

Washington, at least a lot of it, and is spent on other things.

So in my State, in Wisconsin, what is being said? This is saying we want to increase taxes at the State level because we will give them in Washington 11 cents, and in order to maintain the transportation investment in their infrastructure they will have to raise their gas taxes how much? 11 cents? No, 15 cents.

As my colleagues know, the Governors and a lot of experts watching what is happening in our national Federal system have been pointing out that people in Washington cut back on spending and it has to be picked up at the State and local level and higher taxes at the State and local level, and then we pat ourselves on the back for supposedly cutting burdens when all we are doing is shifting it to the State and local level.

The Governors have been criticized here on this floor, but I think they are elected too and are due our respect. They were out here just a few weeks ago pointing out that over the last 20 years the Federal percentage of investment in our Nation's transportation infrastructure have been gradually declining. We have been talking pretty big out here, but we have been transferring the budget responsibility, the need for raising the revenue to maintain our roads and bridges in the United States, from Washington back to the State and local units of government. This would radically accelerate that, and it would basically short-change every State in the United States by about 4 cents.

Please vote "no."

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I would like to remind my colleagues that in the 1950s when the Federal highway program started it was recognized that it was an improper function of the Federal Government. Therefore the Congress back then, they were still recognizing that the Constitution had some effect as well as the President; they had to come up for a reason for the highway projects, so they did it under national defense.

Of course today we do not debate that issue in that light, but I think we see the results of doing something that was not proper. Today it is very expensive, it is very bureaucratic, and we have seen tonight in the debate how it has become politicized.

So if we are looking for a fair way to build highways, a more efficient way to build highways, I think this is the answer. This is not going backwards, this is going forward. This would be the first time we could have a national highway system really controlled by the States where it is supposed to be. The States would have more money, not less money. They would have less regulation, not more regulation.

This is much better than block grants. This is returning responsibility to the States. I compliment the gentleman for bringing this to the floor.

□ 2030

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise Members that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has 1½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has 1¼ minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Brookhaven, Mississippi (Mr. PARKER).

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kasich amendment. Tim Penny, I saw him yesterday, and Tim made a statement to me which I find fascinating. He said he felt he owed an apology to some of the liberal Democratic chairmen for some of the bills that they had written. He thought there was a lot of pork in them, and he found out that, no, that was not really right; that this particular bill that has been brought forth puts the rest of them to shame. And I agree.

Now, if you think this bill is going to become law as it is, it is not. The Senate is not going to pass this bill, and I pray to God that the President of the United States vetoes it.

The interesting thing is this: Can you imagine the depths that we have sunk to when we have to depend on the other body and the President of the United States to show fiscal responsibility?

I predict that this vote will be one of the worst votes, if you vote for this bill, of any vote you have ever cast, if you are a conservative, a fiscal conservative and believe in fiscal responsibility. You will rue the day you voted for this.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just make it clear: What we want to do is keep 3 cents in Washington to maintain the current interstate system. If you come from Montana, where you are losing in this bill, we are going to keep a penny here to help you and the other heavy transit States. We are going to repeal the 4.3 cents enacted in 1993 that every Republican voted against, and we are going to get rid of the rest of the gas tax and let the States levy their own taxes and manage their own roads with their own regulations.

I do not think that we are going to have any halfway built bridges that are going to end in the middle of a river. I think people are smarter than that. I know this, they are a lot smarter at home than they are right here in Washington.

Vote for the Kasich amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, we hear about turning back to the States, but all 50 State Governors support BESTEA, not the amendments in front of us. Indeed, I

have a letter from Governor Whitman of New Jersey in which she says turn back what hurt our State's ability to move people and goods throughout the Northeast corridor. That is the way it is across America. Why? Because more people are traveling interstate than ever before.

And do not be fooled by this pig in a poke. This does not turn back the 4.3 cents. This does not rescind the 4.3 cents. This amendment does nothing but keep the 4.3 cents, which amounts to about \$6.5 billion a year, here in Washington, not to be spent on highways, but to be spent to mask and disguise the same old Ponzi scheme of using this money rather than building highways in America.

Indeed, my good friend from Ohio talks about the regulations here. Only 1 percent of the money stays in Washington for the Department of Transportation. But we Republicans control the Congress. If we want to change the regulations, then let us do it. And, indeed, we hope that we will control the White House a few years from now, and indeed it may well be the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, who will be the next President of the United States. And if he is the next President of the United States, I will join with him in changing these regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM); Amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT); and Amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series of votes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GRAHAM

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) 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.