United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 2012 No. 100

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As this House adjourns in anticipation of Independence Day, we ask Your special blessing upon our Nation. We have many things to be thankful for, and ask that You send Your spirit, that we might continue to live our freedoms with responsibility and integrity. Help us to be truly grateful for what we have, and generous as well.

Bless the Members of this assembly and their families in the time they have together at home so that when they return, they are rested and energized to take on the important work that faces them concerning our economy and national security in today's world.

These have been historic days. Issues of grave importance have been decided, and much commentary and argument has ensued. Bless our Nation and its citizens, especially those whose energy and emotions are stirred, with equanimity, goodwill, and an abiding trust that, in time, our Nation will emerge into an even greater future as it has so many times before. Give us the faith to believe and increase our trust in You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HECK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side.

OBAMACARE DECISION DISCOURAGING FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's decision by the Supreme Court to uphold ObamaCare is discouraging for America's small businesses by destroying jobs and threatening families with the loss of their insurance policies.

When the President lobbied for the passage of the 2,700-page health care takeover, he promised Americans that the individual mandate was not a tax increase. Chief Justice Roberts based his opinion on his view that it is a tax increase, which contradicts the President as being incorrect.

Chief Justice Roberts and the four liberals now confirm the President has been inaccurate. Not only will this tax place more hardship on small businesses to follow the law, but already 12,000 pages of regulations have been issued with more than 150 new boards, agencies, and programs destroying jobs.

On July 11, the House of Representatives, under the leadership of JOHN BOEHNER and ERIC CANTOR, will vote to repeal the Obama taxes. On November 6, American citizens will have the opportunity to vote for repeal and reform.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

EXPRESSING THANKS TO KRISTIE JOHNSON GREGORY FOR EXEMPLARY SERVICE

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

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thanks to Kristie Johnson Gregory, who is moving on from my staff after 7 years of service to accept the position of special populations coordinator at Augusta Technical College. Kristie started as an intern in my office back in 2005, and she quickly rose up the ranks to serve as a senior constituent services representative.

Every Congressman knows just how important it is to have good staff, and Kristie is the kind of staffer that you need. Kristie and our district staff recovered some $3.7 million in benefits wrongfully withheld from families back home in just the last year alone, and there's no telling how many homes she helped rescue from the brink of foreclosure. When you add it all up, her record is reflected in the thank you letters of grateful constituents and the appreciation of this Congressman for a job well done.

STOLEN VALOR ACT OF 2011

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

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join with me

Printed on recycled paper.

in restoring the honor and valor of our military heroes by cosponsoring my bill, H.R. 1775, the Stolen Valor Act of 2011.

While yesterday our attention was focused on the Supreme Court health care ruling, lost in the media frenzy was the story of how the Court also struck down the Stolen Valor Act of 2005, concluding that the broad nature of the law infringed upon the guaranteed protection of free speech provided by the First Amendment of our Constitution.

The Court determined that the act ''sought to control and suppress all false statements on this one subject, without regard as to whether the lie was made for the purpose of material gain.'' The Stolen Valor Act of 2011 resolves these constitutional issues by clearly defining that the objective of the law is to target and punish those who misrepresent their service with the intent of profiting personally or financially. Defining the intent helps ensure that this law will pass constitutional scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, the need to protect the honor, service, and sacrifice of our veterans and military personnel is just as strong today as it was in 2005. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 1775 so that we can restore the honor and protect the valor of our military heroes.

SRI LANKA

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I rise today to mark the third anniversary of the end of the civil war in Sri Lanka and to urge the U.S. Government to continue to press for full accountability for all human rights abuses committed during the conflict.

Over 70,000 Sri Lankans were killed in the course of the 26-year civil war. The United Nations found claims that both sides committed war crimes to be credible, and although the war ended 3 years ago, human rights violations are reportedly continuing. Reports suggest that over 50 people—mostly critics of the government—have been abducted in the last 6 months. Human rights activists have been targeted for harassment and labeled as traitors in the national media. Gender-based violence is on the rise in the country's north.

Mr. Speaker, the international community must continue to call for accountability for the crimes during the conflict, and we must urge the Colombo government to uphold its international commitments and fully respect the human rights of all Sri Lankans.

□ 0910

SEQUESTRATION OF DEFENSE DOLLARS

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to share my frustration with the Congress' inaction on looming cuts coming to the Nation's defense budget.

In America's First District, we have a deep military history. Many of my constituents have or continue to bravely serve their Nation in a military uniform. Set to take effect in January 2013, sequestration will cut billions of defense dollars at a time when we see so much unrest across the world and American troops still deployed in harm's way in Afghanistan.

I am adamantly opposed to these catastrophic cuts and believe Congress must act now. Sequestration threatens the capability of our military to adequately protect this Nation. The Bipartisan Policy Center estimated that sequestration would result in a loss of about 1 million jobs in 2013 and 2014. This is not simply American job loss; it is a loss of critical national security capability.

Congress must not choose failure over making tough choices for the greater good of this country. Failure is an outcome we must not and cannot accept.

INVESTING IN AMERICA

(Mr. LARSEN of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, later today the House will take up a bill that is key for jobs now and for opportunity for the future.

First, we cannot have a big league economy with little league infrastructure. The transportation bill will do more to create jobs through public investment than any other piece of legislation that this House has passed in the last 18 months. It puts thousands to work repairing roads, bridges and highways, and maintaining our transit systems.

Second, this bill creates opportunity for the future by stopping a devastating interest rate hike on loans students take to pay for college. College affordability is a necessary step for creating opportunity for the future. The bill sends a clear message to college students everywhere that America will invest in you.

WHAT TEXANS THINK OF THE SUPREME COURT'S RULING ON OBAMACARE

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, here's what the people of Texas think of the Supreme Court's ruling on ObamaCare.

Jason from Kingwood, Texas says this:

Now that the Supreme Court has deemed every action of Congress that it does is acceptable so long as it's considered a tax, you can kiss it all goodbye. Tax on gun ownership, boxes of ammunition, worship fees, mission trip tax, Bible fee.

But don't worry. They won't take away your right to vote directly. They'll just dilute it with multiple voting, illegal voting and fuzzy counting. But it won't be through taxation.

Stacie from Texas also wrote me and says this:

This ruling sets up so much more of nanny taxes and government telling us what we can do and cannot do. Don't buy the right car? It's a tax. Don't buy the right vegetables? Tax. Don't buy the right newspaper? Tax. Don't buy the right music? Another tax.

Mr. Speaker, the power to tax is the power to destroy. So what's the next tax from Big Government?

Congress and the Supreme Court have both had their chance to voice their opinion. Now it's time for the American people to voice theirs.

And that's just the way it is.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE PATIENT PROTECTION AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I stood here 2 days ago addressing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and reviewing its benefits. I stand here today after the landmark Supreme Court decision to make people aware of the Republicans' efforts to repeal this historic piece of legislation.

The stakeholders must remember: seniors, the benefits with the prescription drugs already benefiting with $3.7 billion in savings; young adults who stay on their parents' plan until the age of 26, 6.6 million of you; small businesses who will experience tax credits of up to 50 percent by the year 2014; and women, women who suffered discrimination in premiums and on preexisting conditions like pregnancy. Imagine being defined a preexisting condition. 2014 they will stop.

These are just highlights, and this is why we need to, again, focus behind the Affordable Care Act and remember, it's the largest part of our GDP that keeps growing; and we need to have it under control in order to have our great economy.

CONGRATULATING DAVID BONNER FOR HIS 2011 PRESIDENTIAL AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE TEACHING

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate David Bonner on earning the 2011 Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. Mr. Bonner is a physics

teacher at Hinsdale South High School in Illinois.

As a former school board member for Hinsdale District 86, as well as a member of the Education and Science Committee, I have seen how important STEM education is in preparing our students to succeed in the 21st century. And I also know how special it is to have a great teacher who can inspire our students to get excited about a future in science, physics, math, and engineering.

Mr. Bonner should be very proud to join the ranks of only 97 teachers from across the country who have been selected for this award by a panel of distinguished scientists, mathematicians, and educators. He is a very important asset to our community, our children, and our future; and I wish him the best of luck in the future.

READ THE LAW

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the health care reform act, the Affordable Care Act, we continued to hear cries of ''read the bill, read the bill, read the bill,'' as if those of us who had supported the bill had not read it. As a matter of fact, I, among many, had read it; and we were astounded at the misrepresentations that were out in the public, foisted by our Republican opponents.

Well, I'm going to be generous today and assume that they just hadn't read that bill. But now that bill is unquestionably the law of the land. So I implore my Republican colleagues, before they continue to mislead and confuse their constituents, read the law. Read the law. Read the law.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5856, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6020, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4348, MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 717 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 717

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5856) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except for section 8121. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6020) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with '': Provided'' on page 95, line 9, through ''level'' on page 95, line 11. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4348) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of June 29, 2012, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1(c) of rule XV, relating to the following: (a) measures addressing expiring provisions of law; and (b) a concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of H.R. 4348.

SEC. 5. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of June 29, 2012, providing for consideration or disposition of the following: (a) measures addressing expiring provisions of law; and (b) a concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of H.R. 4348.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHOCK). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 0920

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bills.

House Resolution 717 provides for a standard conference report rule for the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4348, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012, Part II, also known simply as the ''highway bill.'' The conference report for the highway bill represents a bipartisan and bicameral effort to address our aging national infrastructure and chronic unemployment with a 2-year authorization.

This long-term transportation bill, agreed to by both Houses and by both parties in this conference report, provides much-needed certainty. It provides certainty not only to States and to State governments but also to the transportation and construction industries and to those Americans whose livelihoods depend on them. Rather than another short-term extension measuring mere weeks or months, this bill authorizes transportation funding for 2 full years and allows businesses to plan ahead, hire workers, and grow.

The conference report ensures taxpayer dollars are spent on high-priority infrastructure projects that support jobs and economic activity. The conference report also contains significant reforms: it streamlines the lengthy bureaucratic approval process with reforms aimed at cutting the permitting process in half; it consolidates and eliminates duplicative Federal programs; and it embraces increased private sector involvement by leveraging

Federal, State, and local dollars with private sector funding. As importantly, it does all of this without any earmarks and without any spending increases.

The conference report also extends the current student loan rate of 3.4 percent for student loans for another year. This ensures that young Americans have certainty when it comes to the terms of their student loans for the coming year; and because it is paid for, the conference report ensures that no further debt will be heaped upon the American taxpayer.

Finally, the conference report reforms and reauthorizes for 5 additional years the Federal Flood Insurance Program. This program is depended upon by so many in times of natural disaster.

House Resolution 717 also provides for an open rule both for the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2013 and the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2013.

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2013 includes funding for critical national security needs, and it provides the resources needed to continue the Nation's military efforts abroad. In addition, the bill provides essential funding for health and quality-of-life programs for the brave men and women of our Armed Forces and their families.

The Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2013 has jurisdiction over agencies responsible for regulating the financial and telecommunications industries; collecting taxes and providing taxpayer assistance; supporting the operations of the White House, the Federal judiciary, and the District of Columbia; managing Federal buildings; and overseeing Federal workers. The activities of these agencies impact nearly every American and are an integral part of the operations of our government.

So, once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bills. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to express my disappointment, not necessarily in this measure, but in how it has come about. We are here considering a rule for five unrelated measures the day before we recess for the 4th of July. Once again, we are rushing to the floor with vital legislation that most Members have hardly had the chance to read. This rule is the very embodiment of congressional dysfunction.

While my colleagues are busy playing political games, our Nation's infrastructure is crumbling, and we all know that. Tuition costs are rising, and we all know that. The economy is struggling. Perhaps, if my Republican friends weren't so preoccupied with appeasing their base, we wouldn't find ourselves in this position yet again.

We could have taken care of student loans back in March when the House first considered a measure to keep current rates. However, instead of paying for it in a way that was amenable to both sides of the aisle, the Republican leadership chose to pay for it by cutting much-needed preventative health funding. The President said he would veto the bill in this form, yet Republicans still chose to waste this body's time and defer to the Senate to come up with an affordable pay-for.

The transportation bill we are considering has been an even longer time in coming—over 3 years to be exact. While the conference report is not perfect, it is clear that we must pass a long-term reauthorization so that construction projects all across the country can move forward with repairing and improving our Nation's aging transportation system and infrastructure. Yet, once again, we find ourselves racing against the clock.

Without a long-term bill, opportunities to truly invest in our Nation's infrastructure and economy will continue passing us by. Without a long-term bill, construction projects all across the country could shut down. Without a long-term bill, 3 million Americans will be faced with not having a job after Saturday. We should not have to pass nine extensions over 3 years' time to get to this point, and we would be better served than this 27th-month extension if we did a 4- or a 5-year bill.

Infrastructure investments are essential to our Nation's economic growth and prosperity. This reauthorization should never have been held hostage by political gamesmanship. There is simply too much at stake. Short-term extensions put millions of jobs and the safety of our Nation at risk by casting great uncertainty on long-term transportation and infrastructure projects. This is unacceptable.

□ 0930

While I'm not happy about every provision in the flood insurance portion of this conference report, after 10 years since its last reauthorization and countless short-term extensions, it's about time that we get a long-term extension.

The National Flood Insurance Program insures 5.6 million properties across every State in the Nation. Yet, one Senator from Kentucky refused to allow the bill to go forward on the most specious of reasons, a vote on abortion. I have yet to hear the Senator explain what abortion has to do with flood insurance or why he would threaten the security of the homes of all those Americans just to make a political point. I guess I shouldn't be too surprised. Last night, I read where he said just because two or more persons at the Supreme Court make a decision, that doesn't mean that it's constitutional. I hope this guy goes back to law school, if he ever went.

Finally, on today's underlying appropriations measures, I can only say: here we go again. Once again, the Republicans refuse to provide the necessary funds to reach the hardest-hit Americans. Once again, the Republicans kowtow to corporate power rather than provide the resources to keep rampant excesses at bay. And once again, my friends on the other side of the aisle choose to undermine the long-term priorities of this Nation in favor of partisan posturing.

I've said before and I maintain again and now that the Republicans are living in a world of let's pretend. In ''Alice in Wonderland,'' Alice said that ''if she had a world of her own, everything would be nonsense.'' In the Republican world, as Alice said, ''Nothing is what it is, because everything is what it isn't.'' In the Republican world, Mr. Speaker, the best way to rein in the most corrupt practices of Wall Street is to underfund the SEC; the best way to close a $400 billion tax gap is to force the IRS to fire thousands of taxpayer support employees; and the best way to ensure our national defense is to continue to pump in billions and billions of dollars into nuclear weapons that serve no earthly purpose but to destroy our Earth. What part of ''we have enough nuclear weapons to destroy every human being 25 times'' do we not understand?

In this world, increasing unemployment somehow improves our economy; defunding essential government programs somehow helps the hardest-hit Americans; and cutting domestic programs in health care, education, infrastructure, and economic development while increasing Defense Department funding somehow serves the long-term needs of this country. Well, it doesn't. For months we've known that student loan rates were set to rise; for months we've known that the highway bill was going to expire; and for months we've done nothing but use the House floor as a political playground.

Mr. Speaker, our country cannot prosper if every major piece of legislation is held hostage to partisan interests. As Alice said—again referring to ''Alice in Wonderland''—''of all the silly nonsense, this is the stupidest tea party I've ever been to in all my life.''

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Sacramento, California, a former member of the Rules Committee, my good friend, Ms. MATSUI.

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report includes a transportation bill that will help put Americans back to work and rebuild our infrastructure. It will also

ensure that students will not see an interest rate hike on their loans. This package also includes a much-needed 5-year extension of the National Flood Insurance Program. This comes after 17 short-term extensions.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Sacramento, which is the most at-risk metropolitan area for major flooding, as it lies at the confluence of the American and the Sacramento Rivers.

Since Hurricane Katrina, more than 25,000 homeowners in my district have been remapped, and flood insurance is now mandatory for them. The average homeowner in Sacramento that has been remapped currently pays about $350 for a PRP policy. That's a preferred-rate policy. Beginning in 2013, they were set to pay $1,350 once the PRP rate expired. However, that is no longer the case.

This bill contains a number of important provisions, including a flood insurance phase-in amendment offered during debate on the House NFIP bill last July. Instead of overnight sticker shock for homeowners, the provision allows for the price of flood insurance to be phased in at 20 percent per year over 5 years to the full policy price, when preferred-risk policies are no longer available in their community.

Specifically, it will effectively allow homeowners next year, in 2013, residing in Sacramento and the rest of the country, to pay close to if not the same amount they're currently paying. Each year after that, the price of flood insurance will continue to be both affordable and predictable, only rising by 20 percent until it reaches full price in year five. This provision will save the average policyholder in a remapped area hundreds of dollars, if not a few thousand, over the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this provision offers real savings, especially in these trying economic times, whether it's for a senior citizen on a fixed income or a family struggling to make ends meet.

Finally, I would like to commend Chairwoman BIGGERT and Ranking Member WATERS for working with me, for their continuous efforts to preserve this amendment and work towards achieving this 5-year extension.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding.

It's not often that I find agreement with both of my friends from Florida at the same time. When I listened to my friend from Florida, my Democratic colleague on the Rules Committee, in his opening statement, he's absolutely right. We're bringing five completely unrelated provisions to the floor in this conference report today, and we're bringing it in a rushed fashion so folks can get out of here and go home for the 4th of July week.

I agree with my friend from the Republican side of the aisle, my freshman colleague, who says this is just a standard conference report rule. That's absolutely right. All of these things that the gentleman from Florida, my Democratic colleague, finds troubling are just part of the standard conference report process.

I've been watching this process for a long time. I may be a freshman, but I've been watching it for a long time. And it's just the way things go around here. We've done better. To be fair to this House leadership, over the 18 months that I've been here in Congress, we've done better. We've made a commitment to bring one idea to the floor at a time, and 99 percent of the bills I've voted on have been 10 pages or less, and I could read them. I didn't have to staff it out. I could do it myself.

But something happens when we get to this conference report time. Mr. Speaker, the question goes to our colleagues. I suspect if we put the question to our colleagues—my friend from Florida knows it's true: Would you rather rush these five unrelated bills to the floor today and get home for all the commitments you've made over the weekend, or would you rather stretch this thing out and do it right?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. You can't really believe that it should be standard procedure for us to do a 600-page bill that CBO has not scored until 10 minutes ago.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I absolutely do not believe it should be standard procedure, but it is. It has been the entire time my friend from Florida has been serving here in this House.

Again, we've done better. To the credit of my freshmen colleagues, we've done better over these last 18 months, and we will continue to do better. But Chief Justice Roberts had it right yesterday: elections have consequences. The American people are responsible for what goes on here. Mr. Speaker, we keep this calendar for a reason. We do it out of a need for service. You and I both have commitments to constituents starting at dawn tomorrow morning.

□ 0940

We have commitments to constituents to keep transportation bills going, to work with student loans, to reauthorize flood insurance, on and on and on. We have competing commitments to our constituents. I would just hope, Mr. Speaker, that if you were asking your constituents, that they would say, You know what; I would rather you cancel on me this weekend and stay up there and get it right than rush it through.

Now, with that said, it has not been partisan politics that's kept us from getting it here until this point. We've been working hard on this. To the credit of the folks on the transportation conferee committee, they have been working hard. And this was just the best they could do, getting it done today, for whatever reason. This town only operates in crisis.

I say to my friend, if we can work towards regular order, I would love to see regular order come to this institution. We have done better. Eighteen months on the job since I have been here, you and I. We have done better. My colleague from Florida and I. We have done better. But we can still do better. But we're only going to do better if the constituents demand it.

The Supreme Court had it right. You can throw out the folks who aren't doing it right. Mr. Speaker, I encourage you to encourage all voters to look at what we do, see when we're getting it right and tell us, and see when we're getting it wrong and ask us to do better. We can do better. We will do better.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from the Virgin Islands, Dr. CHRISTENSEN.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

After 20 years of being fully and fairly included in the surface transportation bills, what is being voted on today cuts funding to the smaller territories by $10 million. And while I am glad our sister territory of Puerto Rico as well as the States and District of Columbia are level-funded, it just seems grossly unfair that only the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Marianas are singled out for cuts.

Why cut $10 million? Or it could have been spread out across the entire bill and not raised a blip in the 50 States, the District, or Puerto Rico. But for us small economies, it's a big blow.

That being said, it could have been worse. This body would have made our funding discretionary and, therefore, not secure. So while I decry the cuts, I have to thank the Senate for hearing our pleas and keeping our funding in the trust fund.

After all of the time, though, that we have waited for even this 2-year, 3-month infrastructure and job-creating transportation bill and knowing the need to keep college affordable and reauthorize flood insurance, I cannot, in good conscience, oppose the bill before us today.

But what is being done to the territories is unfair and discriminatory. And since it makes so little difference in the overall bill, it seems deliberately and unnecessarily punitive to us loyal Americans who serve and shed our blood just like every other in the defense and love of this, our country. Fairness would demand that it be restored.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman, my good friend from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there's no small amount of irony that we are having this discussion today. It's on the anniversary of President Eisenhower signing into law the National Defense Highway Act. This weekend will be the 150th anniversary of the Transcontinental Railroad Act, signed into law by Abraham Lincoln. There was an era when Republicans believed in infrastructure and development.

In fact, for most of our history, actually, infrastructure has not been partisan. It's been something that people on this House floor could come together to work on. There would be differences, to be sure. But for the 20 years that I've been involved with this issue, we've been working to broaden our view of how to make transportation work better, involve citizens, more flexibility, make the dollars stretch. This came crashing to a halt with this Congress.

Now the bill that's going to come before us, I will very reluctantly vote in favor of it in part because of what's not in it. Remember, our Republican colleagues tried to force through a bill which, for the first time in history, had never had bipartisan work that came out of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, that came out of Ways and Means. In fact, it never even had a full committee hearing, rush-to-work session. Mercifully, it collapsed before it came to the floor.

And one of the reasons I'll vote for this bill is because what the Republicans wanted has been rejected. Remember, they wanted to take away all the funding guarantees for transit. Working with the Senate, we were able to resist that effort. They wanted to gut environmental protections.

And while you're going to find that there are some problems with this legislation, at least it's not as bad as what our Republican colleagues wanted. They wanted to completely eliminate the guarantees for transportation enhancements, for bikes and pedestrians. They were even going to eliminate the wildly popular Safe Routes to School bill. Well, most of that has been retained, although they were successful in gutting the provisions, for some reason, for Safe Routes to School.

We have a bill that actually is a little higher in terms of the funding level than what the Republicans wanted, and it is at least going to be guaranteed for 2 years. It has some provisions that are important to those of us who have rural schools, Oregon among them. It's going to make a big difference. Putting this extraneous provision in is going to help. A little help in terms of student loans. And we worked in the finance title to be able to have the money come from something that's actually going to make it more likely that we stabilize some private pension programs.

So it's not without merit. There are important things here. But the main reason to vote for it is because we've been able, working with the Senate, to resist what the Republicans attempted to inflict on the House and the American people.

But make no mistake, it is not a bill to be proud of. As I mentioned, it dramatically reduces the funding for the transportation enhancements. There is no rail title. There will be reductions in citizen opportunities for environmental protection and participation.

It is, sadly, a missed opportunity that didn't need to happen. They could have allowed the Senate bill, in its entirety, to be voted on, and I'm confident that would have passed. Or wonder of wonders, they actually could have worked, like we used to do, in a bipartisan fashion. The last transportation bill under Republican control passed with 412 votes.

Well, we've missed an opportunity. At precisely the time when America needs more investment in renewing and rebuilding, for transit, for roads, for rail, for water and sewer, there are a whole range of things that we should be coming together to work on.

I hope that the American public looks very closely at what was attempted here in the last 6 months, they look at what we managed to stagger through, and that it is a wake-up call for people to be engaged.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I have worked for 5 years with a broad coalition of stakeholders that's not partisan, that are committed to working together on a vision for how we're going to rebuild and renew the country, how we're going to revitalize the economy, and how we make our communities more livable, our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

If we're able to use this flawed process and sadly inadequate bill as a springboard, maybe in some ways it will have been worth it.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind everyone again, as I said in my opening remarks, this bill has no earmarks. Yes, we know how they did it in the past, with 6,000, 7,000, 8,000 earmarks, and certainly there would be a lot of support among individual Members if that were the case. This bill has no earmarks. It's good policy.

□ 0950

The Federal Government says: We know all. We know everything that's needed in every single community, and we can stamp out one of our famed cookie-cutter approaches to funding transportation, as we used to do, so that every single dollar has a little teeny category and every State is brought into spending within those little teeny categories.

Yes, we could have done that, but that's the old way of doing it. We did it a different way. We actually had a conference, no earmarks, and we gave States flexibility. We sent to the States the opportunity to decide. Did we take out any of those things that were mentioned? Absolutely not. They're all options. So every single dollar we send to the State, the State has an opportunity to say, Maybe we don't want to do a sound barrier, whatever it is that's there. No, we can take the flexibility that's given to us, we can use it. We can use it to our benefit far better to build transportation from the ground up rather than to build it from the top down, Washington, D.C. cookie-cutter style.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues today to support this bipartisan compromise to enact three of our top economic priorities.

Some people have said, Well, we don't like the bundling; we don't like putting three bills together. But I think this is the art of compromise, and this is the art of the possible. Because all three of these bills are very important to all of us, I think, and to have this bipartisan way to do this, I think this is the way that we should go.

I started out with the flood insurance bill. And before we even had a bill, we did a draft so that every group could look at it, so that every Member could look at it and be a part of it and to have what they thought was necessary or to talk about what they didn't think was necessary. So we came up with a bill that came out of my Financial Services Subcommittee by voice vote, but out of the Financial Services Committee last June, 54–0. And people said, How did that happen? Well, it happened because we got together and worked before we really just said, Vote for my bill. And I think it's so important that we do this and get back together to be able to work in a bipartisan way. The gentlelady from California was my cosponsor. And everybody joined together.

So I think it's really important. Actually, the student loan bill is also my bill. So I really care about what is going on this morning and that we can really get together and pass these. And the transportation bill is so important to all of us. Several of us in Illinois had real concerns about how the transit part of that bill was going to be in it and really wanted to do something like what the Senate had done and include that in the trust fund.

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

Mr. WEBSTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. BIGGERT. So I really thank the gentleman, and I think that it took a lot of compromise on both sides of the aisle. But this agreement safeguards the things in all of the bills such as the suburban transit options and funds critical road and bridge projects. So it's been a long time, but I encourage

my colleagues to look at the big picture and lend this agreement their strong support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan compromise to enact three of our top economic priorities: an extension of lower student loan rates, reform of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), and a long-term transportation bill.

All three face tight statutory deadlines. And this agreement gives us the momentum to get all three over the finish line.

Reforming the NFIP will restore financial security to the flood program, which yields savings for taxpayers and stability in the housing market.

And extending affordable loan rates for our students will ensure that our young graduates don't have to pay the price for gridlock in Washington. Already, half of recent graduates are either unemployed or underemployed, and now is not the time to burden them with more debt and higher education costs.

Both of these proposals began here in the House with legislation I sponsored. And both passed in the House with bipartisan support. Today, we can send them to the President alongside a third critical economic priority—a long-term transportation bill.

This agreement includes a two-year extension of federal transportation funding, avoiding the need for another short-term bill.

In my home State of Illinois, transportation managers need a long-term bill to invest in the road and rail projects that will keep commerce and traffic moving—not to mention create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it took a lot of compromise—on both sides of the aisle—but this agreement safeguards suburban transit options and funds critical road and bridge projects.

It's been a long, tough fight, but I encourage my colleagues to look at the big picture and lend this agreement their strong support.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell me the time remaining for both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 13½ minutes, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) has 18¾ minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am very pleased at this time to yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for his courtesies and his friendship. We've known each other a long time, and his service has been one of great commendation, and the manager as well.

We've gathered here on the floor this morning, and I want to acknowledge that the legislative process is not always pretty, but there are lives embedded in this legislation today. And though I have concerns, I am more pointed toward this House doing things to improve the quality of life for Americans who stand by the wayside and the highways of despair waiting for us to provide jobs to improve the conditions of infrastructure and their lives.

Over the past 2 years, we have seen tornadoes. We've even seen an earthquake here in Washington, D.C. We've seen hurricanes on the coastline where I come from in Texas. And in Florida, just recently, Hurricane Debby has pierced the infrastructure. Obviously, this legislation points to some of those needs.

As I stand here today, I do want to take note of a comment made by a person in the other body and suggest to Attorney General Holder: Do not resign. We have better things to do than to speak to a Cabinet officer who is a commended public servant. So I want to make sure that that does not occur.

But as I discuss this legislation, I think it is important to note several things. One, there are young people that are facing the uphill battle of getting a college education. Now we'll have a refuge. I held a town hall meeting, and to hear the stories of $37,000, $50,000, $90,000 in debt that these young people have. And they are first and second year. They are sophomores and juniors. Or maybe the veteran who does not fall into the schedule of veterans benefits with college and that person has an enormous amount of debt.

And so I'm grateful that we have frozen that interest rate; and we should say loudly to the students who are now studying that America cares about them and this House will care about them.

Now, I am concerned. And I am reading language that indicates while there's been significant progress regarding MWBEs—and this bill has $13 billion in it for surface transportation and highways—there is concern expressed in this report that we have not really met our goals to help small businesses and minority-owned businesses and women-owned businesses. And in actuality, they have an outreach goal of 10 percent. Do we realize that there are some that are receiving Federal funds that don't even meet that goal? And I'm going to cite Houston Metro, because I was proud to have this body provide $900 million to Houston Metro; but I'm disappointed in their lack of commitment to MWBEs.

And so this is an important statement. As I read the language, it is adding women to this to create jobs. And we want to work together. We don't want to be fighting against each other. But we create jobs and we help small businesses. And that is crucial. Mass transit has been helped. But I want to note the jobs that President Obama and Democrats have been speaking of are now focused in this bill. Because as we begin to fix the crumbling infrastructure and the $13 billion that we've committed to mass transit, the highways, to the construction of infrastructure and bridges that are crumbling and those that have now been the subject of tornadoes, as I indicated, of hurricanes, deteriorating infrastructure, it can now be revitalized and rebuilt.

So, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues, yes, I will be voting on this conference report and acknowledge the work that has been done. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge that legislation sometimes, when you have to pull things from people who are desperate, may not be a process that one says is the ordinary process. But I like the fact that ordinary people have done extraordinary things. And this is an extraordinary legislative initiative with its problems, but with $13 billion going to the people of the United States and protecting our young people and doing the business of the American people, as opposed to other direction. I hope that we will move forward in serving the American people.

□ 1000

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and if I could ask the gentleman how many more speakers he has.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Two more, possibly three, but we're moving rapidly.

I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

The seeds of this bipartisan agreement were sown in the other body 3 or 4 months ago; and, frankly, I wish these agreements had been brought to this floor a lot sooner. They would have done a lot more good, but I'm glad that these agreements are here today.

This is a bill that will help create jobs in the transportation sector. It's overdue. It's a bill that will help our real estate industry by resolving matters about the national flood insurance program. That is overdue. And it's a bill that will avoid a dramatic doubling of student loan interest rates on Sunday, which is long overdue, so it's worth supporting.

I want to commend the negotiators on both sides for another provision regarding pension law that helps offset and pay for the provisions in this bill because it, I believe, will represent a significant investment by businesses around the country in job creation and purchasing of equipment and capital goods.

Under the terms of the pension payfor in this bill, American employers will have about $28 billion for the next year to spend on something other than pension plan contributions. Now their pensions will be safe and secure, but this is $28 billion that will be available to these companies—private money—to hire people, to buy equipment, to invest in their companies and to help their businesses grow. This is businesses as large as some of the major companies in our country and businesses that are quite small.

So one of the reasons to support this legislation is, in fact, it includes for

this year alone a $28 billion opportunity for the private sector to help put Americans back to work. This is a good idea. It was advanced by both Republicans and Democrats in this body and the other body, and I hope that we receive a ''yes'' vote for it here today.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 4348, the Surface Transportation Extension Act, which provides funding for the Federal-aid highway program through fiscal year 2014 at current funding levels.

Among other things, the conference report makes key investments in our Nation's infrastructure critical to goods movement, which is specifically very important to me in my district, and the additional $500 million that is there for projects of national and regional significance.

The conference report also calls for a national freight strategic plan, and it encourages States to develop State freight plans to incentivize those States to invest in freight projects, policies, and to make sure that we can make progress in that area that has long avoided us.

In recent days, some Members have come down and expressed a desire for the Federal Government to adopt a national freight policy. As a member of the Transportation Committee representing the 37th Congressional District, I represent a very transportation-intensive district, and that's why last March I introduced a bill, H.R. 1122, the Freight Focus Act. That particular legislation was supported very much across the aisle and included support of the American Association of Port Authorities, the American Trucking Association, Operating Engineers, and many more.

My Freight Focus Act was to establish an office of freight planning within the office of the new assistant secretary, and many of those ideas have been incorporated.

As we look forward at this bill, it certainly is not what we had hoped for. We had hoped for something more like a 5-year reauthorization. That would be helpful, but at this point, given our limitations, the key thing I would like to see us focus on is to ensure that there is a strong freight plan, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure that's implemented.

Further, my legislation created a goods movement trust fund. That is something that is not addressed in this legislation but should be considered as we go forward.

As you can see, there are sound freight policies. I have been a leader of that in working with Chairman MICA and others, and I look forward to us bringing forward not only this bill, but many more to come which will put Americans back to work.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, it's a shame that we are here today considering this hodgepodge measure. For too long, my Republican colleagues have used this House to further their partisan agenda rather than the interests of the Nation.

So it is no surprise that, once again, we are rushing to the floor to take care of business that should have been taken care of months ago. Time and again, when given the choice between reasonable, bipartisan measures and blatantly partisan policies, Republicans have chosen to pander to the extreme wing of their conference. They have passed bills they know will be dead on arrival in the Senate, pursued legislation with no hope of being signed into law, and attached controversial measures to otherwise innocuous matters.

While Republicans are busy playing politics, Americans have been wondering how they're going to get a job, put a roof over their heads, or afford to pay for college or food.

Though I'm glad these measures are finally being brought to the floor, our constituents deserve better. On this measure, 600 pages, the dead of night last night, five measures put together under one, and we received a CBO score just a few minutes ago. Most Members in this body don't have any idea what's in this bill or how much it costs.

This Republican tactic of saying ''no'' to everything is dragging down our Nation, slowing our recovery, and threatening the survival of important and necessary government programs. There's serious work to do here in the House of Representatives, and my and your constituents can't afford to sit around and watch this spectacle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, as I have said during previous debates on short-term transportation extensions, our national infrastructure is aging, stable construction jobs are lacking, unemployment lingers about 8 percent nationally and a little over 9 percent in Florida. Regrettably, that remains the case today, many short-term extensions later. However, unlike the past, the House and Senate have come together to offer a glimmer of certainty to try to address these problems.

A long-term, multiyear highway reauthorization is critical to rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure, reforming antiquated and inefficient transportation programs, strengthening our economy, and creating jobs. A long-term authorization also provides for certainty and stability necessary for the transportation industry to contain costs through long-term planning.

This agreement, while not perfect, is long overdue. It will begin to chip away at the bloated bureaucracy which defines our Federal transportation system. It will create jobs and it will promote economic activity in our local communities, all without adding to the deficit. For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to join me in favor of this rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I now rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 718

Whereas the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has interfered with the work of an independent agency and pressured an administrative law judge of the National Labor Relations Board by compelling the production of documents related to an ongoing case, something independent experts said ''could seriously undermine the authority of those charged with enforcing the nation's labor laws'' and which the House Ethics Manual discourages by noting that ''Federal courts have nullified administrative decisions on grounds of due process and fairness towards all of the parties when congressional interference with ongoing administrative proceedings may have unduly influenced the outcome'';

Whereas the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has politicized investigations by rolling back longstanding bipartisan precedents, including by authorizing subpoenas without the concurrence of the ranking member or a committee vote, by refusing to share documents and other information with the ranking member, and restricting the minority's right to call witnesses at hearings;

Whereas the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has jeopardized an ongoing criminal investigation by publicly releasing documents that his own staff has admitted were under court seal;

Whereas the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has unilaterally subpoenaed a witness who was expected to testify at an upcoming Federal trial, despite longstanding precedent and objections from the Department of Justice that such a step could cause complications at a trial and potentially jeopardize a criminal conviction;

Whereas the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has engaged in a witch hunt, through the use of repeated incorrect and uncorroborated statements in the committee's ''Fast and Furious'' investigation; and

Whereas the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has chosen to call the Attorney General of the United States a liar on national television without corroborating evidence and has exhibited unprofessional behavior which could result in jeopardizing an ongoing Committee investigation into Operation Fast and Furious: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives disapproves of the behavior of the chair for interfering with ongoing criminal investigations; insisting on a personal attack against the attorney general of the united states; and for calling the Attorney General of the United States a liar on national television without corroborating evidence thereby discredit to the integrity of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of privilege.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the adoption of House Resolution 717.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 259, nays 161, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

YEAS—259

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

NAYS—161

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Barton (TX)
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Filner
Fortenberry
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Platts

□ 1035

Messrs. ELLISON and WELCH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CHAFFETZ, DUNCAN of Tennessee, McKINLEY, KIND, ALTMIRE, COSTA, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. HOCHUL, and Messrs. NUGENT and NUNNELEE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 443, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5856, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6020, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4348, MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 717) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5856) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6020) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4348) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 176, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

YEAS—244

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek

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

NAYS—176

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Barton (TX)
Clyburn
Conyers
Filner
Gohmert
Harris
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Platts

□ 1043

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 444, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 443 and 444, I was delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 443, and "yea" on rollcall No. 444.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 2012, I regret that I was not present to vote on the Motion to Table the Jackson Lee Privileged Resolution and H. Res. 717.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on both bills.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4348, MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 717, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4348) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 717, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 28, 2011, at page H4432.)

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4348.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, it has indeed been a very bumpy road to get to this point where we could pass a transportation bill.

First, I have to thank my colleagues. I want to particularly thank the Speaker of the House of Representatives who stuck by me, who insisted that we pass this legislation that we worked on together in the best interest of the people of the United States, particularly in a time when people have lost their jobs, particularly at a time where the construction industry is at its lowest point in probably our history, and particularly at a time when it's important for Congress to act, not just to talk about problems that we have, but to get things done in the best interest of the people of the United States.

□ 1050

So I want to thank first the Speaker. I want to thank my colleagues who participated. I want to thank the staff who have been up almost nonstop for 2 weeks day and night trying to help wrap this up.

I'm not particularly pleased with some of the twists and turns. Let me say, first of all, my predecessor Mr. Oberstar, I regret that he was not able to achieve what we've achieved. He was undermined, unfortunately, by this administration to pass a bill. I tried to help him to pass a bill, not for partisan reasons or political reasons, but, again, for the people that we represent and trying to get this country, the economy moving forward. They had to pass six extensions. I was forced to pass three. But we're here today because so many people worked so hard.

One of the funniest things that happened to me during the passage of this bill—and you know that people have been kind of tough on me during this process—is I came to the floor one morning after a particularly tough time, and a staffer looked at me and he said, Mr. MICA, your shirt is awfully clean. He looked at my shirt, opened

my coat, and he said, Your shirt is awfully clean.

I said, What do you mean?

He said, For someone that's been thrown under the bus so many times, you don't have many tire tracks on you.

One of the light moments in this process.

But you know what you have to do is, when they throw you under the bus, you get up, you right yourself, you dust yourself off, and then you gain even more determination to win and get the job done. And that's what we're doing today.

Today we're passing a bill, again, that the other side couldn't pass when they had complete control of the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. We're passing this today, ironically, in the week that they passed the first transportation bill in Congress, and it was signed into law back in June of 1956.

This isn't the bill that exactly I would like, but this is a bill that, first of all, has the most historic reforms in the Federal participation in transportation programs in its history, since its adoption back in 1956. Those reforms are included, and there is a dramatic change in consolidation of some of the programs that mushroomed. Government mushrooms. Nobody does anything about reining in the size of government. This bill does something about that.

This bill takes the plea that we've heard from Beckley, West Virginia, to the west coast, from sea to shining sea in an unprecedented number of hearings across the country. And people said the whole paperwork process, red tape of Federal Government involved in transportation projects has to be changed. And we change it here for the first time historically, dramatically reducing the time that it takes to permit and go forward with a project, dramatically reducing the cost, dramatically reducing the mandates, increasing the flexibility for local government. So we have a streamlining process, unprecedented.

Now, this wasn't easy to do because my previous chairmen—and one of them that, at least, is here—they had a little thing called earmarks. In fact, the last bill had 6,300 earmarks. And you see, my hands are behind my back. I don't have them tied, but I didn't have the ability to pass out earmarks and the other little goodies in this bill. Instead, we had to focus on policy. And this is good policy. This is good policy for transportation safety. This is good policy for, again, reforms, and it's good policy for moving forward projects across the country and putting people to work.

''Shovel-ready'' will no longer be a joke. The administration, when they tried the stimulus dollars to throw that money out there, 35 percent was left in the Federal Treasury 2½ years after we passed the bill because ''shovel-ready'' even made the President and others cringe at the thought of how Federal red tape and paperwork stops projects in their progress.

So those are some of the reforms.

I'm grateful, again, for all that helped us move in a positive bipartisan direction.

I want to compliment Senator BOXER. She and I are probably like oil and water when it comes to political philosophy, but we joined together, like everyone should do, to get the people's work done and to get people working in the United States and pass this long overdue legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As with health care in the aftermath of yesterday's landmark Supreme Court decision, it's now time to move forward and put the divisiveness which has plagued the enactment of a surface transportation reauthorization bill for the first time in decades behind us and coalesce in support of the pending conference agreement.

This bill makes a sound investment in America. Fifty-six years ago, a Democratic Congress and a Republican President came together. And on this day in 1956, President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed into law the Federal-Aid Highway Act, which established the interstate system of highways. This historic piece of legislation created a transportation system in this country that awed the world. Yet in recent decades, our roads, bridges, trains, and transit systems have slipped into decline because we have failed to make the necessary investments to improve the condition and performance of this network.

The pending legislation will not completely reverse the course of this decline, but, at the very least, States will see no reduction in the infrastructure investment funding that they desperately need to tackle crumbling roadways, deficient bridges, and to secure rail-highway grade crossings.

The States and transportation contractors will have the ability to count on a stable source of funding through fiscal year 2014, sustaining and creating jobs, and enhancing the mobility and safety of American motorists.

Critical investments in transit will continue, reducing traffic congestion. And alternative means of transportation will continue to be a valued enterprise in which to invest, increasing the quality of life and the health of the American people.

To be sure, there are some glaring shortcomings:

The transit privatization provisions threaten service, not enhance it;

The environmental streamlining provisions shortchange public input and could very well lead to greater delays in project delivery;

The Buy America provision is lethargic compared to the bold and decisive strokes that I advocated;

The mandate to install black boxes on commercial motor vehicles will come at great cost to struggling independent business people, without any proven safety benefits; and

There's an ill-advised provision that has no business in this legislation, which harms our maritime industry by weakening our cargo preference laws.

When all is said and done, though, this bill is what it is.

As with so much legislation in this body, this conference agreement—this one, in particular—means jobs, and it means that we will not have further layoffs. It means that we will continue to move our economy.

And when all is said and done, I will choose to vote for American jobs any day.

Mr. Speaker, before reserving the balance of my time, I ask unanimous consent that time on this side be temporarily managed by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon will control the time.

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon will control the time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), who does a wonderful job chairing and leading the Highways Subcommittee.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 4348, the surface transportation reauthorization bill of 2012.

I first want to salute Chairman MICA for the tremendous job he has done in bringing this bill to the floor today, and I want to thank him for allowing me to serve as chairman of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee. This monumental reform package will be considered the signature jobs bill of the 112th Congress, and I am pleased to have been a conferee on the negotiations of the conference report.

States will have over 2 years of funding certainty with no tax increases. By providing long-term funding stability to States, major projects will be able to move forward to help create jobs and make much-needed repairs to our Nation's critical transportation infrastructure. These are jobs, Mr. Speaker, that will not be outsourced to China or elsewhere.

Traffic congestion costs the U.S. economy over $100 billion a year, approximately. With congestion expected to increase over the next decade and beyond, the job creation from this bill will help reduce congestion costs and boost the economy.

This conference report contains no earmarks.

□ 1100

Funding is distributed based on formulas which go directly to State Departments of Transportation, which will prioritize the highway and transit projects that are the most needed and most important in their State.

The number of Federal programs has been greatly reduced, which will give the States greater flexibility on how they spend their limited Federal resources. The conference report doubles the funding for the Highway Safety Improvement Program, which gives States resources for improvements to dangerous and unsafe sections on our Nation's highways and will save lives. A more robust Highway Safety Improvement Program will help continue the downward trend of highway fatalities and serious injuries that we have seen in the last several years.

The House included several streamlining provisions that will have a dramatic effect on the project delivery process. Federal agencies will be given deadlines to review burdensome environmental requirements, and it requires concurrent instead of consecutive project reviews. Projects that are in the footprint of an existing highway will not be required to go through this process. According to the last study of the Federal Highway Administration, the project delivery process can take up to 15 years from conception to completion. This is government at its worst. These reforms will help cut project delivery times in half and save taxpayers a great deal of money.

The Senate bill also includes a wide spectrum of additional government bureaucracy and red tape for small business that would have severely hurt their bottom line. We were successful in removing most of these over-burdensome regulations.

This, Madam Speaker, is the most conservative highway bill ever, both from a fiscal standpoint and from a policy standpoint. I would especially like to praise the staff that has worked so hard, led by Jim Tymon, one of the most competent and capable people this Congress has ever had, from a staff standpoint.

I look forward to passing this reform bill and putting Americans back to work, and I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield myself 2 minutes.

This is 27 months of certainty for the States. That's good. They'll be able to plan major projects. That will mean there will be some equipment acquisitions by contractors and others, unlike the short-term miniscule amount of money spent during the so-called ''stimulus'' bill, which I opposed. That's good. But this is not enough.

Ten years ago, the United States of America was rated as having the fifth-best transportation infrastructure in the world. Not great, but not that bad. Today, we are 25th in the world. Most Third World countries are spending a much larger percentage of their gross domestic product on transportation infrastructure than we are.

The Eisenhower legacy is crumbling. We have 150,000 bridges that need repair or replacement. Forty percent of the pavement on the national highway system needs to be totally redone, not just surfaced. And we have a $70 billion backlog in transit, and we have Buy America rules, which guarantee that all the products that go into those jobs, that investment we need, would be kept here at home. So we did not get to that point with this bill.

This is essentially a little decline from what we just spent last year on transportation infrastructure. And what we spent last year, according to two blue ribbon panels commissioned during the Bush administration, is about half of what we need to begin to bring this up to a world-class system to compete with the rest of the world and deal with the deficiencies. Build a 21st century transportation system. This money in this bill for 27 months will be enough to put a few more Band-Aids on the 20th century, and the 19th century infrastructure, in some places, that we're still utilizing.

There are good things. It builds on the ideas that Chairman Oberstar and I offered 2 years ago to dramatically consolidate the bureaucracy downtown at the Department of Transportation. We don't need to be spending money on 106 different programs that are so complicated that no one knows how to apply, and how to apply the rules, and all that. That's good. We're going to consolidate that. It does some streamlining so projects will get done more quickly.

There are a number of salutary aspects of this bill. But we need to do better by the American people the next time we address that issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a former chairman of our committee, a great Member of this body, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, Members of this body, I want to congratulate the staff, primarily. We mentioned some of them before. The work that they put in this bill is awesome, when they're dealing with the dark side. And you did such a good job of getting things done that we tried to get done in H.R. 7.

I will agree with the gentleman from Oregon about the future and what we have not done in this body because the public still does not believe we need to do what should be done, and that is to pay for the infrastructure through a system that's fair to everyone and quit thinking there's a magic wand to get this job done to build our infrastructure as it should be. We are declining each year.

I would like to thank the chairman also, Mr. MICA. He's absolutely right. When I was chairman, we had a $289 billion, 5-year bill. It's been in place now 8 years. And I'm quite proud of TEA-LU. But the chairman was, yes, with his hands tied, because we did not and have not in the Congress retained what I think is a constitutional right of every Congressman: direct money in directions that they know best, without costing the budget one dime. Now we've transferred this money to the State Departments of Transportation, and I think that's really a wrong way to do it, because they're not elected. They don't know what's best for a State.

But Mr. MICA did an outstanding job. Mr. DUNCAN did an outstanding job. And the staff did an outstanding job to make really a small silk purse out of a sow's ear. But now we have to go forth and do another legislative bill in the very near future and explain it to the public: you don't like those potholes, you don't like that wobbly bridge, then you better support the concept of a user's fee or some way to raise the money, because you won't take it out of the general fund.

We have to do this for America if you want a sound economy. Our economy is based upon energy and the ability to move product to and from. If you don't do that, you don't have the America I know.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

Mr. BOSWELL. I would just like to give my appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. RAHALL, and to you, PETER, and everybody that's worked so hard on this.

Just one comment. We're moving forward. We're going to have jobs. We've done the right thing. It's a good first step. We've got more to do, as was just said. Everybody gives up something.

We've got this control box, if you want to call it, the black box; the recorder that's going to be in all trucks. The Mexican trucks get theirs paid for.

This happens to be a commercial driver's license. I don't know how many of you have got one, but if you want to see one, come look at it sometime. It's a little doing to get one. Owner-operators have to pay for their own. They're making $50,000, $60,000 a year if they're doing a good operation. That's prevalent in trucks running across this country. They're doing a good job. They're keeping commerce moving. We ought to just keep in mind we ought to give those middle class, hardworking, patriotic Americans the consideration they deserve.

But I'm glad we got the bill. I will go out there and work with all of you to try to get it better and get more done, but we've got a good first step.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) be permitted to control the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from West Virginia will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chair of the Science, Space and Technology Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I, of course, rise in support of the conference report accompanying H.R. 4348, a bicameral effort that provides States flexibility and eliminates duplication of effort. I want to thank Chairman MICA for his leadership in this conference and for his outstanding work in negotiating a strong surface transportation reauthorization. The conferees' commitment to reforming Federal surface transportation programs has ensured hardworking taxpayers' dollars are being used more effectively and efficiently.

□ 1110

Chairman MICA actually visited most areas of this country. At a time when we were at home in our districts, he could have been at his home in his district, but he was seeking to empower a bill that sought the greatest good for the greatest number. He worked hard at it. I don't believe in my 32 years here I've ever seen a chairman work so hard to get a bill that was very difficult to start with.

At the outset of the conference, many of us committed to ensuring that surface transportation and restoration funding is used for its intended purpose. As chairman of the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology, I'm pleased that the transportation research programs in the reauthorization are focused on enhancing safety, reducing congestion, and improving quality in the transportation system.

The reauthorization before us provides, among other things, greater flexibility to keep research programs focused, and eliminates a number of unnecessary programs.

The inclusion of language contained in the RESTORE Act illustrates our commitment to the revitalization of those areas harmed by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. The addition of certain transparency requirements and the ability for the gulf States to dedicate funding to research and development and undertaking projects and programs using the best available science ensure the area most impacted will benefit.

I would also like to thank my colleague from Science, Space, and Technology, Mr. CRAVAACK. He worked hard to protect the interest of his constituents in Minnesota, and he was committed to ensuring that we come away with a strong research title. I believe we've done that.

Finally, I'd like to thank the Speaker for the opportunity to work with the Senate to complete a conference report that will provide more certainty to the States and the localities for infrastructure planning purposes.

I believe this bill helps to create jobs for the American people, which is vital in this troubled economy.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Education and Workforce Committee, who has jurisdiction over the student loan section of this conference agreement.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this conference agreement.

Without it, transportation projects would dry up, countless American workers would be thrown out of work, and a college education would cost an additional $1,000 for more than 7 million students and their families.

The benefits of this legislation for millions of Americans will be felt immediately. In my home State of California, this legislation will save or create nearly 180,000 construction jobs rebuilding our highways and bridges and bike paths; and it will save 570,000 California students from going deeper into debt this next academic year. With this conference report, 7 million students across this country will get another year of interest rate relief as they take out their student loans for the coming college year. More than 4.5 million of those will be women, more than 1.5 million of those will be African American, nearly 1 million are Hispanic students, all who are struggling to stay in college. This interest rate relief that we are providing today will help them.

What is happening today, though, is a rare thing in this Congress. It's a victory for college students. It's a victory for low-income families. It's a victory for the middle class. It's a victory that should not be as rare as it is in the Congress today. The American people should thank this win, and we should make sure that we continue to cooperate in this Congress. And we should also make sure that we heed the words of Mr. YOUNG and Mr. DEFAZIO that we have to do more on our infrastructure to make this country a first-rate country going forward in the future.

Thank you very much for yielding me this time, Mr. RAHALL, and for all of your work on this legislation.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the distinguished chair of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, first let me commend Chairman MICA on behalf of this Congress and the American people for the fine work that you and your committee have done on this bill. We'll build more roads with less money and cut through red tape and expedite projects.

I also want to associate myself with the words of DON YOUNG, our former chairman, and of Mr. MILLER from California. You cannot have—the leading country in the world cannot have a Third World infrastructure. And unless we find new funding sources, we will continue to fall behind, and we will continue to have those potholes and bottlenecks.

Now, I want to move to the National Flood Insurance program which is a part of this bill. It also is a win for the American people. This House over a year ago approved comprehensive flood insurance, risk based, that would reduce the cost and bring many benefits to the program. Last week, the Senate sent us a bill which is essentially the bill we sent them over a year ago. It's a bipartisan bill. It was a lot of hard work and input from Members. We passed it overwhelmingly in the Financial Services Committee and overwhelmingly on the floor of this House. I would like to commend Chairwoman BIGGERT for her fine work. Her name is on this bill, and there's a reason for that. She worked harder than anyone in this Congress to deliver a good bill. It's a 5-year bill, and it will begin to make up for the deficit of $17.5 billion that this program has as a result of those hurricanes back in 2005.

I would like to commend the Illinois delegation and the California delegation under Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. COSTA who, sadly, is retiring this year. This bill takes care to balance costs and communities that use their own funds. I urge Members to pass this bill. It's a good bill. It includes many good provisions, and I'm proud to say that the Financial Services Committee and its members have been a part of this effort.

As the legislation to reauthorize and reform the National Flood Insurance Program heads to the President's desk, I would like to acknowledge the time, effort, and wisdom that four members of the Financial Services Committee staff provided to create this positive outcome. These staff members were able to reconcile the differences between the House and Senate bills—working through a host of complex, highly technical issues—in less than one week. The efforts of Clinton Jones, Tallman Johnson, Ed Skala, and Nicole Austin helped all of us to achieve this very beneficial outcome for the American taxpayer, and I thank them for their service to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, first I want to commend Transportation Committee Chairman MICA, Subcommittee Chairman DUNCAN, Ranking Member RAHALL and others for their hard work on the needed transportation and infrastructure improvements in this bill.

I also want to take the time to comment on provisions in this bill regarding reauthorization and reform of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

Today we're doing something we haven't done since 2004: provide a long-term reauthorization with meaningful reforms for the National Flood Insurance Program. Since September 2008, the NFIP has been extended 17 times and the program has lapsed four times during that same time period, creating needless uncertainty in the residential and commercial real estate sectors in communities across the country.

Over a year ago the Financial Services Committee and then the House, in a bipartisan display of cooperation, overwhelmingly passed a five-year flood insurance bill with comprehensive reforms and savings for the taxpayers. This week the Senate approved our legislation.

This bipartisan bill represents the hard work and input of many members, and I especially

want to thank Housing Subcommittee Chairwoman BIGGERT for her leadership in getting us to this point.

This bill takes great care to balance the need to make the NFIP more actuarially sound with the need to recognize the hard work and difficult decisions many communities are making to build or rehabilitate their dams and levees. I particularly want to thank Mr. SHIMKUS for working with us to address those concerns in a responsible way.

Many of us have been calling for fundamental reforms of the NFIP for several years. The hurricanes of 2005 led to massive flooding and overwhelmed the program, which now carries a debt to the Treasury of $17.5 billion as a result.

The NFIP is facing serious financial challenges and cannot afford to continue on its current trajectory, which is why today's bill is vital. The reforms in this bill end the decades-old subsidies for about 355,000 policyholders and reduce the program's need to borrow additional funds from the Treasury, which will help reduce the program's shortfall and protect American taxpayers.

Congress has a responsibility to ensure that the taxpayers are not left holding the bag. This bill puts us on the path to reforming the program with risk-based premiums, and provisions to better protect both taxpayers and homeowners while encouraging greater private sector participation.

Since January of 2011, I have held as a goal of this Congress to achieve fundamental reform of the NFIP. The bill we have before us today accomplishes that in a fair and responsible manner. I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I'm happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a distinguished member of our conference on this agreement.

Ms. NORTON. I thank Chairman MICA and Ranking Member RAHALL for working together on this bill. This year's transportation bill could be named the Jobs Act of 2012 because it is the only bill from the 112th Congress that will create a significant number of jobs.

A word on a couple of significant provisions. Seldom has a pioneering, landmark bill found its way into a transportation reauthorization bill, but in today's bill is the first bill to set national standards for subway safety, bringing subways in line with all other modes of transportation, which have long had national standards. This is probably the most significant provision of this bill.

The DBE language is tailored to ensure that the government is equipped with the tools it must have to address the compelling need for the government to meet its responsibility to continue to address discrimination in small business contracting.

With all of its shortcomings, and there are many, the American people finally will have a jobs bill from this Congress.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), one of the leaders of our committee and the chair of the Rail Subcommittee.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I first would like to thank Chairman MICA and CHAIRMAN DUNCAN for their hard work in producing what I believe is a very solid bill with historic reforms in it. The chairman was a tough negotiator, and he came away with something that I believe we can all be very proud of.

We need to act on this bill. If we don't act, if we fail to act, the trust fund will default. We'd have to figure out a way to bail it out. And yet, here we are with a 2-year bill that is fully funded and has some significant reforms in it.

Those reforms include, first of all, the fact that it is a 2-year bill which puts certainty out there to the States and the companies and people who build roads and highways and supply them with the products that they need. That is extremely important.

Second, it consolidates nearly two-thirds of the programs, which is important in reducing red tape and in streamlining project delivery. That is significant. We believe that will reduce the amount of time it takes to build a significant highway project in half. That's a tremendous savings. When you look at a project I recently visited in Oklahoma City, the Crosstown Expressway, a $680 million job, it took 15 years. If you cut that in half, it saves somewhere between $60 million to $80 million just on the inflation alone. So that's a significant savings, and that's why I believe this bill has great reforms in it. It is something that we all need to get behind and pass.

Again, I want to congratulate the chairman for his great work, and also the staff, all of the staff on the committee, both sides of the aisle. Both sides of the Capitol worked hard, but a special thanks to Jim Coon, Amy Smith, Jennifer Hall, and Jim Tymon for their tireless effort. There were a lot of late nights, but they did a great job, and we owe them a great deal of thanks for what they did.

Again, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I'm happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), another valued conferee on our side.

□ 1120

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the transportation reauthorization conference report with mixed feelings. The conference report provides $105 billion over the next 27 months for highway and transit programs and will put about 2 million people to work at a time when we desperately need jobs. These funding levels, although far from adequate, are a great improvement from the original House bill and will allow transportation agencies to plan and construct projects important to the economy. The conference report also prevents student loan interest rates from doubling, which is critical to more than 7 million students.

The transit funding formulas are focused on regions with the highest need and will provide essential resources for the MTA to maintain a state of good repair and to make capacity improvements to New York City's subway system. It is unfortunate, however, that the ability of transit agencies to flex funding for operating assistance has been dropped from the final bill.

Also, unfortunately, the Transportation Enhancements program, which includes bicycle, pedestrian, and safe routes to schools, is reduced by several hundred million dollars. And the Projects of National Regional Significance account, which provides for essential freight projects, is substantially watered down.

Thankfully, the Keystone pipeline and coal ash provisions are out of the bill. And although the 270-day deeming provision is no longer in the bill, there are other environmental streamlining provisions of concern, such as the expansion of NEPA categorical exclusions for any project within an existing right-of-way. Massive highway projects could occur within an existing right-of-way, but would no longer be subject to NEPA environmental review requirements.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. The final package is a combination of hard-fought victories and losses. Overall, this legislation is essential for creating jobs, preventing interest rates from increasing for millions of students, and putting us on a path toward economic recovery. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the transportation reauthorization conference report, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act or ''MAP–21'' (H.R. 4348).

Madam Speaker, I was honored to be appointed as a member of the conference committee, and I was ready to negotiate in good faith to craft a bill that we could all be proud to support. Unfortunately, the process by which this conference was conducted over the last couple of weeks is a cause for concern and was tarnished by a lack of transparency and bipartisan collaboration. House Democratic conferees were shut out of the final negotiations. Our committee staff was not even allowed in the room. The bill text wasn't made available until 4 a.m. yesterday morning, so we have had a very limited amount of time to review the details of this legislation. Yesterday morning, I declined to sign the conference report simply because I could not endorse a product without an adequate understanding of all of its contents, and of the full impact to New York. Our Senate counterparts appear to have struck a compromise including some important victories, as well as concessions of concern. The final package will provide at least $105 billion over the next two

years for highway and transit programs, putting thousands of people to work at a time when we desperately need jobs. These funding levels are an improvement from the original House bill, and will allow transportation agencies to plan and construct projects important to the economy. The conference report also prevents student loan interest rates from doubling, which is critical for over 7 million students. As such, I will vote for this conference report, but with a number of reservations.

The highway program appears to retain the funding structure from the Senate bill and essentially preserves current funding levels to the states. There were efforts to revise the formula, which could have resulted in cuts to many states, including, potentially, to New York. It should be considered a victory that all states are essentially held harmless and will benefit from this economic recovery and jobs package. The transit funding formulas are also focused on regions with the highest need, and will provide essential resources for the MTA to maintain a state of good repair and to make capacity improvements to New York City's subway system. The transit title requires a report on transit agencies' compliance with existing civil rights laws, and includes an enhanced workforce development grant program, although not as comprehensive as the Transportation Job Corps Act, which I introduced to establish a career ladder apprenticeship program. These are important and positive aspects of the conference agreement. I am extremely disappointed, however, that the Senate bill's temporary and targeted ability for transit agencies to flex funding for operating assistance has been dropped from the final agreement.

The bill retains the Projects of National and Regional Significance Account as a competitive grant program that we first established in SAFETEA-LU, but the provision is greatly watered down and is rendered largely symbolic. The authorization level is scaled back to $500 million for one year in FY13, and the funding is not guaranteed, but subject to general fund appropriations. The Transportation Appropriations bill for FY13 has already been considered in the House. It passed just yesterday, and there was no funding for this program contained in it. Perhaps we will get lucky and secure funding for it when the appropriations bill is conferenced with the Senate later this year, but the spending levels in that bill are already much too low and resources are strained. It's hard to see how any significant funding will be dedicated over the life of this bill to these projects that are essential to freight movement, economic growth, and global competitiveness. There is a requirement that DOT prepare a report on potential projects that would be funded under the program, so some work in this area will continue, but it is wholly inadequate.

The National Freight Program originally in the Senate bill is not in the conference report, but the designation of a primary freight network and development of a national freight strategic plan is retained. For too long, freight has been too low of a priority, and this must be changed. We must make the efficient movement of freight a national priority. There is no greater transportation issue in the federal interest, and I hope that the measures contained in the conference report will be a stepping stone to a greater federal emphasis on freight policy and funding—and not an end result.

The Transportation Enhancements program, which is now called Transportation Alternatives and includes bicycle, pedestrian, and safe routes to schools, is still in the conference report, but the program is weakened from current law and from the Senate bill. These projects have bipartisan support, as evidenced by the Cardin-Cochran amendment to the Senate bill, and the Petri amendment to the House bill. Despite the broad support for transportation enhancements, the conference report lowers the overall amount of funding for these projects by several hundred million, and expands the ability for states to use this funding for other purposes, including for projects already eligible under other highway programs.

The Senate should be commended for keeping the Keystone Pipeline out of the bill, as well as the provisions limiting EPA authority to regulate coal ash. These are important concessions that were undoubtedly difficult to secure. The RESTORE Act, which would dedicate 80% of the fines levied on BP to Gulf Coast oil spill restoration, is still in the bill, but it is unfortunate that the provision directing funding through the Land and Water Conservation Fund did not survive.

There are problematic environmental streamlining provisions. Although the 270 day ''deeming'' provision is no longer in the bill, there are several changes to the NEPA process that will undercut environmental reviews and public participation. The bill sets accelerated, hard deadlines for environmental reviews, with penalties for failure to comply, but ignores the fact that many agencies are too understaffed and underfunded to be able to meet these deadlines. Or perhaps that's the point—to deplete these agencies of resources, and make it virtually impossible for them to effectively do their job. The bill also expands NEPA categorical exclusions, which are typically reserved for smaller-scale projects that will not have a significant impact and therefore no EIS is required. One provision allows categorical exclusions for any project within an existing operational right of way. Massive highway projects could occur within an existing right-of-way, but would no longer be subject to NEPA requirements. I find it curious that many of the Members who espouse local control pushed this provision that will severely limit the ability of communities directly impacted to have a voice in proposed projects. There is bipartisan support for environmental streamlining. I believe there are common sense things we could do to shorten project delivery time, but this conference agreement goes too far in this regard.

The conference agreement includes several important safety incentive grant programs, including those targeting distracted and impaired driving. The bill includes additional incentive grants for states that adopt mandatory alcohol ignition interlock laws for individuals convicted of a DUI. Ignition interlocks are a key feature of Leandra's Law, a New York statute named for one of my constituents, a 9 year old girl who was killed in a drunk driving incident. I am thankful that the conference report contains this important provision. The conference report also does not include any increases to truck size or weight requirements and it includes a study which could provide useful information on truck size and weight safety impacts. The bill also includes improvements to motorcoach safety, requiring seat belts and establishing roof strength and crush resistance standards. However, these standards apply only to newly-manufactured motorcoaches, and there is no mandate to retrofit existing buses.

This final package is a combination of hard fought victories and losses. There are several aspects of it that I do not support, and the process by which this conference report was developed was, at times, regrettable. But the funding levels and distributions to the states and transit agencies should be considered a victory, especially given the position of House Republicans, and the bill will put a lot of people back to a work at a time when we need it most. Because of the positive aspects of the transportation bill, and the extension of lower student loan interest rates, I will vote for the conference report.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to one of the distinguished leaders in the House, the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), who had a great deal to do with the flood insurance provisions—worked tirelessly.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the chairman for giving me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report and wish to address particularly title II, which would reauthorize for 5 years the National Flood Insurance Program, or NFIP.

There are six important reforms included in this bill: It improves NFIP's financial stability; it will reduce the burden on taxpayers; it restores integrity to the FEMA mapping system; it will help bring certainty to the housing market through a 5-year reauthorization; and last, it explores ways to increase private market participation.

Many of us in Congress would like for the private sector, instead of taxpayers, to shoulder the risk of the National Flood Insurance Program. Market participants have signaled that they can assume the risk of flood insurance. And with the appropriate data from FEMA, the reinsurance industry has indicated that within weeks it can price this risk. That's why, for the first time in the NFIP's existence, this flood reform measure will require FEMA to solicit bids to determine the cost to the private sector, not to the taxpayer, of bearing the risk of flood insurance.

Finally, I'd just like to say that this bill is proof that bipartisanship is possible, particularly when it comes to an issue of national significance, such as the most frequently occurring national disaster in the United States, flooding. When a flood occurs, it does not choose an area that has Republican or Democrat leanings or elected officials. Floods affect most of the country and people of all walks of life. Today's flood reform measure demonstrates the democratic process, where reforms are publicly vetted, reflect input from interested stakeholders, and are realized.

Let me just thank the bill's cosponsor, Ms. WATERS, as well as Chairman BACHUS and the Financial Services Insurance Subcommittee and full committee staffs on both sides of the aisle. Let me just say also that I'd like to thank the Senate and House leadership, including Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR, as well as the thousands of constituents and groups who gave their valuable time and input to making this a very good bill.

I rise in support of this Conference Report, and I wish to address in particular Title II, which would reauthorize for five years the National Flood Insurance Program or NFIP.

There are six important reforms included in this bill:

It improves NFIP's financial stability; it will reduce the burden on taxpayers; it restores integrity to the FEMA mapping system; it will help bring certainty to the housing market through a 5-year reauthorization; and last, it explores ways to increase private market participation.

Many of us in Congress would like for the private-sector—instead of taxpayers—to shoulder the risk of the National Flood Insurance Program. Market participants have signaled that they can assume the risk of flood insurance, and with the appropriate data from FEMA, the reinsurance industry has indicated that—within weeks—it can price this risk.

That's why, for the first time in the NFIP's existence, this flood reform measure will require FEMA to solicit bids to determine the cost to the private sector, not to the taxpayer, of bearing the risk of flood insurance.

It brings an end to the decades-old, chicken-and-egg game that has characterized the program by finally answering the question "how-do-we-get-the-government-out?"

Flood policyholders also now will have the option to choose private flood insurance over government flood insurance without the risk of lender rejection. Taxpayer-subsidized rates are eliminated, so that the private sector can offer consumers increasingly competitive rates as compared to the NFIP.

Finally, I would like to simply say that this bill is proof that bipartisanship is possible, particularly when it comes to an issue of national significance, such as the most frequently occurring natural disaster in the United States, flooding. When a flood occurs, it does not choose an area due to its Republican or Democrat leanings or elected representatives. Floods affect most of the country and people of all walks of life. Today's flood reform measure demonstrates a true, democratic process, where reforms are publically vetted, reflect input from interested stakeholders, and are realized.

With that, I will note that this conference report includes the first significant reform to the NFIP in nearly a decade. After 17 extensions since 2008, multiple lapses in the program, and months of inaction, this flood insurance reform measure is a major bipartisan accomplishment. As I've said from the beginning, the NFIP is too important to let lapse and too in debt to continue without reform. I urge my House—and Senate—colleagues to support the conference report so that we can send this agreement to the President's desk and put the nation's flood insurance program back on a sound financial footing.

In closing, let me thank the bill's cosponsor, Mrs. WATERS, as well as Chairman BAUCUS, Financial Services Insurance Subcommittee and full committee staffs on both sides of the aisle, Senate and House Leadership, including Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR, as well as the thousands of constituents and groups who gave their valuable time and input to making this a very good bill.

I would also like to thank the following:

My constituents in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois who provided advice to us throughout the development of this bill;

Illinois floodplain managers, Paul Osman and Sally McConkey;

Mrs. WATERS, Chairman BACHUS, and all of the 54 Members of the House Financial Services Committee who voted unanimously to pass out of Committee a flood reform bill last May (2011);

All of the Members of the House who contributed to the development of this bill, and the 406 Members of the House who voted for H.R. 1309 last July (2011);

Republican House Financial Services Committee staff: my designee, Nicole Austin, as well as Clinton Jones, Ed Skala, Tallman Johnson, Jim Clinger, and Eric Thompson;

Democrat House Financial Services Committee staff: Charla Ouertatani, Dom McCoy, and Kelly Larkin;

House Republican and Democrat leadership, particularly Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader CANTOR, and their staff;

Members and staff on the Science, Judiciary, and Rules Committees;

Senators and Senate Banking Committee staff;

Dan Hoople with the Congressional Budget Office;

Paul Callen and his colleagues at the House Office of the Legislative Counsel;

FEMA staff, including technical experts, congressional affairs, and Vince Fabrizio;

Witnesses who testified during our hearings on flood reform; and

All of the various financial services organizations, consumer groups, as well as the Smarter Safer Coalition, which includes groups from the National Wildlife Federation to the International Code Council to Americans for Tax Reform.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member on our Railroads Subcommittee and a valued member of our conference, the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I had much higher hopes for this transportation reauthorization bill and long for the days that our committee worked together in a bipartisan manner, but this is a good day for the traveling public and for the American economy. This transportation bill will strengthen our infrastructure, provide quality jobs, and serve as a tool to put the American people back to work.

Although I would have preferred a long-term bill with much more funding for infrastructure, and I'm disappointed that we did not include a rail title or give our local transit agencies the flexibility they asked for during these economic times, this bill will give States, local governments, and other transportation stakeholders some stability to plan and build critical transportation projects.

This bill provides steady funding for both highway and transit programs, maintains the 80–20 split between highway and transit, speeds up the permitting process for projects, includes important safety measures that will save lives, and maintains OSHA oversight of hazardous materials.

I am also pleased that this legislation includes the RESTORE Act, which will help gulf States like my State of Florida recover damages and plan for and prevent future oil spills. Florida's economy is based on tourism and would be destroyed overnight if an oil spill reached our beaches.

This isn't a perfect bill, but I am going to vote for it. I want to thank the Senate, and I want to thank Senator BOXER, Mr. MICA and Mr. RAHALL, and all for working together. My understanding is that this is a clean bill and we can vote for it. No riders are included is my understanding. So I will vote for it, and I will recommend my colleagues vote for it too.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to one of the leaders of transportation, new on the committee, but a conferee; did an outstanding job, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, as a member of the House transportation conference committee, I join my colleagues in proudly supporting this legislation.

My House colleagues and I attended many of the conference negotiations, and we fought hard for commonsense transportation reforms. This bill streamlines the environmental review process, consolidates and eliminates duplicative programs, and provides more flexibility to the States. Passing this legislation will provide job security for millions of Americans.

I'm grateful to my House and Senate colleagues that stood with me in opposing an amendment that was in the Senate bill. This amendment unfairly punished the State of Indiana for pursuing a public-private partnership. Not only would it have cost Indiana millions in transportation funding, but it would have set our country backwards in innovative transportation policy. This type of thinking is not where we need to be headed in transportation policy. We need to put taxpayers first and continue to engage the private sector in transportation projects.

I would like to thank the House and Senate staff, who have been working tirelessly on the legislation. I thank Chairman MICA, Senator BOXER, and Senator INHOFE for their leadership on this issue. Thanks to everybody's work, 25,000 Hoosiers will have job security for the next 2 years.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation, and let's put millions of Americans back to work.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member on our Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as a valued member of our conference on transportation, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you, Ranking Member RAHALL, and thank you for your leadership. I also thank Chairman MICA and all of my colleagues.

This bill provides certainty for our States, but overall funding for highways is reduced relative to fiscal year 2011. To ensure our Nation's mobility, we need expanded investments in all modes.

Critically, this bill finds that discrimination and related barriers continue to pose obstacles for minority and women-owned business in the transportation industry. My colleagues and I have considered the extensive evidence provided to us in testimony in the Transportation Committee and detailed disparity studies documenting ongoing discrimination in transportation contracting. We've concluded there is a compelling national interest in reauthorizing our DBE programs. I thank Senator BOXER for her leadership on this issue.

That said, I'm disappointed that House Democrats' participation in the conference was so limited. And as I have had the chance to review the final report, several of its provisions deeply concern me—perhaps none more so than section 100124, which would reduce by one-third the percent of food aid shipped on U.S. vessels.

There are fewer than 100 U.S.-flagged vessels in the foreign trade now, and they carry less than 2 percent of U.S. cargos. Without the MSP and cargo preference programs, we would have no domestic merchant marine, leaving our military, and indeed, our economy, completely dependent on foreign vessels.

□ 1130

The effect of section 100124 will be to speed the continuing decline of our fleet. It should never have been included in this bill, and it should be immediately repealed.

With that, I am going to support the bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), who has worked very hard for a provision, and she's going to explaining the situation that brings her here at this point.

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and ranking member and the conference committee, for what I think is a victory today. I think this reauthorization bill is one of the most important responsibilities we have. It's a jobs bill. It will bring efficiencies to our funding stream for very important projects, and it will remove a lot of uncertainty.

As a member of this committee, I'm really, really pleased that we were able to come to a compromise. The efficiencies and the streamlining, when the chairman brought the committee to Yeager Airport, that was one of the resounding complaints about current funding in the transportation sector is it takes too long, it's too expensive, and time is money. And we can do a lot better job with more efficiencies and make our dollars go farther. And with hard deadlines and some exemptions, I think that this bill will do that.

There are a couple of provisions in here that I regret were not included, and most specifically, the provision on the coal ash provision. I mean, we're looking at a time where we have scant resources. We have to make smart decisions about how to weave the balance between our environment and our economy; and the coal ash provision would have provided, I think, the certainty to the construction industry and to those surrounding, also, the coal industry that smart use and responsible use of coal ash would be in our future.

Unfortunately—and I believe it occurred in the Senate that that provision was not included in our bill, and I'm deeply disappointed by that. But we will, as an energy State and as energy representatives, we'll live to fight another day.

Additionally, I would like to say, as a member of the Financial Services Committee as well, the reason that the flood bill is on this bill is extremely important, again, to lend the certainty to lenders, Realtors, homebuilders, and really, the consumer that we can get that housing market moving again; and the certainty provided by the reauthorization of the flood bill in here will provide us with that.

But I simply want to say that I think that in a bicameral, bipartisan way we moved together to show folks in West Virginia and across this Nation that we can work together to create the jobs that we need in the sectors that we need, and I look forward to supporting the bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who has higher jurisdiction over the flood insurance portion.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased that we could work in a bipartisan fashion to not only extend our expiring transportation and student loan interest rate programs, but to also reform the Federal flood insurance program.

I'd like to thank Representative JUDY BIGGERT for her leadership and commitment to reforming flood insurance. Representative BIGGERT and I both worked together to meet the needs of our respective caucuses, and the result is a bill that puts the flood insurance program on a solid footing.

The flood insurance program provides insurance for over 5 million Americans. However, due to massive losses from Hurricane Katrina and an inefficient mapping system, the flood insurance program has faced challenges in serving homeowners and taxpayers.

The Biggert-Waters bill will reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program for 5 years and make critical improvements to the flood insurance program. The reforms in this bill will make flood insurance more affordable, give communities more input into flood maps, and strengthen the financial position of the flood insurance program.

With that, I would urge an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER), another conferee and a young leader in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Thank you, Chairman MICA. And I'd like to thank you and your staff for working tirelessly on this issue.

For the past several months, both House and Senate Members and staff have been working around the clock, and through tough negotiations we were able to work in a bipartisan, bicameral way to produce something that has direct impact on the lives of the folks I serve in southwest Washington.

I'm well aware the perception that this Congress is having difficulty getting things done, and I fought for us to stay at the table to keep working to push through for solutions to demonstrate our ability to put America's needs ahead of politics; and today, Madam Speaker, we were successful.

Particularly folks in my home district in southwest Washington State are excited that the House fought for vital reforms that are going to allow us to cut project delivery times down, even by half in some instances. That means dollars are going to go further, more projects are going to get done, and more money will be available for additional projects. That sets us up for more jobs.

We're also giving rural communities the necessary support to fund schools, emergency services, and roads while we come up with a more permanent solution that allows for increased and better forest management. My thanks to Chairman HASTINGS and his committee for their tireless work on this issue.

We also have projects of national and regional significance: the Recreational Trails Program that benefits trail riders, hikers, outdoor enthusiasts, all in my beautiful district down in southwest Washington.

We've supported using the Harbor and Maintenance Trust Fund for its intended purposes: improving our waterways that are economic arteries for places like Washington State and around the country.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not perfect, no bill ever is. However, this is a symbol of how Congress is supposed to operate and why we're here.

With that, I urge its passage.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE), a valued member of our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, it's been 7 years since the Congress enacted a long-term highway authorization; and since that law expired in 2009, State transportation agencies across America have had to deal with the uncertainty of looming funding expirations, construction workers have not known whether there would be jobs available to them, and motorists, retailers, and manufacturers have watched our infrastructure continue to crumble as this body continually failed to act. We cannot wait any longer. That's why I'm pleased today Congress will finally pass a long-term authorization that will provide certainty that has been lacking for years.

I'm also pleased that the final conference report includes a provision I authored to make America's roads safer for older drivers. By improving the safety of our roads and highways and making older drivers' travel as safe as possible, we increase road safety for every American.

This bill is an example of the success Congress can achieve when we work together. I thank my colleagues for their dedication to our Nation's infrastructure, and I'm proud to support this bill.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I'd like to inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from West Virginia has 14½ minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman from West Virginia is ready to close, I am ready to close, also.

Mr. RAHALL. Okay. I'm ready to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, first I want to extend my deep appreciation to all conferees on this legislation, some 47, I believe.

I'd like to pay particular word of commendation to the chair of the conference committee, the gentlelady from California, Senator BARBARA BOXER. She worked extremely hard on this legislation. She worked tirelessly to resist many, many, many extreme proposals that were lobbed at her by Republican House conferees. She worked to ensure that policies and investment levels of this legislation will serve America, and she did work in a bipartisan fashion.

I'd also like to thank my counterpart and the chair of our House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. MICA, for his leadership. He has already spoken, and has many times, of the bipartisan nature in which we started this journey in my hometown of Beckley, West Virginia, and I deeply appreciate the hearings that he started there and his continued outreach across the country.

□ 1140

As this hard road progressed, there were some diversions along the way. There were efforts to sidetrack what we were trying to do in providing long-term funding for this Nation's infrastructure, yet we're here today to hail not the perfect bill—we've heard that many times in this body, and we're not considering the perfect bill. Yet we are, out of necessity, finding ourselves working together to extend our transportation program so that millions more American workers are not laid off the job.

I also want to thank my senior Senator, JAY ROCKEFELLER, the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, for his great contribution to this pending measure. Again, efforts were fought. Efforts on his part prevented the further degradation of any safety measures that were proposed in this conference agreement. We have a strong measure in regards to safety issues thanks to Senator ROCKEFELLER.

This legislation will preserve American jobs. As I said in the opening of this conference committee, it's time that we quit taking those political jabs at one another and, rather, provide jobs for our people. That's what we're doing in this legislation. The contracting season is late, especially in many of our northern States, and our contractors need this legislation in order to have the certainty to sign those contracts that put Americans to work this summer repairing our infrastructure. We have put aside, I guess you'll say, our hard heads—I'm happy to say—in exchange for hard hats doing the work that's necessary to get our economy back on.

As with any piece of legislation, we've compromised in this bill—all sides have—which is part of the legislative process. I've always said that. There are some things in this bill we don't like and some things we like. There are probably 435 different ways this bill could have been written if each of us had had his own way to write a bill, but that's not the way the process works. With the process being what it is, we are where we are today, so I am here to support the pending legislation.

As I sit down, I want to also thank the staff for their hard work on both the majority's side in the House and on the minority's side, on our side, and the staff on both sides of the other body as well.

I want to thank our conferees on the House side: PETER DEFAZIO, JERRY COSTELLO, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, JERRY NADLER, CORRINE BROWN, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, LEONARD BOSWELL, and TIM BISHOP. These individuals stuck with us every part of the way, and they truly had their hearts in improving our infrastructure and providing jobs for America.

So this is a jobs bill. I'm happy to support it, and I urge my colleagues to support this conference agreement.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, it is good to be at this point in the completion of a long overdue, major transportation reform bill for the Congress and for the American people.

First, I will take a moment and thank our staff:

Jim Tymon, who is next to me here, is the tireless staff director of the Highway Subcommittee. He is day and night helping to sort things out, looking out for the people and making certain this bill has the very best provisions; Dan Veoni; Shant Boyajian; Geoff Strobeck; Joyce Rose; Fred Miller; Steve Martinko; Justin Harclerode, who is my press secretary, or assistant. He has always had to explain what I've said or at least clarify; Jason Rosa; my sidekick, Clint Hines, who has followed me on the floor with so many member requests; Jennifer Hall, our outstanding legal counsel; Amy Smith has some real firepower for good policy for the country and for transportation for the Nation; and then our untiring leader of the committee, Jim Coon, our staff director, who day and night neglected his beautiful family for the benefit of the people of this country;

Then we even retired Jimmy Miller in the process, who headed this up for many, many years in the service to our Nation and the committee. He retired in the process, hopefully not as a result of all the hard work. He is a great American;

Then there is Stephanie Kopelousos, who was on our team for a while. She is the former Secretary of Transportation from Florida, and she organized the Secretaries around the United States—I think the forward-thinking ones—to help us go through the laws and all the mess that we've created and redline it and get rid of the bureaucracy, the duplication, the costly red tape.

So our hats are off to all of them and to so many more and to all of our distinguished colleagues who were conferees who worked on this.

We actually engaged members in discussion, which is a new approach to a conference committee. We did that, but I'm sorry the other side was thrown under the bus, some by the administration, and particularly Mr. Oberstar, for whom I feel so bad because he waited so long and could never see this day. Then, in the process, we did not draft the legislation; Ms. BOXER's staff did. So, again, if there was anyone who felt that he didn't participate enough, I tried not to be responsible for that approach in having started, as I said, the first hearing in Beckley, West Virginia, Mr. RAHALL's hometown, going all the way to the west coast to have an unprecedented, historic bipartisan and bicameral hearing in California with BARBARA BOXER, who chaired the conference committee.

So this is where we are. Tomorrow would actually close down thousands of transportation projects. Departments of Transportation around the country were on the verge of actually giving sort of IOUs or of giving notification to close down, and probably millions would have been put out of work if we hadn't acted. So this is very important for the American people, particularly at this time when we're on the cusp of not knowing which way the economy is going to go, but it has to go forward.

There are some things in here that are also great: the RESTORE Act; student loans from which our students will benefit; national flood insurance from which people in my States and others will see reductions; transportation safety was paramount; there was a consolidation of some of the programs, streamlining, cutting red tape. We were able to do more with less and move transportation forward for the Nation.

Again, I thank everyone for their cooperation. I am pleased that we've reached this point. It doesn't have everything, and a lot of people said it couldn't be done. As my son often says—and I'll close with his remarks, and he likes the Cable Guy—''Dad, git-r-done.''

Son, we got-r-done today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement on H.R. 4348, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012.

As a conferee on the surface transportation bill, I am glad an agreement was reached and the bill is before us today.

I am pleased that Illinois' share of federal highway formula funding increased to 3.67%, the highest level that our state has received in over 15 years.

In addition, the conference report does not include language that would allow bigger and heavier trucks on our roads and bridges, but instead requires the U.S. DOT to conduct a comprehensive, national study.

While the surface transportation conference report is not perfect, it does provide certainty to State DOTs, transit agencies, and contractors that will help create and sustain jobs for out-of-work Americans and keeps construction workers on the job for the rest of the season.

I commend Chairman MICA, Ranking Member RAHALL, Subcommittee Chairman DUNCAN and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their leadership in helping to bring this conferenc report before us today.

Finally, this legislation does not include residual risk provisions in the National Flood Insurance program that would have required the purchase of flood insurance for communities behind certified levees. A strong bi-partisan effort prevailed to remove these provisions from this legislation, and I commend Congressman SHIMKUS, Senator DURBIN, and Senator KIRK for working with me on this matter.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report and yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4348, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21). This bill significantly cuts critical federal investment in surface transportation projects for the territories. The authorized funds for the next two fiscal years would severely undermine my district's ability to improve and upgrade road systems on Guam and put current projects at risk.

MAP–21 cuts 20 percent from the Territorial Highway Program (THP), which was established to assist Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa and the U.S. Virgin Islands build and improve main and secondary highway systems. The program is critical to ensuring that our districts have a quality highway system that facilitates commerce in the territories. The territories have received funding that does match their current upgrade and modernization requirements. The cuts to the THP will hinder our district's ability to meet these requirements over the next two years. The proposed cut to this program, about $8 million for Guam over the next two years, could jeopardize financiering for larger projects utilizing GARVEE financing. The GARVEE financing mechanism and current bonds assumed level funding of the THP over the next several years. Ultimately, this bill may lead to project cancellations and job losses.

Even at current funding levels, the THP is inadequate in addressing the needs of the territories, and the governments in the territories do not have access to many programs available to the 50 states and Puerto Rico. I introduced legislation that would put the territories on equal footing when competing for federal highway discretionary grant programs. Further, I offered the text of my bill for consideration as Conference Committee commenced but the text of this legislation was not included in the final bill. On top of crippling cuts to the THP, the territories are not even afforded opportunities to compete for other discretionary programs like the Innovative Bridge Research and Deployment program. My bill, H.R. 2743 would permit the Secretary of Transportation to make the territories eligible for this competitive funding to the territories and remedies a disparity where our governments are unable to even compete for this program.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4348 will likely have a detrimental effect on my constituents and would significantly undercut our ability to improve our roadways and invest in critical infrastructure improvements. Guam is being asked to support one of the largest military realignments in our nation's history and our island is in critical need of assistance to improve our roadways to support the military buildup. Cutting 20 percent from the THP would provide nominal short-term savings but it would cost significantly more in the long-term.

However, I am very supportive of the efforts of House and Senate leaders who reached agreement to freeze student loan rates for an additional year. Increases in student loan rates would have had a significant negative impact on a generation that is already competing with the most difficult job market in generations. Keeping student loan interest loans for an additional year keeps our commitment to our younger generations.

It is unfortunate that this compromise on student loans is attached to the transportation reauthorization as I strongly opposed to the cuts to the THP and, as such, urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4018, the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act, of which I am a cosponsor, and I thank my colleague from across the Delaware River, Mr. FITZPATRICK, for his work on this extremely important issue.

During the early morning hours of August 28, 2011, as Central New Jersey was bearing the brunt of Tropical Storm Irene, the Princeton First Aid and Rescue Squad was called to investigate a vehicle submerged in raging floodwaters with the occupants possibly trapped inside. Michael Kenwood, a 39-year-old volunteer emergency medical and rescue technician, entered the water tied to his partner in an attempt to reach the stranded vehicle. The two quickly realized that the current was too strong and tried to turn back, but Michael lost his footing and was sucked into the current. When he was pulled from the water, Michael was unconscious and not breathing. Michael died later that day, leaving behind a wife, Beth, and 3-year-old daughter, Laney. The submerged car turned out to be empty.

Michael's death was a tragedy. But what compounded this tragic situation was the fact that, under current law, Michael's family was not eligible for federal death benefits because he was a volunteer member of a non-profit organization. This is just wrong. Michael's sacrifice would be no different if he had been a member of a paid fire department or EMS agency, and federal law should treat it as such. When he was called to enter those floodwaters, Michael did not stop to think, ''I don't get paid for this should I do this?'' He answered the call just like thousands upon thousands of others do each and every day, risking their lives in the service of others, regardless of whether or not they are paid.

This legislation would expand federal benefit programs for the women and men who volunteer for fire departments and rescue squads and are injured or killed in the line of duty. Quite simply, it is the right thing to do. I am glad to see this bill being brought to the floor and I urge my colleagues to support it here today.

Last Saturday, Michael's name was added to the National EMS Memorial in Colorado Springs, Colorado. I would ask that my colleagues join me in remembering Michael's sacrifice, and those made by the other police officers, firefighters, and emergency medical responders who put their lives on the line each and every day to protect ours.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, the Conference Agreement on H.R. 4348, Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012 unfairly places the financial burden on the smaller territories—American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI), Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Island (USVI). Specifically, the agreement would result in a 20-percent reduction for each of the smaller territories under the Territorial and Puerto Rico highway program (Div A, Title 1, Subtitle A, Section 1114) for FY 2013 and FY 2014.

The territorial highway program underscores federal commitments to sustain economic development in the territories as well as to ensure safe highways in our communities. Funding from the territorial highway program has provided for the construction and improvement of highways and roads, critical infrastructure for commerce and transportation in the territories.

Mr. Speaker, any cuts to these critical funding could prove devastating to the economies of the smaller territories, yet we face the same challenges—the high cost of energy and transportation—as everyone else across the country.

Similarly, the initial version of the Highway Reauthorization bill that the House passed earlier this year would have replaced the Highway Trust Fund as the funding source for the Territorial Highway Program, with a less stable source.

For these reasons, the territorial delegates wrote a joint letter to the Conference Committee on April 26. We specifically highlighted the need to maintain the current funding levels for the territorial program. In addition, we asked that the territories be made eligible for certain discretionary grants and planning grants programs.

I am pleased that the conference agreement would keep the Highway Trust Fund as the funding source for the Territorial Highway Program. While I am disappointed to know that the smaller territories are given the brunt of the budgetary cuts to bear, I am hopeful however that the territories would be made eligible for certain discretionary grants and planning grants programs. These additional grants could help mitigate some of the financial issues as a result of the proposed reduction.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, a rare thing has happened today. Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate have reached a compromise for the greater good of the American people. Today we will vote on three critical measures: a long-term transportation extension, a long-term flood insurance extension, and a one-year continuation of current rates for need-based student loans.

Each of these is of critical importance to our nation's economic recovery. This legislation will create or save more than 2 million jobs, including approximately 9,000 in Rhode Island, by authorizing highway and transit programs through 2014.

Unfortunately, in order to secure an agreement, the conferees included some provisions in this bill with which I disagree. I am disappointed that the legislation threatens critical environmental funding and protections and fails to expand funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which provides matching grants for our state to acquire land and water for the benefit of all Rhode Islanders. I will work to restore these resources in the future, but on balance this is a good agreement that will benefit communities and workers across our state.

I am also pleased that this measure prevents the Stafford loan interest rate from doubling to 6.8 percent on July 1 for 7 million college students, saving them $1,000 over the life of their loans. However, I am concerned that the bill cuts the student loan program by limiting the amount of time a student qualifies for a loan to 150 percent of the program's length and eliminates the six-month interest subsidy grace period after a student has graduated. Too many students—especially those from low-income families—face unnecessary barriers to pursuing a college degree, and it is our responsibility to empower them by investing in their education.

Thousands of jobs in Rhode Island have been on hold, waiting for Congress to act This delay was needless, and this legislation is long overdue. Nowhere is our nation's fragile recovery more apparent than in my home state of Rhode Island, with an unemployment rate of 11 percent. I applaud the Conferees for their tireless efforts to craft this compromise, which will bring loan relief to our students, provide flood insurance to our homeowners, and allow our states and cities to move forward on the path to rebuilding our roads, our communities, and our economy.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the underlying bill, the Conference Report to H.R. 4348, legislation that will keep student loans affordable for more than 7 million students: 4.5 million of whom are women, 1.5 million of whom are African-American, and nearly one million of whom are Latino.

This legislation will prevent interest rates on need-based student loans from doubling on July 1st, from 3.4 to 6.8 percent and provide much-needed relief to students and families.

This will save students an average of $1,000 over the life of their loan. In my home state of Texas, approximately 461,533 borrowers will benefit from this congressional action.

As you know, student debt is skyrocketing, with the average borrower graduating with loan debt of $25,000. According to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, total outstanding student loan debt surpassed $1 trillion late last year.

As Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill and to work in a bipartisan manner to reaffirm Congress' strong commitment to accessibility and affordability in higher education.

Together, we must address the rising cost of higher education and the ever-increasing amount of debt that students are being burdened with.

Young people in our communities must know that Congress is working hard to ensure that they have a bright future and access to an affordable, high-quality education—one that prepares them to lead healthy and prosperous lives.

With that, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4348, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21). This bill significantly cuts critical federal investment in surface transportation projects for the territories. The authorized funds for the next two fiscal years would severely undermine my district's ability to improve and upgrade road systems on Guam and put current projects at risk.

MAP–21 cuts 20% from the Territorial Highway Program (THP), which was established to assist Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa and the U.S. Virgin Islands build and improve main and secondary highway systems. The program is critical to ensuring that our districts have a quality highway system that facilitates commerce in the territories. The territories have received funding that does match their current upgrade and modernization requirements. The cuts to the THP will hinder our district's ability to meet these requirements over the next two years. The proposed cut to this program, about $8 million for Guam over the next two years, could jeopardize financiering for larger projects utilizing TIFIA financing. The TIFIA financing mechanism and current bonds assumed level funding of the THP over the next several years. Ultimately, this bill may lead to project cancellations and job losses.

Even at current funding levels, the THP is inadequate in addressing the needs of the territories, and the governments in the territories do not have access to many programs available to the 50 states and Puerto Rico. I introduced legislation that would put the territories on equal footing when competing for federal highway discretionary grant programs. Further, I offered the text of my bill for consideration as Conference Committee commenced but the text of this legislation was not included in the final bill. On top of crippling cuts to the THP, the territories are not even afforded opportunities to compete for other discretionary programs like the Innovative Bridge Research and Deployment program. My bill, H.R. 2743 would permit the Secretary of Transportation to make the territories eligible for this competitive funding to the territories, and remedies a disparity where our governments are unable to even compete for this program.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4348 will likely have a detrimental effect on my constituents and would significantly undercut our ability to improve our roadways and invest in critical infrastructure improvements. Guam is being asked to support one of the largest military realignments in our nation's history and our island is in critical need of assistance to improve our roadways to support the military buildup. Cutting 20% from the THP would provide nominal short-term savings but it would cost significantly more in the long-term.

However, I am very supportive of the efforts of House and Senate leaders who reached agreement to freeze student loan rates for an additional year. Increases in student loan rates would have had a significant negative impact on a generation that is already competing with the most difficult job market in generations. Keeping student loan interest loans for an additional year keeps our commitment to our younger generations.

It is unfortunate that this compromise on student loans is attached to the transportation reauthorization as I am strongly opposed to the cuts to the THP and, as such, urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in reluctant support of the Transportation and Student Loan Agreement (H.R. 4348). We must prevent interest rates on student loans from doubling as they are set to do tomorrow. We must reauthorize our transportation programs and get people to work rebuilding our

infrastructure. This legislation, while far from ideal, accomplishes both of those worthy goals.

The bill does leave much to be desired. It invests far too little in the infrastructure investments we need, it restricts the ability of part-time students to afford college, underfunds transit, biking, and pedestrian projects, its ''Buy America'' provision is weak, and it includes a pay-for that could further weaken our pension system. However, given the situation we are in, passing it today is the responsible thing to do.

Continuing their trend of governing through hostage taking and brinksmanship, the Republican Majority has once again brought the nation to the edge of a vital program—in this case, Surface Transportation—expiring. More than three months ago, the Senate overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan, job-creating transportation bill with 74 votes. Instead of taking up that bill, as myself and many of my colleagues and the President urged, Republicans brought up a hyper-partisan bill that included numerous anti-environmental riders, gutted mass transit, and ended investments in pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. Compared to that debacle, today's legislation is a vast improvement. It does not contain provisions mandating that the tar sands pipeline be built or that EPA rules on safe disposal of coal ash be undermined. Instead of slashing mass transit, it maintains funding. Most importantly, it will support more than 2 million American jobs, including 180,000 in California, rebuilding our nation and providing some certainty for California and other states to move forward with much needed infrastructure projects.

The student loan issue is another example, much like the payroll tax cut at the end of last year, of Republicans refusing to act in the interest of the American people until their hand is forced by overwhelmingly public opinion. On March 29th, House Republicans voted to allow student loan interest rates to double when they passed the Ryan Budget. They voted to increase rates on 7 million students, including 570,000 California students—the equivalent of a $1,000 education tax on these students and their families. After hearing an outcry from the public and feeling political pressure to act, the majority finally changed their tune. I wish that the interest rate fix we are voting on today was for longer than a year and I also wish we were not paying for it, in part, by punishing part-time students by taking away interest deferment for those students. But compared to allowing the interest rate hike staring millions of students in the face to go into effect, passing this legislation is the right thing to do.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Highway Conference Report. This bill helps to provide the funding that cities and towns depend on to develop and maintain the infrastructure they need to attract businesses to locate in their communities and create jobs. However, given the current fiscal challenges facing our country, we must ensure that meeting those obligations does not further hamper an already weak economic recovery.

This legislation reflects that effort and serves as a reminder that Washington must learn to live within its means. To that end, House Republicans ensured that the provisions in this conference report promote job creation and do not add to the national debt.

First and foremost, the Conference Report rejects nearly $7 billion in tax hikes included in the Senate bill. From higher taxes on private investment in infrastructure to redundant and ineffective tax enforcement measures, House Republicans were able to prevent $7 billion in costly tax hikes on the nation's families and businesses during a time when our economy is still struggling to get back on its feet.

In addition to preventing these job-killing tax hikes, the Conference Report also adopts necessary reforms to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation—or PBGC—resulting in greater accountability to taxpayers, the pension plans who participate in PBGC's insurance program, and workers who depend on PBGC to insure their retirement needs. Importantly, these reforms will also protect taxpayers from being on the hook for potential bailouts in the future.

Along with these critical reforms, this legislation provides companies who sponsor pension plans with some important funding relief made necessary by the stagnant economy, while also requiring greater accountability and transparency so that resources are correctly accounted for and used in a way that puts workers first.

Specifically, to address the failed policies of the Obama Administration that are squeezing employers and pension plans, there has long been bipartisan support for some form of pension funding relief. Liabilities in pension plans are often calculated by using an average of interest rates on corporate bonds over the prior two years. In response to an extremely weak Obama economy, the Federal Reserve has driven interest rates to historic lows and kept them there. Combined with plan investment policies, this has substantially increased the value of plan liabilities, resulting in ''a rising tide'' of required pension contributions (to quote a report by the Society of Actuaries). The pension funding relief provided in this conference report will allow companies to spread these skyrocketing required contributions over a long period of time, rather than forcing employers to divert resources in the near term from other business activities such as hiring, expansion or pay increases.

Pension funding relief is necessary, but so too are reforms that provide greater protection, accountability and transparency to the workers who depend on the PBGC, and taxpayers who should not be called upon to bailout PBGC. That is why this Conference Report includes several necessary PBGC reforms that were not included in the Senate bill to protect against a taxpayer-funded bailout. Those reforms include:

Disclosure requirements so participants in pension plans know of any shortfalls;

Adjustments to PBGC fees, including for multiemployer plans, which currently pose the greatest risk to PBGC;

Reforms to PBGC's governance structure;

The establishment of a new PBGC Risk Management Officer;

A required annual peer review of PBGC's insurance modeling systems; and

The termination of PBGC's unsecured $100 million line of credit from the U.S. Treasury.

Madam Speaker, we have passed nine extensions of the highway bill. Today we have an opportunity to put an end to the ''stop and start'' and take more significant steps toward a longer-term set of solutions. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this Conference Report.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I commend the Speaker, Chairman MICA, Chairman CAMP, the conferees and their staffs for their work on this surface transportation reauthorization conference bill. With a history of short-term extensions and bailouts of the highway trust fund since the last highway bill was enacted, to the credit of Chairman MICA and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, they acted at the beginning of this year to report legislation to fundamentally reform this program to put it on a sustainable basis. While H.R. 4348 does not ultimately achieve that goal, it makes progress and the Chairman, the Committee, and the leadership are to be commended for that effort. For the first time, it offsets general fund transfers to the highway programs to keep the program operating through September, 2014. The bill also is at current level funding, earmark free, reduces the federal bureaucracy by consolidating transportation programs, and cuts red tape to institute significant reforms to complete major infrastructure projects. Relative to the Senate highway bill that irresponsibly relied on taxpayer bailouts for highway spending and past funding practices, the conference bill before us today is an improvement.

Despite this bill's progress, it does not address the structural problems in our transportation programs and I have some concerns with some aspects of the legislation.

First, though the Highway Trust Fund was intended to be financed at the level of gas tax revenues, Congress has increased spending for the program well beyond gas tax revenue levels. As a result, the fund has increasingly operated in the red by relying on general fund transfers to pay for annual funding shortfalls. The trust fund has required three large general fund transfers, or taxpayer contributions, totaling $35 billion since 2008. Over the next decade, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) anticipates the Highway Trust Fund to run cash deficits in total of $105 billion, even upon enactment of today's bill. Through a budgetary loophole, these transfers of general taxpayer revenues are not captured for budgetary effects, allowing Congress to bail out the program without being recorded as a net increase in spending or deficits.

The FY 2013 House budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 112, included a reform to close the budget loophole for general fund transfers to ensure future transfers are fully offset and assumed potential funding streams in the form of new oil and gas revenues for the Highway Trust Fund. Congress needs to continue to reform the critical highway program to put it on sound financial footing without further bailouts with borrowed money. H.R. 4348 makes an important effort to offset the $18.8 billion in general fund transfers contained in the bill. But, instead of continuing to rely on general fund transfers going forward, we need to address the systemic factors that have been driving the trust fund's bankruptcy.

In terms of the bill's cost estimate, according to CBO, the unified budget impact of the entire bill is $16 billion in net deficit reduction over ten years. However, under traditional budget scoring, this does not include the cost of general transfers to the highway fund nor the flood insurance reforms' net income. When considering the bill under House budget enforcement per its budget resolution, if we include the costs of higher spending under scored general fund transfers and the flood insurance income, it leads to a small deficit reduction over ten-years.

Second, I am concerned with H.R. 4348's use often-year savings to finance two years of spending. We need to be reducing spending and deficits and when we increase spending, we should be offsetting the cost in as short a timeframe as possible.

Based on CBO scoring, the bill produces ten-year savings from pension law changes, but some of these changes come with long-term costs. It appears possible that any savings gained in the ten-year window may be offset by greater federal obligations in the future. I expressed my concern over a similar 'smoothing' provision when used in past legislation.

Finally, this bill extends the current interest rate on certain student loans for another year. This is another example where Congress established a temporary subsidy with sudden expiration dates and no plans for next steps. I believe it is imperative that we work toward responsible, long-term reform in this area. Congress must stop playing games with students' interest rates to score political points. A well-educated population is critical to higher incomes and stronger economic growth, but our current education programs have serious problems. The right question is not should the interest rate be 3.4 or 6.8 percent. The focus should instead be on how developing an effective, fair and sustainable process for providing capital to students one that ensures access to higher education without fueling tuition inflation and exposing the taxpayer to unacceptable levels of risk. I look forward to working with my colleagues to achieve such reforms.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to see that H.R. 4348 includes pension reform provisions that will allow businesses to invest more to create jobs, while generating over $9 billion in Treasury revenue over the next 10 years. H.R. 4348's pension reforms are critical to help businesses create jobs in a struggling economy.

However, I am concerned these vital reforms will be incomplete if financial reporting requirements known as Generally Accepted Accounting Principles do not conform to H.R. 4348's changes in law. H.R. 4348 does not provide a deadline to adjust these financial reporting requirements to match the bill's pension reforms.

We should expect prompt harmonization between the law and how pension obligations are reported on companies' financial statements. If there is not harmonization many company balance sheets will be required to show inflated liabilities that H.R. 4348's pension reforms seek to address.

The clear policy of H.R. 4348 is that pension funding be calculated by a more stable, long-term method. I expect, and Congress should expect, that financial reporting requirements conform with Congress's clear intent on this issue. Financial statements should be consistent with the rate stabilization set forth in this legislation.

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Chairman for bringing this bill to the floor, and for all the hard work of our conferees in getting us to this point.

Today, I rise before you to remind this body one last time of the importance of Gulf Coast recovery and the importance of passing the RESTORE Act.

Less than a year ago, a small group of Gulf Coast legislators came together with big support from their communities, and a mission to make the Gulf Coast whole.

This was no small effort. But it is the least we could do to show our support once more to all those affected by the single largest man-made disaster in our history.

I am proud to have been a part of this landmark legislation. I want to thank all those who worked so hard with us to make this happen—from my Gulf Coast colleagues to local leaders, business interests to conservation groups.

There were many who said this could not be done in an election year, with so much competing for time on the legislative calendar. But we knew how important it was to pass this bill.

We did not give up because we knew that restoring and replenishing the Gulf Coast is more than just a responsible decision; it is the right thing to do.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4348. While this is not a perfect bill, it will fund important transportation projects while creating well-paying jobs across this country.

H.R. 4348 will reauthorize through the end of fiscal year 2014 our highway and transit programs at current levels—$105 billion. While I am disappointed in this short-term reauthorization, I do believe this authorization will provide some stability to our state and local governments. We know that for every $1 billion of federal funds invested in our highway and transit infrastructure nearly 39,000 jobs are created or sustained. This investment will give our transportation industry the ability to continue to create thousands of jobs across our country.

I am also extremely pleased that all states will be guaranteed a minimum rate of return of 95 percent on their payments into the Highway Trust Fund. During the last reauthorization I worked hard with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to increase Michigan's rate of return to 92 percent, and I am pleased to be able to support increasing it once again. This bill will continue the Safe Routes to School program, and the transportation enhancement activities such as bike paths, bike lanes, and trails. This program has been critical to helping communities in my district, like Ann Arbor, to make their communities more livable and attractive to families and businesses, while also greening our environment by providing alternatives for their commute. Furthermore, I am pleased that H.R. 4348 will continue to fund our mass-transit program, providing funding to critical projects that will bring our transit infrastructure into the 21st Century.

I am disappointed that H.R. 4348 did not reauthorize the Coordinated Border Infrastructure program. Michigan was one of the leaders in creating CBIP given its critical relationship with Canada and it has been instrumental in addressing border congestion. It is my hope that we can reauthorize this program in the coming months. Unfortunately, this bill does not include any provisions directing the Department of Transportation to develop a long-term national rail plan. I passed one of the first pieces of legislation authorizing investment in high-speed rail, but there has never been a strong commitment to bringing our rail program into the 21st Century until this Administration. This Administration has wisely invested billions of dollars into bringing highspeed rail travel across the country and to corridors outside the Northeast. By ignoring this goal we are halting the progress of high-speed rail and falling further behind our neighbors abroad.

I would have liked for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, or LWCF, reauthorization and funding to be included in the final bill. LWCF was included in the Senate language with overwhelming bipartisan support and I joined with 145 of my House colleagues requesting the conference committee to include the reauthorization and funding. LWCF develops local partnerships to conserve critical wildlife habitat, hunting and fishing access, state and local parks, productive forests, and important lands to be protected for future generations. I hope the House will give serious consideration to reauthorizing and funding LWCF in the coming weeks.

This bill includes a one-year extension of the 3.4 percent interest rate for subsidized Stafford student loans. I am happy that this is finally being authorized because as we continue to recover economically, we must ensure that students can afford a higher education. There were nearly 48,000 students attending a university or college in my district last year who received one of these loans and doubling the interest rate would have a significant impact on students as they get ready to start the new school year. Our children, 25 percent of our population, are 100 percent of our future. They are counting on us and I am pleased we are now standing up for the future to make higher education and job training affordable.

While we are taking a step forward today, we must start thinking towards next July when this one-year extension will expire. We cannot wait until the last minute to address this issue as we did this year. We must start thinking now about how to deal with this problem. This is not just a campaign talking point, this affects students and families and can be the difference between achieving your goals or being priced out of your dreams.

The Flood Insurance extension is a much needed part of this compromise. As we continue to experience extreme weather across the country, we need to ensure that homeowners with flooded homes can get the help they need to put their lives back together. However, as FEMA works on implementing new floodplain maps, we must ensure that the maps make sense. Homeowners and small businesses in my district are being driven out of the homes and stores due to the high cost of flood insurance that they've never had to pay before. I urge FEMA to continue to work with local governments to address these concerns and keep families in their homes and small businesses open.

I applaud this bill, and I hope my colleagues keep working together in this manner—actually passing bills that make a difference and take action instead of playing political football on issues that do not impact the majority of Americans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4348 the ''Surface Transportation Conference Agreement.'' More than 100 days ago, the Senate passed a bipartisan, job-creating transportation bill to rebuild America—that is similar to the bill we are taking up today.

This bill will create or save more than 2 million jobs, authorize highway and transit programs for more than two years at current levels, make key reforms consolidating transportation programs, and leverage federal resources to expand public-private partnerships in transportation.

However, regarding the education of our Nation in making college more affordable has always been a top priority of Democrats. In

2007, the Democratic-led Congress enacted legislation that cut the interest rate on need-based student loans in half—to 3.4 percent—over five years.

Unfortunately, under current law, that reduced rate expires and doubles to 6.8 percent on July 1.

This Congress cannot sit by and let students suffer and be denied a chance at making a better future and a brighter tomorrow because we failed to act. I am determined to see that students have a chance to learn, to aspire, and to dream.

If we don't pass this bill with common-sense pay-fors, we are setting up a roadblock to dreamers, in essence telling them that education can be foreclosed on because we did not do our jobs.

If the current rates expire the average student faces an increase of $1,000 each. In doing nothing, House Republicans are, putting more barriers in the way of millions of Americans already struggling to pay for a higher education. It is time for Republicans in Congress to stop playing politics with students' futures and come to the negotiating table.

Minority and Women Contractors. Regarding set-asides to ensure that minority, women and other disadvantaged businesses are able to compete for transit and highway contracts, the conference report continues the program and includes key findings regarding discrimination in transportation contracts to ensure that these important provisions are upheld if ever challenged. These provisions are not expanded to rail, which is not authorized in the bill.

Although I am disappointed the bill does not include rail, it is important that as we move forward, transportation contracts, whether it be for airlines, bus, rail, or even little red wagons, women and minorities are able to compete on equal footing with the old boy's network.

I have supported this reauthorization at least 16 times since 2008. The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) has been invaluable for victims and potential victims of flooding in Texas.

Congress must extend authority for the NFIP to write or renew flood insurance policies, which are required in order to obtain a mortgage in the 100-year floodplain. This is an issue of importance to not just the coastal states but in nearly every state.

Just a month ago the Houston Association of Realtors was in town and came to advocate for a reauthorization but as a practical matter would prefer—like many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle—a long-term, 5-year reauthorization for this important measure.

The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) was established in 1968 in response to increasing federal government spending for disaster relief. Standard homeowners insurance does not cover flooding and therefore offers no protection from floods associated with hurricanes, tropical storms, heavy rains and other conditions. The NFIP mandates that federally regulated or insured lenders require flood insurance on properties that are located in areas that have a high risk of flooding.

As Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection of the Committee on Homeland Security, I understand as well as anyone that supporting and securing our Nation's transportation systems are critical to ensuring the free movement of people and commercial goods. But I also know that, in the strained economic circumstances that we currently face, it is equally imperative that we allocate limited resources in a way that maximizes their capacity to improve the lives of as many Americans as possible.

I am pleased that the Conference Agreement measure includes provisions to strengthen highway and motor carrier safety programs. The legislation consolidates National Highway Traffic Safety Administration incentive grant programs, and increases funding flexibility for states that qualify for safety incentive grants. The measure also improves motor carrier safety in a balanced manner.

As the Representative of 18th Congressional District of Houston, Texas, I am keenly aware of our transportation needs. Houston needs infrastructure to relieve congestion and provide adequate public transportation, but it also needs this because an investment in Houston's New Start Transit Project means jobs for Houston's constituents through the transportation sector in its communities and around the Nation.

However, I must balance the needs of my constituents. This funding is critical for funding existing and pending surface transportation and infrastructure projects while we pursue longer term solutions in the face of a misplaced focus on spending cuts. We must work together to forge a bipartisan long-term solution to our Nation's transportation and infrastructure needs.

Economic experts universally agree that funding the critical and necessary infrastructure projects nationwide creates jobs for America and increases our level of global competitiveness. There is an intense competition between fiscal responsibility and investment in job growth & infrastructure.

We must make investments in job creating infrastructure projects in order to grow the US economy. We must be winners in contest for economic change now and for our children's future. We cannot be the losers. We must catch the wave of economic growth or be crushed by it. China, India and Europe understand this because they have committed to greater investments in their infrastructure.

As I think of my home District, the 18th Congressional District in Houston, Texas and its busy ports, much like the other ports around this great nation, I am compelled to urge my colleagues to consider the pressing national necessity of decongesting the surface transportation, both rail and highway, that moves the goods in and out of those ports.

We must improve this surface transportation system in order to accommodate national economic health, global competitiveness, and to avoid harm to agriculture industry, maritime jobs and manufacturing jobs. Maritime jobs and construction jobs for infrastructure provide a good middle class wage, allow workers to get educations at night, and lower crime rates in our cities.

We must invest in High Speed Rail. We have about 500 miles of high speed rail in process, but China has about 10,000 miles being built! We need to have a domestic talent pool with the required knowledge, skills and trained workers to do projects like high speed rail or we will be paying for skilled Chinese companies to do it for us.

Infrastructure Investment is a Non-Partisan Issue: If the AFL–CIO and U.S. Chamber of Commerce have teamed up to promote infrastructure investment, then surely the Democrats and Republicans in this Congress can do the same. Moreover, now is the time for us to consider the creation of a long overdue National Infrastructure Bank and Public-Private partnerships to shift our infrastructure improvement into full gear. We should not shy away from this issue when a nation is waiting for us to do our part to restore our economy through fortification of our infrastructure. It is time for another large, bold, national forward thinking infrastructure project like interstate highway system.

Governors and Mayors at ground level around this nation will quickly confirm that Infrastructure investments create jobs, help balance budgets, and grow both state and national economies. We must listen to our local elected officials who must fix the potholes, repair the crumbling bridges and tunnels or be held directly accountable by their constituents on every street corner. Our local elected officials will quickly tell us that infrastructure investment creates jobs, because it attracts business!

The American Association of Civil Engineers (ASCE) gives U.S. Infrastructure the Grade of "D" in its 2009 Report Card. Infrastructure Investment equals Jobs! But, the U.S. is falling behind its competitors in infrastructure development (especially China, India & Europe). The bottom line is that Transportation and Infrastructure Investment is needed for a Strong Economy.

So, I say to my colleagues that we weight this measure carefully. A delay in enactment of this Conference Agreement will shut down more than $800 million next month in highway reimbursements and transit grants to States and urban areas, endangering more than 28,000 jobs and multi-million dollar construction projects across the country.

As Ranking Member of the Transportation Security Subcommittee at the House Committee on Homeland Security, I have continuously supported the increase in adequate resources aimed at enhancing the efficiency, safety and security of our rail and mass transit systems.

This Congress, I introduced the "Surface Transportation and Mass Transit Security Act of 2011" which seeks to authorize adequate resources and program attention to surface and mass transit security programs at the Transportation Security Administration.

To this end, the bill authorizes additional surface inspectors needed to validate security programs impacting our surface and mass transit security. The bill also creates mechanisms to strengthen stakeholder outreach, makes key revisions to the public transportation security assistance grants program and increases canine teams and resources for surface and mass transit modes.

I must say that I am pleased today that our colleagues have come together in a bipartisan and bicameral manner to create a Conference Agreement that will put Americans back to work.

Mr. TIBERI. Madam Speaker, many employers have reassured me that the pension stabilization language included in the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012 will allow them to invest more to create jobs and will prohibit a reduction in their workforce. I hope this is the case and that these pension reforms will help businesses create jobs in a struggling economy.

However, H.R. 4348 does not make changes to the financial reporting requirements known as Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) to allow companies to reflect the reforms on their balance sheets. The end result of this is that many company balance sheets will be required to show inflated pension liabilities that the reforms seek to address.

There is also no guidance provided to the overseeing entities of GAAP on how to conform these reforms and accounting requirements.

The pension stabilization language is meant to allow companies to calculate their pension funding status through a more stable, long-term method. There should be consistency between the law and how pension obligations are reported on companies' financial statements.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 717, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on adoption of the conference report.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5972, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 697 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5972.

Will the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1150

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. BUCSHON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 27, 2012, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 150, line 9.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the request for a recorded vote on the Landry amendment to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Without objection, the request for a recorded vote on the amendment is vacated and the Chair will put the question de novo.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

An amendment by Mr. LANKFORD of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. DENHAM of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 254, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

AYES—166

Adams
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Biggert
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DesJarlais
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—254

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon

McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Nugent
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Cantor
Carney
Clyburn
Duncan (TN)
Filner
Graves (GA)
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Neal

□ 1217

Mr. CARTER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. MARCHANT, HARRIS, CASSIDY, ROSKAM, ROYCE, HARPER, HERGER, and KINGSTON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 445, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THORNBERRY). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 186, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

AYES—235

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

NOES—186

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Akin
Carney
Clyburn
Duncan (TN)
Filner
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Neal
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1221

Mr. DOLD changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 446, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DOYLE was allowed to speak out of order.)

CHARITIES REAL WINNERS FROM CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, you all know that last night was the 51st annual Congressional Quarterly-Roll Call baseball game for charity, and I'm pleased to inform the House this morning that the Democratic team won 18–5 last night.

Mr. Chairman, there are 21 outs in the game we play because we only play seven innings. Cedric Richmond struck out 16 batters, so he didn't leave much work for our infield. It's my understanding that if the Republicans should win the Presidency, that Cedric is going to be offered a Cabinet position just to get him out of here. Other notables, Cedric also came within about 3 feet of hitting one out of the park at National Field, too. BEN CHANDLER also had a fantastic game for our team as co-MVP.

But, Mr. Chairman, the real winner last night was the Boys and Girls Club

of Washington, D.C. and the Washington Literacy Council. This was a record year for the congressional baseball game. We came close to raising, for the first time ever, almost a quarter of a million dollars for the charities.

I want to congratulate my good friend and Republican manager, JOE BARTON, on a hard-fought game. I can tell you, as someone who has played in the game for 18 years now, I've been part of the highs and part of the lows. I know what it's like to be on both ends of a winning and losing ball game. But the Republicans were game opponents. They came out there, and they did their best last night; but we were just a little bit better than them. And now I yield to my good friend, JOE BARTON.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Thank you, Congressman DOYLE. There are a few things you said, like most Democrats, stretching the truth a little bit. You know, you said that there are only 21 outs in the game. Well, we being very generous and open-hearted Republicans, we play a game where you got about 31 outs because we were so friendly with the way we didn't catch the ball.

For my Republican colleagues, there is good news and bad news. The good news is we got nine times as many hits this year. We got 500 percent more runs this year. So in some ways, we did a lot better. But the bad news is that the Democrats doubled the number of runs. And as my 6-year-old son Jack told me on the way home after the game—he's a T-ball expert—he said, Those guys didn't let up on you.

Mr. DOYLE. It's not in my nature, Joe.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. As some of you who actually went to the game noticed, at about the fourth inning, PETE SESSIONS, our first base coach, and TIM SCOTT, one of our pitchers, who are both on the Rules Committee, had to leave to go back to Rules. Now, there's no truth to the rumor that I had asked for an emergency rule asking CEDRIC RICHMOND be declared ineligible for that game. There is no truth to that rumor.

Our guys played well. Our MVP, PAT MEEHAN of Pennsylvania, pitched in relief real well. JOHN SHIMKUS got two hits. JEFF FLAKE got a double and knocked in two runs. SAM GRAVES stole several bases and played very well out in the field. So as my 6-year-old son Jack also said, Mr. DOYLE, enjoy it while you can because it won't last forever; you can't win every game.

But congratulations, and a job well done on both sides.

Mr. DOYLE. I think it is also notable that our House Chaplain, Father Conroy, did get a chance to play in the game last night. We put him in as a pinch runner. I think it's notable to say Father Conroy stole home.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. He did, but that means that God owes us one. Congratulations.

Mr. DOYLE. We want to give a round of applause to our Chaplain, too, for playing in the game.

One final look: here's the trophy, guys.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 191, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

AYES—234

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

NOES—191

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Akin
Clyburn
Filner
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1231

Mr. WHITFIELD changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 447, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 185, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 448]

AYES—239

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

NOES—185

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Akin
Clyburn
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)

□ 1235

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 448, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013''.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Acting Chair 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. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill, as amended by House Resolution 697, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any further 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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. BARBER. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Barber moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5972, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 71, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $34,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $34,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $13,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $26,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000)''.

Page 75, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 82, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

□ 1240

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I'm offering this final amendment to assist our veterans.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I came before you last week to be sworn in, and I spoke then about working together, working across the aisle to ensure that my constituents and all of our constituents are served by our very best work, rather than our partisan ambitions.

So I rise today in that same spirit. I rise today to ask that we come together on an amendment to help those who most deserve our gratitude and our assistance, the veterans who have bravely served to defend our homeland. Today, we have an opportunity to take care of the veterans of our military who, much to our collective shame, are homeless.

I remember the Vietnam War, and I remember how it divided our Nation. But most of all, I remember the men and women who were sent to fight in Vietnam, who often bore the brunt of the anger over the war itself. Derision that should have been directed towards policymakers was, instead, directed to those who had put their lives on the line for the country we love. And we let them down.

We failed them when they came home, and now they, and other veterans, a total estimated 70,000 of our Nation's homeless population—70,000. That is, I'm sure we all agree, completely unacceptable. I don't believe that anyone on either side of the aisle thinks that we should allow 70,000 men and woman who wore our Nation's uniform to continue to go without a home.

With my amendment, we will ensure that we have enough housing vouchers to assist every one of those veterans. I submit, Mr. Speaker, and esteemed colleagues, that this is the least we owe to our veterans.

There are over 100,000 veterans in my southern Arizona district. Let me tell you about one of them. Christopher Murray, a disabled Operation Desert Storm medic and combat veteran, came to our office to seek our help when I served as Congresswoman Gifford's district director. A bank was foreclosing on his home, and he had recently been diagnosed with terminal cancer. Our staff was able to work to rescind the foreclosure and allow Mr. Murray to stay in his own home. The simple dignity of being in your own home during your final days is something we all too often take for granted. We must not deny that dignity to those who have, like Mr. Murray, served our country so well.

My amendment offers every one of us a chance to do what our office did then: to ensure that our veterans get our help and have the simple dignity of a roof above their heads. And my amendment does that while reducing the deficit.

The passage of this amendment will not prevent passage of this underlying bill. If the amendment is adopted, it will be incorporated into the bill, and the bill will be immediately voted upon. And so, though we may disagree on parts of the bill today, we have the opportunity to speak up for the men and women who have fought for our country.

And let us all be able to go home and look every veteran we represent in the eye and know that we did the right thing by them and by their homeless brothers and sisters.

I urge everyone to vote ''yes'' on this final amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The veterans homeless program is a very good program. We all understand that. In this bill—and everybody should listen—we provide $75 million for 10,000 new vouchers already. So there's no question that we are meeting the need. This is the same as last year, and what we have in the bill is the President's request. Let me say that again. What we have in the bill for veterans vouchers is what the President asked for.

I will also say, it's interesting at this time to bring this motion. We have been through subcommittee markup, we have gone through full committee markup, we have been on the floor of this House for 2 days, and no one's ever raised this issue because everyone understood that we had fully met the funding requirements for the veterans homeless vouchers. So now it's an interesting time to bring this amendment or this motion.

And I will tell the folks, if, in fact, we find out there is an additional need before we get to conference, there isn't anybody in this House that won't support it. But we have fully funded the needs. This has been a full vetting process, and now, at the last moment you come up with a motion that is not necessary because everyone supports these vouchers.

This is a good, balanced bill, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. BARBER. 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 H.R. 5972 and adoption of the conference report on H.R. 4348.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 233, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

AYES—188

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—233

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)

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

NOT VOTING—11

Akin
Castor (FL)
Clyburn
Filner
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Pelosi
Schock
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1301

Mr. SERRANO changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 449, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 261, nays 163, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—261

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stark
Stivers
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—163

Adams
Amash
Bachmann
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Cohen
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jordan
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lummis
Mack
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Reyes
Richmond
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Akin
Clyburn
Filner
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1309

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 450, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 2012, I inadvertently voted "aye" on rollcall no. 450. I intended to vote "nay," and that reflects that I oppose H.R. 5972.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4348, MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adoption of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4348) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and for other purposes, 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 conference report.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 52, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—373

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—52

Adams
Amash
Bachmann
Black
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Campbell
Chabot
Conaway
Duncan (SC)
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Harris
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jenkins
Jordan
Labrador
Lummis
Mack
McClintock
McHenry
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nugent
Olson
Paul
Pompeo
Posey
Quayle
Ross (FL)
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Thornberry
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder

NOT VOTING—7

Akin
Clyburn
Filner
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)

□ 1322

Ms. JENKINS changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. ROHRABACHER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 451, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, the House passed a bipartisan 1-year extension of the current interest rate for Federally subsidized student loans. This is a good things for students across the country. But as we celebrate this accomplishment, let's keep our eye on the larger picture. We wouldn't be worried about these interest rates if not for the fact that the economy is so weak and the cost of education is so high. According to the Department of Education, the savings will be $7 a month for the average Stafford loan borrower. While that might not seem like a lot, each dollar counts for a college graduate still searching for a good-paying job.

We can have a larger effect for students by working to repeal Federal unfunded mandates that drive up the cost of college tuition and by working to put the wheels back on the economy. As a member of the Subcommittee for Higher Education and Workforce Training, I'm committed to making that happen. Let's work together to ensure that students can achieve a quality education at a reasonable cost and get great jobs when they graduate. There's no better social program than a good-paying job.

LET'S CONTINUE THE GREAT WORK

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, with a few minutes to spare, we just voted to make sure that the interest rate for the Stafford student loan program was going to stay at 3.4 and avoid the doubling of rates, which would have happened Saturday night if we had not acted. This is an issue which took months to get to. President Obama challenged Congress back at the State of the Union in January, telling us that we must act. It took months to get any response. And I want to congratulate the 130,000 college students all across America who submitted a petition to the Speaker's office saying it was time to get moving.

We started the countdown clock on that day at Day 110, and now we are officially defusing the time bomb that would have exploded with a higher interest rate if we had not acted. We have a lot more work to do with the high cost of college and student loan debt, which now exceeds credit card debt and consumer loan debt. But having said that, we saw today an honest

compromise; people coming together to make sure that that lower rate was going to be extended. Let's use that example to move forward and solve this problem for middle class families all across America.

Again, to those students who worked so hard to have their voices heard, congratulations. Let's roll up our sleeves and continue the great work.

IN SUPPORT OF THE RESTORE ACT

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, today is a good day for the people of Mississippi's Fourth Congressional District and it's a good day for all the people of the Gulf State. Because today, with passage of the RESTORE Act, we give these States the tools they need to continue vital economic and environmental recovery.

Less than a year ago, a small group of gulf coast legislators came together with big support from their communities and a mission to make the gulf coast whole. This was no small effort, but it is the least we can do to show our support once more to all those affected by the single largest man-made disaster in our history. I am proud to have been a part of this landmark legislation. I want to thank all those who worked so hard with us to make this happen, from my gulf coast colleagues and House leadership to local leaders, business, and conservation groups. There were so many who said this could not be done in an election year with so much competing for time on the legislative calendar. But we know how important it was to pass this bill. We did not give up because we knew that restoring and replenishing the gulf coast is more than just a responsible decision: It is the right thing to do.

LET'S NOT DECEIVE OURSELVES ON WHAT THE MUSLIM BROTHERHOOD SEEKS

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, as people in the United States evaluate what happened this past weekend in the Presidential election in Egypt, I have a simple message: we shouldn't deceive ourselves.

At a time when we are focused on stopping Iran's nuclear weapons program and on isolating the Iranian regime, the incoming Egyptian President vows to expand ties with Iran. At a time when families in southern Israel constantly live in fear of Qassam rocket attacks from Hamas-controlled Gaza, the incoming Egyptian President vows to expand ties with Hamas. As for relations with Israel, we should not paper over the most obvious reason for alarm. While the incoming President has recently pledged to honor the Camp David Accords, it is our responsibility to ensure that the U.S. goodwill is not taken advantage of and painfully looked upon as naive.

We must understand that the Muslim Brotherhood has a very clear history of opposing the peace treaty. Six weeks ago, incoming President Mohammed Morsi stated: ''Jihad is our path, and death for the sake of Allah is our most lofty aspiration.''

While we welcome the democratic process, Mr. Speaker, this result is nothing to cheer. We must not be in denial of what the Muslim Brotherhood really wants.

□ 1330

TRIBUTE TO WENDY WAYNE

(Mr. MCCARTHY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor longtime Bakersfield icon, Wendy Wayne, who passed away on June 17 after a 4-year struggle with cancer. Wendy was the type of person who would go out of the way for those in need, personally taking action to make sure that those in need were helped. She was instrumental in leading the Community Connection for Child Care in Bakersfield, and later the First 5 Kern organization which served the youth of our community.

One of my fondest memories is from just 2 years ago when Wendy joined me in this House. She was my guest for the State of the Union. Sometimes we had philosophical differences, but it never changed our friendship.

Wendy will forever be known as the Mother Teresa of Bakersfield. She will be missed, but her deeds and her life will not be forgotten.

HONORING KYLE R. SCHNEIDER

(Ms. BUERKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BUERKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Corporal Kyle R. Schneider. Kyle R. Schneider was born on January 8, 1988, to Richard and Lorie Schneider. He was raised in the Baldwinsville, New York, area with his brother, Kevin. Kyle was a graduate of Baker High School in Baldwinsville and attended Onondaga Community College for 1 year in the criminal justice program. While at Baker High School, he played baseball, football, and ran track. He loved the outdoors and was an avid hunter and fisherman.

In March 2008, Kyle joined the United States Marine Corps and in January of 2011 was assigned to the 3rd Platoon and deployed to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. In defense of our Nation, Kyle was killed in the Helmand province, Afghanistan, on June 30, 2011, by an improvised explosive device. Kyle Schneider was 23 years old.

As we commemorate the first anniversary of his death, let us honor the service and sacrifice of Corporal Kyle R. Schneider. He is an American hero. He was a proud and valiant marine. He was also a son, a brother, a grandson, a fiancee, friend, and comrade. Kyle is greatly missed, and no words will diminish the grief of those who knew and loved him. In his death, Kyle R. Schneider has earned the thanks of a grateful Nation.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today this House voted to extend the cap on student loan interest rates, or at least certain student loans, for an additional year. That's fine, but it's only a Band-Aid. Over 1 million Americans, and this is just one box of many that contains petition signatures, say that they want more relief. They want their student loan debt cut, reduced, and excessive debt forgiven.

So let's listen to more than 1 million Americans who want the student loan debt forgiven in this country so we can give people hope and create jobs.

TEMPORARY SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure; Ways and Means; Natural Resources; Energy and Commerce; Science, Space, and Technology; and Education and the Workforce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6064) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6064

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS; SPECIAL RULE FOR EXECUTION OF AMENDMENTS IN MAP–21; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Temporary Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012''.

(b) RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the amount apportioned or allocated for a program, project, or activity under this Act in

fiscal year 2012 by amounts apportioned or allocated for the program, project, or activity pursuant to the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–102) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.

(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR EXECUTION OF AMENDMENTS IN MAP–21.—On the date of enactment of the MAP–21—

(1) this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall cease to be effective;

(2) the text of the laws amended by this Act shall revert back so as to read as the text read on the day before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) the amendments made by the MAP–21 shall be executed as if this Act had not been enacted.

(d) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; reconciliation of funds; special rule for execution of amendments in MAP–21; table of contents.

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

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

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

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

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

Sec. 203. Additional programs.

TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 301. Allocation of funds for planning programs.

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

Sec. 303. Allocating amounts for capital investment grants.

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

Sec. 305. Apportionment based on fixed guideway factors.

Sec. 306. Authorizations for public transportation.

Sec. 307. Amendments to SAFETEA–LU.

TITLE IV—HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXTENSION

Sec. 401. Extension of trust fund expenditure authority.

Sec. 402. Extension of highway-related taxes.

TITLE V—STUDENT LOANS

Sec. 501. Temporary authority.

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

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

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

(1) by striking ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' each place it appears and inserting ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(2) by striking ''¾'' each place it appears and inserting ''280/366''; and

(3) in subsection (a) by striking ''June 30, 2012'' and inserting ''July 6, 2012''.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 111(c)(3)(B)(ii) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 343) is amended by striking ''$479,250,000'' and inserting ''$485,640,000''.

(c) EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS UNDER TITLE V OF SAFETEA–LU.—Section 111(e)(2) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 343) is amended by striking ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 112(a) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 346) is amended by striking ''$294,641,438 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$314,493,723 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(e) SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DELIVERY PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 327(i)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the date that is 7 years after the date of enactment of this section'' and inserting ''September 30, 2012''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in section 101 of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012 and shall not be subject to the special rule in section 1(c) of this Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

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

(a) CHAPTER 4 HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 2001(a)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$235,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $176,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$235,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $178,600,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(b) HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 2001(a)(2) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$108,244,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $81,183,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$108,244,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $82,265,440 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(c) OCCUPANT PROTECTION INCENTIVE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(3) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011, and $18,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011, and $19,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(d) SAFETY BELT PERFORMANCE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(4) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$124,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $36,375,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$124,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $36,860,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(e) STATE TRAFFIC SAFETY INFORMATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 2001(a)(5) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$34,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $25,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$34,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $26,220,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(f) ALCOHOL-IMPAIRED DRIVING COUNTERMEASURES INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 2001(a)(6) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$139,000,000 for each of fiscal years fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $104,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$139,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $105,640,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(g) NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.—Section 2001(a)(7) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''$4,116,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $3,087,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$4,116,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $3,128,160 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(h) HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—Section 2001(a)(8) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''$29,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $21,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$29,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $22,040,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(i) MOTORCYCLIST SAFETY.—Section 2001(a)(9) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $5,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $5,320,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(j) CHILD SAFETY AND CHILD BOOSTER SEAT SAFETY INCENTIVE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(10) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $5,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $5,320,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(k) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 2001(a)(11) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''$25,328,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $18,996,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''$25,328,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $19,249,280 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

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

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

''(8) $161,120,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

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

''(H) $185,549,440 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

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

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2011 and $22,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $22,800,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.'';

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking ''2011 and $24,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $24,320,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.'';

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking ''2011 and $3,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $3,800,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.'';

(4) in paragraph (4) by striking ''2011 and $18,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $19,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''; and

(5) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking ''2006 and'' and inserting ''2006,''; and

(B) by striking ''2011 and $2,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011, and $2,280,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

(d) HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2011 and $11,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $11,400,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''.

(e) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and up to $21,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''and up to $22,040,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''.

(f) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by striking ''and 2011 (and $750,000 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and $2,250,000 to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012)'' and inserting ''and 2011 (and $760,000 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and $2,280,000 to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012)''.

(g) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1744) is amended by striking ''2011 and $750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $760,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''.

(h) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 4144(d) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1748) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2012'' and inserting ''July 6, 2012''.

(i) WORKING GROUP FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES TO ENHANCE FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS.—Section 4213(d) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 14710 note; 119 Stat. 1759) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2012'' and inserting ''July 6, 2012''.

SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS.

(a) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS RESEARCH PROJECTS.—Section 7131(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1910) is amended by striking ''2011 and $870,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $881,600 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''.

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

(1) in subsection (a) by striking ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''.

TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR PLANNING PROGRAMS.

Section 5305(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012'' and inserting ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012''.

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

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

(1) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting ''SPECIAL RULE FOR FISCAL YEARS 2005 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JULY 6, 2012.—'';

(2) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''; and

(3) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting ''MAXIMUM AMOUNTS IN FISCAL YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JULY 6, 2012.—''; and

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking ''2011 and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012'' and inserting ''2011 and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012''.

SEC. 303. ALLOCATING AMOUNTS FOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.

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

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2006 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JULY 6, 2012.—'';

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''; and

(C) in subparagraph (A)(i) by striking ''2011 and $150,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $152,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''2011 and $11,250,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $11,400,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''though 2011 and $3,750,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''through 2011 and $3,800,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''; and

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(I) in the first sentence by striking ''2011 and $7,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $7,600,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''; and

(II) in the second sentence by striking ''shall be set aside for:'' and inserting ''shall be set aside:'';

(ii) in clause (i) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $1,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $1,900,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(iii) in clause (ii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $1,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $1,900,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(iv) in clause (iii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $760,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(v) in clause (iv) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $760,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(vi) in clause (v) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $760,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(vii) in clause (vi) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $760,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(viii) in clause (vii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $487,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $494,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''; and

(ix) in clause (viii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $262,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $266,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

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

''(vii) $10,260,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''and not less than $26,250,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''and not less than $26,600,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''; and

(E) in subparagraph (E) by striking ''and $2,250,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''and $2,280,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''.

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

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

''(G) $11,400,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

SEC. 305. APPORTIONMENT BASED ON FIXED GUIDEWAY FACTORS.

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

''(g) SPECIAL RULE FOR OCTOBER 1, 2011, THROUGH JULY 6, 2012.—The Secretary shall apportion amounts made available for fixed guideway modernization under section 5309 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012, in accordance with subsection (a), except that the Secretary shall apportion 76 percent of each dollar amount specified in subsection (a).''.

SEC. 306. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

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

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

''(G) $6,354,029,400 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''$113,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009

through 2011, and $85,125,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$113,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $86,260,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''$4,160,365,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $3,120,273,750 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$4,160,365,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $3,161,877,400 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''$51,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $38,625,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$51,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $39,140,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''$1,666,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $1,249,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$1,666,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $1,266,540,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(E) in subparagraph (E) by striking ''$984,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $738,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$984,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $747,840,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(F) in subparagraph (F) by striking ''$133,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $100,125,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$133,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $101,460,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(G) in subparagraph (G) by striking ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $348,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $353,400,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(H) in subparagraph (H) by striking ''$164,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $123,375,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$164,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $125,020,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking ''$92,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $69,375,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$92,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $70,300,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking ''$26,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $20,175,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$26,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $20,444,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking ''$3,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $2,625,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$3,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $2,660,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(L) in subparagraph (L) by striking ''$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $18,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $19,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,'';

(M) in subparagraph (M) by striking ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $348,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $353,400,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''; and

(N) in subparagraph (N) by striking ''$8,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $6,600,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''$8,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $6,688,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''.

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

''(7) $1,485,800,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

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

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''2011, and $33,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011, and $33,440,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''; and

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

''(3) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—

''(A) RESEARCH.—Of amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012, the Secretary shall allocate for each of the activities and projects described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (1) an amount equal to 48 percent of the amount allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each such subparagraph.

''(B) UNIVERSITY CENTERS PROGRAM.—

''(i) OCTOBER 1, 2011, THROUGH JULY 6, 2012.—Of the amounts allocated under subparagraph (A) for the university centers program under section 5506 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012, the Secretary shall allocate for each program described in clauses (i) through (iii) and (v) through (viii) of paragraph (2)(A) an amount equal to 48 percent of the amount allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each such clause.

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

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

''(7) $75,021,880 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012.''.

SEC. 307. AMENDMENTS TO SAFETEA–LU.

(a) CONTRACTED PARATRANSIT PILOT.—Section 3009(i)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1572) is amended by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''.

(b) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 3011 of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1573) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(5) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012''; and

(2) in the second sentence of subsection (d) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''.

(c) ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 3012(b)(8) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 5310 note; 119 Stat. 1593) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2012'' and inserting ''July 6, 2012''.

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

''(8) $7,948,291,280 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012, of which not more than $6,354,029,400 shall be from the Mass Transit Account.''.

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

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012,''.

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

''(2) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on July 6, 2012, in amounts equal to 48 percent of the amounts allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each of paragraphs (2), (3), (5), and (8) through (25) of subsection (a).''.

TITLE IV—HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXTENSION

SEC. 401. EXTENSION OF TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

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

(1) by striking ''July 1, 2012'' in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting ''July 7, 2012''; and

(2) by striking ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012'' in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting ''Temporary Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012''.

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

(1) by striking ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012'' each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting ''Temporary Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012''; and

(2) by striking ''July 1, 2012'' in subsection (d)(2) and inserting ''July 7, 2012''.

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Paragraph (2) of section 9508(e) of such Code is amended by striking ''July 1, 2012'' and inserting ''July 7, 2012''.

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

SEC. 402. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY-RELATED TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Each of the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''June 30, 2012'' and inserting ''July 6, 2012'':

(A) Section 4041(a)(1)(C)(iii)(I).
(B) Section 4041(m)(1)(B).
(C) Section 4081(d)(1).
(2) Each of the following provisions of such Code is amended by striking ''July 1, 2012'' and inserting ''July 7, 2012'':
(A) Section 4041(m)(1)(A).
(B) Section 4051(c).
(C) Section 4071(d).
(D) Section 4081(d)(3).
(b) FLOOR STOCKS REFUNDS.—Section 6412(a)(1) of such Code is amended—
(1) by striking ''July 1, 2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''July 7, 2012'';
(2) by striking ''December 31, 2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''January 6, 2013''; and
(3) by striking ''October 1, 2012'' and inserting ''October 7, 2012''.
(c) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS.—Sections 4221(a) and 4483(i) of such Code are each amended by striking ''July 1, 2012'' and inserting ''July 7, 2012''.
(d) EXTENSION OF TRANSFERS OF CERTAIN TAXES.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9503 of such Code is amended—
(A) in subsection (b)—
(i) by striking ''July 1, 2012'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting ''July 7, 2012'';
(ii) by striking ''JULY 1, 2012'' in the heading of paragraph (2) and inserting ''JULY 7, 2012'';
(iii) by striking ''June 30, 2012'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''July 6, 2012''; and
(iv) by striking ''April 1, 2013'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''April 7, 2013''; and
(B) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''April 1, 2013'' and inserting ''April 7, 2013''.
(2) MOTORBOAT AND SMALL-ENGINE FUEL TAX TRANSFERS.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (3)(A)(i) and (4)(A) of section 9503(c) of such Code are each amended by striking ''July 1, 2012'' and inserting ''July 7, 2012''.
(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—Section 201(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–11(b)) is amended—
(i) by striking ''July 1, 2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''July 7, 2013''; and
(ii) by striking ''July 1, 2012'' and inserting ''July 7, 2012''.
(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Paragraph (4) of section 4482(c) of such Code is amended to read as follows:
''(4) TAXABLE PERIOD.—The term 'taxable period' means any year beginning before July 1, 2013, and the period which begins on July 1, 2013, and ends at the close of September 30, 2013.''.
(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2012.
(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—The amendment made by subsection (e) shall take effect as if included in section 402 of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012.

TITLE V—STUDENT LOANS

SEC. 501. TEMPORARY AUTHORITY.

(a) TEMPORARY AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Education is authorized to delay the origination and disbursement of Federal Direct Stafford loans made to undergraduate students under part D of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a et seq.) until the date of enactment of the MAP–21, except that the Secretary may only delay the origination and disbursement of such loans until July 6, 2012.
(b) SPECIAL RULE DOES NOT APPLY.—Subsection (a) shall not be subject to the special rule in section 1(c) of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S TOXIC REGULATION REGIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only as a Member of Congress, but as a citizen of the great State of Florida.

My fellow Floridians are frustrated with the Federal Government for imposing more and more burdensome regulations that continue to hurt our already struggling State and Nation. The President's policies have failed and are making this economy worse. While the President continues to give speeches on the principles of job growth, his administration continues to pursue job-killing policies that threaten this country's economic recovery. In fact, since President Obama took office, we've seen a 52 percent increase in completed regulations deemed economically significant. These regulations are costing the economy at least $100 million each year.

Mr. Speaker, this is worth repeating so the American people clearly understand: since January of 2009, this President has increased by more than 50 percent the regulations costing at least $100 million annually. The President cannot stand on his record of the last 3½ years, so he has regrettably turned to the politics of envy and division.

We cannot create a fair system for job creators when the Federal Government keeps changing the rules. We can't help the job seeker by punishing the job creator with more government red tape. According to a September 2010 report from the Small Business Administration, total regulatory costs amount to $1.75 trillion annually.

Put another way, this $1.75 trillion of regulatory burden is enough money for businesses to provide 35 million private sector jobs with an average salary of $50,000. According to the same report:

Small businesses which have created 64 percent of all new jobs in the past 15 years face an annual regulatory cost of $10,585 per employee, which is 36 percent higher than the regulatory costs facing large firms.

Yet rather than provide incentives for these businesses to expand and create jobs, the Obama administration raises taxes and imposes unnecessary, burdensome layers of red tape that impede private sector investment and destroy jobs.

In the last few months, we've heard a lot about fairness from the President, especially when it comes to the so-called rich. Accompanying President Obama's budget for fiscal year 2013 was a simple message to the American people: everyone must shoulder their fair share.

Mr. President, the free market is not about fairness. This is not Little League baseball where everyone gets a trophy. There is nothing fair about the Federal Government telling you what kind of lightbulbs you can use to light your home, how many gallons of water you can use to flush your toilet, and which kinds of food your children have to consume.

While the President continues his ''Kansas City shuffle'' trying to get the American people to look right while he goes left, he continues to try and turn the attention of the American people away from his policies that continue to drag the economy down.

The facts speak for themselves. Today, there are more Federal regulations on the books than in any other time in the history of our Nation. The Obama administration currently has proposed 3,118 regulations with 167 considered economically significant.

□ 1340

In 2011 alone, Mr. Speaker, there were 79,000 new pages printed in the Federal Register. The same year, the Obama administration issued $231.4 billion in regulatory burdens from proposed or final rules.

Today, there are 291,676 unelected Federal regulatory agency employees surrounding the United States Capitol. According to the Financial Services Roundtable, it will take 24,503 employees just to comply with the flood of regulations emanating from the Dodd-Frank banking regulations.

According to a February 15, 2012, Gallup poll, 48 percent of small businesses said they were not hiring due to concerns about possible rising health care costs, while 46 percent said they were worried about new government regulations.

A 2010 study by The Heritage Foundation found that an unprecedented 43 major regulations were imposed in fiscal year 2010, with a total economic cost of $26.5 billion, the highest total since at least 1981.

A recent report from The Heritage Foundation also found that during the 3 years of the Obama administration, a total of 106 new major regulations have been imposed at a cost of more than $46 billion annually and nearly $11 billion in one-time implementation costs. This amount is about five times the cost imposed by the prior administration of President George W. Bush.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is essential the American people understand just a few proposed Obama administration regulations that will cost each of us billions of dollars:

Reconsideration of the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Estimated cost: $19 billion to $90 billion. It was withdrawn in September 2011.

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Coal and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units. Estimated cost: $10 billion.

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Major Source Industrial, Commercial and Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters. Estimated cost: $3 billion.

Standards for the Management of Coal Combustion Residuals Generated by Commercial Electric Power Producers. Estimated cost: $6 million to $1.5 billion.

Require motor carriers operating commercial motor vehicles in interstate commerce to use electronic onboard recorders to document their drivers' hours. Estimated cost: $2 billion.

Hours of service on commercial motor vehicle drivers. Estimated cost: $1 billion.

A Consumer Product Safety Commission rule deeming children's books printed prior to 1986 to be potentially toxic due to the possibility of excessive lead in the ink, even though the actual risk of the lead exposure from older books ranks only about 0.5 on a scale of one to 10, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Nonetheless, the Consumer Product Safety Commission has urged libraries to put older children's books in storage until they can be tested for lead toxicity—at a cost of $300 to $500 for each book.

The Federal Government's attempt to regulate the precise moisture, temperature, and chemical standards of compost for use in producing certified organic foods.

The Department of Energy's desire to rewrite water efficiency standards for the Nation's urinals—yes, rewrite water efficiency standards for the Nation's urinals, that's correct, Mr. Speaker.

An Equal Employment Opportunity Commission declaration that requiring a high school diploma as a job certification has a disparate impact on certain individuals that failed to meet such a standard.

A Department of Justice regulation requiring enhanced access for disabled individuals at public and private facilities such as swimming pools.

And of course Numeric Nutrient Criteria, which I will discuss later.

It's no surprise why entrepreneurship in the United States of America is at a 17-year low. In 2010, the Obama administration published 82,480 pages of regulations. Two comprehensive legislative packages—the Affordable Care Act and the Dodd-Frank banking regulations—were passed and scheduled to regulate greenhouse gases as well for the first time ever in the history of this country.

In 2011, agencies finalized $187 million in deregulatory actions, and proposed more than $1.1 billion in rescissions. However, these deregulatory measures were dwarfed by the new regulations that the administration published just this year.

For proposed or final rules, the Obama administration published $231.4 billion in regulatory burdens and 133 million paperwork burden hours. Assuming a 2,000-hour work year, it would take 66,730 employees just to file the Federal paperwork.

On average, Mr. Speaker, eliminating the job of a single regulator would grow the American economy by $6.2 million and nearly 100 private sector jobs annually. The reverse is true as well: each million-dollar increase in the regulatory budget costs the economy 420 private sector jobs.

A recent article in The Economist highlighted the increased complexity caused by ObamaCare, citing that ''every hour spent treating a patient in America creates at least 30 minutes of paperwork, and often a whole hour.''

Next year, the number of Federally mandated categories of illness and injury for which hospitals must claim reimbursement will rise from 18,000 to 140,000.

There are nine codes, Mr. Speaker, relating to injuries caused by parrots—yes, parrots—and three relating to burns emanating from flaming water skis.

Let's be real clear at this point of time: The only jobs created by regulations are jobs for regulators and more regulators. What I notice when I ride up and down Federal and Dixie Highways in south Florida are the numbers of closed storefronts, the numbers of vacant spaces. However, when I fly into Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker, I see the number of sky cranes building more housing and office space for these regulators.

The number of Federal workers employed in regulatory activities—excluding the TSA—has jumped 20 percent since 2008 while total workforce participation in the United States of America is at a 30-year low.

Our Nation has faced 3 years of unemployment at or above 8 percent. Mr. Speaker, do you want to guess what the employment rate is in Washington, D.C.? In May, the unemployment in the Washington, D.C., metro area was 5.3 percent.

Of course, the environment is only one area of regulatory overreach by the Obama administration. In its review of overregulated America, The Economist magazine noted that the Dodd-Frank banking law, at 848 pages, is 23 times longer than the preceding Glass-Steagall Act. These regulations are choking off the oxygen of growth in this country, especially in our area of south Florida.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to talk about an example which is taking place in our congressional district. In 2006, Rybovich Yachts became the only company in the United States capable of repairing mega-yachts with the opening of its facility in West Palm Beach. The company took a dilapidated boatyard and turned it into the finest repair facility in the world. This facility now employs 230 workers directly and as many as 300 subcontractors each and every day. The facility quickly exceeded all business expectations, attracting commerce from around the globe and cementing south Florida's leadership position in the marine industry.

□ 1350

Last year, this facility generated $5.5 million in local and State tax revenue. Consider the regulatory hurdles Rybovich had to leap through, the mountains of paperwork in order to get a permit issued, and the burdensome red tape they endured every step of the way.

Mr. Speaker, it is remarkable that any U.S. company chooses to do business on its own shores. To satisfy the environmental regulations and requirements for the first facility, Rybovich was required to inspect and analyze every other possible location in the area to see if there was an alternate site that would have less impact on local sea grass beds.

Once the location was chosen, the environmental impact had to be measured and mitigated one for one. In the case of Rybovich, 5 acres of sea grass needed to be replaced. Since there are limited areas where sea grass could be replanted in the vicinity, the company, Rybovich, a private sector company, had to buy an island, construct a wall around it, and plant sea grass. The island alone cost the company $4 million.

In 2008, Rybovich realized there was market potential for a second facility to service even larger yachts. Construction for this new facility is estimated to create over 600 jobs. The total economic impact from the first 5 years of operations is estimated to be $630 million in Palm Beach County and $111 million in the city of Riviera Beach.

One would think, after going through the permitting process and jumping through all the environmental hurdles to open the first facility, the second would go more smoothly. One would think.

One would think, given the state of our local economy, a new project of this scope would be welcomed with open arms. But, Mr. Speaker, 4 years later, Rybovich still hasn't received a permit for its proposed project in Riviera Beach.

And did I mention the 600 jobs that would be created? That's correct. I did. However, the Federal regulators don't seem to care about that fact.

What is happening to Rybovich is not an isolated incident. This is happening all over the United States. Rybovich is merely a whiff of the toxic bureaucratic fumes emanating from the Obama administration that regulators are using to go choke off job and economic growth with excessive environmental regulation.

Another case in point is the numeric nutrient criteria. The Environmental

Protection Agency has proposed ludicrous standards for Florida's nitrogen and phosphorus levels for the State's lakes, rivers, streams, and springs.

Until 2009, the State of Florida was working cooperatively with the EPA to improve our water quality standards. However, in 2009, in an attempt to settle a lawsuit brought by environmental groups, the EPA decided to abandon that cooperative approach, federally preempt our water quality State standards, and impose new criteria on our State.

Like all Floridians, I want clean and safe water. For several years now, Florida has been working to improve its water quality, and in many respects, the State's efforts have been a model for other States throughout this country.

As Florida Wildlife Commissioner Ron Bergeron explains, ''A water standard of 10 parts per billion required by numeric nutrient criteria, is more stringent,'' Mr. Speaker, ''than rainwater which is 15 parts per billion, and is a quality of water that is humanly impossible to achieve.''

Even the EPA's own Science Advisory Board has expressed serious concerns about the science used to support the regulation, and the EPA has repeatedly refused to allow a third-party review of the proposal.

But there is no doubt about one thing, Mr. Speaker. This mandate is poisonous to the economy. These regulations are not about whether we want clean water for Florida. These regulations are about how we reach that goal and at what cost.

This EPA mandate, which singles out the State of Florida, will drive up the cost of doing business, double water bills for all Florida families, and will destroy jobs. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection estimates this Federal mandate may force municipal wastewater and storm water utilities to spend as much as $26 billion in capital improvements to upgrade their facilities. This $26 billion will eventually be paid by each Floridian who uses water, and that means every resident.

A study by the University of Florida and the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services concluded that the EPA's numeric nutrient criteria regulations would directly cost Florida's agricultural community roughly $1 billion each year, with additional indirect costs also exceeding $1 billion. This billion dollar cost eventually will be paid by every American who wants to enjoy an orange, a grapefruit, or other produce that comes from our State.

The study goes on to say that implementation of the EPA regulations could put more than 14,000 agricultural workers out of a job and would cost the average household up to $990 in higher sewer rates. That is per year, per family, $990 more in higher water bills.

Can our already stagnant economy in Florida take that? Will families move to Florida and choose to buy homes in our already depressed housing market if they're going to have to pay nearly $1,000 more in their annual water bills for years to come?

The EPA has repeatedly refused to allow any third-party review of the science behind the proposed mandate of numeric nutrient criteria. The EPA has also failed to complete an economic analysis.

In a disturbing article in The New York Times on February 16, 2011, an EPA official said they have no plans to implement this regulation in any other State except for the State of Florida.

Excessive EPA regulations hamper business expansion and job growth in nearly every industry. They hurt farmers. They hurt utility workers, pipe fitters, construction workers, coal miners, factory workers, truck drivers, and machinists.

Sixty national companies and dozens of Florida-based companies and organizations, including the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Farm Bureau, have sent letters to the United States Congress to oppose these burdensome regulations.

Mr. Speaker, we must reduce the regulatory burden on our Nation's businesses and help put Americans back to work. We must get the Federal Government out of the way of our small businesses and entrepreneurs so that they can succeed and prosper.

When there is a need for regulations, they should be developed in concert with the private sector and, of course, done with common sense.

Over the last few months, the United States House of Representatives has passed more than two dozen bills designed to do just that—staunch the toxic regulatory flow coming from the Federal agencies. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, they're all still sitting on Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID's desk, which really does stink.

John Engler, the President of the Business Roundtable, recently stated that:

> Regulations are hidden taxes that strangle job creation. We need action by government agencies to clear out obsolete rules and streamline permitting to reduce delays and impediments for companies to invest and grow.

The private sector is the only hope for future job creation. We need to recognize this and work together to let businesses, small and large, invest in people.

Mr. Speaker, I could not have said that any better.

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

□ 1400

BUDGET AUTONOMY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members may be aware that I come to the floor occasionally in order to make certain that Members have the full background as they find themselves in the perplexing situation of receiving legislation on a local government and local residents.

We had a misunderstanding—I can only think it was a misunderstanding this week—when Senator RAND PAUL, who I know has been a student of history when it comes to the Constitution, engaged in actions that had the effect of compelling a bipartisan group of Senators to pull back their budget autonomy bill for the District of Columbia.

First, recognize that the Framers didn't go to war with American citizens, including citizens who live right in the very city in which we are now meeting, the District of Columbia, only to leave them out of the very franchise and local control that made the Framers commit what, I'm sure, the British believed were acts of treason when they rebelled against England for its refusal to recognize that taxes are a matter of local control. Bear in mind that those who went to war included the residents of this city and that the Framers in every respect showed that they respected the fact that the citizens of this city were included among those who went to war.

For example, in the transition period—10 years—as the District of Columbia moved to become the Nation's Capital—the four Framers of the Constitution from Maryland and from Virginia made sure through legislation that their members lost nothing, in as much as Maryland and Virginia had donated the land to the Nation for our Nation's Capital. Maryland and Virginia citizens were allowed to vote in their jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia. They voted for Congress, and they were treated in every way like other Americans at that time. In 1802, when full transition to become the Nation's capital occurred, they lost what they had been promised. They lost their full rights as American citizens.

The District got back some of those rights under a Republican President 39 years ago when the District was granted home rule, the right to govern itself, under the Home Rule Act.

Richard Nixon said at the time:

I share the chagrin that most Americans feel at the fact that Congress continues to deny self-government to the Nation's Capital. I would remind the Congress that the Founding Fathers did nothing of the sort. Home rule was taken from the District only after more than 70 years of self-government, and this was done on grounds that were either factually shaky or morally doubtful.

So the Congress returned to the District some measure of home rule in 1973. In returning a good measure of home rule, the Congress nevertheless said to the District that, while it had

authority over its own budget, the budget had to come to the Congress of the United States before it became final.

We are trying, as I speak, to make sure that that budget does not become a vehicle for denying the very principles that the Framers fought for and that every American stands for. This is not a country where you can pay taxes and somebody else can have something to say over how those taxes will be used. That would cause another rebellion. When this matter was put to the American people in a recent poll, here is what they said: more than seven in 10 believe that the District of Columbia should control its own budget.

I suppose in America people are saying, Duh, of course. That's a basic founding principle. Why do you need to tell us that?

We need to tell you that because there are attempts here—and there was an attempt just this week in the Senate—that contradicted the increasing bipartisan consensus for local control by the District of its own local funds, funds that not one Member of this body has had anything to do with raising. So when you put that to the American people, you get a predictable answer: seven in 10 say yes to local control by the District alone of its own local funds.

What does that mean in terms of Democrats and Republicans?

Seventy-one percent of Democrats and, by the way, 72 percent of Republicans support it. I'm not surprised at those figures. Seventy-one percent of Democrats—and slightly more—72 percent of Republicans believe that the people who pay taxes and happen to live in their Nation's Capital should be treated as full American citizens when it comes to how they spend their own local funds.

That principle is not always recognized in this body, and that's why I've come to the floor today, because I do not believe that the failure to recognize this principle comes from venality. I think it comes because there is turnover in the Congress and because people don't focus on the anti-democratic bills that come before them, so they simply do what they are told to do. They don't do much analysis of their own about why they may be voting as a Member of Congress to overturn local laws.

Last year, the District of Columbia government was almost shut down three separate times. I don't think I could find a Member of this body—in fact, I'm sure I can't—who would say that when the Federal Government is engaged in a Federal fight over Federal spending that the District of Columbia should have to shut down, too; but that was the case because the District of Columbia local budget—its balanced budget (unlike our own)—which had been approved by the Appropriations Committee, was still here. Because it was still here and for no other reason, the District of Columbia three different times had to prepare for a shutdown of the city government, and had to prepare for the consequences of the possible violation of contracts and other serious consequences through no fault of their own.

It's important to note that a Senate appropriations bill this year does contain my no-shutdown bill for the District of Columbia, which simply says that the District of Columbia doesn't shut down if the Federal Government shuts down; of course, if the city is spending only its own local money, that's okay for the city to do.

When I refer to a bipartisan group of congressional leaders who support budget autonomy, I'm speaking of leaders who have been in the Congress, and have been in the District and have seen what the effects of not treating the District as a full local-controlled jurisdiction have been. In the House today, I am grateful to Chairman DARRELL ISSA, chairman of the committee with some jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, who is a leading proponent of budget autonomy for the District of Columbia, so much so that he has his own bill for budget autonomy, which is very much like my own.

□ 1410

In the Senate, Senator JOE LIEBERMAN and Senator SUSAN COLLINS had a bipartisan bill in committee this week for budget autonomy for the District of Columbia much like Chairman ISSA's. Budget autonomy has been supported by majority leader ERIC CANTOR. Budget autonomy has been supported by the Republican Governor of the State of Virginia.

When we note what happened in the Senate on the bill, we cannot believe that it came from animus or some sense that the District of Columbia is not a city whose citizens should be treated as other American citizens are treated. Yet, as the bill went to committee, Senator RAND PAUL appeared to have proposed any and every amendment he could think of, amendments that no self-respecting American jurisdiction could possibly abide, not because there is anything inherently wrong with these amendments, but because they violate what the voting majority of taxpaying residents of the District of Columbia have approved as local law.

The Senator did not stay he disagrees with this or that policy and he wants to make sure that the District does this or that thing. He said: I think it's a good way to call attention to some issues that have national implications. We don't have control over the States, but we do for D.C.

Oh, really? What control do you have over our local funds? Do you raise a cent of it?

This must be a misunderstanding. Since Senator RAND PAUL founded the Tea Party Caucus in the Senate and is the champion of small government and local control there, I choose to believe that this freshman Senator had not yet come to grips with the rather complicated history of the Nation's capital. If he had, I don't think he would have put forward an amendment that would require the city to allow conceal-and-carry permits. We may not have a problem with conceal and carry in the United States, but that's not what the people of the District of Columbia, who pay taxes here, have written into their constitutional local laws.

Moreover, public safety is the essence of local control. If you look to the two or three issues that nobody should have anything to say about in another local jurisdiction, surely at the head of the list would be local police power, when that power is consistent with the Constitution.

Then a stream of other amendments came forward from Senator PAUL on abortion, one of them on licensed firearms dealer, one of them having to do with labor organizations. It's as if the Senator went down a checklist. He virtually said so himself. He said: What national issues can I highlight using the District of Columbia?—as if the city were nothing but a plaything and not a jurisdiction of 600,000 American citizens who have fought and died in every war, including the war that created the United States of America, of 600,000 citizens who pay the second highest Federal taxes per capita in the United States. That's 600,000 citizens, one of whom was killed in Afghanistan last month. It means 600,000 Americans who have every right to demand equal citizenship.

Nevertheless, good news, from bipartisan support and from national polls, continues to roll in. The Senate has just passed out of committee the D.C. budget. The most the Senate and the most the House should do is act as a pass-through as long as the D.C. budget does not violate the Constitution. Of course, no local budget belongs in the United States Congress. However, D.C. does not yet have budget autonomy. Yet there is nothing, in American principle or American history which says that once you have the local budget through here, you can just do anything you want to do, overturn local laws or restrict funds that Congress had nothing to do with raising.

I met Tea Party people for the first time when they came to Congress. I thought local control was their most basic principle. In fact, Senator RAND PAUL would like to get the Federal Government out of issues where the Constitution allows the Federal Government to be. But what about hopping over Federal issues and trying to interfere in the business of a local jurisdiction? That's against his principles; that's against everything the Framers stood for.

Polls within the last few months show that the overwhelming majority of Americans believe Congress should pass a D.C. budget without changes. Who is this overwhelming majority? Seventy eight percent of them are Democrats. Once again, Republicans lead the pack at 81 percent.

This is how the question was framed: ''Today, Members of Congress are withholding approval of Washington, D.C.'s local budget unless the city agrees to a series of unrelated provisions on issues ranging from guns to abortion. Do you think Congress should or should not interfere in the city's local affairs and budget in this way?''

If anything, the issue was framed against D.C. Because you can bet your bottom dollar that of this 81 percent of Republicans who answered that Congress should not interfere with D.C.'s local affairs and budget were many who, in fact, oppose abortion and oppose any restrictions on guns or gun owners. Yet this is how they responded when asked a base question, a fundamental question regarding, if it is local money, should a national body in Washington have any right, whatsoever, to impose its will on a local budget.

Congress does lag occasionally behind the American people. This is a big lag. But the lag does not include several leaders of this House and of the Senate.

□ 1420

Senator JOE LIEBERMAN is retiring this year. He has been a champion of equal citizenship for the residents of the District of Columbia, whether it was voting rights or statehood or budget autonomy. Equal citizeship rights for District of Columbia citizens, in many ways, partially define his service.

Yet the first budget autonomy bill to pass at all in Congress came from Senator SUSAN COLLINS, when democrats were in the minority. That was in 2003. That bill went all the way to the floor and was passed in a Republican Senate. It was the House that did not pass it or D.C. budget autonomy would be law today.

So when I speak of first principles, I think there is great evidence that those first principles resonate in the Senate and resonate in the House. They resonate in the House when Representative ISSA puts forward a budget autonomy bill, it resonates in the House, when Majority Leader CANTOR, in fact, says he supports budget autonomy.

I don't believe that the average Member even desires the opportunity to use 600,000 American citizens as playthings through a local budget. We joust with one another. We disagree with one another. But I don't believe when it comes to this serious matter that if we had an opportunity, one on one, to speak with Members of this body they would give you a justification for a federal body overturning the will of the people of a local jurisdiction.

That is why I say this afternoon that by assuming that disparate treatment of any American citizens, even those who live in the District of Columbia, must reflect a misunderstanding that I hope, by coming to the floor from time to time, I can help clear up. Unequal treatment of American citizens flies in the face of the very principles that particularly Members of this House have professed from the moment the 112th Congress convened: Get the Federal Government out of our lives, even where the Federal Government has historically been in our lives; get the Federal Government out of any opportunity to get involved in our lives.

Witness the view of Republicans on the Affordable Health Care Act. Up with local control, and when it comes to local money, hands off.

You might imagine that when the District raises $6 billion from local citizens, they wouldn't want anybody telling them anything about how to spend their local funds. The District spends that money on some matters and in some ways that are different from the way the jurisdictions of my colleagues spend their own money. Isn't tolerating these differences what is most wonderful about America?

The Framers put together a nation that was very different, that has kept us from going to war with one another over issues by above all separating out local from Federal, meaning if you stay in your part, we won't go there. We will only go where matters of national concern are to be found. That was the promise.

I must say, to my colleagues, that's the promise that's been kept for every American district, except my own. And that is why I have called Senator RAND PAUL. I have not been able to speak to him yet. I am going to ask to sit down with him. I am going to walk over to the Senate to see if I can have a good conversation with him about the District of Columbia, because I have no reason to believe, given his own short history in the Senate, that he means to do anything but carry out his own originalist principles, his principles that local control is different from Federal intervention. Given a conversation, we can at least make some headway on what the District means to our country and how the citizens of this city feel when they are basically kicked around.

We're powerless to do anything about it. If a bill comes to the floor which keeps us from spending our own money, every Member of this body can vote on that bill except the Member that represents the District of Columbia because, as of yet, the Congress has not, in fact, given the District the voting rights that we have given to the people of Afghanistan and Iraq, with citizens from the District of Columbia among those fighting for their freedom. So I don't think anybody would blame us for coming forward to ask for what every other American takes for granted.

What is truly gratifying to me, even as I complain about the withdrawal of a budget autonomy bill in committee, which Senator JOE LIEBERMAN and Senator SUSAN COLLINS had worked so hard to perfect, what encourages me is, first, the leadership we have in the House for budget autonomy, the leadership that continues to stand strong with us in the Senate. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, what encourages me is what these two charts tell us about our country, tell us about what the American public believes, tells us what they overwhelmingly believe—that American citizens have a right when it comes to their own funds raised by them and them alone.

Yes, I take heart in the fact that while there are only small differences between Democrats and Republicans on subject autonomy, those who most favor control of the city's own budget by its own local citizens are Republicans, who are, it seems to me, only confirming their own principles.

And when it comes to whether or not the Congress, when the D.C. budget comes here, should pass it clean, just as it was when it came, or should in some way use it to profile national issues, you have even greater majorities essentially sending Congress a message that it should pass the D.C. local budget without changes. Seventy-eight percent of Democrats and 81 percent of Americans regard this as something of a truism. My colleagues represent the people included in these massive majorities.

I don't expect my colleagues to spend a lot of time on the District of Columbia. I ask only that when the budget of a local jurisdiction comes here that there be some thought behind what you do when you have the vote on that budget and I do not. In a real sense, I ask you to put yourself in my position. I am a Member of the House of Representatives. I have the same standing that all of you have, except I do not have a vote.

I would be so bold as to ask my colleagues to put themselves in my position when they see Members of this House or Members of the Senate try to direct the District about how it ought to spend its own local funds. I ask you to put yourself in my position because I think there would be some genuine empathy with the position in which I find myself, representing 600,000 citizens who have lived up to every obligation of citizenship ever since the founding of the Republic of which they have always been a part, but never with equal citizenship.

We will continue to come forward in good faith and in the spirit of understanding and in the hope that, with greater highlighting of the discrepancies between professed principles and how they are occasionally carried out, change will come in a country which is always striving to live up to its own ideals.

I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the Washington Post, June 27, 2012]

RAND PAUL'S SITUATIONAL PRINCIPLE

(By Editorial Board)

Sen. Rand Paul (R–Ky.) came to Washington on the wave of the tea party movement to limit big government. ''I think a lot of things could be handled locally . . . the

more local the better, and the more common sense the decisions are, rather than having a federal government make those decisions,'' he said during his 2010 campaign. So how to explain his spoiling a move to give the District autonomy over its own tax dollars by—and this is really rich—injecting the federal government into local affairs?

We thought we could no longer be surprised by congressional hypocrisy when it comes to the nation's capital, but Mr. Paul's willingness to turn his back on his supposed libertarian principles and devotion to local rule is truly stunning.

A bill that would give D.C. officials the ability to spend local dollars—we repeat, locally collected, locally paid tax dollars—without congressional approval was pulled from consideration this week after Mr. Paul introduced a set of amendments that would dictate to the city policies on guns, abortions and unions. ''The last senator I would expect it from,'' said Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D–D.C.), telling us that she has never seen so many amendments offered at one time by a single member to restrict D.C. rights. Ironically, Ilir Zherlca, head of the advocacy group DC Vote, said that Mr. Paul initially had been seen as a potential ally for the District because of his views on small government.

Mr. Paul told The Post's Ben Pershing, ''I think it's a good way to call attention to some issues that have national implications. We don't have [control] over the states, but we do for D.C.'' In other words, ''I am doing this because I can''—not exactly the argument one expects to hear from someone who has railed about federal intrusion. As Mr. Zherka pointed out, Mr. Paul's brief for small government is not whether the federal government has the power but whether it should use it.

A spokesman for Mr. Paul e-mailed us a reminder that the District is not a state but a federal jurisdiction: ''Efforts to change that have failed, and until it is changed it is not only the prerogative but the duty of Congress to have jurisdiction over the Federal District.'' What we don't get is how someone who raises the banner of a movement inspired by a time when Americans were ruled without representation could be so unsympathetic to the rights of D.C. citizens who are in the same position.

□ 1430

SUPREME COURT HEALTH CARE DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. It's always an honor to speak before the House of Representatives, a great storied history here, just as the Supreme Court has a great storied history. There's some moments in time with regard to the United States Supreme Court which show it to have consisted of a bastion of strong-willed, determined, principled, constitutionally minded Justices. There are other times when the Supreme Court has shown itself to consist of some great judges and some who are more interested in politics, more interested in feathering their friends' nests than they are in doing what was right under the Constitution, even though it was easy enough for them to rationalize that, gee, if they did what helped their friends, then obviously that would make it better for the whole country.

I think we get some of that rationalization from this administration. Gee, if they just throw billions or hundreds of billions of dollars at friends, then their friends will do better. And if their friends are doing better, surely the rest of the country would. We have also found that to be true with regard to things like Solyndra and the massive number of other cronies of the administration that have received hundreds of billions of dollars over time and also at a time when this country is sorely hurting from overspending and running up debt.

In fact, today we had a bill regarding transportation and a conference report. I know my friend JOHN MICA from Florida worked exceedingly hard, as had other members of Transportation, trying to reach an agreement with the conference report. It looked like the Senate got the better end of the deal. But I know these people, I know their hearts, and I know they try to do what is right for America when it comes to Chairman MICA and those who are assisting him.

But, nonetheless, we heard our friends across the aisle over and over today talk about how critically important infrastructure is, how we ought to be spending money, and how just $1 billion added to the transportation budget could really make a tremendous difference. I hearken back to a year-and-a-half ago when the President of the United States, Barack Obama, had told people that if you will give me basically a trillion—whether it's $800 billion, $900 billion, apparently it looked more like a trillion dollars by the time it was finished—you just hand me over a trillion bucks and we'll get this economy going. If you don't give it to me, then it will turn out that we may see as high as 8.5 percent unemployment. But if you do give it to me, we'll never see 8.

Of course, he was wrong that we would never see 8 percent unemployment. We've gone for many months—I guess that was 3½ years ago now—that he was telling us about his big stimulus. How quickly time flies.

As the transportation proponents were pushing their bill today and talking about what the good infrastructure will do, many of us believed that was true back in January of 2009, that it would be good. If we're going to spend money on anything, spend it on the things that we really need to do: bridges, roads, all these things that need construction, need renovation.

So the President sold America largely on his stimulus because we're going to fix all the infrastructure in America. But the last 3½ years have borne out that the President did not spend $800 billion, $900 billion on infrastructure. He spent maybe 6 percent of the largest giveaway in American history. He surpassed the terrible mistake that TARP was—$700 billion. And we haven't been able to get an exact number, but of the $700 billion, it may be $450 billion-or-so that his administration inherited. So when you get the $800 billion, $900 billion, trillion-dollar stimulus giveaway—porkulus, as some called it—and you combine that with $400 billion, $450 billion, $500 billion that he was able to inherit from the TARP fund, you think maybe a trillion and a trillion-and-a-half dollars he had to give away.

And we hear debate over what difference $1 billion would make. He was talking about a thousand times that for infrastructure. And he spent a tiny fraction on infrastructure, preferring instead to have massive grants and giveaways to programs that were his cronies, his pets, that are now producing no dividends and in fact are increasing further debt.

So we hear those things, how wonderful infrastructure would be, and yet we know when we as a Congress provided this administration with massive amounts of money for infrastructure, they diverted it. They did more damage to the country than they did good. And we look at the people that this President has surrounded himself with. He had a Solicitor General named Elena Kagan. The Solicitor General's job is to assist the White House, assist the administration with potential legislation that may come to litigation, assist them with litigation. As I know from working 30 years ago in the private sector, you can't advise people about existing litigation and do your job without advising them about the way to avoid future litigation problems that you run into.

So we know that the biggest legislative agenda item for this administration was the complete takeover of health care. And as most thinking people would understand, if you could control all health care, you can pretty well control all people. You get to decide who gets what treatments, who can have a new hip, who can have a new knee, who can have radiation therapy, who can have the surgery. And as one secretary in my hometown pointed out, her mother acquired breast cancer in England, and since the English Government's wonderful health care system decided how long you had to wait before you could get to have diagnostic tests done, before you could have therapeutic activity occur, her mother didn't get the diagnostic tests in time to find out she had it for sure, didn't get the surgery in time, didn't get the treatment in time and she said, My mother died of breast cancer because she lived in England and the government was in charge of health care.

□ 1440

She said I have been found to have cancer since I've been here in the U.S., and because the government was not in charge of my health care, I got it diagnosed in time. I got treatment in time.

I didn't have to live by any preconceived requirements of the government. So I'm alive because I was in America. My mother is dead because her health care was in England.

Some think the great panacea is government being charged with health care. We've heard over and over again that this is for the good of the children.

At this point I would be delighted to yield to my friend from Michigan.

UNITED WAY CELEBRATES 125 YEARS

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me some time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very honored today to commend the United Way on 125 years of serving our country. In particular, the United Way of Southeastern Michigan has done so much good for our region and for our people. It has helped provide shelter to the homeless, provide education to our young people and training to the unemployed.

So again, I want to thank the United Way of Southeastern Michigan for its service, and also congratulate the United Way on its 125th anniversary of outstanding work for our country.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank and greatly appreciate my friend, Mr. CLARKE. That is obviously an important announcement. I didn't realize that the United Way had been around 125 years. They do great work, and I appreciate my friend, and I do mean my friend, calling that to our attention.

The Obama administration had an agenda item, getting ObamaCare passed. Elena Kagan was Solicitor General, and she continued to be Solicitor General even up until after the time when the first lawsuits were filed against ObamaCare. Now, she gave testimony before the Senate that satisfied them at the time that she was pure as the driven snow and she would in no way compromise integrity. That was the feeling that was gotten. She got the votes that she needed to be confirmed, and then went on to the U.S. Supreme Court.

But since that time, more questions have arisen. Wait a minute, she was there during this, that, and the other. When ObamaCare was being drafted, when it was being prepared, and even after it passed and it became law, she was the Solicitor General.

And so now that we see all of these things in perspective, we go, wait a minute, could she have been the worst Solicitor General in American history that she would never advise the President, her boss—never advise him—on the litigation that would surely be coming when his prize legislation got passed, if it got passed? Because a legitimate lawyer, an adviser, a counselor, will tell the client—in this case, the President—Look, if you want to have this pass constitutional muster, here's what you need to do. Let's get this verbiage in one place, let's get this in another.

Could she have foreseen that perhaps a weakness of the brilliant John Roberts would be, if you call something a penalty in a bill and then later call it a tax after it's passed, that maybe the Supreme Court would buy it? I don't even think that Solicitor General Kagan could have foreseen that John Roberts would totally abandon intellectual consistency. No matter how intelligent, I don't think she could have seen that coming. I certainly didn't.

But the law regarding judges, Federal judges, is not just a matter of ethics—gee, you can have an ethics complaint filed against you as you can if you're a practicing attorney or a judge. The law is 28 U.S.C., section 455, and it says:

Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself—that's generic for him and her—in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

Well, it is absolutely clear that her impartiality is certainly questionable in her boss's most prized legislation: ObamaCare.

My friend from Alabama, one of the great Senators over at the other end of the hall, JEFF SESSIONS, had extended eight questions to Attorney General Holder asking for answers, and they were submitted timely under the rules so they were part of the hearing and would require answers from our Attorney General Holder. And three of them in particular were these. These were questions for Attorney General Holder, because as 28 U.S.C., section 455 is the law and Justice Kagan's impartiality has reasonably been questioned, there is potential here for a law violation by Justice Kagan, and we need to know more. Since this is with regard to the law that the Attorney General is supposed to uphold, fair questions. From JEFF SESSIONS to Attorney General Holder:

Are you aware of any instances during Justice Kagan's tenure as Solicitor General of the United States in which information related to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and/or litigation related thereto was relayed or provided to her?

Another question from U.S. Senator JEFF SESSIONS to Attorney General Holder that required an answer:

When did your staff begin ''removing'' Solicitor General Kagan from meetings in this matter? On what basis did you take this action? In what other matters was such action taken?

Clearly, Solicitor General Kagan was on the email list for people who were talking about the laws that were coming up that the administration wanted to get passed, including ObamaCare, so it's a legitimate question to know at what point did she stop getting emails regarding ObamaCare.

It's also important to know what she said in those emails, because the one email they slipped and let us get a glimpse of was when ObamaCare passed. She sent an email something along the lines of: Can you believe they got the votes? Sounds like an excited utterance.

And it's worth noting that under 28 U.S.C., section 455 the law is very clear, this is the law. It's not an ethics, an encouraged rule. This is the law.

□ 1450

''Where he or she has served in government employment''—as Solicitor General Kagan had—''and in such capacity participated as counsel, adviser or material witness concerning the proceeding or expressed an opinion concerning the merits of the particular case in controversy, she shall disqualify herself.''

So, clearly, she is already disqualified because her impartiality is certainly reasonably being questioned. But is there even another law—not rule, but law—in which her impartiality can be questioned? But it makes it very clear, if she ever, ever expressed an opinion concerning the merits of ObamaCare, she should not have been allowed to sit on this case.

I think history is going to judge this case in a way that Justice Roberts never dreamed. He is so brilliant. There's no question that he was able to rationalize that coming as part of the majority as he did was the thing to do. He has gotten accolades, just as Chief Justice Taney did when he came out with the Dred Scott decision. Justice Taney got accolades from people, you know, wow. Yes, he got criticism, just as Chief Justice Roberts has, but he got some of the same accolades he's got: wow, what a brilliant man. He has removed politics from the Supreme Court when the truth is just the opposite of what occurred.

The politics of the White House prevailed. It was pure politics; it was nothing but politics. And anyone who honestly reads this opinion from an entirely objective standpoint will not be able to say this is a beautiful piece of well-reasoned legal logic because it is not. It is a hodgepodge of poorly written, poorly thought-out, poorly pieced-together opinion; and it's an embarrassment. And one day, history will record that this Court was possessed of four individuals who had political agendas and could not set them aside, and that a Chief Justice, who knew better, decided he would try to make the Court look less than political, and in doing so became very political.

We need answers to these questions.

The third one was:

Did you ever have a conversation with Justice Kagan regarding her recusal from the matters before the Supreme Court related to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act? If so, please describe the circumstances and substance of those conversations.

Real easy. Now, we know that this Attorney General has significant recollection problems. He recalled, under penalty of perjury before our Judiciary Committee that he had only learned about Fast and Furious a few weeks, he said, a few weeks before the hearing. Within months, we found documentation showing that that was a lie. It had been months before, at a minimum,

that he had learned. Then, when he had that presented to him, he said a few weeks, months, what's the difference? Highest Justice official in America sees no difference between a few weeks and months.

These questions need to be answered. It's already embarrassing enough that a Justice hid behind the refusal to answer questions, the avoidance of questions, to be able to sit on this case and participate in one of the worst thought-out and thought-through and expressed opinions that I've read from the U.S. Supreme Court.

And it's worth looking at some of them. If you go to the opinion itself, first of all, the Supreme Court has to deal with the issue of whether the Supreme Court can consider the case because the Anti-Injunction Act basically, in essence, says: if Congress passes a tax, then the Supreme Court does not have any jurisdiction to consider the case. No one can file such case in Federal court until the tax is actually levied and the individual filing suit has actually had it levied on them. Then that individual has standing, can file a lawsuit, and the Supreme Court can consider it. But until the Supreme Court could decide and determine whether or not the penalty for not buying health care insurance was a penalty or a tax—even though the language in the act clearly said it was a penalty—well, the Court couldn't go forward. So that was the first thing they had to wrestle with. You see it particularly highlighted from pages 11 through 15.

But it's worth noting—this is page 11—the Court says: before turning to the merits, we need to be sure we have authority to do so. That's Justice Roberts, before turning to the merits, we've got to be sure we have authority. He said the Anti-Injunction Act provides:

> No suit for the purpose of restraining the assessment or collection of any tax shall be maintained in any court by any person, whether or not such person is the person against whom such tax was assessed.

Can't bring the lawsuit, the Supreme Court can't consider it if it's a tax, because it won't be 2014 or so before that happens.

So you look at this decision, page 12, our brilliant Chief Justice—and he really is brilliant, he just compromised it here:

> Congress's decision to label this exaction a ''penalty'' rather than a ''tax'' is significant because the Affordable Care Act describes many other exactions it creates as ''taxes.''

Because there are taxes. There are, clearly. There's the medical device tax that ObamaCare adds. All these other taxes, they call themselves taxes. This doesn't. And Justice Roberts points out, it's a penalty. They call it that.

Justice Roberts says, and this is page 13 of his opinion:

> The Anti-Injunction Act and the Affordable Care Act, however, are creatures of Congress's own creation. How they relate to each other is up to Congress and the best evidence of Congress's intent.

Get that: best evidence of Congress's intent is the statutory text. That's why he goes through and says the text calls it a penalty. On page 15, he says:

> The Affordable Care Act does not require that the penalty for failing to comply with the individual mandate be treated as a tax for purposes of the Anti-Injunction Act. The Anti-Injunction Act therefore does not apply to this suit, and we may proceed to the merits.

It's not a tax; it's a penalty. All right. So, page 15, all this legal reasoning, it's not a tax, it's a penalty, best evidence of what it is is what Congress calls it, Congress calls it a penalty, ergo it's a penalty and we can move on. And now we're entitled to consider the merits.

Now, he also adds—this is over at page 39:

> The joint dissenters argue that we cannot uphold section 5000A as a tax because Congress did not frame it as such.

Now, in fact, the four intellectually honest dissenters have pointed out to the Chief Justice—they called it a penalty. You said the best evidence of what it was was what Congress called it. Congress calls it a penalty, they treat it as a penalty, and that's the best evidence. So you can't uphold 5000A as a tax because it was not intended to be one.

If you look, page 39 is where—and the full sentence says: ''An example may illustrate why labels should not control here.'' This is the Chief Justice saying these lines. Labels should not control here. He just said, in page 11 through 15, labels should control. Congress puts the label on what they mean it to be: that should control. Now he's saying labels don't control here.

He goes on to say, and this is at page 44:

> The Affordable Care Act's requirement that certain individuals pay a financial penalty for not obtaining health insurance may reasonably be characterized as a ''tax.''

□ 1500

I called it a penalty so I'd have jurisdiction to write this opinion, but now that I have jurisdiction to write this opinion, now, page 44, I'm calling it a tax. Also on 44 he says:

> The statute reads more naturally as a command to buy insurance than as a tax, and I would uphold it as a command if the Constitution allowed it.

Well, that is the point I guess, that is really strange in an opinion because that's in a paragraph marked Capital D that starts with:

> Justice Ginsberg questions the necessity of rejecting the government's commerce power.

You never put that in, you're not supposed to. In good writing of judicial opinions, you don't put that in a majority opinion. You don't attack another co-majority signer, and yet he does that a few times in his majority opinion.

But then to add first person, the first person pronoun ''I'' and then follow that with a conditional future tense verb ''would'' uphold it as a command if the Constitution allowed it, why is that there?

That looks like that should have been part of a dissenting opinion, not, for heaven's sake, the majority opinion by one of the smartest lawyers in the country. He sacrificed not only his intellectual consistency, he sacrificed his intellectual ability to write as one of the best writers we ever had. It's really tragic.

But the statute reads more naturally as a command to buy insurance. I would have allowed it. It makes no sense there in that context.

One other quote we have down here, it's found at page 57. He says:

> We are confident that Congress would have wanted to preserve the rest of the Act.

He knows that's not true. He knows that the House version of ObamaCare had the severability clause. And the severability clause, every good lawyer, even every bad lawyer knows, if you want the whole document to be preserved, even if one line is struck out, you better put that Mother Hubbard clause in there so that it's all protected. You lose one line, you don't lose the whole document.

And that was in the House version, but the Senate chose to strike it out. They didn't want it in there to say, if any of these parts get struck down by the Court, it all has to fall. They didn't want that. They wanted the bill without the severability clause because if anything got struck, everything had to go. That's the way they looked at it.

In fact, that debate was even made. If we don't get this part, we don't get that part, then there's no sense even having any of it.

Well, it's pretty tragic, pretty tragic. But there's been so much sacrifice.

I'm very grateful to Justice Kennedy, Justice Scalia, Justice Thomas, Justice Alito for maintaining their consistency. The dissent is very well-written, very consistent. They not only didn't sacrifice their intellectual integrity, they did not compromise their writing ability.

It's a dangerous time, and now we know, because of this Supreme Court decision, talking to my friend, ALLEN WEST this morning, he brought this up. I didn't know he'd brought it up already in an interview. But since we now know that bringing down the cost of government function is a legitimate interest that justifies intrusive legislation, and you can now have a tax on people if they don't participate, then we know everywhere that concealed guns have been made legal, the crime rates have gone down. When the crime rates go down, the costs go down. So we need a bill that will require everybody in America to buy a gun, and if you don't, you'll be taxed.

And this Supreme Court, in their intellectual lack of integrity, will sustain that bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1335. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide rights for pilots, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4348) ''An Act to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.''.

GLOBAL WARMING AND AMERICAN FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I have a policy in my office that every time anyone from my district actually comes to the Capitol, they have a right to see me and talk to me, especially young people. And I have, over the years, seen hundreds and hundreds, maybe thousands of young people from my home district in southern California. And I let them talk to me and ask any questions that they would like to ask.

And I have a question that I always ask them, and I thought it would be interesting for my colleagues and perhaps any of those who are watching C–SPAN or reading this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to know the answer that I get when I ask a question of the young high school students from my district.

Mr. Speaker, when our kids come in to my office and are talking to me, I note that I was actually in high school in southern California 47 years ago. And I always ask the kids, is the air better quality today, or is it worse today than when I was going to high school in southern California 47 years ago?

And 90 percent of the students, over the years, whom I've asked that question to have had exactly the wrong answer. Their answer is, oh, you were so lucky to live at a time when the air quality in southern California and around the Nation was so good, and it's so terrible that we have to put up today with air quality that's killing us.

They've been told that the air quality when I was in high school was so much better than it is today, which is 180 degrees wrong. But this is a general attitude among today's young people because our young people are being lied to. They are intentionally being given misinformation.

Now, their teachers may not be intentionally lying to them, but their teachers maybe are given information from scientists and other sources that is an exact lie from people who know that, yes, the air quality back when I went to school, and I go into description about how the air quality was so bad at times we couldn't even go out on the playground. They wouldn't even let us out of the classroom on to the sports field because the air was so bad. Today that happens maybe once a year or twice a year in southern California. Back then it happened once a week at times during the summer and during the school year.

So our kids have this view that their generation is being poisoned, and they're willing to accept stringent measures in order to protect the environment that take away a great deal of the opportunity that they should have in their lives in order to correct this horrible problem that they're told that they've got.

Well, when I tell them it's just the opposite, they're so surprised. Well, the truth is, our Nation's environment is no longer the disaster that it was 50 years ago. And 50 years ago we did have a problem. Fifty years ago I remember that when my dad was a Marine down in Quantico, when I was a child I came up here several times and my dad would say, whatever you do, don't put your finger in the Potomac River or your finger will fall off. Well, it wasn't quite that bad, but it was really bad.

We've made tremendous progress over the years on the Potomac River. I can't help but notice there are people water-skiing and sailing and fishing in the Potomac now.

Well, we don't live in the same time of 50 years ago. The air today has never been cleaner than at any time in my lifetime. The water has never been cleaner in any time in my lifetime than it is today. And I am hopeful that my children will never have to experience the pollution that was rampant when I was their age.

So, let's take a look and give credit where credit's due. That progress is, in large part, because of the efforts of the government, well, and the EPA, yes, which came in under President Nixon, and others who have used science to fight for environmental reforms and to improve the quality of life of our people.

And while I am thankful, I also would like to heed the warning that President Eisenhower left with us in his farewell address. And I quote, ''that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific technological elite.''

He was warning us about government-funded research becoming so intertwined with public policy and the creation of regulations it would compromise the integrity of both.

Well, in recent years, we've seen political agendas being driven by scientific-sounding claims being used to frighten the general public again and again and again.

□ 1510

An unjustified fear has been used, for example, to ban DDT. I remember when I was a kid, and I used to run through these clouds of DDT—again, when my father was in the military down in North Carolina. Yes, it was killing millions of mosquitos in North Carolina, but when they banned that DDT, I seem to remember it had something to do with the thickness of shells of certain birds. Well, they banned DDT, and because of that we have had millions of deaths due to malaria in Africa. Millions of young African children, because they don't have a good diet, succumb to a disease like malaria and die because of it. These children are dead—make no mistake about it—because we were frightened into an irrational position on DDT, banning that and thus destroying the lives of millions of children in the Third World.

We've seen alarmism with ''The Population Bomb.'' Do you remember that in 1968? It was a book claiming that increasing populations and decreasing agricultural yield would lead to cannibalism and global warfare over scarce resources by the mid-1970s. Here we are a long way from the 1970s, and I'm afraid Malthus, who 150 years ago started this type of scarism, was wrong, wrong, wrong. Right now, there are a lot of scientists, unfortunately, who are molding themselves after the Malthus mistakes that were made 150 years ago.

Today's environmental alarmists use faulty and, in some cases, deceitful computer models to ''prove'' that the world is being destroyed one way or the other, quite often, in the ones they've been using in the last 10 years, of course, was that the world was being destroyed by manmade carbon emissions. This is proven by their computer models, even though the Earth has seen significantly higher atmospheric carbon levels many times before. Those were not necessarily bad times for this planet, but those computer models were suggesting, because of carbon emissions, we were going to face a catastrophe. In fact, I remember very well the predictions of 10 and 15 years ago that, by now, we would have reached a tipping point in the temperature of the world—that we'd have reached a temperature of about now—and then it would go up 5 to 10 degrees, which is a big jump, but we haven't seen that big jump.

The alarmists, of course, are not interested when they make mistakes, and they're not really interested in solving real problems. They are part of a coalition that wants to change our way of life—that's their goal—with their computerizations showing that just horrible times are ahead of us unless we change. The idea isn't to stop those horrible times, because those horrible times are just a product of what they put into their computers. Of course we all know what ''garbage in, garbage out'' means. If you put into a computer that you're going to have some kind of disaster, that's what you're going to get out of your computer, but what they have in mind, of

course, and what they want to do is to change the way of life—our life—which requires us to acquiesce, or better yet, they frighten us into submission.

Make no mistake: manmade global warming, as a theory, is being pushed by people who believe in global government. They have been looking for an excuse for an incredible freedom-busting centralization of power, and this global warming is just the latest in a long line of such scares.

This was recently acknowledged by the godfather of the global warming theory, a man who over the years has been given such credit for laying the intellectual foundation and the scientific foundation for the theory of manmade global warming. His name is James Lovelock. James Lovelock, however, has changed his mind. James Lovelock now concedes—and after a longtime dialogue with Burt Rutan, one of the great engineers of our day—has come around to understand that he was not being totally honest about things when he was accepting information that bolstered his position, and was rejecting the consideration of other information. He has changed his mind about the real threat that global warming poses to the Earth—not that there wouldn't be any global warming but that it has been totally exaggerated by the scientific community, and that he, himself, played a major role in that exaggeration.

Dr. James Lovelock is in an article in the Toronto Sun, which is entitled, ''Green 'drivel' exposed: The godfather of global warming lowers the boom on climate change hysteria,'' which is what we have been hearing over these last few years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce for the RECORD this article that was just recently in the Toronto Sun, and I would like to put this in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Toronto Sun, June 23, 2012]

GREEN 'DRIVEL' EXPOSED

THE GODFATHER OF GLOBAL WARMING LOWERS THE BOOM ON CLIMATE CHANGE HYSTERIA

(By Lorrie Goldstein)

Two months ago, James Lovelock, the godfather of global warming, gave a startling interview to msnbc.com in which he acknowledged he had been unduly ''alarmist'' about climate change.

The implications were extraordinary.

Lovelock is a world-renowned scientist and environmentalist whose Gaia theory—that the Earth operates as a single, living organism—has had a profound impact on the development of global warming theory.

Unlike many ''environmentalists,'' who have degrees in political science, Lovelock, until his recent retirement at age 92, was a much-honoured working scientist and academic.

His inventions have been used by NASA, among many other scientific organizations.

Lovelock's invention of the electron capture detector in 1957 first enabled scientists to measure CFCs (chlorofluorocarbons) and other pollutants in the atmosphere, leading, in many ways, to the birth of the modern environmental movement.

Having observed that global temperatures since the turn of the millennium have not gone up in the way computer-based climate models predicted, Lovelock acknowledged, ''the problem is we don't know what the climate is doing. We thought we knew 20 years ago.'' Now, Lovelock has given a follow-up interview to the UK's Guardian newspaper in which he delivers more bombshells sure to anger the global green movement, which for years worshipped his Gaia theory and apocalyptic predictions that billions would die from man-made climate change by the end of this century.

Lovelock still believes anthropogenic global warming is occurring and that mankind must lower its greenhouse gas emissions, but says it's now clear the doomsday predictions, including his own (and Al Gore's) were incorrect.

He responds to attacks on his revised views by noting that, unlike many climate scientists who fear a loss of government funding if they admit error, as a freelance scientist, he's never been afraid to revise his theories in the face of new evidence. Indeed, that's how science advances.

Among his observations to the Guardian:

(1) A long-time supporter of nuclear power as a way to lower greenhouse gas emissions, which has made him unpopular with environmentalists, Lovelock has now come out in favour of natural gas fracking (which environmentalists also oppose), as a low-polluting alternative to coal.

As Lovelock observes, ''Gas is almost a give-away in the U.S. at the moment. They've gone for fracking in a big way. This is what makes me very cross with the greens for trying to knock it . . . Let's be pragmatic and sensible and get Britain to switch everything to methane. We should be going mad on it.'' (Kandeh Yumkella, co-head of a major United Nations program on sustainable energy, made similar arguments last week at a UN environmental conference in Rio de Janeiro, advocating the development of conventional and unconventional natural gas resources as a way to reduce deforestation and save millions of lives in the Third World.)

(2) Lovelock blasted greens for treating global warming like a religion.

''It just so happens that the green religion is now taking over from the Christian religion,'' Lovelock observed. ''I don't think people have noticed that, but it's got all the sort of terms that religions use . . . The greens use guilt. That just shows how religious greens are. You can't win people round by saying they are guilty for putting (carbon dioxide) in the air.''

(3) Lovelock mocks the idea modern economies can be powered by wind turbines.

As he puts it, ''so-called 'sustainable development' . . . is meaningless drivel . . . We rushed into renewable energy without any thought. The schemes are largely hopelessly inefficient and unpleasant. I personally can't stand windmills at any price.''

(4) Finally, about claims ''the science is settled'' on global warming: ''One thing that being a scientist has taught me is that you can never be certain about anything. You never know the truth. You can only approach it and hope to get a bit nearer to it each time. You iterate towards the truth. You don't know it.''

For those who are listening or who are reading this specifically in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to quote from that article now. That article reads:

Having observed that global temperatures since the turn of the millennium have not gone up in the way computer-based climate models predicted, Lovelock acknowledged, ''The problem is we don't know what the climate is doing. We thought we knew 20 years ago.''

The sign of a very intelligent person, really, is to admit the things that he doesn't know. I mean I've always said I'm not the smartest guy on the block, but I know what I don't know. Thus, when I'm talking to people, I can have an honest discussion to try to expand my knowledge. We've had too many people claiming that they know it all and that we have to give up our freedom because they know it, and they don't even have to engage in a debate with us over the details of something like global warming.

Let me know who has heard the words ''case closed.'' I mean, 3 years ago, that's what they were saying here. What does that mean? When you hear people in government and when you hear scientists saying, ''the case is closed,'' well, that must mean there is going to be no further debate on this issue.

I've been here as a Member of Congress for 24 years. Before that, I served in the White House for 7 years under President Reagan. I have never seen a time when there was such an effort made to cut off debate on an important subject than has been done on global warming. Never have I heard over and over again people being told to shut up and that the case is closed. Never have I seen so many research projects canceled because they in some way challenged the theory of global warming. Never have I seen so many scientists fired from their positions because they believe that the global warming theory may not be accurate.

So what we need to do is to make sure that we have an honest discussion of the issue, when even some of the promoters—some of the people who have been the strongest advocates, like the individual, the doctor, I just quoted—have changed their positions, if not totally reversed them. At least they've been open to have said, We really don't know what we've been advocating for these last few years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD a letter from an esteemed physicist, Gordon Fulks. This is a letter and some communication between this physicist and aerospace pioneer legend Burt Rutan. I would like to put that into the RECORD at this point.

JUNE 23, 2012.

Re Bravo on your courage!

DEAR BURT: I think you deserve much of the credit for helping James Lovelock understand the AGW phenomenon. You patiently provided him with the pertinent data and logic. As with most of us, it took some time to digest the enormity of the necessary shift in perspective. He had to give up a faith in the honesty of government agencies and most of the scientists they are supporting.

For Jim Lovelock the transition apparently involved two steps. That lessened the need for a complete about face. He first figured out the Chlorofluorocarbon-Ozone Hole scam by discovering that some scientists were cheating on the data, apparently to further their careers. He probably also knew that the chemists who received the Nobel Prize for their work had overestimated the effect by a large factor. It was not such a huge step to then realize that climate scientists might be doing the same. But

Lovelock, to his credit, wanted to be sure and took his time examining the information that you and others sent to him.

My own recognition of what was going on was likewise a two step process. During the ''Nuclear Winter'' scare about 25 years ago, we redid Carl Sagan's original calculations to discover that he had carefully chosen the inputs to his climate code to produce the result he wanted. When we realized that a highly respected physicist would prostitute himself to support his politics, his stature, and his income, we, in principle, understood all the other scams of the post World War Two era.

From 1946 Nobel Laureate Hermann Joseph Muller hiding evidence of a threshold phenomenon in human radiation exposure to Rachael Carson promoting half truths about DDT, to unfounded scares about Acid Rain, Ozone Depletion, Magnetic Fields, Global Warming, Ocean Acidification, Diesel Particulates, and more, we have been victimized by continuous hysteria that has led to disastrous public policies. Far too many scientists and their fellow travelers have supported a grand bilking of American taxpayers for their own selfish and political interests.

Many thanks for your efforts to convince one very important individual to re-examine the logic and evidence. Now we need to figure out how to avoid falling victim to these scams in the first place. As you know, that must involve fundamental reform of the reward process that funnels vast amounts of money to those who play along.

GORDON J. FULKS, PhD (PHYSICS),
Corbett, Oregon USA.

Now let me read, in part, what that letter says:

During the ''Nuclear Winter'' scare about 25 years ago, we redid Carl Sagan's original calculations to discover that he had carefully chosen the inputs to his climate code to produce the result he wanted. When we realized that a highly respected physicist would prostitute himself to support his politics, his stature and his income, we, in principle, understood all the other scams of the post World War II era.

□ 1520

Whoever looked up to Carl Sagan, and when they realized he was cheating on the information and the analysis, they realized that this was so widespread it was something to be concerned about. And I continue:

From 1946 Nobel Laureate Hermann Joseph Muller hiding evidence of a threshold phenomenon in human radiation exposure to Rachel Carson promoting half-truths about DDT, to unfounded scares about acid rain, ozone depletion, magnetic fields, global warming, ocean acidification, diesel particulates, and more, we have been victimized by continuous hysteria that has led to disastrous public policies. Far too many scientists and their fellow travelers have supported a grand bilking of American taxpayers for their own selfish and political interests.

That is the end of that quotation from that letter to Burt Rutan from this world famous physicist.

It's clear that our current system, fueled by the horrific waste of borrowed money, isn't working. Perhaps it's time that we acted on President Eisenhower's warning and find a better way to separate research and the creation of regulations. Otherwise, we will find ourselves held truly captive with no access to inexpensive energy, reduced access to food and water, and we might find ourselves also with none of our basic freedoms because we've given them away because someone has frightened us into giving away our freedom and giving away the opportunity for a better life for our children.

Mr. Speaker, I am someone who is very optimistic about the future. We have great possibilities. There are other people who look to the future and think that the technological revolutions that we have faced are actually a detriment to humankind. People did not live good lives 100 years ago. As I mentioned, my father was a marine. Before that, he grew up on a dirt-poor farm in North Dakota, as did my mother. In those days, ordinary Americans did not live well. It was a struggle. The longevity of these people was not that long because of the struggle they were in.

We need to make sure that we continue our technological development so that we can have, yes, a clean environment, which I have indicated was a product of the good technology and, yes, the research that came from honest and hardworking scientists and engineers, quite often on a government contract. But we need to make sure that we don't back off, because we know there is a group of people in our society, and perhaps around the world, who for some reason believe that back before the industrial age that people lived better than they live today. Some of them have tried their best to fight modernism. They have declared war, for example, on the internal combustion engine. This global warming thing, that was the motive here. The internal combustion engine is supposedly putting out carbon dioxide, and carbon dioxide they believe is changing the climate of the planet.

I told you what I have asked young students who come into my office. I asked: Is the air better or worse than it was 50 years ago? I even ask Members of Congress and I ask people all the time, the ones who buy into global warming, who are saying they're advocates of global warming caused by mankind—basically the internal combustion engine—what percentage of the Earth's atmosphere is carbon dioxide, is CO_2. I hope that everyone who is focusing on these comments now ask themselves how much CO_2 there is, because CO_2 is being blamed for changing the entire climate of the planet. It would be an enormous undertaking to change the climate of the whole planet, so it must be a pretty good part of our atmosphere.

With that question, Members of Congress tell me that they believe it's 25 percent. Some people say 10 percent. Others say 20 percent. I have never had a Member of Congress come anywhere close to what it really is. It's not 10 percent or 20 percent. It's not 5 percent. It's not 1 percent. It's less than one-half of one-tenth of 1 percent. Have you got that? It's not just 1 percent. It's less than one-half of one-tenth of 1 percent. Of that, humankind is only responsible for 10 percent of that CO_2. That makes it so minuscule that it would be like putting a string across a football field and believing that was going to create changes in the entire football field.

The fact that people are unaware, even at this level, of how small the CO_2 impact is causes them to buy onto these scare tactics. This is a challenge for those of us here because that threatens our freedom. It threatens us and our children in being able to have the opportunities that we had and that we hope that all Americans and all people throughout the world will have.

Let us go back on one thing. I am planning a trip this year across the country, even though the gas prices are pretty high. I'm hopefully going to drive across the country with my children. It's a wonderful thing. What a wonderful vacation. We're going to have 2 weeks to do it. I'm really looking forward to that. We're going to go in an automobile, and it will cost us. The price of gas is up and I'm not a wealthy man, but we do have this opportunity, and it's a wonderful thing.

What about 150 years ago? Did people have an opportunity like this? No. What was the biggest challenge that we faced to the health and safety of the people of this country 150 years ago? Or, let's say just at the beginning of the last century, when we turned from the 19th to the 20th century. Do you know what it was? It was horse manure. Horse manure and horse urine was enveloping our cities and the water and created health hazards for people. And the flies and the stench and the internal combustion engine came along, and it has been a great factor in providing health for human beings. All over the world we got rid of the massive animal droppings that were a threat to our health.

Also, there is the fact that we couldn't produce a lot of wealth based on animal strength and we couldn't go on long trips with our families and we didn't have a good quality of life, but the internal combustion engine provided that for people of the United States and humankind. There is no doubt that we have needed to improve the efficiency of the internal combustion engine, and we have.

Here's the thought we'll leave with. In southern California, when I was a kid, there was so much pollution—although our young people don't know about that today. But today, when they think the air is polluted in southern California, we have twice as many cars on the road and we've reduced pollution into the 90s. It's probably 95 percent. This is a tremendous accomplishment. And yes, some of the regulations that we have had from the Federal Government have motivated this change. We need to accept that. But we need to also accept that it is our technological advances, and it has been not cancelling out technology for fear of

things like CO_2, which are not a threat to our health. That's how we have kept America on an upward course, even though we've been dragged down scare after scare after scare.

□ 1530

I remember when we had Meryl Streep come to this Congress and testify about Alar in apples. What happened was, for 2 years apple farmers went broke throughout the United States. There were thousands of families who suffered because their product was not being bought because they were afraid of Alar. What happened to that? Alar, it was found 2 years later that it was all a scare. There was nothing to it. The same thing with cranberries. When I was a kid, we couldn't eat cranberries for Thanksgiving.

The gentleman that I quoted here, that I mentioned, who is the godfather of the global warming theory, James Lovelock, he is also the man who discovered fluoro hydrocarbons, which gave people the analysis of the ozone hole. Well, guess what? The ozone hole, as we have found out—and as it was mentioned in passing there—the ozone hole was overrated as a threat. In fact, it went away, and it's a natural cycle.

What we have had on this planet is a natural cycle of weather, of temperatures, and that will continue. But what's happened is, we've had people step forward, trying to create hysteria for their own political ends, trying to frighten people into accepting policies they otherwise would never accept.

So today, I'm hoping that as we celebrate the Fourth of July, we, again, reaffirm that we will never give up our liberty. We will never be frightened out of our liberty by foreigners who threaten us with weapons, and we will not be frightened out of our liberty by people who do not believe in the same type of freedom that we believe in but are using scare tactics to create hysteria among our people that are phony scare tactics to try to frighten us into giving up our freedom.

So on this Fourth of July, I hope we all reconfirm that guarantee of our commitment in this Nation to freedom, to opportunity for ordinary people so that ordinary people can live decent lives with liberty and justice, prosperity for all.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the House that, pursuant to House Resolution 711, the Speaker has certified to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia the refusal of Eric H. Holder, Jr., to produce certain papers before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1605

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged concurrent resolution:

S. CON. RES. 51

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Friday, June 29, 2012, through Monday, July 2, 2012, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, July 9, 2012, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Friday, June 29, 2012, through Friday, July 6, 2012, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its majority leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, July 9, 2012, or until time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Message in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXTENDING LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRY BENEFITS TO SENEGAL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112–120)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 502(f)(1)(B) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the ''1974 Act'') (19 U.S.C. 2462(f)(1)(B)), I am notifying the Congress of my intent to add the Republic of Senegal (Senegal) to the list of least-developed beneficiary developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences program. After considering the criteria set forth in section 502(c) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(c)), I have determined that it is appropriate to extend least-developed beneficiary developing country benefits to Senegal.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 2012.*

TERMINATING DESIGNATIONS OF GIBRALTAR AND THE TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS AS BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112–121)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 502(f)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the ''1974 Act'') (19 U.S.C. 2462(f)(2)), I am providing notification of my intent to terminate the designations of Gibraltar and the Turks and Caicos Islands as beneficiary developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program. Section 502(e) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(e)) provides that if the President determines that a beneficiary developing country has become a ''high income'' country, as defined by the official statistics of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (i.e., the World Bank), then the President shall terminate the designation of such country as a beneficiary developing country for purposes of GSP, effective on January 1 of the second year following the year in which such determination is made.

Pursuant to section 502(e) of the 1974 Act, I have determined that it is appropriate to terminate Gibraltar's designation as a beneficiary developing country under the GSP program, because it has become a high income country as defined by the World Bank. Accordingly, Gibraltar's eligibility for trade benefits under the GSP program will end on January 1, 2014.

In addition, pursuant to section 502(e) of the 1974 Act, I have determined that it is appropriate to terminate Turks and Caicos Islands' designation as a beneficiary developing country under the GSP program, because it has become a high income country as defined by the World Bank. Accordingly, Turks and Caicos Islands' eligibility for trade benefits under the GSP program will end on January 1, 2014.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 2012*.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending a funeral.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1335. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide rights for pilots, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 11, 2012, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 5883. To make a technical correction in Public Law 112–108.

H.R. 5890. To correct a technical error in Public Law 112–122.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, 112th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 9, 2012.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, July 9, 2012, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6722. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations, Sumter County, Florida, et al. [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-B-1253] received May 29, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6723. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations, Mobile, AL et al., [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0003] received June 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6724. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Mutual Insurance Holding Company Treated as Insurance Company (RIN: 3064-AD89) received June 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6725. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Political Contributions by Certain Investment Advisers: Ban on Third-Party Solicitation; Extension of Compliance Date (RIN: 3235-AK39) received June 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6726. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of OMB Guidance on Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension [Docket ID: ED-2012-OS-0007] (RIN: 1890-AA17) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6727. A letter from the Deputy Director for Policy, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6728. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Programs; Disallowance of Claims for FFP and Technical Corrections [CMS-2292-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ32) received May 29, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6729. A letter from the Associate Division Chief Policy Division, PSHSB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 12 and 90 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Redundancy of Communications Systems: Backup Power Private Land Mobile Radio Services: Selection and Assignment of Frequencies, and Transition of the Upper 200 Channels in the 800 MHz Band to EA Licensing received May 29, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6730. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Health Physics Surveys During Enriched Uranium-235 Processing and Fuel Fabrication Regulatory Guide 8.24 Revision 2 received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6731. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Withdrawal of Regulatory Guide 8.33, ''Quality Management Program'' received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6732. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Endorsement of Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 12-07, ''Guidelines For Performing Verification Walkdowns of Plant Flood Protection Features'' received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6733. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Endorsement of Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) Draft Report 1025286, ''Seismic Walkdown Guidance'' received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6734. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Foreign Species, Endangered Species Program, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule To Remove the Morelet's Crocodile From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2010-0030] (RIN: 1018-AV22) received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6735. A letter from the Assistant Regional Director, USFWS; Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska — Subpart C — Board Determinations; Rural Determinations [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2011-0068] (RIN: 1018-AX95) received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6736. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Recovery, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of American Burying Beetle in Southwestern Missouri [Docket No.: FWS-R3-ES-2011-0034] (RIN: 1018-AX79) received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6737. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Snapper-Grouper Management Measures [Docket No.: 110511280-2424-02] (RIN: 0648-BB10) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. Third Semiannual Report on the Activity of the Committee on Financial Services for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Semi-Annual Report of the Activity of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. Activity Report of the Committee on Energy and Commerce (Rept. 112–561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. Third Semi-annual Activity Report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States House of Representatives for the Period January 5, 2011 through May 31, 2012 (Rept. 112–562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5892. A bill to improve hydropower, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. House Concurrent Resolution 127. Resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding actions to preserve and advance the multistakeholder governance model under which the Internet has thrived (Rept. 112–564). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1588. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to assure meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3128. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to adjust the date on which consolidated assets are determined for purposes of exempting certain instruments of smaller institutions from capital deductions (Rept. 112–566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. Survey of Activities for the House Committee on Rules For The Third Quarter of the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Third Semiannual Activities of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. Report on the Activities of the Committee on Education and the Workforce (Rept. 112–569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. Committee on Appropriations House of Representatives Semiannual Report of Committee Activities 112th Congress (Rept. 112–570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN: Committee on House Administration. Third Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on House Administration During the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. Report on Legislative and Oversight Activities of the Committee on Natural Resources During the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MICA: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Summary on the Activities of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Agriculture. Third Semiannual Report on Activities During the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCKEON: Committee on Armed Services. Third Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4367. A bill to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to limit the fee disclosure requirement for an automatic teller machine to the screen of that machine (Rept. 112–576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 940. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than September 14, 2012.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 6059. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect Medicare beneficiaries' access to home health services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 6060. A bill to amend Public Law 106-392 to maintain annual base funding for the Upper Colorado and San Juan fish recovery programs through fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STARK, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KIND, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 6061. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to ensure the continuation of services under the Work Incentives Planning and Assistance program and the Protection and Advocacy for Beneficiaries of Social Security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 6062. A bill to reauthorize the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program through fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. ADAMS, Ms. BUERKLE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. BASS of California, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 6063. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to child pornography and child exploitation offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 6064. A bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, Science, Space, and Technology, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned. considered and passed.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 6065. A bill to make improvements to the Children's Gasoline Burn Prevention Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HAYWORTH (for herself, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 6066. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the parity between the exclusion from income for employer-provided mass transit and parking benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MACK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. TURNER of New York, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 6067. A bill to enhance the security of the Western Hemisphere and bolster regional capacity and cooperation to counter current and emerging threats, to promote cooperation in the Western Hemisphere to prevent the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, to secure universal adherence to agreements regarding nuclear nonproliferation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 6068. A bill to provide for continued conservation efforts in the Chesapeake Bay watershed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 6069. A bill to provide protection for certain Federal employees with respect to implementation of the June 15, 2012, memorandum from Janet Napolitano, Secretary of Homeland Security, regarding the exercise of prosecutorial discretion with respect to individuals who came to the United States as children; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 6070. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study to determine the impact on the United States of the policy announced by the Secretary of Homeland Security on June 15, 2012, concerning the exercise of prosecutorial discretion with respect to individuals who came to the United States illegally as children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 6071. A bill to make supplemental appropriations for medical and prosthetic research of the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 6072. A bill to provide for certain land conveyances in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 6073. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that deceased veterans with no known next of kin can receive a dignified burial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 6074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the refundable portion of the child tax credit to individuals who are not authorized to be employed in the United States and to terminate the use of certifying acceptance agents to facilitate the application process for ITINs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BUERKLE (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 6075. A bill to permit the chief executive of a State to create an exemption from certain requirements of Federal environmental laws for producers of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 6076. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for the calculation of the minimum wage based on the Federal poverty threshold for a family of 2, as determined by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 6077. A bill to designate the Rachel Carson Nature Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 6078. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for higher goals for procurement contracts awarded to small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. QUAYLE:

H.J. Res. 114. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to construing provisions of law as having been enacted pursuant to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. MEEKS):

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 103rd anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H. Res. 719. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should initiate negotiations to enter into a free trade agreement with Tunisia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself and Mr. SCHILLING):

H. Res. 720. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of the Rock Island Arsenal and the men and women who currently and have previously worked on Arsenal Island; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

H. Res. 721. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that bolstering literacy among African-American and Hispanic men is an urgent national priority; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H. Res. 722. A resolution expressing support for designation of July as National Sarcoma Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H. Res. 723. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the classification of Dr. Shakil Afridi as a refugee of special humanitarian concern to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 6059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 6060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H.R. 6061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 8.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 6062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 6063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 6064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, Clause 7, and Clause 18.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 6065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 which allows Congress to ''fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.'' This legislation would set the standards of portable fuel containers.

Additionally, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 allows Congress to ''regulate Commerce . . . among the several states.'' As portable fuel containers are objects of interstate commerce, it is appropriate for Federal standards to be set.

By Ms. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 6066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 6067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 6068.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 6069.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to ''Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution Clause 18.''

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 6070.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to ''Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution Clause 18.''

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 6071.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section I of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 6072.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 6073.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 6074.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BUERKLE:

H.R. 6075.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among several States, and with Indian Tribes.

Also, the Tenth Amendment—

The powers not Delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the pe ople.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 6076.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority to enact this legislation can be found in:

Commerce Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 3)

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

Constitutional analysis is a rigorous discipline which goes far beyond the text of the Constitution, and requires knowledge of case law, history, and the tools of constitutional interpretation. While the scope of Congress' powers is an appropriate matter for House debate, the listing of specific textual authorities for routine Congressional legislation about which there is no legitimate constitutional concern is a diminishment of the majesty of our Founding Fathers' vision for our national legislature.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 6077.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 6078.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. QUAYLE:

H.J. Res. 114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.

H.R. 178: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 181: Mr. HIMES and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 192: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 273: Mr. CANSECO and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 361: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 371: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.

H.R. 420: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 657: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 718: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 831: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 854: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 941: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 942: Mr. TONKO and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 998: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1063: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1195: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1236: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1259: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1265: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1370: Mr. LANDRY.

H.R. 1381: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1464: Mr. RIVERA and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1475: Mr. RIVERA.

H.R. 1489: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 1543: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1546: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 1639: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1653: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1704: Mr. TURNER of New York.

H.R. 1775: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. COLE, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1867: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1878: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1897: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1936: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1971: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2033: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 2040: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 2104: Mr. BERG.

H.R. 2139: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. BERG.

H.R. 2140: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2305: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2382: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2479: Mr. BERG.

H.R. 2497: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 2554: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2563: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 2569: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 2672: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2794: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2874: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 2978: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 2985: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2989: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2992: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3053: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3057: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 3165: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3187: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. NUGENT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COLE, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 3337: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3405: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 3423: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 3458: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3461: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.

H.R. 3489: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 3586: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 3627: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 3709: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3798: Mr. DICKS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 3803: Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 3861: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 3875: Mr. HOLT and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 4057: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 4103: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4104: Mr. COOPER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 4154: Mr. MORAN and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 4169: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 4190: Mr. FARR and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 4215: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 4243: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 4259: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 4277: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 4350: Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4367: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 4373: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 4385: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 4402: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 4454: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 5542: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 5647: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 5684: Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 5749: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5796: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 5806: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 5839: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 5840: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KIND, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5850: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5865: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 5872: Mr. FORBES and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 5893: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 5910: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 5931: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 5954: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. DENT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 5969: Mr. KELLY and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 5970: Mr. KELLY and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 5987: Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 5991: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 6000: Mr. LONG, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 6003: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6019: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 6048: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. SARBANES.

H.J. Res. 103: Mr. SCALISE.

H.J. Res. 110: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. KEATING, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WELCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FARR, and Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 216: Mr. CLAY.

H. Res. 298: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H. Res. 484: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H. Res. 521: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 583: Mr. GARDNER.

H. Res. 618: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire and Mr. FORBES.

H. Res. 695: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H. Res. 701: Mr. LONG.
H. Res. 702: Mr. LONG.
H. Res. 704: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. CRITZ.
H. Res. 705: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CONYERS.
H. Res. 709: Mr. CAPUANO.
H. Res. 716: Mr. WELCH, Mr. AKIN, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. MARKEY and Mr. TURNER of Ohio.