Thirteen states, including California, ban gender discrimination in insurance coverage. Fortunately, in 2014 when the Affordable Care Act goes into effect, the same will be true for the whole country.

This is a long overdue step for women's equality and a key moment for health care.

GENDER DISPARITIES IN COMPENSATION

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observation of Equal Pay Day, a day that signifies, to a degree, how far we've come with regard to breaking the glass ceiling and providing opportunities for all Americans, regardless of gender, but it also reminds us how far we have to go, how far we have to go before parity is reached.

For every dollar earned by a man, for the same job, women continue to earn only 77 cents. That extra difference—thousands of dollars a year of income for working families—constitutes a lot of groceries or a lot of gas money that men can buy for the same work that women are undercompensated for.

I was proud that one of my first votes in the United States Congress in the 111th Congress was to pass the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

But we are not yet there in reaching gender parity in this country and ensuring that every American, regardless of their gender, has access to the same opportunity and the same compensation. That's why I introduced the Women WIN Jobs Act, along with ROSA DELAURO, which helps train women for high-paying jobs.

I ask my colleagues to continue to address the disparities in compensation among the genders.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 619 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 619

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. 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 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 Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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

Ms. FOXX. 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 619 provides for a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4348, a bill which extends the Federal highway, transit, and highway safety programs through the end of fiscal year 2012 and establishes program funding levels consistent with the fiscal year 2012 appropriated levels. The highway trust fund taxes and expenditure authority are also extended through fiscal year 2012. The Federal surface transportation programs and highway trust fund taxes and expenditure authority are currently authorized through June 30, 2012.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill today extends the authority of the government to fund highway programs through the end of this fiscal year.

□ 1230

In addition, the bill provides for the approval of the Keystone XL pipeline by giving the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 30 days to approve the Keystone XL pipeline expansion, and also includes language contained in H.R. 3096, the Resources and Ecosystem Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States, or RESTORE, Act which would establish the Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund and dedicate 80 percent of penalties paid by the responsible parties in connection with the Deepwater Horizon oil spill to the restoration of the gulf coast ecosystem and economy.

Mr. Speaker, our constituents are feeling great real pains at the pump, and their pains are being ignored by the President and his liberal extremist enablers in Congress.

Recent polls indicate that 63 percent of Americans say increases in gas prices have caused financial hardship for their families. My Democratic colleagues may be well served to ignore their Occupy Wall Street handlers for a moment and recognize that, as gas prices increase, it costs more to transport food and other essential goods and services, which lowers the standard of living for all Americans.

The simple truth is that when President Obama was sworn into office in January 2009, the price of a gallon of gasoline was $1.84. Today, in many parts of our country, it's over $5 a gallon. My guess is this is not the kind of change that most Americans were expecting or wanted when President Obama promised change.

Maybe since the President doesn't fill up his own gas tank, he does not fully appreciate this reality.

These steeply rising gas prices have major ripple effects. Higher energy costs destroy jobs and leave families with less money to meet their basic needs.

One of the most well-known precepts of economics is the principle of supply and demand, and the price of gasoline is not immune to this basic principle. That's why we need to increase the supply of all American energy sources to get us to American energy independence.

Republicans have crafted and passed legislation that would not only lower the price of gas, but create jobs at the same time. Unfortunately, the liberal Democrat-controlled Senate stubbornly refuses to move these bills through the process.

It's better to produce our own American energy and create American jobs rather than rely on unstable, hostile foreign regimes for critical energy resources.

It seems that Democrats subscribe to the wisdom of President Obama's Energy Secretary who proclaimed that ''we somehow have to figure out how to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe.''

Mr. Speaker, in Italy gas prices exceed $9 per gallon. The Obama energy policy consists of ignoring the needs of Americans and pleasing his liberal base, rather than working for all Americans.

Congressional Democrats persist in their claim that increasing domestic oil and natural gas production will not immediately decrease the price of gasoline. For decades, this argument has been used as an excuse to continue stalling. We can no longer delay and

deny access to our own American resources.

Another false claim of congressional liberals is that the oil producers are somehow responsible for the high price of gasoline, even though official government investigations have shown time and again no wrongdoing. But they insist on tying their fundamental disdain for capitalism into the claim that denying fair tax treatment to domestic energy producers that is provided to every other industry will somehow lower gas prices.

Well, Mr. Speaker, increasing taxes on American energy producers will only make the price of gasoline higher for families and job creators because affected companies simply pass their increased costs on to customers in order to stay in business.

In what universe does making something more expensive to produce make it cheaper to sell?

The simple truth is that domestic energy producers are essential to the U.S. economy, job creation, energy security, and deficit reduction. It supports more than 9 million jobs and adds more than $1 trillion to the U.S. economy each year.

Today, the energy industry pays over $86 million a day in income taxes, royalties, bonuses, and rents to the Federal Government. Between 1996 and 2007, the industry invested more than $1.2 trillion in a range of long-term energy initiatives, compared to net income or earnings of $974 billion.

The reality is that failure to produce domestic energy supplies, along with global turmoil and competition for supplies with developing nations, has driven up energy prices and boosted foreign energy companies that do not pay American taxes, nor comply with American environmental standards.

House Republicans are now bringing forward yet another bill that will have the dual impact of lowering gas prices while supporting job creation. Republicans remain committed to solutions that promote America's energy independence, lower gas prices, and help create American jobs.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 4348, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012, Part II.

Transportation policy has been and should be bipartisan. In fact, it's largely considered nonpartisan across our country, where mayors and county commissioners rely on and expect certainty from Washington with regard to necessary investments in infrastructure and mass transit.

Yet, instead, here again, with this bill, politics has been injected into a process that has long been both bipartisan and an engine of our economic dynamo that ties our country together through our transportation infrastructure. Instead of creating jobs and advancing our economy, here we are with a bill that offers further delays, crippling States' and localities' ability to plan and fund projects and put Americans back to work.

The bill before us provides yet another short-term extension, the 10th extension since the last highway law expired in 2009. The facts on the ground aren't changing. Whether we extend this for 2 months or 3 months or 1 month, we'll be back here again with the same facts on the ground, the same looming fiscal crisis at the Federal level, the same need for infrastructure at the State and local levels.

So what facts are new? And what's the justification for such a short-term extension?

As we stand here today to vote on another transportation extension, 50 percent of our roads have been identified as in disrepair; 70,000 bridges are structurally deficient and potentially dangerous.

We need to make investments in our Nation's highways and transit projects—that much Republicans and Democrats can agree on—to bring our infrastructure into the 21st century. Yet, instead, this short-term bill before us represents another missed opportunity to make these critical investments for our country's future.

The impact of voting on another short-term extension is not insignificant. As a former small business owner myself, I know very well the importance of certainty in business planning. Rather than providing States with the confidence they need to pass long-term projects planned for them and plan their highways, and for construction companies to gear up, this bill prolongs the uncertainty, which only increases costs, contributing to the deficit and contributing to taxpayers getting a worse deal for their investment at the State and local levels.

The underlying bill only allows States and localities to plan for one short construction season. What guidance do they have for the next construction season? How can bidders and contractors offer their best pricing when they don't even know if there will be a paycheck after this building season?

As the bipartisan National Governors Association has said, a string of short-term extensions will only increase uncertainty for State and local governments and the private sector. Yes, this approach will actually increase costs, rather than decrease costs.

We should be voting, instead, on the bipartisan comprehensive transportation bill that the Senate has already passed that, if this House brought to the floor, I'm confident would pass and that President Obama would sign. It passed the Senate by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 74–22.

The Senate bill maintains critical investments in our highways and public transportation, improves accountability through asset-management plans, and establishes performance measures so States are accountable for using their funds efficiently.

□ 1240

Extremely disappointing is the transportation policy, an issue that has long been bipartisan in its support, which has turned into a political football in this Congress. The House majority has continued to offer partisan bills that would weaken our economy and create uncertainty. This time, the majority has crafted a transportation bill by linking it to unnecessary and unrelated politically motivated riders. It is a completely unrelated Christmas tree of a bill that we see before us with elements that have nothing to do with our transportation and infrastructure.

Almost as appalling as the riders in the bill are the restrictive rules before us. This rule only made in order three Republican amendments, completely shutting out all Democratic, and even some Republican, ideas. When it comes to transportation policy, this body should be considering amendments under an open process that allows Members of both parties to bring forward their ideas to save taxpayer money and to invest in infrastructure. Unfortunately, thoughtful amendments were not made in order in this process, including some that I will discuss later in the debate.

Because this rule and the underlying bill represent some of the worst partisanship that I've seen in the 3 years I've been here, I strongly oppose them both. I urge my colleagues in the House to reject this approach, to reject this rule, to reject this bill, and to bring up the Senate bill and to bring it quickly to passage in the House so that we can send it to President Obama in order to reauthorize transportation in a bipartisan way, one that reflects our values as Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I think I should remind my colleague from Colorado that the Democrats were in charge of both Houses of the Congress and had the Presidency when the authorization for this bill first expired, and I believe they reauthorized it several times and weren't able to get a bill passed.

I would now like to yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I want to thank my colleague and friend from North Carolina for yielding time to me.

I rise in support of the rule and of the underlying bill. I am very pleased that the rule has allowed one of my amendments to go forward, a very important amendment, I should add.

Our country depends on its maritime commerce. Without the use of our maritime transportation routes, we're not really talking about transportation. We cannot expand exports and we cannot move our agricultural commodities or our manufactured goods to other

destinations around the world if we do not have waterways that have been maintained.

The Army Corps of Engineers has said to me on multiple occasions, if you take the top 60 ports and harbors in this country, fewer than 35 percent of those waterways are dredged adequately to the authorized depth and width authorized by Congress. My bill, which is now an amendment to this transportation bill, H.R. 104, is the RAMP Act. It is the Realize America's Maritime Promise Act. It has bipartisan support with 190 Members in the House and with over 30 Senators over on the Senate side.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is this: in 1986, Congress created the harbor maintenance tax and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. This was a user fee on the owners of the cargo—a user fee, an ad valorem tax. The revenue was supposed to be dedicated solely to operations in maintenance dredging by the Army Corps of Engineers where they have Federal authorization.

What has happened over time is that these funds have been diverted to other uses. In 2011, the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund collected more than $1.4 billion in revenue, but only slightly over half of it was used for the intended purpose. The rest was diverted off to all kinds of other sources. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee on Ways and Means, I find this to be an egregious abuse and diversion of taxpayer dollars.

My amendment is very simple. It ties the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund receipts to the expenditures so that these funds will be used for their intended purpose, and that is to dredge, to maintain, these very important waterways. Now, why is all that important? Well, the years of neglect of these waterways is hurting American competitiveness, and it is hurting our ability to export.

The bottom line is this: for every foot that we lose in shoaling on the Mississippi River, we're losing $1 million per day per ship because of the short loading or the light loading of these vessels or of their operating under restricted schedules. In January of 2012 alone, we had five vessels that ran ashoal on the Mississippi River—five vessels that ran ashoal. It is a safety issue as well as an economic issue. Not only that, many of our Great Lake ports are closing. They're closing because of shoaling.

How can we be a competitive Nation that is engaged in international trade if we don't take care of these waterways? This funding is critical to preventing these draft restrictions. In fact, the Army Corps of Engineers has said if they could have access to the incoming receipts, they could maintain all these waterways to the specified depth and width.

What is really good about this amendment is that it also adds nothing to the deficit. According to the CBO, it doesn't score. It's not an earmark. It's programmatic spending. It's basically restoring the original intent of the use of these funds. So I urge the support of the rule and, certainly, of my amendment and of the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont, my former colleague from the Rules Committee, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Unfortunately, this is another example of Congress failing the American people. It's failing our States. It's failing our communities.

First of all, how in the world can we expect transportation projects to be done on a short-term basis—90-day extensions? 4-month extensions? That just isn't possible to get from planning, to execution, to construction. It won't happen. Number two, how can we have a transportation bill where we don't fund mass transit? alternative transportation? That makes no sense whatsoever.

What has happened here is that the need to have a transportation bill for this whole country has been hijacked for political purposes. The Keystone pipeline is an example. Take whatever position you want on Keystone, but will the implementation of Keystone bring down gas prices, as is asserted? Will allowing drilling everywhere that the ''drill, baby, drill'' folks want to drill even lower gas prices?

A study of the Energy Information Administration said if we opened up all of the coastal waters—off Florida, off the east coast, off the west coast—and if we drilled on all of the public lands, that might add over time, which is about 10 years, 1 million barrels a day to the supply. That's in a world demand of 100 million barrels a day.

So the question is: What impact is that going to have on price? The best estimate they came up with was about 3 cents per gallon. That suggests when there is so much effort and so much political rhetoric about something that is so profoundly ineffective in giving relief at the pump to folks who need it, that it has a political agenda. Let's, instead, do things that would make a difference at the pump.

One, let's fully fund the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Turn that into what it has historically been, which is a safeguard for consumers and a safeguard for businesses that need stable pricing in the commodities market. Instead, we are allowing it to become a casino for Wall Street speculation, which is probably adding about $20 on the price of a $100-barrel of oil, or 50 cents on a gallon of gas when you go to fill up. That doesn't need to be. Squeeze out the Wall Street speculation, and give a break to our consumers and businesses.

Two, allow the President in fighting this speculation to deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, 800 million barrels of oil owned by the taxpayers. When that has been deployed by Presidents—two Republicans, two Democrats—it has been a shot across the bow to the speculators, and it has brought down prices by 8 percent to 33 percent.

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

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

Mr. WELCH. Three, let's commit ourselves to using American oil that is produced on American soil to be used in America. So, if there is going to be Keystone oil that is flowing through our States, why do we just want that to go to the export market when it will provide no benefit whatsoever to the American consumer?

Let's do the things we can to bring down the price. Let's tap the SPR. Let's strengthen the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and let's use American oil on American soil.

□ 1250

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

Again, I want to point out to my colleague from Vermont that it was under Democrats that this authorization expired. They renewed the authorization six times while they were in control of both Houses of Congress and had the Presidency, so they haven't done the job they should have done.

I also want to point out that the President has the tools he needs through agencies already to do the investigations that need to be done; they have done them over and over again and they've found no fault on the part of ''speculators'' or the oil companies.

All the President and his allies on the other side of the aisle are doing, Mr. Speaker, is trying to distract people from their failed economic policies. Every policy that they have instituted has failed miserably, brought us record unemployment, and brought record gas prices. He blames, blames, blames other people, takes no responsibility, refuses to be held accountable for anything that this administration has done, that the Democrats, when they were in charge of the Congress for 4 years, did which created this situation.

I think it's time that they quit casting blame and look for ways to solve problems, like encouraging the President to approve the Keystone pipeline and increasing the real supply, not 17 hours' worth of fuel from the strategic oil reserve.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that the House votes on H.R. 14, a bill brought forth by Representative TIM BISHOP and Representative CORRINE BROWN containing the text of the Senate transportation bill, S. 1813, which passed the Senate by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 74–22.

To discuss our amendment to the rule, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage every Member to defeat the previous question so we can end this legislative circus and bring the bipartisan Senate transportation bill to the floor.

Our Nation's infrastructure is at a critical juncture, and the traveling public and men and women who build our roads and rails don't have time for the games that the Republicans are playing with this bill.

The Republican ''my way or the highway'' attitude is not how we should legislate. Transportation has always been a nonpartisan issue, but that has changed since the new Republican leadership took control of the House. In just 2 years, the Republican leadership has ruined a process that used to be bipartisan from a committee that used to be bipartisan. I think Secretary LaHood said it best when he said that this bill that the Republicans are bringing to the floor is the worst bill he has seen in 35 years.

We are in danger of letting our transportation system fall into total despair, slowing the economy even further and putting the traveling public in harm's way.

The American Society for Civil Engineers give America a D grade in infrastructure quality and has estimated $2.2 trillion is needed to bring our Nation's infrastructure to good repair. Transportation for America reports that there are 69,000 structurally deficient bridges nationwide. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce said the Nation will lose $336 billion in economic growth over the next 5 years due to inadequate infrastructure. The World Economic Forum ranks the United States of America 24th in infrastructure quality. We are the world's largest superpower and we should never be ranked 24th in anything.

The Senate amendment that was offered by the Democratic leadership on the committee would fund 2 million jobs every year, provide continued dedicated funding for public transit, streamline project permitting in a responsible way, strengthen Buy America requirements, increase funding for safety programs, and—let me emphasize—is fully paid for.

Transportation and infrastructure funding is absolutely critical to this Nation and, if properly funded, serves as a tremendous economic engine to job creation. The Department of Transportation statistics show that for every $1 billion we invest in transportation, it generates 44,000 permanent jobs.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Again, I would encourage every Member to vote ''no'' on the previous question. All we're asking for is an up-or-down vote on the Senate bill.

When I was a kid, we used to say, ''I dare you.'' I double dare you, my Republicans. Bring the bill to the floor for an up-or-down vote.

I heard someone on the floor yesterday talking about the Senate, that we need to do away with the Senate. I now thank God for the United States Senate, because they are behaving very responsibly. They passed a bill with over 80 percent of the Members voting for a bipartisan transportation bill. That's what we've always had in the 20 years I've been on the committee.

Let's pick up that Senate bill. Let's pass it, send it on to the President to create jobs, and let's see what happens at the next election.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 5 minutes to my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the Rules Committee, Chairman DREIER said this: ''There's no way we're going to have a transportation bill unless it is bipartisan.'' Mr. Speaker, it was music to my ears. I thought the chairman had a revelation, because that's exactly the tune the Democrats have been singing for weeks, that we need a bipartisan transportation bill. We've been saying this month after month after month.

Transportation bills have always been bipartisan. Our colleagues like to criticize the Senate for inaction, but even they passed an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill this year.

Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words. Instead of taking the bipartisan path, my Republican friends have tried one partisan approach after another, and they have failed every time. And the partisan march continues today.

Last night, nine Members of the House submitted amendments to this bill, five Democrats and four Republicans. Then, not 2 minutes after the chairman said what he said, my Republican friends approved a rule on a straight party-line vote to block every single Democratic amendment.

Let me review this for my colleagues because I think it is important.

First, the underlying bill was written by Republicans in a back room without any Democratic input, none. Now Republicans are only allowing themselves to amend the bill they wrote.

This chart produced by the majority says it all: four Republican amendments submitted, three made in order for debate on the House floor; five Democratic amendments in order, not a single one allowed.

Maybe some of the people in the back room can't see this number because it's so small. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to make it a little bit easier for those who need a little help here. Here we go. Zero Democratic amendments allowed.

This is a bill written only by Republicans which only Republicans can amend. Apparently, this is what a bipartisan process means in the Republican House. This is the new and improved open House that they promised.

Open House my foot, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are real consequences to this approach. I had a very important amendment blocked yesterday in the Rules Committee, an amendment to end the subsidies to the oil companies that are gouging Americans at the pump, an amendment that will cut the deficit by $40 billion. I don't care what my Republican friends say, that is a lot of money.

□ 1300

The taxpayers' money that's going right into the pockets of the same oil companies that are driving up gas prices just as summer approaches, why in the world are American taxpayers being asked to subsidize Big Oil? These are the same oil companies that recorded tens of billions of dollars in profits in the first 3 months of 2012. These companies took in tens of billions of dollars in profits in 3 months while raising gas prices to more than $4 a gallon and we reward them with $40 billion worth of tax breaks and giveaways? Come on, what is wrong with the leadership of this House of Representatives?

Look, there is nothing wrong with corporations making profits. That's what they're in business to do. What is wrong is for American taxpayers to be subsidizing wildly profitable companies at a time when too many Americans are still unemployed and struggling to pay their bills. With their tax dollars funding corporate welfare for Big Oil and then still paying astronomical prices at the pump, it's a double whammy for American families.

With all the talk about cutting spending and reducing subsidies here in Washington, I would have thought that the Rules Committee would have made in order my amendment, an amendment, by the way, just so there's no confusion here, that I have offered repeatedly. I have offered it over six times, and all six times it has been blocked by the Rules Committee.

But the Rules Committee decided not to make it in order. And to say that this is somehow a bipartisan process and then immediately deny any Democrat amendments, including my amendment to end tax breaks for Big Oil companies, tells you everything you need to know about the Republican leadership in this House. This is a lousy process, and the American people are paying the price.

I would just close by saying the fact that we can't vote up or down on the Senate bill to extend the highway bill for at least 2 years means that our cities and our towns and our States can't plan ahead. What an awful thing for us to do during this difficult economic time.

I urge my colleagues to reject this very partisan rule. Let's get back to working on a transportation bill in a bipartisan way that will actually help the American people.

Enough of these games.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to my colleague from Massachusetts that if we raise taxes on the oil companies, surely that will be passed along to consumers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FOXX. When I'm finished. I believe the gentleman from Colorado probably has adequate time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thought since you referred to me we would have a dialogue, but I guess not. Okay.

Ms. FOXX. As my colleague knows, yesterday, in the Rules Committee, people on his side of the aisle talked about tax breaks and giveaways, and that, again, implies that all the money that hardworking taxpayers earn is government money, and that is not the way it is. That attitude about giving away money from the Federal Government implies that the money belongs to the government.

I would also like to point out to my colleague that the subsidies he talks about are not subsidies. They are the tax deductions, tax ''breaks'' that every manufacturer gets, not just the oil companies. To talk about corporate welfare is a bit disingenuous.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) to respond to the gentlelady.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, give me a break. I mean, oil companies are making record profits. We are producing more oil in this country than ever before. They are producing so much they are exporting oil, and at the same time they are raising gas prices at the pump for average, ordinary citizens.

The fact that taxpayers are subsidizing Big Oil when they're making record profits and sticking it to the American people, I think is unconscionable. That's what I tried to get rid of, and we should at least have a vote up or down on that on the floor.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would just add one more thing: the amount of subsidies that we are giving to multinational corporations who are taking their jobs overseas, let's stop that. Let's stop the subsidies that are going to Big Agriculture all over this country, not small mom-and-pop farms, people who are taking care of themselves. But Big Agriculture, let's stop that.

Let's also stop $147 million going to Brazilian cotton farmers as a subsidy every year. They will not tell you. They will not tell you about these subsidies. American taxpayers are footing the bill for that and paying high prices at the gas pump to get their gas, and the oil companies are rolling around in that money.

I rise in opposition to this rule.

Yesterday I submitted an amendment to this bill that would have provided the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, or the CFTC, with a steady, sustainable source of funding so that it could do the job that it has been assigned to do—that's oversee the futures markets and curb rampant speculation in the oil market that is causing families pain at the pump.

Again, this House majority has put the profit margins of Wall Street and oil speculators over the needs of American families and the American economy. They refuse to allow an up-or-down vote on this amendment. Specifically, the amendment would authorize the collection of user fees to offset the cost of the Commission's operation. It would simply bring the CFTC into line with all other Federal financial regulators, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

This is in keeping with a pattern by this majority to hamstring this Commission at every turn. Last year, their agricultural appropriations provided only $172 million in funding, 44 percent below the request, meaning that we have less cops on the beat to stop speculation. We fought back. We got that up to $205 million in the final 2012 budget, but it's not enough for the Commission to do its job.

Meanwhile, high oil prices affect every aspect of Americans' lives, not just the cost of traveling but of heating homes, food, other purchases. The cost of gas is irrefutably affected by rampant speculation in the oil market. Goldman Sachs has estimated that speculators increased crude prices by about 20 percent and the price of gas by 56 cents a gallon. The chairman of ExxonMobil talked about speculation going on on Wall Street.

We're here to represent the American consumer, not oil speculators.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. I am going to repeat it, our job, the job that all of our constituents gave to us—they gave us this job—we are here to represent their interests and the consumers, not the oil speculators.

We need to ensure that the Commodity Futures Trading Commission is the agency to regulate the oil industry, that it has the resources that it needs to do the job and is doing it.

The amendment that I proposed is a commonsense solution to this problem. It should have had an airing, and it should have been passed by this Congress because that is in the best interests of American taxpayers. That's our job. And if we're not prepared to do our job, the American people should turn their backs on us and shut the place down.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that our colleagues across the aisle, as well as President Obama, the answer to everything is to raise taxes, but they never can explain how raising taxes would lower costs, especially on gasoline. To me, that shows how disconnected they are from economic reality.

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

Mr. POLIS. May I inquire of the gentlelady if she has any remaining speakers?

Ms. FOXX. We have no remaining speakers, and I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

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

Again, there were several amendments offered in Rules Committee to make this bill better. To help reduce the budget deficit, my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, introduced an amendment ending $40 billion in subsidies to the oil and gas industry. As the gentlelady said, that has nothing to do with the price of gas. Getting rid of subsidies to oil companies doesn't make gas more affordable. But the question is: Why are we giving money to oil and gas companies at a time when we have a national deficit? Why don't they pay taxes like every other company?

□ 1310

I was a small businessman before I got here, and the companies that I was involved with had to pay taxes. What I don't understand is why economically a tax subsidy is any different than an expenditure subsidy. And economists across the ideological spectrum would agree corporate welfare is a government giveaway, whether it appears on the tax line or the expenditure line.

Specifically, with regard to any tax breaks to the oil and gas industry, Mr. MCGOVERN's amendment, which is, unfortunately, ruled out of order for this bill, would end the section 451 credit for producing oil and gas from marginal wells, the section 43 credit for enhanced oil recovery, the section 263 provision allowing the existing expansion of intangible drilling costs, and a number of other provisions that in effect give oil and gas companies a lower tax rate than other companies in this country.

Why don't we use that money to reduce the deficit? Why don't we use that money to bring down the corporate tax rate overall, as is a key component of corporate tax reform, which I strongly support and discussed with Mr. BRADY in our Rules Committee yesterday with regard to the other bill which moves in the wrong direction with regard to bringing down our tax rates and having a simpler Tax Code?

Mr. MCGOVERN has offered a similar amendment to save the U.S. Government $40 billion to reduce our deficit to several different bills in the past, including through an appropriations bill, an energy bill, a tax bill. Every single time the Republicans have said, Oh, it's not germane to this bill. Every single time they voted the McGovern amendment down.

Clearly, this is a proposal that's worthy of discussion. If it's not a tax discussion and not an energy discussion, not an expenditure discussion, what kind of discussion is it? And why can't we be talking about reducing the deficit here on the floor of the House instead of continuing to spend unnecessary money on subsidies? It's funny how the majority party waives rules when it's convenient for their agenda but refuses to apply a consistent standard to an amendment that is worthy of consideration by this House.

At the same time oil companies have record profits, we're continuing to subsidize oil injection, extraction, exploration, drilling, manufacturing, pricing, and inventory valuing by creating price floors, offsetting taxes, providing generous credits and deductions, providing tax shelters, and allowing the valuation of inventories at deeply discounted prices. If we are serious about deficit reduction, let us take this opportunity to vote down this rule and allow for the discussion of the McGovern amendment. We need to close these loopholes and allow for real deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment to the rule in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. This amendment is the Bishop bill and the Corrine Brown bill, which would simply allow the House the opportunity to vote on the Senate bill, which, given the strong bipartisan majority in the Senate, I believe would pass the House of Representatives. At least let's give it a chance. Let's give the House a chance to work its will, Democrats and Republicans, and see where we really are with regard to this Congress' commitment to critical infrastructure needs in this country. Voting down this rule would be the first step in allowing Mr. BISHOP and Ms. BROWN to come forward with the Senate bill for consideration in this House, which would provide some certainty to State and local planners, allowing them to reduce costs and get better value for the taxpayer dollar.

I also strongly encourage the majority to consider allowing amendments and good ideas from both sides of the aisle in bills like the transportation bill, and let us work to find an appropriate time and an appropriate place for the consideration of Mr. MCGOVERN's bill and Mr. MCGOVERN's amendment. And whether the proceeds are used to reduce the deficit or bring down corporate taxes or some split thereof, or other worthy public purposes, surely we can at this juncture, when we cannot afford the government we have, help reduce the size and the scope of government by ending subsidies and giveaways to big multinational oil companies.

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

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 619 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(1) 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. 14) to reauthorize Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. 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 Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. 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. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 180, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—243

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

Biggert
Bilbray
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
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
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)
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
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
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
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
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—180

Ackerman
Altmire
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
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
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
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 (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
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
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
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
Sires
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

Andrews
Filner
Kaptur
Marino
Napolitano
Paul
Rangel
Slaughter

□ 1339

Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. PELOSI and Mr. HONDA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. YOUNG of Indiana, SMITH of Nebraska and Mrs. BLACK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 165, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 18, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 165 due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" On Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 619 Providing for consideration of 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 multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and for other purposes.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 177, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—246

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
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
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fattah
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
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
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
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
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)

NOES—177

Ackerman
Altmire
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen

Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
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
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 (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kildee
Kind
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
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
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
Sires
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

Andrews
Filner
Kaptur
Marino
Napolitano
Paul
Rangel
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1346

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 166, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 18, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 166 due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on agreeing to H. Res. 619 Providing for consideration of 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 multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 295, nays 118, answered "present" 2, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—295

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—118

Adams
Altmire
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Benishek
Biggert
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Burgess
Capuano
Cardoza
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Critz
DeFazio
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Foxx
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Keating
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Matheson
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Neal
Nugent
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Quayle
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schilling
Shuler
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tipton
Towns
Turner (OH)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Amash
Owens

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews
Eshoo
Filner
Gohmert
Kaptur
Labrador
Lofgren, Zoe
Marino
Napolitano
Paul
Pingree (ME)
Rangel
Rivera
Slaughter
Walberg
Waters

□ 1352

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RIVERA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 167, I was unavoidably delayed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 167, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

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 material on H.R. 4348.

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