

Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits to qualifying veterans and Fry Scholars seeking an undergraduate STEM degree or who have earned a STEM degree and are seeking a teaching certification.

Our bill makes a necessary and timely change to the eligibility requirement for the Rogers STEM Scholarship program from 128 required credit hours to a much more common 120 credit-hour requirement.

After passage of the Forever GI Bill, the VA discovered that there were only three States where the average STEM degree exceeds 128 required credit hours, meaning that the vast majority of veterans would be unable to access this benefit.

This scholarship is set to launch August 1, as was recently said, of this year, and it is incumbent on Congress to make this fix before then to ensure that more student veterans pursuing STEM degrees are able to utilize the additional funding Congress provided for them in the Forever GI Bill.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman LEVIN, for his support in introducing this bill, as well as Ranking Member ROE and Representative RADEWAGEN for their cosponsorship as well.

This is a win-win. There is a labor supply shortage, especially in critical STEM fields, and so employers need STEM-educated workers. At the same time, there is no better group of people than veterans who know teamwork, who know about putting a cause greater than themselves, and who, in many cases, have skills that are particularly adaptive to the STEM fields where this is a win for them, as well, in their movement to civilian life.

I am proud to see this legislation pass by voice vote in our committee, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to ensure we are setting up our veterans for success and job security after their service to our Nation.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative RADEWAGEN for yielding to me, and I thank my friend, Mr. BARR, for his leadership on this important issue.

We live in an information-based technological world. As we look around us, all our lives are touched by STEM innovation. It is the science- and math-based education that will continue to shape our country and world and drive our economy into the next century.

H.R. 2196 is a commonsense, bipartisan fix to give student veterans who are enrolled in STEM programs more flexibility to utilize the educational benefits they earned through their service.

By allowing student veterans to take additional credit hours, such as additional math and science courses, the Edith Nourse Rogers Scholarship helps veterans receive a strong STEM education, which is essential for succeeding in technological industries.

As I travel around my district in Pennsylvania, I consistently hear from local businesses about the widening skills gap, and I know these are sentiments echoed in districts throughout the Nation. Our workforce demands more individuals with a STEM education, and who better to have on the front lines of our evolving global economy than men and women who bravely served our country.

We owe it to our student veterans the ability to pursue a STEM education and to ensure they have the tools and resources they need as they transition back into civilian life. This legislation takes an important step in doing just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote in support of this bill.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2196, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MALINOWSKI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2196.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPOSING SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-45)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order with respect to Iran that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995.

I am enclosing a copy of the order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 24, 2019.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 445 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. 3055.

Will the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1518

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. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, with Mr. SABLAN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, June 21, 2019, amendment No. 221 printed in House Report 116-119 offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCADAMS) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 229 OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL. The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 229 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 193.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, if you had granted me more than 5 minutes, I would have spent much more of that time talking about how good it was to see you there in the chair, but you will just have to know I am feeling it here, even though I can't belabor that point.

I serve on the Transportation Committee, Mr. Chairman, and my amendment proposes to strike jurisdiction that belongs to the Transportation Committee from the appropriations bill. Now, as you know, clause 2 of the House Rules prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill, but the House Rules Committee waived those rules as this bill came to the floor, so the only alternative I have is to come and try to strike that provision.

The truth is that we have not had a single hearing on this provision in the Transportation Committee, Mr. Chairman. We have not had a single witness testify in the Transportation Committee. We have had bills sitting in the Transportation Committee that purport to deal with this topic since January and have not called a single bit of activity directed in this direction, despite having moved a whole host of bills to the House floor already this year.

I see that my friends, the chairman of the Transportation Committee and the chair of the subcommittee, have put out a Dear Colleague encouraging the defeat of this amendment, surrendering this jurisdiction of the Transportation Committee to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, there are times that we do have to legislate on appropriations bills, those times that we can't have a functioning authorizing process. That is not the case with Chairman DEFAZIO. It is not the case with Chairwoman HOLMES NORTON, and I cannot imagine, for the life of me, why this House would choose to tuck into the back of an appropriations bill language that should be heard by the full authorizing committee.

If we strike this language today, my commitment is to work with all my friends in the House to try to move language forward through the regular authorizing process and have that back on the House floor this year.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, section 193 simply ensures that when TIFIA loans are repaid by local funds, they are treated as part of the local share of transportation projects. That sounds like common sense to me.

Let me address some of the concerns addressed by my colleague from Georgia.

First, this provision was included in the bill with the full support of the authorizers, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Second, when my colleague was in the majority, I would remind him there were no concerns with making permanent authorizing changes on the Transportation appropriations bill, and it did not matter if a highway reauthorization bill was on the horizon.

Third, section 193 is not a significant departure from current law. Today, the Department of Transportation may—may—determine that a TIFIA loan repaid from non-Federal funds—that is, local funding—can be designated as part of a non-Federal share of Transportation projects costs. This is particularly important for large, complex projects, which are seeking to piece together local, State, and Federal funding from multiple sources.

The gentleman claims to be concerned about small communities losing their fair share of Federal capital investment grant funding, but he should know that we have appropriated ample funding for all projects in the grants pipeline. The bill includes more than \$430 million for smaller projects, which are often projects in small and midsize communities, in addition to the \$500 million that was appropriated last year.

To provide greater certainty to States and local communities, section 193 requires the Department to consider if a TIFIA loan has been repaid by local funds. That is just common sense. If a local government is going to use local revenue to repay a loan, why wouldn't that count as a local share?

For an administration that speaks so often about innovative financing, public-private partnerships, and local communities taking on more when it comes to improving our Nation's infrastructure, it makes no sense to discourage State and local governments from contributing to the overall cost of a project. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I would have said in the realm of common sense that the authorizing committee should be allowed to authorize.

I would have said the realm of common sense would have been that, if we have a committee that is functioning, we should allow that committee to function.

I would have said in the realm of common sense, if the committee chairman supports it and the subcommittee chairman supports it, that perhaps we should have had a hearing where we at least talked about it.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, when 80 percent of the TIFIA money goes to only 10 States, what impact does this have on smaller States?

□ 1530

I would yield to anyone who knows, but we don't know because this isn't the authorizing committee.

The cardinal is absolutely right: He provided additional money in CIG dollars this year. But when there are projects on the horizon that would, by themselves, as a single project, Mr. Chair, consume not 1-year's worth of funding, not 2-years' worth of funding, but 3-years' worth of funding, leaving nothing for any other projects in the Nation, what is the impact of having a mandatory authorization?

I see my friend, the chairman, at the desk. I love working with my friend, the chairman, in the committee. In his Dear Colleague that he and ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON sent last year, he pointed out exactly what I am concerned about today, Mr. Chair. He said: "As you know, the CIG program's statutory language is not like a typical discretionary grant program. . . . It is a pipeline program where eligible projects that meet the statutory criteria . . . are funded subject only to continuing appropriations."

The "may" language my friend from North Carolina cited, rather than "shall" language, is included specifically because there is no discretion to prevent the large projects from sucking all the money out of the funding stream.

I have that concern, and I would love to be able to share that concern and talk about that concern in the committee of jurisdiction. Again, I commit to working with any Member who wants to move such language forward.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I appreciate my colleague's con-

cern about the committee of jurisdiction, so I am happy to be able to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the chairman of that committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, this is a ridiculous issue, to put it mildly. This administration has taken two totally contradictory positions on this.

Prior to this administration, if you had a TIFIA loan, you were responsible for paying it back with local funds. It was counted as a local match. It is their obligation. They have to pay it back. They have to pay the loan fees. They have to pay for everything that is involved.

Then, in the first year of this administration, they said it is local. It counts as a match.

Oh, wait a minute, a year ago, they changed their mind. Exactly 1 year apart: June 29, 2017, TIFIA loans will be considered a local match; June 29, 2018, they will not be considered a local match. They will be considered as Federal money, ineligible.

What happened in between? I don't know. I think it had something to do with the Portal Bridge in New Jersey and the Gateway Program, and President Trump being in a dispute with the Democratic leader of the Senate.

This is about politics, plain and simple, rotten politics, for critical infrastructure that this country needs.

If a jurisdiction borrows money—they borrowed it, they have to pay it back—that doesn't count. If they go to a bank and borrow it and pay higher interest rates, putting more burden on local taxpayers, that is okay. But if they got it from the Feds—by the way, the Feds make money on TIFIA loans. It is one of the most amazing programs. We make money on it. There has only been like one default in the history of the program. These are good loans.

They have to pay it back, so why wouldn't it count? Politics, plain and simple. This is trying to return to politics, as opposed to common sense, following preexisting practices and the letter of the law.

By the way, this is just clarifying existing law because of a bizarre interpretation written by the Trump DOT a year ago this June.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chair, I know my friend from Oregon, when he talked about rotten politics and those motivations, wasn't talking about me. I know that he was not. If he had been, we would have taken that conversation a different direction. I know that he was not because my concern is sincere.

The fact that so much of that conversation centered on the White House does make me wonder whether or not politics is at play here.

To have the authorizing chairman say on the floor of the House that there is no statutory difference between the Secretary “may” and the Secretary “shall” is the most shocking thing I have heard in 2019. It is the definition of a categorical difference.

We put “may” in there for a reason, and that is to prevent a perversion of the process, the perversion that I am concerned about, the perversion that my friend from Oregon could dismiss if only we would hold a hearing in the committee and allow me to hear from some experts about it.

My concern is sincere, and the concern of communities in my State is sincere. There is a reason the House rules prohibit doing this on the House floor because our shared concerns are sincere.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, if our colleague says that the word “may” was put in to prevent a perversion of the process, I will simply say, as Mr. DEFazio has made very clear, we put in the word “shall” to prevent a clear and present perversion of the process.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio).

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Chair, I certainly wasn't referring to my colleague, who I know is here in good faith on his own terms.

The point is, on June 29, 2017, the DOT stated that TIFIA loans will not be considered Federal funds for the purposes of evaluating how much local share an applicant brings to the table.

What changed in that year? All years prior, that was allowed. In 2017, suddenly, they changed their mind.

That is what I am talking about, rotten politics.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 445, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 7 consisting of amendment Nos. 230, 236, 238, 242, 245, 250, 252, 254, 256, 260, 261, 262, 264, 266, 269, 270, 271, 272, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 283, 285, 286, 287, and 290 printed in part B of House Report 116-119, offered by Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

AMENDMENT NO. 230 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 448, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000) (increased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 236 OFFERED BY MS. NORTON OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Page 464, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1) (increased by \$1)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 238 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 550, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 550, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 592, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 594, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 594, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 242 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 449, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 245 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 448, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$800,000)”.

Page 644, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$800,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 250 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER OF ILLINOIS

Page 449, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1)”.

Page 449, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 252 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 447, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 254 OFFERED BY MS. SEWELL OF ALABAMA

Page 447, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1)(reduced by \$1)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 256 OFFERED BY MR. BERA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 447, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 515, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 515, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 260 OFFERED BY MS. ADAMS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 448, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 468, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 261 OFFERED BY MS. ADAMS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 550, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 550, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 599, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 262 OFFERED BY MS. ADAMS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 550, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 555, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 264 OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Page 455, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 266 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 450, line 25, insert “, or any territory or possession of the United States” before the colon.

Page 517, line 21, insert “, or any territory or possession of the United States” before the colon.

AMENDMENT NO. 269 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL OF WASHINGTON

Page 471, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000) (increased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 270 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL OF WASHINGTON

Page 447, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 535, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 271 OFFERED BY MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER OF DELAWARE

Page 592, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 272 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 461, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

Page 461, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 275 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF CALIFORNIA

Page 608, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,500,000) (reduced by \$1,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 276 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR OF MINNESOTA

Page 603, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

Page 603, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 277 OFFERED BY MS. SCHRIER OF WASHINGTON

Page 500, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 278 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR OF TEXAS

Page 472, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 279 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR OF TEXAS

Page 450, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 280 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 447, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 479, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 480, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 281 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

Page 519, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 283 OFFERED BY MR. MALINOWSKI OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of division E (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 5309(d)(2) of title 49, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 285 OFFERED BY MR. MALINOWSKI OF NEW JERSEY

Page 533, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 286 OFFERED BY MR. MALINOWSKI OF NEW JERSEY

Page 447, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 535, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 287 OFFERED BY MS. CRAIG OF MINNESOTA

Page 469, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,500,000) (reduced by \$1,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 290 OFFERED BY MS. FINKENAUER OF IOWA

Page 447, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 454, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, the amendments included in the en bloc amendment were made in order by the rule.

Mr. Chair, I support this amendment. I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the chair for yielding.

My amendment provides direction to do everything possible to fix the indefensible disparity between States in the per capita allocation of transportation funding through the Highway Trust Fund. Under the current process, known as apportionment, many States receive far more in Federal funding for surface transportation than they contribute through the gas tax.

Apportionment in no way is a scientific or mathematical formula but is simply grandfathering in a table of numbers that were used to buy votes in the Senate generations ago. Unsurprisingly, this table of numbers greatly favors the low-population States that are overrepresented in the Senate.

This problem is compounded by the fact that high-wage States like Illinois pay more in taxes but get no credit for this when income tax funds are transferred into the Highway Trust Fund. As a result, some States receive sometimes five times more per person than Illinois and other large States.

My amendment represents a clear statement by the House of Representatives that we should move toward a per capita allotment that is fair to people no matter what State they live in.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this en bloc package.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI).

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Chair, my first amendment increases funding for the Department of Transportation’s Of-

fice of the Inspector General by \$1 million and decreases funding for the Office of the Secretary by \$1 million.

I am very concerned about recent reports that the Department assigned senior officials to smooth a “special path” for the Senate majority leader’s favored grant projects.

I have no problem with funding transportation projects in Kentucky or any other State. We should all have a problem with the Department setting up a concierge service for one State while slow-walking obviously critical projects like New Jersey’s Gateway Program.

My second amendment makes clear that the Capital Investment Grant program cannot be run in a manner outside the bounds we have established in law. Congress never intended for politically motivated, indefinite delays to transportation projects or for some projects to be held to a much higher standard than others.

Infrastructure spending is something we all agree on. It is something we all need.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Every part of the country will lose, if not now then eventually, if we allow grantmaking to become politicized and the intent of Congress to be ignored.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for the en bloc amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support to En Bloc No. 7, which includes Jackson Lee Amendment No. 242.

I wish to thank Chairman MCGOVERN and Ranking Member COLE of the Rules Committee for making this Jackson Lee Amendment in order.

I thank Chairman PRICE and Ranking Member DIAZ-BALART for their hard work in bringing Division E, the Transportation Housing and Urban Development portion of this omnibus appropriations legislative package, to the floor.

I include in the RECORD letters of endorsement for this Jackson Lee Amendment provided by Bike Houston and the League of American Bicyclists.

I thank them all for this opportunity to explain the Jackson Lee Amendment, which makes a good bill even better by providing \$10 million to support urban bicycle and pedestrian safety programs.

In June the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration published its traffic fatality report which showed a one percent decrease in traffic fatalities and a four percent increase in pedestrian fatalities but a whopping 10 percent increase in bicyclist fatalities.

On March 30, 2019, in the city of Houston, at the intersection of North Shepherd Drive and West 10th Street located in the 18th Congressional District of Texas, Leshia White, 54, was driving with her daughters when she saw Jesus “Jesse” Perez struggling to cross the intersection in a wheelchair.

Ms. White pulled over and got out of her car to help Mr. Perez cross the street when another vehicle struck them, and they were both killed.

On March 7, 2019, 23 year-old David Leon Loya was killed in a collision with a school bus while riding his bicycle in The Heights area of Houston.

Police report that Mr. Loya was in the bike lane and tried to avoid the accident by sliding under the bus, but unfortunately he was run over by the back axle.

This young man was greatly loved by his family, the lives of the people he touched in his volunteer work, and the bicyclist community.

This amendment was offered in remembrance of Leshia White, Jesus “Jesse” Perez, David Leon Loya, and all of the other pedestrians and bicyclists who have lost their lives in accidents with motor vehicles in urban areas.

In the past sixteen years, the Houston area has seen 2,000 deaths of bicyclists and pedestrians, at an average of 100 a year, with the last three years seeing the rate increase to 150 a year, according to federal statistics.

In 2017, the most recent year for which comprehensive statistics are available, according to the Texas Department of Transportation (“TDOT”), the numbers were no more encouraging.

According to TDOT, 1,409 Houston-area pedestrians were injured in roadway crashes:

275 of them were injured seriously; 146 pedestrians were killed in roadway crashes; 639 bicyclists were injured in roadway crashes; and 82 bicyclists were injured seriously.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has called the number of deaths a ‘public health crisis.’

The problem is no more encouraging on the national level as Texas ranks third nationwide in bicycle deaths, behind California and Florida.

Nationwide, the number of fatal bicyclist accidents is rising and are also amounting to a greater percentage of total traffic fatalities.

Cities are uniquely susceptible to this problem, as the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration reports that 70 of bicycle fatalities occur in cities.

City of Houston Mayor Turner has launched a Vision Zero Policy initiative to address the issue of bicycle and pedestrian fatalities.

In May 2019, Mayor Turner invited bike advocacy groups like Bike Houston to partner with LINK Houston to identify the 10 highest priority intersections for improving pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

LINK Houston analyzed motor vehicle crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists from January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2017, to identify priority intersections across Houston.

This work identified seven priority intersections that if addressed could reduce pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries:

Fanning & Pierce; Rochester & Bellaire; Westheimer & South Dairy Ashford; Long Point & Gessner; Westpark Dr. & U.S. 59 South; Old Spanish Trail & U.S. 288 South; Fondren & West Belfort; Bissonnet & Wilcrest; West & Airline; Bellair & Gessner.

Mayor Turner prioritized twelve intersections for the Safer Streets initiative by selecting seven intersections selected by LINK Houston and five intersections proposed by BikeHouston.

The city then reached out to the Federal Highway Administration to request their assistance in performing a multi-disciplinary Road Safety Audit for six of the twelve locations.

The city of Houston could fund six of the areas that are listed as high priorities and needs funding to perform assessments on the remaining six.

Additionally, funding is needed to make the needed changes to the intersections to improve pedestrian and bicyclists safety.

We must come together to tackle this problem and work to ensure that we stem the tide in these fatalities.

The rising death and injury toll of pedestrian and bicyclists is alarming and merits serious attention but as we know too tragically, behind the statistics are stories about people who are treasured and sorely missed by family, friends, and coworkers.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of En Bloc No. 7, which includes Jackson Lee Amendment No. 242 to help reduce the number of pedestrian and bicycle fatalities in urban areas.

BIKEHOUSTON,
Houston, TX.

LILLIE CONEY, *Policy Director,*
Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee (TX-18),
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. CONEY: BikeHouston is writing to endorse Jackson Lee Amendment 103 to the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations section of HR 3055. Cities throughout the country are experiencing major changes to urban mobility, including an increasing number of trips taken by biking, walking, and riding scooters and other micro-mobility options. At the same time, fatalities are on the rise for people who walk and ride a bike.

This month, June 2019, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration released preliminary traffic fatality data for 2018 that shows while overall traffic fatalities dropped by one percent, pedestrian fatalities rose by 4 percent, and bicyclist fatalities rose by 10 percent! Nationally, bicycling and walking account for 12 percent of transportation trips, but 18 percent of overall traffic fatalities, and yet states report spending less than one percent of their highway safety funds to address the too common deaths of vulnerable road users. By setting aside funds to specifically address bicyclist and pedestrian fatalities in cities, this amendment will help address this unacceptable increase in fatalities of our most vulnerable road users.

Thank you again introducing this amendment to set aside national infrastructure investment funds to address bicyclist and pedestrian safety in cities. We look forward to continuing our work with you to address this serious issue.

Respectfully,

CLARK MARTINSON,
Executive Director, BikeHouston.

THE LEAGUE OF
AMERICAN BICYCLISTS,

Washington, DC, June 18, 2019.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN JACKSON LEE: The League of American Bicyclists is writing to endorse amendment 103 to the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations section of HR 3055. Cities throughout the country are experiencing major changes to urban mobility, including an increasing number of trips taken by biking, walking, and riding scooters and other micro-mobility options.

At the same time, bicyclist and pedestrian fatalities are on the rise. This month, the

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration released preliminary traffic fatality data for 2018 that shows while overall traffic fatalities dropped by one percent, pedestrian fatalities rose by 4 percent, and bicyclist fatalities rose by 10 percent!

Nationally, bicycling and walking account for 12 percent of transportation trips, but 18 percent of overall traffic fatalities, and yet states report spending less than one percent of their highway safety funds to address the too common deaths of vulnerable users. By setting aside funds to specifically address bicyclist and pedestrian fatalities in cities, this amendment will help address this unacceptable increase in fatalities of our most vulnerable road users.

Thank you again introducing this amendment to set aside national infrastructure investment funds to address bicyclist and pedestrian safety in cities. We look forward to continuing our work with you to address this serious issue.

Sincerely,

BILL NESPER,
Executive Director,
League of American Bicyclists.

[From Houston Chronicle, June 24, 2019]

DYING TO RIDE,
(By Dane Schiller)
A CYCLE OF LOSSES

Teenager Miguel Marcial pedaled his bike along a narrow, dark stretch of Richmond Avenue early one morning last July, following closely behind his older brother. The immigrant dish washers had worked the late shift and were both biking to a nearby pharmacy to buy toilet paper. Only a few feet from the drug store's parking lot, a brand-new BMW driven by a law student, Steven Moritz, who had just left the Estate Lounge, smacked 17-year-old Marcial from behind and launched him head-long into an oak tree. The vehicle didn't stop, according to police. It dragged Marcial's orange and white bike beneath it for six blocks before disappearing into the humid summer gloom. "If I had not pulled in, we would both be dead," Miguel's brother Palemon recalled hauntingly last week.

Marcial was one of at least 23 bike riders killed on Houston streets in the past five years, according to police and safety reports, as well as court and medical records reviewed by the Houston Chronicle. But only four times in five years have drivers been charged with a crime after fatally hitting a cyclist.

The tally comes as tensions have increased in Houston's cycling community, with two bike riders killed in recent weeks in unsolved hit-and-run crashes. Outspoken cyclists contend the city hasn't created enough clean, safe bike lanes. They also believe police aren't ticketing cars for coming too close to riders or doing enough to find people who run them down.

Fred Zapalac, co-owner of Blue Line Bike Lab bike shops and a cycling community advocate, said anger is simmering over a lack of accountability.

"If we are getting run down, and there are no consequences for the driver's actions then our lives have about as much value as a stray animal," Zapalac said.

A review of municipal court records conducted at the Chronicle's request found that no citations were issued during the first six months of a city ordinance that went into effect in May and required that cars stay at least 3 feet from cyclists and pedestrians, and trucks 6 feet away.

Some motorists, however, counter that certain cyclists think they own the roads and openly defy traffic laws.

City Council Member Ed Gonzalez, who has been an advocate for cycling issues, said

more should be done to protect and educate riders, as well as motorists, and train police on enforcing the 3-foot ordinance.

"We are a very car-centric city," he said. "We are very dependent on the automobiles, and we don't have a very robust mass transit system. There are some major shifts that need to occur."

THREE CONVICTED

Crashes that claimed the lives of riders over the past five years are often a blend of bad choices by bike riders and motorists.

Three drivers were convicted after pleading guilty in agreements that include deferred adjudication—a form of probation that enables them to have their criminal records cleaned if they stay out of trouble.

One was for causing an accident with a death, another for criminally negligent homicide, and a third for failing to stop at the scene.

Moritz, a student at South Texas College of Law, was eventually arrested and faces up to 10 years in prison if he is convicted of failing to stop and render aid. Marcial's death was typical among fallen cyclists and reflects a reality about many people who ride bikes in this city.

He was riding for transportation, not exercise. He was in the street, not on a bike path.

Marcial and his brother had recently gotten off work. Like many undocumented workers, they didn't have cars or driver's licenses, so they rode bikes.

But his death also stands out.

There were witnesses and charges were filed, although authorities didn't know about Moritz until more than a week after the incident when a lawyer for the car's owner called police.

He is not accused of breaking the law by killing Marcial, but by not stopping afterward and calling for help. Moritz's lawyer, J. Gordon Dees, declined comment.

'REALLY FRUSTRATING'

The deaths cross the spectrum of circumstance, from cyclists who were riding on sidewalks to others who tried to roll across freeways.

Mohammad Qureshi, then 19, was driving along the Southwest Freeway in 2010, when he bolted across four lanes of the highway to make the Hillcroft exit. He lost control of his Honda Accord and hit a cyclist riding on the sidewalk of the service drive.

A year later, he pleaded guilty to criminally negligent homicide in the death of Marcotulio "Benjamin" Tzul as part of an agreement that requires him to serve 45 days in jail in five-day chunks: nine days each year for five years, through 2015. In 2010, Carmenza Arreaga, then 24, pleaded guilty to a charge of "accident involving death" of Paul Miller and was required to pay \$18,000 in restitution to the bike rider's family.

She hit Miller in the early morning hours along the Loop 610 feeder road and drove away, leaving behind pieces of the front bumper of her Honda Civic. An anonymous tip to Crime Stoppers led to her arrest.

Jonathan Turner pleaded guilty in 2010 to failing to stop and render assistance after the death of Anthony Jones, who was trying to cross Interstate 45 at 10:15 p.m. Turner was given 30 days in jail and ordered to pay \$5,199 in restitution. A sheriff's deputy caught him at a gas station trying to pull a mangled bicycle out from under his Chevy Tahoe.

Harris County prosecutor Alison Baimbridge said it is not unusual for defendants to serve sentences in segments on the anniversary of a victim's death to repeatedly remind them they killed someone and didn't go to prison.

"There is no sentence that you can give anybody that would actually justify losing somebody's life," she said. "You can't do that, you can't bring them back. You have to look at the defendant's life, the circumstances and any potential issues in the case."

Despite criticism from some cyclists who contend authorities treat biker deaths as less than a priority, Baimbridge said the cases are investigated as thoroughly as the deaths of motorists or pedestrians.

"Their lives are just as valuable as anyone else's," she said. She said many cases in which bikers have been killed in car crashes are especially challenging because they often involve both the motorist and the cyclist doing something wrong.

"It is kind of a double-fault situation," she said of cases such as when motorists should have steered clear of a cyclist, but the cyclist was crossing the street inappropriately or not having reflectors or lights.

Among the toughest cases are hit and runs where no one saw the incident, she said. "It is really frustrating," she said. "Their families deserve to know what happened, if nothing else. It is horrible."

HIT AND RUN

In the two hit-and-run crashes in recent weeks there have been no arrests. Nabor Rosas, 40, was found in the bayou in mid-January after he was hit riding over a bridge on Harrisburg at night on the way home and landed in the water.

Chelsea Norman, 24, was killed in the Montrose neighborhood in early December as she rode home from her job at Whole Foods, also at night.

Each time a bike rider's death makes the news it hits hard for Xenia Sanchez. Her daughter, Leslie Roman, 6, was riding her bike in 2009 in her apartment complex parking lot when she was hit and killed by a silver PT Cruiser that has never been found.

"It comes back," she said at a table beneath three photos of Leslie that were hung on the wall as part of a shrine of sorts, along with her daughter's Barbie doll perched on a shelf beneath them.

"I know exactly how his or her mom is feeling. It is painful to see other people go through what we went through."

Leslie's father, Leonardo Roman, who ran into the parking lot and picked up his daughter, who was still barely alive, found some peace in that though her body was badly battered, she was not crushed.

"It could have been so much worse," he said quietly.

Houston Police Sgt. Carlos Miller, of the vehicular crimes division, said there are many reasons why motorists flee after hitting a bike rider.

"A lot of times they are frantic over what just happened," he said, noting that they can be motivated to drive away by everything from fear, even if they have done nothing wrong, to wanting to hide the tracks of other criminality.

Among the others to die was Cruz Riojas, 67, who worked in sculpture repair. He was riding back to work in 2011 from an Alcoholics Anonymous meeting. He had been on the sidewalk on Sawyer Street, just outside the Heights neighborhood, but was hit as he tried to cross an intersection.

The car's driver, Ricardo Abonce, 30, said he was coming back from a Target and drove through the intersection with a green light. Riojas came over the car's hood and hit the windshield.

It was a moment of "silent shock" as the glass shattered, then as he got out of the car and other motorists streamed by honking at him.

"I feel bad because he didn't make it," Abonce said. "I can't have that over me all the time."

Police found that Riojas was at fault for crossing an intersection when he had the red light. No charges were filed against Abonce.

NEVER FORGET

One of the few sport riders to be killed was Jonathan Lennard. The 47-year-old aerospace engineer, known for being meticulous, had once traveled to Europe to see the Tour de France and cycled across that continent.

He was killed last August, on Memorial, where it cuts through Memorial Park, after being struck by a 19-year-old motorist.

The driver told police that he had the green light and swerved to avoid Lennard. Police found that Lennard was at fault.

But Kevin Hood, a lawyer who is a cyclist and runner, said he was watching Lennard and believes the driver was not paying attention and ran a red light.

Hood said he will never forget what he saw. "It is terrifying. You cannot unsee that stuff."

Back where Marcial lived, a few blocks from where there are now flowers and a cross rising from the dirt beneath the tree where he landed, his family waits for answers.

They have adapted to Houston, but some struggle with English and even Spanish, as they are from a rural region of Mexico where an indigenous language is spoken.

Marcial had been in Houston three weeks. He was proud of his first paycheck and planned to save enough to one day go back home and buy a house.

Family in Houston who had not seen him since he was very young was just getting to know him. The brothers went to the store so they would be ready for a party at their apartment later that Sunday.

They decided to ride in the street because the sidewalk was a minefield of cracks, telephone poles and trees. The road was empty. "There was no noise," Marcial's brother recalled, "not even any cars."

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 445, and as the designee of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 8 consisting of amendment Nos. 239, 240, 243, 246, 247, 249, 255, 257, 259, 263, 265, and 274 printed in part B of House Report 116-119, offered by Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

AMENDMENT NO. 239 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 447, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000) (reduced by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 240 OFFERED BY MR. DOGGETT OF TEXAS

Page 464, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,500,000)".

Page 464, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,500,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 243 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 613, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000) (increased by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 246 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

At the end of division E (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 422. None of the funds made available by this division may be used to issue rules or guidance in contravention of section 1210 of Public Law 115-254 (132 Stat. 3442) or section 312 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5155).

AMENDMENT NO. 247 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF ILLINOIS

Page 508, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000) (reduced by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 249 OFFERED BY MR. BOST OF ILLINOIS

At the end of division E (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order 13858.

AMENDMENT NO. 255 OFFERED BY MR. BURCHETT OF TENNESSEE

Page 447, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,000,000)".

Page 479, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$12,000,000)".

Page 480, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$12,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 257 OFFERED BY MR. SPANO OF FLORIDA

Page 464, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$8,089,000)".

Page 464, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,089,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 259 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of division E (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation in contravention of the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (29 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.).

AMENDMENT NO. 263 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Page 551, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 553, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 555, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 567, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 265 OFFERED BY MISS RICE OF NEW YORK

Page 469, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000) (reduced by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 274 OFFERED BY MR. GARCÍA OF ILLINOIS

Page 519, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 519, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, the amendments included in this en bloc were made in order by the rule. They have been agreed to by both sides. I support the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, first, I thank my friend, Chairman PRICE, for working with me to include a number

of provisions important to Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chair, I congratulate Mr. MEADOWS for his amendment to help unmanned aircraft manufacturers, one of our most important and innovative transportation sectors.

I also thank Mr. GRAVES and Mr. SCALISE on their tireless work on behalf of their constituents to help them recover from devastating hurricanes and floods.

Mr. BURCHETT has a great amendment that increases funding for highway and bridge infrastructure.

Also, Mr. Chair, I want to mention Mr. CALVERT and Mr. COOK. They have cosponsored an amendment to address an issue that is critical to Amtrak employees in their districts.

Finally, I congratulate Mr. SMITH of New Jersey for his tireless advocacy for veterans housing, as he always does.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Miss RICE).

□ 1545

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Chair, my amendment supports the Federal Aviation Administration Airport and Airway Trust Fund. This program is responsible for the research, engineering, and development of aircraft technologies that reduce aviation noise.

In my district, communities near JFK Airport and La Guardia Airport must endure the constant noise of overhead aircraft, and other communities farther away are beginning to experience significant airplane noise as a result of newly developed flight plans.

I am disappointed that the FAA recently announced it would postpone important minimum altitude regulations for certain flight patterns coming into JFK Airport, and I call on the FAA to implement these regulations as soon as possible.

While changing flight paths are no silver bullet to solving airplane noise, we must continue to adequately fund Federal efforts to discover new technologies that can retrofit existing airplanes to be quieter for the benefit of communities not just on Long Island, but airport communities across the country.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA).

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I offer this amendment to bring attention to the provision I fought to include in the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development funding package.

With support from the Amalgamated Transit Union, we were able to secure \$5 million in technical assistance and training in this bill, with a specific \$2.5

million set aside for frontline bus, rail, and transit workers.

These critical funds would provide frontline workers with professional development and training to help bus and transit operators hone their professional skills. This funding will make our public transit safer, more efficient, and help workers better provide for their families as they climb up the professional ladder.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman PRICE and NITA LOWEY for supporting the inclusion of this provision, and I urge support for this en bloc amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of En Bloc Amendment number eight, which includes my amendment to reaffirm Amtrak's legal obligations under the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification (WARN) Act.

The WARN Act was created to protect workers and their families by requiring certain employers to provide notice 60 days in advance of mass layoffs. As many of my constituents learned first-hand, having advance notice of a major staffing decision is essential for employees so they can make thoughtful and deliberate decisions about their future and the future of their families.

Last year, Amtrak shuttered a reservation call center in my district. Hundreds of my constituents and their families had just 60 days' notice before having to decide whether to uproot their lives and accept another Amtrak job across the country—or accept a meager severance package and keep their families rooted in the community they grew up in and love. It was part of Amtrak's tactic to only meet the statutory requirement of providing 60 days' notice under the WARN Act and force attrition by applying pressure on its employees. Today, we must go further to protect these workers.

Congress must reaffirm the legal requirements under the WARN Act, but also strengthen these protections to ensure that workers have more advance notice of executive decisions that will impact their lives. Congress must also ensure that the penalties for violating this law will send a clear message to employers that this anti-worker behavior will not be tolerated.

Mr. Chair, I thank Representatives KEN CALVERT, BRENDAN BOYLE, and PAUL COOK for joining me in putting forth this bipartisan amendment and I look forward to building on these protections for workers all across the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 231 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 232 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

AMENDMENT NO. 233 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 233 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division E (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 4(b) of Executive Order 13868 or to issue a special permit under section 107.105 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, that allows liquified natural gas to move by rail tank car.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, this is an extraordinary move to suddenly turn trains into liquid natural gas pipelines. Of course, liquid natural gas is not transported by pipeline. It brittles metal, and this would be a new and innovative way of moving liquified natural gas.

Now, there are a few problems with this. We had the Administrator into the committee last week. It is going to be moved in DOT 113 tank cars.

I said: Are those puncture-proof?

He said: No, they are not puncture-proof.

I said: Well, what happens?

He said: Oh, we carry volatiles all the time.

I said: You don't carry anything like liquified natural gas.

There is something called the BLEVE; it is a boiling liquified explosive vapor explosion. So the BLEVE has an unbelievable blast impact. And this is just one rail car. These will be six trains a day going through the most populated parts of Florida, 100 cars in each train.

Envision this: Here is Fort Lauderdale, Florida. This is the blast zone. And that is just one—one of these tank cars. It is likely it will cause a chain reaction and explosion. It is going to be about as powerful as Hiroshima if it goes off.

Now, this maybe will get someone's attention. This is the Brightline high-speed rail line. That is where they are going to run six trains a day with 100 cars of liquified natural gas—never, ever been done before; except in small containers, never been done before.

And, oh, by the way, within the blast zone is Mar-a-Lago. Are they going to allow the trains to run while the President is there?

All you need is someone with a .50 caliber to shoot a hole in one of those tank cars and you are going to have one humongous explosion that goes beyond Mar-a-Lago.

So what is the foolishness?

The Pipeline and Hazardous Safety Materials Agency has not evaluated this. They are the ones who are supposed to do this. They haven't finished imposing laws that we put in place in

2011 for the safe movement of hazardous goods, but now they are rushing this through.

The administration says, oh, no, we want this permit done in 12 months. Well, maybe the President doesn't know he is in a blast zone. Maybe he wouldn't be ordering it be done in 12 months if he knew it was within the blast zone.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, liquefied natural gas is a major component of domestic U.S. energy growth, and it is facilitating the export of U.S. natural gas around the world.

Railroads have been successfully moving flammable gases for 100 years. As a matter of fact, Transport Canada already allows LNG on rail and tank cars. So this provision would put us at a huge disadvantage with our largest trading partner.

Furthermore, DOT always conducts a thorough, comprehensive, and transparent safety evaluation, accounting for public input and, again, before allowing for transportation of any hazardous material.

This amendment would block a proven process at DOT and would inhibit U.S. LNG from meeting growing markets, the demand from growing markets for cleaner—again, cleaner—and more affordable energy.

And again, Mr. Chairman, this is another important point. Currently, this is moved by trucks. They are all over the country, trucks moving LNG. And so, obviously, the question is: Are rails less safe than moving this on trucks? Obviously, the answer, I would say, is no.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman referred to trucks. Actually, we are talking about very small quantities in special containers, not massive rail tank cars holding these amounts.

Another thing is that there is no known company. You can't contact them. There is no publicly available contact information, no headquarters, but they have petitioned and they are going through a special permit process with—the gentleman says there is going to be public review and input—sure—to move six trains a day with 100 cars in each one, essentially, a liquid pipeline through these heavily populated areas.

We saw what happened at Lac-Mégantic up in Canada with just crude oil in tank cars killing dozens of people, obliterating a town. This is 10 times more powerful than that.

Yet the gentleman from Florida is advocating that this should happen in Florida, and the people living all along

the Brightline—Fort Lauderdale, Hollywood, the President at Mar-a-Lago—just shouldn't worry their sweet little heads about it: It won't be a target of terrorists; there won't be an accident; it is never going to happen. Well, we have heard that before.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I would just remind everyone that there are trucks with natural gas right in Florida and in, pretty much, every State around the Nation.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN).

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the liquid natural gas revolution going on in this country is making us more energy secure, and it is revitalizing our local economies across the country.

According to the Department of Energy, natural gas applies to nearly one-third of the United States' primary energy. It is the primary heating fuel for approximately half the U.S. households.

The oil and gas industry generates more than \$50 billion a year in my home State of Oklahoma. The industry has been the single largest contributor to Oklahoma tax revenues in recent years.

The discovery of promising new natural gas formations in the Permian Basin of Texas and New Mexico along with the Marcellus shale formation in Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New York show that the near-term future of our country's energy mix will be supplied by an abundance of natural gas.

Natural gas is a cost-effective, reliable, and clean form of energy that has created thousands of high-paying jobs across the Nation, including in Oklahoma's First Congressional District. America is now the world's largest producer of natural gas. For the first time since 1957, we are a net exporter of natural gas to the rest of the world.

Recognizing the benefit that the natural gas revolution is having on our economy and energy security, President Trump issued an executive order in April of this year. Section 4(b) of the executive order requires the Department of Transportation Secretary to propose a rule for notice and public comment that would “treat liquid natural gas the same as other cryogenic liquids and permit liquid natural gas to be transported in approved rail tank cars.”

Mr. Chairman, no matter our production levels of natural gas, we cannot realize its full potential unless we have safe and reliable ways to transport it. That is what the President's executive order is all about.

I believe this amendment unnecessarily takes away a vital transportation option for transporting our natural gas to both underserved markets

on the mainland United States and to our ports so it can be exported around the world.

With certain States making it more difficult to transport LNG by pipeline, we need all the available options at our disposal to transport these much-needed energy sources.

We have been transporting oil by rail for decades, but since liquid natural gas is a relatively new energy commodity, Federal rules and regulations have not caught up to the need for flexibility in transporting LNG, which is why I was pleased to see section 4(b) included in President Trump's executive order.

Instead of trying to inhibit this administration's effort to make our Nation more energy secure, I believe we should be assisting them in any way possible to benefit our economy and our energy security.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues join me in opposing this amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Again, this has potential for massive explosions. This has not been done before.

This is not natural gas. It is liquefied natural gas, 600 times as dense, and, if punctured, this is the blast zone. I hope the President is watching.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for raising this issue.

I want to note that the underlying bill provides \$1 million for the Transportation Research Board to conduct a study to review all aspects of the transportation of liquefied natural gas in rail tank cars, and it requires the Department to incorporate findings and recommendations from this study into any rulemaking on the transportation of LNG in rail tank cars before issuing a final rule authorizing such shipments.

Mr. Chair, I plan to vote for this amendment, and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleague on this issue.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I find it ironic that some of the same folks who are concerned about climate change and global warming want to make it so difficult to transport things that actually lower emissions compared to other sources of energy.

Mr. Chair, I ask for a “yes” vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, again, in closing, I think it would be wise to actually conduct a study before this is

permitted. That is not the intention of this administration, and that is why I offer this amendment.

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

□ 1600

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

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

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 234 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 234 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike line 20 on page 642 and all that follows through page 643, line 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment that will allow the Department of Housing and Urban Development Secretary Ben Carson to restore the long-standing, scientific definition of gender as it relates to federally subsidized same-sex housing.

The underlying legislation strips the Secretary of that power, and my commonsense amendment simply gives it back to him. I ask the House to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

June is LGBT Pride Month, a time when people across the country are taking a positive stance against discrimination and violence against LGBT individuals, but this amendment seeks to allow discrimination against the LGBT community in HUD-funded housing and shelters.

Make no mistake, this amendment will weaken protections for LGBT people, especially children, who are experiencing homelessness and fleeing nat-

ural disasters, as well as survivors of violence.

These protections are important because nearly one-third of transgender and gender nonbinary people experience homelessness at some point in their life; about one-half of transgender people do.

According to a Center for American Progress study done in 2015, only 30 percent of shelter providers across four States, including my own of Virginia, were willing to properly accommodate transgender women. According to another recent survey, over half of transgender survey respondents who stayed in a shelter in the past year were verbally harassed, physically attacked, and/or sexually assaulted because of their gender identity.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), chairwoman of the House Values Action Team.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support my colleague's amendment to strike section 236 from this bill. This amendment will preserve the right of women to be protected in a domestic violence shelter designated just for them, free from the unexpected and unsettling presence of a man identifying as a woman sharing the same facility. Faith-based organizations and many community organizations segregate programs based on gender, but under the Obama administration, rules were changed allowing policies that forced domestic violence survivors into unwanted and unsafe coed housing arrangements.

We can see how this is causing problems as already in Anchorage, Alaska, Downtown Hope Center's mission was providing overnight shelter for abused and battered women. However, the center is facing a lawsuit for not allowing a man, who identifies as a woman, access to the women's shelter.

The core to the Downtown Hope Center's mission of providing women suffering from rape, physical abuse, and domestic violence as a safe place to sleep at night without the presence of men, is at risk.

This nonsense must stop, and I urge my colleagues to support this very commonsense amendment for the protection of women.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Some say that this amendment will negatively impact the safety and privacy of women in shelters. Service providers around the country who operate shelters every day disagree. These providers believe that nondiscrimination protections are necessary to ensure everyone in need can access shelters.

Over 300 domestic and sexual violence organizations across the country signed a national consensus statement in support of full and equal access for the transgender community. These leaders agree that serving transgender

women victims in shelters is appropriate and does not pose a safety issue.

While housing transgender people according to their gender identity does not propose a safety risk to others, failing to do so puts transgender people in danger. Transgender people experience shockingly high rates of sexual and physical violence and forcing transgender people to use facilities that don't match their gender identity leaves them at risk for harassment, assault, and a host of harms that result when people avoid using the bathroom during the day.

Allowing shelter providers to decide who is eligible for access to single-sex or sex-segregated shelters opens the door to discrimination. Make no mistake, this is incredibly dangerous. The consequences of being turned away from a shelter can be dire.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding.

In 2016, HUD published a final rule, the Equal Access in Accordance with an Individual's Gender Identity in Community Planning and Development Programs rule requiring Community Planning and Development-funded single-sex projects "to provide all individuals, including transgender individuals and other individuals who do not identify with the sex they were assigned at birth, with access to programs, benefits, services, and accommodations in accordance with their gender identity without being subjected to intrusive questioning or being asked to provide documentation."

This rule prohibits a HUD-funded shelter from providing for single-sex facilities based on an individual's gender at birth. There are other rules that were put in place in the Obama administration, similarly. None of these rules recognize that housing programs, particularly faith-based facilities, ability to distinguish between genders and an individual's marital status; both rules placing vulnerable women at risk.

This administration announced a proposed rule that "permits shelter providers to consider a range of factors in making such determinations, including: privacy, safety, practical concerns, religious beliefs, any relevant considerations under civil rights and nondiscrimination authorities . . ." I could go on. It is a commonsense rule.

Yet, now, we are sitting here in an appropriations bill when we are supposed to be figuring out how to fund the important, ailing infrastructure of this country, housing and urban development, figure out how to solve the problems in this country, while we have got a border that is being overwhelmed every single day—yes, I am coming back to that because it is the crisis of our day—and now we are turning this into a gender-identity game.

The gentleman from South Carolina is properly trying to protect the ability

of this administration to have a commonsense rule to ensure that people are safe when we have got facilities in place and the Federal Government has something to do it with. I applaud him for doing so.

I would ask my Democrat colleagues why we are not getting back to the business of the day, making sure that we have strong infrastructure, strong border security, and doing the job the American people actually sent us to do instead of manufacturing social engineering and gender identities.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. It is important that we give the Secretary the ability to set this definition. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. May I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am baffled and distressed that my colleagues seem so intent on targeting such a vulnerable population.

This Equal Access in Accordance with an Individual's Gender Identity in Community Planning and Development Programs rule simply ensures that all Americans have access to HUD services regardless of sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status.

This amendment strikes protections for homeless youth seeking help in shelters. It also strikes eligibility for other HUD programs and for FHA loans. Mr. Chairman, research shows that same-sex couples and transgender individuals experience significant discrimination when seeking housing.

LGBTQ youth comprise up to 40 percent of the homeless population. Let me, again, remind my colleagues of the risks faced, as Ms. WEXTON has stressed, the risks faced by transgender, homeless youth when they are living on the streets.

This population is much more likely to experience physical, emotional, sexual abuse, intimate partner violence, sexual exploitation, or trafficking. LGBTQ youth have over twice the rate of early death compared to other youth experiencing homelessness.

When these young people arrive at a shelter, they are not a safety risk for others. On the contrary, they are desperate. They are vulnerable. Many are homeless because their families rejected them for being transgender. We should be doing everything we can to ensure they have alternatives to living on the streets, and that when they ask for help, they are not turned away and revictimized.

Secretary Carson assured our committee and our colleagues on the Financial Services Committee as well, that HUD would not revoke these protections. But right after he made those assurances, the announcement came that he was doing just that.

Our subcommittee has repeatedly asked the Department to provide a re-

port detailing their strategy for continuing to ensure that LGBTQ individuals have access to HUD programs, and that they plan for disseminating this information to housing providers. They have yet to provide such a strategy or such a plan, leaving us with no choice, Mr. Chairman, but to enshrine the Equal Access in Accordance with an Individual's Gender Identity in Community Planning and Development Programs rule in law, and to permanently reinstate the Department's guidance to ensure that providers have the tools they need to protect and to serve this vulnerable population.

This heartless amendment would lead to more discrimination, more homeless LGBTQ youth, and more vulnerability to abuse and violence.

We simply must vote "no," and I urge my colleagues to do so, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 235 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 235 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 643, strike lines 9 through 14.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer another commonsense amendment that will allow the Department of Housing and Urban Development Secretary Ben Carson to restore the longstanding and scientific definition of gender as it relates to federally subsidized same-sex homeless shelters.

The underlying legislation strips the Secretary of that power, and my commonsense amendment simply gives it back to him. By doing this, we are working to protect at-risk homeless women and children in the shelters.

I ask the House to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I join Chairman PRICE in strong opposition to this amendment. Two years ago, HUD removed guidance that was meant to ensure our transgender community members are able to access emergency housing or homeless shelters.

House Democrats stood up against this assault on LGBTQ Americans, and HUD Secretary Ben Carson assured us that the removal of this guidance was only temporary.

Later this spring, Secretary Carson testified that we should not be pressing for guidance or pressing him on this issue because we wouldn't like the answer that HUD would provide.

□ 1615

In other words, HUD stood ready to explicitly allow or promote LGBTQ discrimination.

Discrimination in any form for any amount of time is reprehensible and unacceptable, and now we have an amendment before us that would make housing discrimination permanent. It would continue the uncertainty around LGBTQ protections and make vulnerable people's lives harder.

Let's remember what is at stake. One in three transgender people have experienced homelessness, and we know that homelessness in the LGBTQ community overwhelmingly impacts our young people.

Right now, there are approximately 350,000 transgender people under the age of 25 in the U.S., and it is estimated that over 20 percent of them lack secure housing.

Through the appropriations process, House Democrats have put in place protections for transgender Americans and have taken the proactive step of protecting the rights of LGBTQ individuals in emergency housing intervention situations.

No American seeking refuge and safety should be kicked to the curb. No one should be discriminated against, especially not in a time of dire need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge every Member of this body to reject this amendment, reject discrimination, and reject the Trump administration's and Secretary Carson's cruel rollback of LGBTQ protections.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who heads up the Values Action Team which is an important voice for Americans.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Mr. DUNCAN offering this amendment which would strike section 237 from the underlying legislation because without this amendment, a February 2015 HUD notice, which is no longer applicable under this administration and which requires the placement of transgender persons in single-sex emergency shelters, would become law.

Should this notice become Federal law, it would offer no protections for women facing harassment in the shelters' showering or sleeping areas. This bad policy is at the heart of the California emergency shelter lawsuit. Nine women were sexually harassed by a male by birth, a trans individual, while using the showering facilities. The women's shelter confessed that they would rather allow the abuse to continue than lose Federal grant funding. The shelter went as far as threatening the nine women out of the shelter if they continued to refuse to shower with their attacker. This is preposterous.

We should not codify this notice. Instead, HUD must review and strengthen its resolution and notices governing shelters and housing so that these examples do not become the new normal.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Mr. DUNCAN's amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support—in strong opposition to this amendment.

Our subcommittee has repeatedly asked the Department to provide a report detailing their strategy for continuing to ensure that LGBTQ individuals have access to HUD programs and the plan for disseminating that information to housing providers. HUD has yet to provide any strategy or any plan. So that is why we have acted. It has left us no choice but to act.

This House took great strides a few weeks ago in passing the Equality Act, and we are certainly not going to turn around today and take those rights away. I am offended we have not one, not two, but three amendments designed precisely to take those rights away.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this discrimination and to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his Freudian slip because he knows we shouldn't allow men in the bathrooms with our female children.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for her comments. I can't expound upon her eloquent comments much more or the gentleman from South Carolina about the concerns that we have with what has been put in this appropriations bill and why I support the gentleman from South Carolina's amendment to make sure that the Secretary of HUD has the ability to do his job and to do the right thing.

I notice that my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned the Equality Act. Well, what I am hearing from my constituents in Texas is they are concerned. They are concerned that were the Equality Act to be passed out of the Senate, it would undermine the

ability of their daughters to compete. What we are seeing around the country is boys who decide to declare themselves females run in races and make it impossible for girls to compete. This is happening. We see it. It is happening in real time.

I just wonder what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think is being accomplished with an Equality Act that turns on its head the very idea and the very notion of what we have got with respect to the differences between men and women and the ability to recognize that, embrace it, and be able to have women compete in sports.

Here we are in this false name of equality blowing up the ability of secretaries and people in the administration to make commonsense determinations about how to house people, to make tough choices, and to be able to figure out what to do. Heaven forbid they rely upon biological sex to make that determination.

This is why my wife and I, who have been products of public schools K through law school, have our children in a private school because we keep getting our values blown to heck and common sense blown to heck in schools where bathrooms suddenly become social engineering experiments.

That is what we see happening as a result of what is happening in the body and what is happening in an appropriations bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for joining me on this.

We all know that many of the homeless on our streets have mental issues, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are okay with allowing those homeless men in the bathrooms with our female children, and that is just wrong.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense amendment. I ask my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this incredible amendment would target some of our most vulnerable people in our society today.

A study by True Colors United found that among homeless transgender youth, 75 percent had been victims of physical, emotional, or sexual abuse; 25 percent had been victims of intimate partner violence; and 20 percent had been victims of sexual exploitation or trafficking.

Mr. Chairman, more than 300 domestic violence and sexual violence organizations have signed a national consensus statement agreeing it is appropriate to serve transgender women alongside other women according to their gender identity.

They agreed there is no safety issue despite the rhetoric heard today. In

fact, transgender women are much more likely to suffer abuse themselves.

So let's not turn that safety issue on its head. Let's reinstate the guidance, let's enforce the rule, and let's make certain that in this society people are treated equally and fairly.

Mr. Chairman, let's reject this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Chairwoman LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman PRICE for yielding and discussing this issue with me regarding the FAA's recent threat to withhold over \$250 million annually in FAA grants to California's airports and divert over \$70 million in voter approved local general sales tax away from their voter approved purpose for transportation, police, fire, and the healthcare of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, on May 17, California and Illinois were sent letters by FAA threatening to withhold Federal aviation funds because FAA believes the States have not followed a 2014 FAA policy change which would require State and local governments across the country—not just California and Illinois—to use general sale taxes collected on aviation fuel for airport purposes.

Although FAA sent the first letters to California and Illinois, they have sent letters of inquiry to other States like Georgia, and this issue also has significant effects in Georgia and any State and local government that has aviation fuel as a part of their general sales tax.

Mr. Chairman, California sent a letter to the FAA over a year and a half ago on December 8, 2017, explaining their plan of action for compliance with the FAA policy change. FAA did not respond to California's letter until last month when they gave California 30 days to change their compliance plan and seek burdensome tax information from all 58 State counties and over 100 cities in our State.

This is further concerning in the State of California because our general sales taxes are voter approved by two-

thirds margin. FAA is trying to undermine the will of our California voters.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that you work with me and my colleagues who are concerned about FAA's action and with Representatives ALAN LOWENTHAL, JARED HUFFMAN, ADAM SCHIFF, HARLEY ROUDA, JOHN GARAMENDI, SALUD CARBAJAL, DAVID SCOTT, and JOHN LEWIS in addressing this situation regarding FAA's threat of unreasonable enforcement on many States and local governments.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you very much.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman and the colleagues she mentioned for bringing up this important issue. It may impose legal and financial challenges to certain States. Certainly it is an important issue for my friend from California and for her State, so I will be happy to work with her and the FAA to find a mutually acceptable solution.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Chairwoman LOWEY, and I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to share the frustrations of many of my constituents who are suffering from severe noise pollution caused by the FAA's NextGen program which has altered flight paths to Reagan National Airport. Montgomery County, Maryland, residents who live as much as 20 miles away from the airport have experienced a 300 to 500 percent increase in air traffic over their homes. These flight path changes have significantly disrupted life below with relentless noise pollution.

As 400 flights per day cross over Bethesda at low altitudes, many of my constituents are woken up in the middle of the night, others are interrupted and distracted at work by the onslaught of noise, and there are children complaining that they cannot hear their teachers speak over the noise occasionally caused by commercial jets flying over their schools.

After more than 3 years of incessant disturbance of their peace and quiet, my constituents were stunned last month when the FAA announced that it would implement yet another change to flight paths at Reagan National Airport that would lead to even more air traffic over our communities. The FAA casually announced the change slated for an August 2019 implementation date at a meeting with the Community Noise Working Group that works with FAA to address the problem of noise pollution at Reagan National Airport. Given the substantial consequences of this change and the complete lack of public input in its development, I urge the FAA to delay the implementation

date and to engage seriously with our Community Noise Working Group, which is eager to evaluate the proposed changes and work towards alternative proposals or strategies to avert or at least mitigate the impact.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that with the \$17.7 billion that this bill appropriates to the FAA, the agency will take serious steps toward dramatically reducing the noise pollution in residential areas in my district, in Montgomery, and throughout the Nation.

Thank you, Chairman PRICE, for your indulgence.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our colleague from Maryland for highlighting this issue of aviation noise and the need for the FAA to be responsive to community concerns.

Noise we know is an unfortunate and unpleasant side effect of the investments, the jobs, and the mobility gained from aviation service. We received numerous requests about noise from colleagues this year, and we underscore the FAA should make every feasible effort to assist airports, airlines, and local communities mitigate noise for the health and benefit of those affected.

Mr. Chair, I thank our colleague for raising this issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 237 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 241 OFFERED BY MR. HECK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 241 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 582, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 584, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 612, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment is about creating economic opportunities in Indian Country. It is about improving housing conditions, creating jobs, and helping Native communities meet their community development needs.

It is a bipartisan amendment, and it provides an additional \$5 million for the Indian Community Development Block Grant program, which is one of the most flexible, most competitive grant programs of its kind and, might I add, one of the most effective.

Frankly, I was disappointed to see the President's budget request attempt to eliminate the program, especially when the problem statement associated with the need to increase our investment in infrastructure is so clear.

I have said it before, and I will say it again here today: We are in the middle of a housing crisis, in large part because we simply do not have enough homes.

While it is true that housing shortages exist across the country, nowhere is the issue more pronounced than it is in Native American communities. Native Americans experience worse housing conditions and a higher incidence of homelessness than nearly every other demographic.

One of the most important duties I have as a Member of Congress is ensuring the sovereignty of the four Tribes in my district that I have the privilege to represent, as well as the 29 Tribes in my State, and to help them as they work to provide better opportunities for Tribal members.

That is our Federal trust responsibility. Cutting this program violates that trust responsibility. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Indian Community Development Block Grant program and, in doing so, supporting the many Native American communities who will benefit from it.

Finally, I thank my colleagues, Representatives DON YOUNG, GWEN MOORE, JARED HUFFMAN, DEB HAALAND, and TULSI GABBARD, for joining me in offering this bipartisan amendment.

I also sincerely thank Chairman PRICE and his staff for putting together such a comprehensive appropriations package that funds our Nation's vital transportation and housing programs.

Mr. Chair, I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I rise to support this amendment.

The Indian Community Development Block Grant program provides Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Villages the opportunity to compete for a flexible source of funding to address pressing housing and community needs in Indian Country.

We know the needs continue to exceed the funding available. In fiscal year 2017, HUD was able to fund only 62 percent of the eligible applications it received. That is why we provided in the bill \$75 million, a \$10 million increase over last year, for the program. This amendment would further increase that to \$80 million.

Mr. Chair, I support this amendment and the strong investment it would

make possible, but I do want to express a note of concern about the offsetting cuts to HUD's Cybersecurity and Information Technology Fund.

HUD is facing daunting challenges to upgrade its technology infrastructure. As we head into conference negotiations with the Senate, I am hopeful we can reach a comprehensive, bipartisan agreement that makes it possible to boost funding both for critical housing programs and for IT modernization at HUD.

Again, I urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chair, I thank the chair of the subcommittee, again, very much.

It seems to me that often around here, we have solutions in search of problems. That is absolutely not the case in this instance. The problem statement here is clear. It is screaming in its need and the depth of the need.

As a consequence, again, I thank the chair of the subcommittee and the bipartisan cosponsors of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 244 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 244 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, there is an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division E (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. Each amount made available by this division (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 4.6 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I guess there is a series of amendments like this.

It is well known that we have a huge deficit out here. Obviously, one way to deal with a deficit is to make sure that the appropriations bills are not excessive.

We are approaching borrowing 20 percent of the Federal budget. That is just almost beyond belief.

We just got done with an amendment in which some people out there felt we weren't spending enough on community block grants, which is appalling. I am much more in line with President Trump's opinion of that. I don't think we should be increasing things at this time.

This amendment is a modest amendment. Rather than having decreases—

which, of course, we should have—we are taking a 4.6 percent across-the-board cut on this overall provision.

I realize it touches a variety of programs. We are still allowing a 2 percent increase. Quite frankly, I think a 2 percent increase here is more than enough, but what I do here is I propose a 4.6 percent across-the-board reduction.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, this amendment indiscriminately cuts programs in transportation and housing with, apparently, very little thought as to the relative merit of the programs contained in the bill.

The amendment would result in less affordable housing and less support for Habitat for Humanity, public housing, homeless veterans, housing, the elderly, the disabled, and the Department of Transportation and its agencies responsible for the safety of our roads, our bridges, our aviation, our pipelines, and our waterways.

It would reduce funds available to pay the bills submitted by State and local governments for their transportation programs. These programs are the legal responsibility of the Federal Government.

The base bill enables us to continue to make progress in restoring our infrastructure. This amendment would roll that back.

This amendment would not encourage DOT or HUD to do more with less. It would force them to do less with less.

Our colleague describes this as a modest amendment. Well, let me just ask how modest these cuts are for his home State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Chair, is \$3.1 million for CDBG funding, which could have been used to rehabilitate housing or improve water mains and sewers, a modest cut?

\$12.4 million in Wisconsin funding for CDBG dollars, the money that would be generated, is that modest?

Or is \$1.5 million in HOME funding in Wisconsin, \$1.8 million in funding for transit in Wisconsin, or \$1.3 million in funding for highway infrastructure in Wisconsin?

Our colleague may want to inquire back home as to how modest those cuts are.

The amendment is particularly galling since the gentleman voted for the 2017 tax bill, a \$1.5 trillion tax cut, most of which went to the top 1 percent.

He is concerned about the deficit. That tax bill alone adds \$1.9 trillion to our deficit from 2018 to 2027.

Why is it more important to give tax cuts to the wealthy than it is to build affordable housing and other infrastructure like roads and bridges that

all of our citizens need and that they benefit from? It doesn't make sense.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge Members to oppose this damaging and indiscriminate amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I didn't come here to debate the tax cut, but I will point out one more time that the Republicans who voted against the tax cut did so at the request of the wealthier taxpayers in given States who felt that the tax cut unnecessarily didn't help the wealthier members of society.

As far as the other things that were rattled off, the State of Wisconsin right now is running a significant surplus, unlike the Federal Government that continues to borrow substantially. Fiscally, if anybody should be increasing spending on these programs, it should be the States, not the Federal Government.

Not to mention our Constitution—the gentleman rattles off a lot of things that really have nothing to do with interstate commerce and nothing to do with the Federal Government. We not only should be not increasing these programs, but we should be cutting them.

Again, my amendment still allows a 2 percent increase. When I go back home and explain it to the folks, I think the major thing they will be saying is, "GROTHMAN, why are you so generous as to give a 2 percent increase?"

I have no problem saying this amendment is responsible. On the floor, I will probably wind up voting for other amendments that have greater reductions than this.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, as to the tax cut, I will simply quote very reliable figures from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: The top 1 percent of the population received 34 percent of the benefits of the tax cut.

As to the constitutional point, if I hear that correctly, the point is that these programs should be eliminated. Constitutionality raises the issue as to whether this should, perhaps, be zero funding, as opposed to these indiscriminate cuts that would do so much damage to the State of Wisconsin and to the entire country.

Mr. Chair, I urge opposition of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I have nothing more to add, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 248 OFFERED BY MR. BOST

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 248 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 552, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 552, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chair, the purpose of my amendment is to put the House on record in support of strengthening HUD’s oversight of public housing.

Many of my colleagues may have never heard of Cairo, Illinois, or what took place at the Alexander County Housing Authority, but they should.

An investigation by The Southern Illinoisan newspaper discovered a public housing agency plagued with corruption and mismanagement.

Residents lived in unsafe, unsanitary conditions, with mold, rodents, and broken air ducts that allowed for the creation of black mold—public housing that was not suitable for any human being to live in. The problem was so bad that many of the buildings had to be demolished.

□ 1645

Residents were forced to move far from Cairo.

All the while, the housing authority’s senior leadership was cashing in. Officials received excessive pay and benefits, large pensions, lavish travel expenses, and a big consulting contract for a former director; all of this paid for with taxpayer money.

These problems did not occur overnight. It took decades of corruption and neglect. The Federal regulators were asleep at the switch. Despite the terrible living conditions, HUD inspectors gave a passing grade to the Alexander Housing Authority on several occasions.

HUD failed to properly audit the financials. If they did, they would have taken action before conditions became a crisis.

Last year, HUD Office of Inspector General issued a report on failures in Alexander County. The report included four specific recommendations on improvement to the agency’s regulations of public housing.

The House Committee on Financial Services conducted a hearing on this report. I testified as a witness. I was glad to see the bipartisan outrage which occurred about the situation that occurred in Cairo.

More recently, the HUD Inspector General issued a report on the specific

criminal actions of Alexander County Housing Authority leadership. Charges have been filed against these officials. Unfortunately, it comes too late for most residents of the housing authority.

But we can stop this from happening again. The purpose of my amendment is for HUD to implement the OIG improvements.

In addition, it is my hope that the House Financial Services Committee continue its work to conduct oversight of public housing agencies. What happened in Alexander County may be the most extreme outcome, but it is not the only one of these types of issues that are occurring around this Nation today.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to strongly support this amendment and commend the gentleman for offering it. He is highlighting horrible conditions with the situation in Alexander County, Illinois.

HUD’s IG has concluded that HUD should have done more to oversee this decades-long situation, these deteriorating conditions at the Alexander County Housing Authority and has made multiple recommendations to address the situation and to ensure that something like this doesn’t recur.

In fiscal year 2018, our House THUD report requested that HUD work with the community to find adequate housing for displaced residents, and to quickly investigate the root causes of the situation.

The base bill, I am happy to say, does fund the IG account above the request level, partly to help with work on this issue. And we have also increased funding in the Public Housing Operating and Capital Funds to provide more resources to public housing authorities for capital improvements and better management.

Mr. Chairman, we are continuing to monitor this situation. We expect HUD to implement the Inspector General’s recommendations as quickly as possible. So I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his support of the amendment. With this, it is our hope that things like what happened in Alexander County will not happen again; that proper oversight will be given.

The effect that this has on people’s lives is tremendous, and anyone that has worked with these situations knows and understands.

I appreciate the fact that my colleague, the chairman, supports this, and I ask for my colleagues’ support.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 251 OFFERED BY MR. BANKS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 251 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division E (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. Each amount made available in division E, except those amounts made available to the Department of Defense, is hereby reduced by 14 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chairman, here we go again. Another bloated spending deal that doesn’t just bust the spending caps but spends more than ever before on this division. With a \$22 trillion national debt, you would think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would show a little restraint.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, who I have enormous respect for, including the chairman, are proposing to spend \$137.1 billion in this division alone, which is \$6 billion more than last year’s enacted level.

Mr. Chairman, we simply can’t continue to go down this path. While both parties have contributed to Washington’s \$22 trillion national debt, my colleagues are recklessly proposing to bust the budget caps, trigger sequestration, and continue to mortgage our children’s future. At some point, we have got to do something to confront this town’s spending addiction.

I acknowledge that reducing our national debt is a daunting challenge, and I am prepared to debate today how to best accomplish the goal of a balanced budget. But my friends on the other side of the aisle do not even want to have that discussion.

Hoosier families in my district have these tough talks every day around their kitchen table. Why can’t Washington, D.C., do the same?

With these spending packages threatening to bust the budget caps and initiate sequestration, there appears to be an indifference from my Democrat colleagues as to the severe harm that this poses to our national security.

I will not be silent about this, Mr. Chairman. This is my seventh time coming to this microphone offering the same amendment in the last couple of weeks alone. I am looking forward to having a substantive debate today about this particular amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I suppose if you liked a 4.6 percent across-the-board, indiscriminate cut, you will love 14 percent, even more draconian, and equally indiscriminate.

I won't repeat what I said a few minutes ago about the drastic effects a cut of this magnitude would have on the range of housing and transportation priorities for this country. But I will look at a particular State, the gentleman's own State, Indiana, and just mention what some of the consequences would be. I hope this is useful information.

The gentleman's amendment would cut \$10.2 million in CDBG funding for Indiana, which could have been used to rehab housing, to repair streets and sidewalks, provide senior and youth programs. The amount of additional funding generated by CDBG dollars in Indiana is estimated to be—the cut, the effect is estimated to be \$40.6 million in money taken out of the Indiana economy.

Home funding, the most flexible affordable housing funding we have, \$4.8 million taken out of that funding in Indiana.

Transit projects in Indiana take a whopping loss of \$23.8 million.

Highways in Indiana, highway infrastructure, a loss of \$5.1 million; and so it goes.

These are cuts that would reverse the progress we have made.

A lot of people are talking infrastructure these days, including our President. This bill is actually doing something about it. We are making long overdue investments in this country's infrastructure, and that includes the housing infrastructure.

Yet, colleagues who—I don't know what they have said about this as a national priority. Certainly, if they offer an amendment like this, they are marching back down the hill in terms of the progress we have made and hope to make.

So this amendment, I would think, has very little to recommend it for any Member who wishes to invest in our country's future, and I urge its rejection.

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

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chairman, a very wise former Governor of Indiana once said that you will never know how much government you will never miss. And these days, as we roll out spending package after spending package that spends more and more than ever spent before, I look back to those wise words of that former governor, because that former Governor, knew, just as I do, as a former State Legislator, that the States can always run these programs and do better with running govern-

ment, administering programs like these than the Federal Government ever can.

And while there is a difference of opinion between my colleague, again, who I respect and admire so much, it is clear that there is a difference of opinion between those who believe that Washington, D.C., should tax more hard-earned tax dollars out of the pockets of hardworking Hoosier families, just so that Washington, D.C., can spend more and more on spending packages just like these.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, President Ronald Reagan once said: "We don't have a trillion-dollar debt because we haven't taxed enough; we have a trillion-dollar debt because we spend too much."

Since then, we have added roughly \$21 trillion to our Nation's debt. This simply cannot go on. If we do not begin to tackle this challenge now, it will be tackled for us by our creditors.

We need to learn from the common-sense words of President Reagan and start to live within our means today. If we don't, we will be putting our troops at a disadvantage and our national security at risk because of sequestration and leave for our children a country with less freedom and less opportunity than the one that we inherited. That is unacceptable to me, and I plan to fight to prevent that future from becoming a reality. I urge my colleagues' support for this amendment.

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 253 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

AMENDMENT NO. 258 OFFERED BY MR. VARGAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 258 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division E (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 422. None of the funds made available by this division may be used to deny eligibility of a single family mortgage for insurance under title II of the National Housing Act on the basis of the status of the mortgagor as an alien in deferred action status pursuant to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals ('DACA') Program announced by the Secretary of Homeland Security on June 15, 2012.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman

from California (Mr. VARGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Until recently, recipients of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA program, have been able to secure mortgage insurance from the Federal Housing Administration, or FHA.

In 2018, lenders began reporting to news sources such as, HousingWire and BuzzFeed, that officials from the Department of Housing and Urban Development had informed them that DACA recipients were not eligible for FHA insurance.

HUD's conflicting responses to public inquiries on the matter left uncertainty in the market over the past year. Then HUD sent a letter to Representative PETE AGUILAR 2 weeks ago confirming they had stopped providing FHA insurance for DACA recipients' mortgages.

□ 1700

DACA recipients are individuals living in the U.S. under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, program. They were brought to the United States as children. They were children.

As individuals even within this administration have expressed, the United States is the only place many of them know. It is their home.

DACA recipients are taxpayers, students, teachers, and soldiers. They are our neighbors. They contribute to our economy and are pillars of our communities. Yet, individuals now seek to deny DACA recipients access to owning a home.

Our government insures mortgages through FHA to help low- and middle-income individuals buy a home. This program allowed DACA recipients to buy their first homes. HUD's move to deny these young people access to Federal insurance has already blocked people from homeownership.

That is why my colleague, Representative PETE AGUILAR, and I have offered the amendment here today. This amendment simply prohibits HUD from using funds to deny DACA recipients access to FHA-insured mortgages.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and provide these individuals with access to homeownership.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) for his advocacy for decades on behalf of immigrants and his community.

It has been nearly 2 years since the Trump administration arbitrarily ended the DACA program, throwing the lives of these thousands of young people into turmoil. Despite bipartisan efforts to provide Dreamers with a path

to citizenship and the certainty that they deserve, the Trump administration has done all it can to block progress on this issue.

Earlier this year, we learned about Republicans' latest efforts to deny these young immigrants access to the American Dream. For years, FHA-backed loans have made it possible for borrowers with little savings and a low downpayment to become homeowners, giving young families a chance at building generational wealth.

This critical resource helps to build our middle class, invigorates local economies, and gives families security to control their own future. Under the Trump administration, HUD has instructed lenders to deny this opportunity to DACA recipients by declaring them ineligible for FHA-backed home loans.

Let me be clear: This new and cruel policy shift takes away a key tool to help Dreamers succeed in this country, allowing the President's anti-immigrant agenda to seep into our Nation's housing policy.

DACA recipients are every bit as American as anyone in this Chamber today. They grew up in this country. They have started businesses and careers in this country. They are raising families in this country. If our government will not take the necessary steps to allow them to live freely as citizens in this country, the least we can do is to make sure that they will be successful here.

That is why I am proud to support the amendment by Mr. VARGAS, which would give Dreamers the opportunity to use FHA-backed loans to become homeowners and to build their futures in the only country that they have ever known.

Mr. Chair, again, I thank Mr. VARGAS for this amendment.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TONKO). Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, again, I want to first thank Mr. VARGAS, not for this amendment, but for his leadership and for his support of immigrants. He has done that for many, many years, and I thank him for that. But I want to make some things clear.

There is no DACA policy related to FHA-backed mortgages. As a matter of fact, there has been no change in policy. FHA's published policy states that non-U.S. citizens without formal lawful residency are not eligible for FHA-insured loans.

Again, this is not a new policy. This was the policy during the previous administration. This was the policy when Secretary Castro was Secretary of HUD. It has been in place since the previous administration. There has been no change.

Mr. Chair, obviously, I don't question the motives of the gentleman, whom I have great respect for, and I once again thank him for his concern on this issue. If I have some concern, it is the fact that this may let some people believe, those folks out there who are DACA recipients, that, all of a sudden, they have this new protection, which this amendment does not give them.

Mr. Chair, I have no real objection other than to the fact that this really doesn't do anything. But I do appreciate my friend for his years of leadership and of care. Again, I don't have a real objection. This amendment just doesn't do anything.

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Chair, I do thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for his kind words. I appreciate my good friend.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I am happy to strongly support this amendment, and I thank my colleagues for offering it.

I want to make a comment on what is going on over at HUD. Secretary Carson assured our committee that Dreamers were not being denied FHA loans, that there was no change to the policy, no plan to change the policy. Now, HUD has confirmed that FHA will no longer make loans available to Dreamers.

This is the latest in what is becoming a disturbing pattern of HUD telling Congress one thing and then doing another. They haven't been forthcoming, to say the least, on this issue.

This amendment reverses that decision, that HUD decision that would effectively block a key part of the American Dream, homeownership, to this population.

Dreamers are already in limbo, Mr. Chair. Let's not make these young people pay a further price for our failure to act.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for the amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Chair, again, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from California, and, again, my friend from Florida for their comments.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I want to add what I said before, that there has been no change in policy. This was the same policy that was there during the previous administration. Again, that does not take away my great respect for the gentleman who is introducing this amendment.

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Chair, I would just close with saying this: Remember, these are children who were brought to the United States through no decision of their own. It was their parents'.

So many of us have children, and they don't get to make their own decisions. We make the decisions when they are children on where they go, where they live.

Mr. Chair, let's show some heart. Let's show some love to these young people and allow them to pursue the American Dream. I urge its support.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of Chairwoman NITA LOWEY, and I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for the purpose of entering into a colloquy.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, let me thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and let me thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for their kindness. I wish to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman PRICE for the assistance and resources he has helped direct to my home State of Texas in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey and for his commitment to revitalizing the Nation's infrastructure in a way that preserves our Nation's cultural heritage.

In 1966, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the landmark National Historic Preservation Act, which, among other things, established the National Register of Historic Places.

Independence Heights is just one of the dozens of communities throughout the United States that can trace its beginning to freed slaves. Since its beginning in 1915, it has survived economic hardship and natural disasters in the period of 1919 to 1921 called the burnings.

Because of its historical significance, Independence Heights is included in legislation I have introduced, H.R. 434, that will create the Emancipation National Historic Trail, which begins at the location in Galveston, Texas, where General Gordon Granger announced President Lincoln's emancipation of slaves on June 19, 1865.

Mr. Chair, I would inquire of the chairman if he agrees with me that the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act and NEPA regarding the environment apply with respect to USDOT approval of the I-45 Highway project that may adversely impact historic buildings and neighborhoods in Independence Heights, Texas, which, in 1915, became the first African American municipality incorporated in Texas?

Would it be appropriate for USDOT officials to consider the views and input of civic and community leaders of Independence Heights and others in

assessing whether Federal support of the I-45 transportation project complies with the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act and NEPA?

Mr. Chair, will the gentleman work with me to ensure that the approval process for this I-45 transportation project in my congressional district is conducted in a manner that complies with the law and preserves to the maximum extent feasible historic sites in Independence Heights, in compliance with NEPA, that have national, State, and local historic significance for the Nation?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Texas for those questions, which highlight the issue of historic preservation and NEPA review.

As part of its evaluation and approval process, the Department of Transportation must consider the effects of proposed projects on areas of historical significance. Under the law, the Department must make an assessment of any effects of a project on historic properties and evaluate options to avoid, minimize, and mitigate negative effects. This assessment must be completed in consultation with State and local partners, as well as civic and community leaders.

Mr. Chair, I look forward to working with the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on issues of historic preservation.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas for any comments she might have.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chair, thank you, Chairman PRICE, for the assistance and resources you helped direct to my home state of Texas in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey, and for your commitment to revitalizing the nation's infrastructure in a way that preserves our nation's cultural heritage.

In 1966, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the landmark National Historic Preservation Act, which, among other things, established the National Register of Historic Places.

Independence Heights is just one of dozens of communities throughout the United States that can trace its beginning to freed slaves and since its beginning in 1915 it has survived economic hardship, natural disasters, and the period of 1919–1921 called the "Burnings."

Because of its historical significance, Independence Heights is included in legislation I have introduced (H.R. 434) that will create the Emancipation National Historic Trail which begins at the location in Galveston, Texas, where General Gordon Granger announced President Lincoln's Emancipation of slaves on June 19, 1865.

Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 1 minute and 35 seconds remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman very much. If I might, I would like to thank the chairman again for an amendment that increases and decreases by \$10 million

funds for the National Infrastructure Investment Account to provide funding for urban bicycle and pedestrian safety programs.

Let me say that, tragically, we lost a brilliant young man on May 30, 2019, at the intersection of North Shepherd Drive and West 10th Street in the 18th Congressional District. When Leshia White was driving, it was Jesus "Jesse" Perez who was struggling to cross the intersection, and this caused him to lose his life.

Let me also indicate that we know that, in Houston, there are 2,000 deaths of bicyclists and pedestrians. We would like to make sure that we increase opportunities for safety.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman and the Rules Committee for this amendment being made in order.

According to TxDOT, 1,400 Houston area pedestrians are injured, and 275 of them are injured seriously.

We hope that this will work for both pedestrians and bicyclists. Bicycling in Houston has taken off in the State of Texas and everywhere, and we certainly want to make sure that they are safe.

Mr. Chair, let me also thank the gentleman for an amendment that gives \$2 million for the Office of Inspector General account to investigate the Department of HUD's delay in releasing \$4 billion in Hurricane Harvey disaster community block grant dollars.

We are still desperate. Every day, people ask me when their homes are going to be able to be fixed. We do know that we are working to move that along, but we know what is important is to make sure that those dollars get to those individuals and that we can restore our communities.

We are going into hurricane season again, and I thought it was very important that we work strongly to ensure that these citizens are made whole.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for including them in the en bloc and for allowing Houston to stand up again after a devastating hurricane, Hurricane Harvey.

Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk; it is listed in the Rule as Jackson Lee #243.

I wish to thank Chairman MCGOVERN and Ranking Member COLE of the Rules Committee for making this Jackson Lee Amendment in order.

I thank Chairwoman PRICE and Ranking Member DIAZ-BALART for their hard work in bringing Division E, the Transportation Housing and Urban Development portion of this omnibus appropriations legislative package, to the floor.

I thank them all for this opportunity to explain the Jackson Lee Amendment, which makes a good bill even better by providing \$2 million to an effort to explain why the Department of Housing and Urban Development has not released the funds appropriated almost two years ago to the State of Texas, the City of Houston and Harris County to rebuild following Hurricane Harvey.

In August of 2017, Hurricane Harvey paralyzed the Houston region dumping nearly 60

inches of rain, claiming 88 lives and causing \$113 billion of damage.

In February of 2018, Congress appropriated \$4.383 billion to Texas through CDBG-DR funds. In June of 2018, HUD approved the State Action Plan Texas submitted by The General Land Office (GLO), which outlined how the CD BG-DR grants would be distributed throughout the state.

This money still has not made it to Texas to help those in need.

While the waters receded nearly two years ago, many Texans are still struggling to put their lives back together and rebuild.

Homes and neighborhoods remain with visible damage from the flood waters.

I, along with members of the Texas House and Senate Delegations have made numerous requests to HUD Officials to move the process of releasing funding forward, but without success.

The last resort left is to seek the assistance of the Inspector General of HUD to determine the cause of the delay in distributing funds and to determine what needs to be done to release the funds.

The mission of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) is to prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse in the programs and operations of HUD by conducting independent audits, evaluations, and investigations.

The OIG can get answers on why the process of releasing funds is taking so long and whether there is any waste, fraud or abuse associated with the delay.

Hurricane Harvey was the most economically destructive hurricane to hit Texas in its history and the second-most expensive hurricane in American history.

Hurricane Harvey and the resulting flood impacted over 1,000 square miles along the mid-to-upper Texas Gulf Coast, and into the state's interior.

Congress immediately recognized the vast extent of the damage throughout the state and that federal action would be needed to help Texas start to rebuild and recover.

Finally, it would be beneficial to Congress to know if there are other factors within the agency that may be hindering effective administration of the duty to distribute the Harvey Disaster Block Grant Development funds such as agency vacancies, skills and competence of personnel, or administration policy that may be contributing factors.

As the lead state agency for administering CDBG-DR funds, GLO entered into an agreement with HUD and has worked closely with the agency to define the meaning of mitigation and to identify projects that would best help those impacted by Hurricane Harvey.

Despite the collaboration between the GLO and HUD, the rules have not yet been published in the Federal Register.

As a result, the GLO has been significantly delayed in implementing a State Action Plan for the funds, the critical next step needed before the grants can get to those who need them.

I ask my colleagues to support this Jackson Lee Amendment that may pave the way for the funding appropriated in 2017 to reach those still in need of disaster recovery assistance.

Additionally, funding is needed to make the needed changes to the intersections to improve pedestrian and bicyclists safety.

We must come together to tackle this problem and work to ensure that we stem the tide in these fatalities.

The rising death and injury toll of pedestrian and bicyclists is alarming and merits serious attention but as we know too tragically, behind the statistics are stories about people who are treasured and sorely missed by family, friends, and coworkers.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this Jackson Lee Amendment to help reduce the number of pedestrian and bicycle fatalities in urban areas.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for her kind words and also for her relentless efforts, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 267 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 267 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division E (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 422. None of the funds made available by this division may be used in contravention of section 2635.702 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1715

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of amendment No. 267 and in support of H.R. 3055, legislation that includes robust funding for the Department of Transportation.

Simply put, H.R. 3055 will bolster our infrastructure and increase the safety and security for citizens across the country, and I am proud to support it. But, Mr. Chair, when we use billions of dollars in taxpayer money to invest in our infrastructure, our constituents are relying on us to do so in a manner that is fair, transparent, and ethical.

That is why I am introducing, today, amendment No. 267, which would prohibit any funding in the appropriations bill from being used in violation of section 2635.702 of title 5, which is the law mandating that no public office be used for private gain.

In light of recent reporting alleging potential misconduct by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, it is imperative that we remind Federal officials that public money cannot be used for private purposes. Government officials across agencies should not make policy decisions with the intent of benefiting family businesses. They should never use their position in an official capacity to promote their own personal financial interests, and when tasked with any decision where there

are potential conflicts of interest, they must recuse themselves.

Government officials should make decisions only for the public good, not private gain. Favoritism corrodes trust in government and in the vital institutions that have kept our democracy strong for over 200 years. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. DIAZ BALART. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ BALART. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of this amendment and commend my colleague and a number of colleagues, actually, for offering it.

The recent news reports about the Secretary of Transportation are disturbing. It is critical that anyone who serves in public office follows the law, and if the law clearly states you can't use your public office for personal gain, that is what following the law requires. We expect all Federal employees to follow the law, and this amendment reminds them that it is their obligation to do so.

So I thank the gentleman again for raising this issue.

Mr. Chair, I would urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment because we must operate in the public interest, not for private gain, as Federal employees and people in trust in the Federal Government.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 268 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 268 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 548, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 592, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank our Appropriations Com-

mittee chair, Mr. PRICE, as well as the members of the Rules Committee for making this amendment in order.

This is a budget-neutral amendment that would increase the funds dedicated to Federal homeless assistance grants by \$1 million. These grants fund programs that have been shown to play key roles in addressing homelessness. In my hometown, for example, these funds support providers like Catholic Housing Services, which supports people who are formerly homeless, and like Plymouth Housing, which offers housing using the highly effective evidence-based permanent supportive housing model.

In my district, Mr. Chairman, we have 11,000 homeless folks, people who are experiencing homelessness, and they need help. We need more of these programs across the country.

Across the country, neighbors are experiencing homelessness and housing instability, and that instability can take many forms. It can be the veteran sleeping under an overpass, the child whose family is staying with friends and relatives, the low-wage worker who just can't even earn enough to leave the shelter, or the former foster youth who bounces in and out of cheap motels.

Some of these forms of homelessness are highly visible, others, like the housing instability experienced by families and by people living in rural areas, are often much harder to see, but every form of homelessness is deeply harmful.

That housing instability harms children's health. Kids and families facing housing instability had an almost 20 percent increased risk of hospitalization. Being homeless exacerbates physical and mental health issues and causes illness where, before, people had been healthy. And women who are unstably housed face high rates of rape and sexual and physical violence.

This suffering is cruel and unnecessary, and it is preventable. We all lose a piece of our humanity when we leave our unhoused neighborhoods behind. I hope we can do better with this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), our distinguished subcommittee chairman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and wish to express support for her amendment. I commend her for offering it.

Our underlying bill provides \$2.8 billion for HUD's Homeless Assistance Grants program. That is the highest funding level in that program's history. It includes more resources for Emergency Solutions Grants to rapidly rehouse and prevent homelessness, and the bill includes targeted investments for survivors of domestic violence and for youth experiencing homelessness.

In addition, section 231 of the bill creates a mechanism that allows HUD to more readily use recaptured funds from the small number of projects that

might not utilize their resources. We expect this provision will give us an additional \$90 million to use as grantees fight on the front lines to end homelessness.

So we have added resources. More can and must be done, and our colleague's amendment reflects that reality. We are going to pair this with sustained investments in affordable housing, and we are determined to reduce housing insecurity across the Nation.

So I am proud of what our bill accomplishes in this area. I commend the gentlewoman for her amendment additionally emphasizing our homeless challenge, and I urge adoption of our colleague's amendment.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 273 OFFERED BY MS. WEXTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 273 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 468, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,000,000) (reduced by \$7,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment provides \$7 million for the FAA to continue its work developing the remote tower pilot program.

Remote towers are a simple but revolutionary concept: Provide air traffic control services from any location. With remote tower technology, high-definition cameras and other sensors are installed in an airport and feed video and data in real time to a remote tower center.

Remote towers offer a promising new way for the FAA and airports to address air traffic without breaking the bank, saving on construction and maintenance costs that come with building a traditional air traffic control tower.

In addition to these cost savings, remote towers provide additional capabilities beyond the out-of-the-window view, such as integration of local

weather information, tracking moving objects, and the overlay of radar and surveillance information about an aircraft.

Remote tower systems can outline the edges of runways, taxiways, and airport structure, enhance visibility in fog, rain, and other adverse weather, and incorporate infrared cameras to provide night vision. The cameras can be filtered to minimize glare on a bright day or to add light when it is difficult to see at sunrise or dusk or on overcast days.

I am pleased that the first remote tower in the system is undergoing testing in my district at Leesburg Executive Airport. The project was launched in 2014 to address the justified need for an air traffic control tower. The airport has more than 100,000 operations annually and is located in a complex airspace just miles away from Dulles International Airport.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member for the opportunity.

This amendment ensures adequate funding for the purposes of instructing the FAA to continue the remote tower pilot program. Remote towers provide air traffic control services through the use of cameras and/or other instruments that provide information to controllers not in the same location. This is an innovative way to provide ATC services, significantly decreasing the upfront costs of building a control tower, and it reduces the annual operating and maintenance costs, especially where one remote tower provides coverage for several small airports in the vicinity.

A 2007 FAA study found that the technology in a remote tower actually improves surveillance capabilities at night and in inclement weather conditions. With more than 20,000 nontowered U.S. airports missing out on the benefits of an air traffic control tower, including streamlined access, reduced delays, and increased safety margins, remote towers provide a cost-effective way to enhance the safety and performance at these airports.

It is vital that we continue to support the FAA's remote tower pilot program allowing for innovative ways to improve safety and reduce costs. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Virginia for her important amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of her amendment.

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

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I

am happy to express support for her amendment and for highlighting this issue.

Remote towers can be a cost-effective way to provide additional safety and operational benefits to the National Air Space program. The underlying bill, in fact, includes report language encouraging the FAA "to use remote tower technology as a means to enhance safety, reduce costs, and expand air traffic control services at rural and small community airports."

I appreciate the gentlewoman's leadership on this issue. I urge adoption of her well-considered amendment.

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chairman, the National Air Traffic Controllers Association agrees it would be shortsighted not to continue the remote tower pilot program at this point. If funding is not appropriated, the FAA's activities related to certifying remote towers would cease, and the valuable work that has been done to understand the technology, develop operations, train controllers, and conduct safety analysis will be put on hold. In addition, the FAA won't have the resources to install remote tower technology at other airports and evaluate future system improvements and innovations.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to continue advancement of remote tower technology as a cost-effective alternative for providing air traffic control services.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1730

AMENDMENT NO. 282 OFFERED BY MR. GARCÍA OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 282 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 450, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment that I offer, along with Congressman CISNEROS of California, would set aside an additional \$5 million to fund the design, planning, and preparation of innovative transit-oriented development, or TOD, projects. TOD projects that incorporate better land use planning and design can be instrumental in preventing displacement and

gentrification in both urban and rural areas, leading to more equitable development.

Without proper funding for planning, poor land use decisions can often increase the threat of displacement. Too often, it is communities of color and working-class families who suffer most, like the 23,000 Hispanic and African American residents who have left the Logan Square neighborhood in my district, as well as the Pilsen part of my district in Chicago.

My amendment would provide a modest increase to the funds available for transit-oriented planning and design and better provide access to jobs and affordable housing in communities across the U.S.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, first, I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, and I respect him for that. But I think Chairman PRICE has set the right threshold for BUILD planning grants.

More money going to planning could potentially, frankly, mean less money for infrastructure for actual projects. That is particularly true if, as I fear, when there is a top-line number agreed to by the House, Senate, and the White House, the number that Chairman PRICE is going to have to work with might be less than what he is working with today, making his job a lot more difficult.

Again, I understand what the gentleman is trying to do. I have said it publicly and I have said it privately: I think Chairman PRICE has done a great job and has got a good balance. Therefore, even though I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, I respectfully have to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that better planning could, in fact, save more money that would be available for infrastructure and development.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding and for offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept this amendment, take it to conference, and work out what the most appropriate level of funding is.

I want to acknowledge strong support of this Chamber from both sides of

the aisle for the BUILD program. That is the one discretionary program within DOT that allows States and local communities to seek funding for major multi-modal transportation projects.

As our colleague has underscored, technical assistance and planning support is often essential to that process, especially for communities with more limited resources or expertise.

These planning grants are important. The underlying bill provides \$15 million for competitive grants for planning, preparation, and design. The amendment sets that figure at \$20 million. These resources are going to lead to increased investments in our communities, they are going to create jobs, and spur economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the gentleman's efforts to highlight the importance of planning grants, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, again, after hearing the chairman, who is always willing to work with colleagues—again, I just understand the difficult task that he has ahead of him, but it is an issue that, as the chairman himself has said, he will continue to work on and with that—I understand where Mr. GARCÍA is coming from. Also, I know that he understands that this is a very difficult balance that the chairman has to deal with. I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman.

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I urge colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 284 OFFERED BY MR. MALINOWSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 284 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 515, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,000,000)".

Page 515, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$6,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases funding for the Low or No Emission Grant Program by \$6 million, from \$94 million to \$100 million.

The program, as the name implies, provides funding to State and local governments for zero- and low-emission transit bus programs.

Using funds from the first and second round of the Volkswagen settlement, my State of New Jersey has begun our transition to electric transit and school bus fleets. This program, and others like it all across America, would benefit greatly from additional funds from the Low or No Emission Grant Program.

The benefits to our country will be profound.

First, we get reduced carbon emissions. The Department of Transportation has estimated that each zero-emission bus has reduced carbon emitted to the atmosphere by 1,690 tons over its 12-year lifespan, or the equivalent of taking 27 cars off the road.

Second, we get healthier kids. Smog from diesel buses drives up rates of asthma with children and low-income communities suffering the most.

Finally, it is good economics. While electric buses cost more up front, with their lower maintenance costs, they save around \$39,000 per year over their lifetime, a savings to taxpayers of more than \$150,000 per bus.

So I hope my colleagues will agree that this is a smart investment. It will speed our transition to a clean energy economy and it will do it in a fiscally responsible way.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I don't object at all to the program that the gentleman is supporting with an increase. I think he has mentioned why, and I would agree with what he has stated.

The problem that I have is not with the program he is trying to increase. The part that I object to is where the cuts are coming from, where he is obtaining the money, and that is cuts to transit bus and bus facilities.

We have had a lot of Members who were supporting funding for transit bus and bus facilities. I believe it is over a dozen Members who have actually written support letters for that program that this amendment, unfortunately, reduces funding from. That provides vital resources and mobility in urban areas. It is crucial to a number of urban areas around the country.

So, as I said before in other amendments, I think Chairman PRICE has struck the right balance in determining funding for this program. I think what the gentleman is trying to do in his amendment is meritorious. I would, however, say that taking it out of transit bus money and bus facility money is not the place to do it. Obviously, I know that Chairman PRICE will continue to work with the gentleman as the process goes along, regardless of what happens with this amendment.

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding and I wish to support his amendment, particularly to stress the emphasis he has given to low- and no-emission buses. They do improve the environment. They improve public health, they reduce greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution, and also reduce long-term maintenance costs for transit.

Our bill provides robust funding for these grants to State and local governments of \$145 million. That is \$94 million above the authorized amount.

Meanwhile, we are offering strong support for the bus and bus facilities program. That provides vital resources that improve bus fleets in communities large and small. Between the transit infrastructure grants and funding provided via trust funds, the bill provides \$678 million in competitive grants under that program.

These are both important programs for transit grantees. I look forward to working with my colleague to ensure robust funding in public transit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the amendment's adoption.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would add that we are not reducing the grants available for bus programs in this country. We are simply recognizing that there is a transition under way in our economy, a transition to clean energy. We want to speed that transition and we want to make sure that America leads that transition because, if we don't, somebody else will.

We want American companies to be the world leaders in producing electric buses, for example. We know that there is an upfront cost. There is a long-term savings, but an upfront cost that the Federal Government can help with. It will be good for our economy, in addition to being good for the environment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 288 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 288 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 548, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 548, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Page 549, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 578, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 578, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment which would provide increased funding to support the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Family Self-Sufficiency Program.

Access to stable, safe, and affordable housing is a fundamental human right. In my district, the Massachusetts Seventh, one of the most diverse and unequal districts in our Nation, we are distinctly aware of the connection between housing and economic opportunity.

Affordable housing promotes healthy living and provides low-income people a chance at upward mobility. Without it, families are destabilized, productivity suffers, and entire communities crumble.

Recently, the Boston Housing Authority partnered with Metro Housing and Compass Working Capital, a non-profit financial services organization which provides financial coaching services and support to Family Self-Sufficiency Program participants in my district.

The Family Self-Sufficiency Program is a voluntary, 5-year program that provides participants in the federally-funded Housing Choice Voucher Program the opportunity to save part of their rent increase when they earn more money at work. The program provides participating families with an FSS savings account.

My amendment provides \$5 million in additional funding to the organizations working with individuals and families seeking to improve their financial standing. This partnership, under the auspices of the Family Self-Sufficiency Program, has supported low-income families to build assets, pay off debt, and save for their retirement.

Participants have gone on to earn degrees, purchase their own homes, and start small businesses.

This includes Julia, a woman who, after years of working as a tailor and taking on additional side work for friends, learned about the FSS program. Julia used Compass' financial coaching to launch JDLS Couture, a tailoring and design business in Boston.

This includes Ernise, a resident of Cambridge, who graduated from Compass' program last year. Ernise joined the program while unemployed, saying that before she joined she was ready to give up. Ernise found full-time work, paid off debt and increased her credit score, and built enough savings to begin the home purchasing process.

□ 1745

My amendment will support a program rooted in financial empowerment and independence, a proven program.

We must also work to enact policies to guarantee housing for all and leverage the resources to make it a reality.

I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding. I am happy to offer support for her amendment.

Mr. Chair, the Family Self-Sufficiency program helps low-income families living in subsidized housing. It allows them to enhance their job skills and to increase earnings to improve their economic security.

Currently, there are more than 75,000 families enrolled in FSS, which is just a fraction of the number that should be—the families living in assisted housing, many, many more than that.

Mr. Chair, I am proud of the fact that our base bill already increases this program, providing \$100 million for Family Self-Sufficiency. That is a \$20 million increase from current funding. This amendment would do even better, would make FSS available to even more families, so I applaud my colleagues for offering this.

I want to register some concern about the offset in this and other amendments in terms of the Office of the Secretary and other departmental staff. They do have to do their work, and we have to consider the cumulative effect of amendments, but we will do that as the process moves along and we go to conference.

Mr. Chair, the situation can be addressed. This is a useful and helpful amendment, and I am happy to support adoption.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 289 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 289 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 449, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 449, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which underscores the importance of investing in safe, efficient, people-centered transportation systems for all communities across the country.

I view every issue through a lens of equity and health. Without access to safe, reliable, and inclusive modes of transportation, our collective well-being suffers; our families suffer; our communities suffer.

For far too long, our Federal transportation funding and policies have created a landscape which has exacerbated inequities and disparities, particularly for low-income communities, people with disabilities, our youth and seniors.

In my district, Black and Latino commuters are more likely to experience longer travel times than their White peers. These unequal burdens make the promise of economic mobility further out of reach.

I recently rode the T back home with an advocate named Dianna, who was fighting for transit justice. We spent over 2 hours making a journey of just a little over 4 miles. Broken elevators and outdated infrastructure meant that the wheelchair Dianne uses to navigate ran into constant access barriers.

Just 2 weeks ago, the red line train derailed twice in 1 week, causing massive gridlock across my district and impacting the ability of riders to commute to work, school, home, and everywhere in between.

Unfortunately, this isn't new. MBTA trains have derailed 43 times over the last 5 years, the second highest total of any metro transit system in our country. Many of these derailments place a disproportionate burden on the shoulders of low-wage hourly workers who are rushing to their second- or third-shift jobs, parents or caregivers who are traveling with young children on overcrowded and delayed trains, and riders with disabilities who already experience the failures, daily, of a biased and discriminatory system with ableist privilege as a lens.

Our chronic underinvestment in mass transit bus systems, bicycle-accessible and pedestrian paths have caused income inequality and opportunity gaps in communities throughout the country.

According to the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, inadequate access to affordable, reliable transportation has exacerbated health disparities, forcing many low-income patients to miss appointments, oftentimes worsening medical problems.

Mr. Chair, people do not live in silos. They live in intersectionality, and our policies at the Federal, State, and local levels should reflect this reality.

We cannot spur economic development and tackle economic inequities in urban, suburban, and rural communities without modernized roads, bridges, and mass transit, which connects communities to jobs and higher education.

We cannot tackle health disparities without reliable and affordable mass transit systems which enable low-income families, seniors, and people with disabilities to access care.

We cannot tackle the existential threat of climate change without intentionally investing in mass transit systems that protect frontline communities and alleviate the environmental health hazards caused by traffic congestion.

Transit equity is a civil rights issue and an economic justice issue. We must continue to invest in transit infrastructure, multimodal improvements that promote inclusivity and dependability.

My amendment emphasizes the important role that Federal policy and investments make in equalizing access to reliable commuter rail and other mass transit options for all. The BUILD grant program helps to support these types of State and locally driven transit projects.

From investing in bus or commuter rail systems or cycling and pedestrian path projects, the BUILD program helps to drive innovative projects, and it seeks to expand the system, and is people-centered.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman PRICE for his efforts to ensure robust funding for this program, which I do believe gets us one step closer to addressing these inequities across the system, repairing our crumbling infrastructure, as well as expanding our investment in multimodal transit.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the chairman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding. I am happy to offer support for her amendment and to take advantage of the opportunity this offers to say something about the BUILD program.

Mr. Chair, it is unique, as our colleague has stressed. It provides the kind of flexible funding to States and localities that can address complex multimodal projects.

My district has benefited greatly from this. The city of Raleigh has successfully built Union Station, a state-of-the-art rail and public transit facility that is already transforming that area of downtown.

Unfortunately, despite the diverse set of eligible projects, the current administration has heavily favored road projects only when awarding BUILD grants. This has most significantly affected transit. On average, it received about 32 percent of the awards during the previous administration.

Under the Trump administration, this has plummeted to less than 10 percent, and at the same time, the Department has completely abandoned bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects and actually eliminated this as an option for primary project type for years 2017 and 2018.

So, the underlying bill provides \$1 billion for BUILD—that is a \$100 mil-

lion increase—but it places greater emphasis on investments in transit, passenger rail, pedestrian improvements, and multimodal projects. It also maintains a 50-50 parity between urban and rural awards, while directing the Department to consider the full range of benefits from a project, regardless of location in an urban or rural area.

Mr. Chair, I commend my colleague for offering this amendment. I am happy to support it and look forward to continuing to work with her on this issue.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. PRESSLEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. TONKO, 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. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1832

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEAL) at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FIND WILLIAM P. BARR, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, AND WILBUR L. ROSS, JR., SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH SUBPOENAS DULY ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM

Ms. HILL of California, from the Committee on Oversight and Reform, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-125) on the resolution recommending that the House of Representatives find William P. Barr, Attorney General of the United States, and Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., Secretary of Commerce, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly