, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

AYES—322

Abercrombie Childers Filner
Ackerman Clarke Fortenberry
Allen Clay Fossella
Altmire Cleaver Foster
Andrews Clyburn Frank (MA)
Arcuri Coble Frelinghuysen
Baca Cohen Garrett (NJ)
Bachmann Cole (OK) Gerlach
Bachus Conyers Giffords
Baird Cooper Gilchrest
Baldwin Costa Gillibrand
Barrow Costello Gonzalez
Bartlett (MD) Courtney Gordon
Bean Cramer Green, Al
Becerra Crenshaw Green, Gene
Berkley Crowley Grijalva
Berman Cuellar Gutierrez
Berry Cummings Hall (NY)
Biggert Davis (AL) Hare
Billbray Davis (CA) Harman
Billirakis Davis (IL) Hastings (FL)
Bishop (GA) Davis (KY) Hayes
Bishop (NY) Davis, Lincoln Herseth Sandlin
Blumenauer Davis, Tom Higgins
Bono Mack Deal (GA) Hill
Boozman DeFazio Hinchey
Boren DeGette Hinojosa
Boswell Delahunt Hirono
Boucher DeLauro Hobson
Boustany Dent Hodes
Boyd (FL) Diaz-Balart, L. Holden
Boyda (KS) Diaz-Balart, M. Holt
Brady (PA) Dicks Honda
Braley (IA) Dingell Hooley
Brown (SC) Doggett Hoyer
Brown, Corrine Donnelly Hulshof
Brown-Waite, Doyle Inglis (SC)
Ginny Drake Inslee
Buchanan Edwards (MD) Israel
Butterfield Edwards (TX) Jackson (IL)
Buyer Ehlers Jackson-Lee
Capito Ellison (TX)
Capps Ellsworth Jefferson
Capuano Emanuel Johnson (GA)
Cardoza Emerson Johnson (IL)
Carnahan Engel Johnson, E. B.
Carney English (PA) Jones (NC)
Carson Eshoo Jones (OH)
Castle Etheridge Kagen
Castor Fallin Kanjorski
Caza youx Farr Kaptur
Chabot Fattah Keller
Chandler Ferguson Kennedy

Kildee
Kilpatrick Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick

NOES—98

Akin
Alexander
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Carter
Conaway
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, David
Dreier
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Aderholt
Calvert
Cannon
Doolittle
Everett

NOT VOTING—14

Forbes
Lewis (KY)
Miller, Gary
Rush
Smith (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1728

Messrs. CONYERS and BILBRAY and Mrs. BACHMANN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 467, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

ENERGY MARKETS EMERGENCY ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6377, 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 Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6377.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 19, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie Brown-Waite, Davis, Lincoln
Ackerman Ginny Davis, Tom
Aderholt Buchanan Deal (GA)
Akin Burgess DeFazio
Alexander Burton (IN) DeGette
Allen Butterfield Delahunt
Altmire Buyer DeLauro
Andrews Camp (MI) Dent
Arcuri Campbell (CA) Diaz-Balart, L.
Baca Cantor Diaz-Balart, M.
Bachmann Capito Dicks
Bachus Capps Dingell
Baird Capuano Doggett
Baldwin Cardoza Donnelly
Barrett (SC) Carnahan Doyle
Barrow Carney Drake
Bartlett (MD) Carson Dreier
Barton (TX) Carter Duncan
Bean Castle Edwards (MD)
Becerra Castor Edwards (TX)
Berkley Caza youx Ehlers
Berman Chabot Ellison
Berry Chandler Ellsworth
Biggert Childers Emanuel
Billbray Clarke Emerson
Billirakis Clay Engel
Bishop (GA) Cleaver English (PA)
Bishop (NY) Clyburn Eshoo
Blumenauer Coble Etheridge
Blunt Cohen Fallon
Boehner Cole (OK) Farr
Bonner Conaway Fattah
Bono Mack Conyers Feeney
Boozman Cooper Ferguson
Boren Costa Filner
Boswell Costello Fortenberry
Boucher Courtney Fossella
Boustany Cramer Foster
Boyda (KS) Crenshaw Foxx
Brady (PA) Crowley Frank (MA)
Braley (IA) Boyd (FL) Frelinghuysen
Brown (SC) Culberson Gallegly
Brown, Corrine Cummings Garrett (NJ)
Brown-Waite, Davis (AL) Gerlach
Ginny Davis (CA) Giffords
Buchanan Broun (GA) Gilchrest
Butterfield Boyd (FL) Gillibrand
Buyer Davis (KY) Gingrey
Capito Davis, David