

He has destroyed almost every norm that existed for Attorneys General and their relationship to the rule of law, the rule of law that makes America stand out as the beacon on the hill to nations all over the world. No longer, for the rule of law has been diminished by his actions with Michael Flynn, a person who pled guilty twice, admitted to lying, and, yet, wanted to withdraw the prosecution. And the same for the change in the plea agreement for Roger Stone and that recommendation.

He violated the First Amendment at Lafayette Park when he cleared the park for a photo op for the President.

He abused his power in the Mueller report when he misled the people in what the Mueller report really said.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons and others, I have been joined by 35 of my colleagues today in introducing a resolution calling for the impeachment of William Barr and calling on the Committee on the Judiciary to look into it.

#### RECOGNIZING JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pass on the floor of the House H. Res. 1001.

If we can recall our history, we will know that 155 years ago, on June 19, General Gordon Granger rode into Galveston, Texas, and announced the freedom of the last American slaves, belatedly freeing 250,000 slaves in Texas, nearly 2.5 years after Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the 200-plus Members of Congress who signed H. Res. 1001 that deals with recognizing June 19 as this year's observance of the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day.

The reading of this order ended shadow slavery, a form of perpetual servitude, and, as well, the 13th Amendment that then forever banned slavery in this Nation. That servitude held generations of Africans in bondage in the United States for 248 years and opened a new chapter in American history.

Mr. Speaker, it is America's original sin. I hope this legislation and the legislation to come will allow us to have a unified, dignified, peaceful discussion of race and systemic racism in this Nation, and Juneteenth will become a living symbol of freedom for people, including the proposed Juneteenth official Federal holiday.

Juneteenth remains the oldest known celebration or commemoration of slavery's demise.

#### RECOGNIZING JUNE 19, 2020, AS THIS YEAR'S OBSERVANCE OF THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Oversight and Reform be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 1001 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES 1001

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach frontier areas of the United States, and in particular the Southwestern States, for more than 2½ years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, which was issued on January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free;

Whereas African Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19th, commonly known as "Juneteenth Independence Day", as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas African Americans from the Southwest continue the tradition of celebrating Juneteenth Independence Day as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas for more than 150 years, Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures; and

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves remains an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That—

(1) the House of Representatives—

(A) recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation;

(B) supports the continued celebration of Juneteenth Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the Nation; and

(C) encourages the people of the United States to observe Juneteenth Independence Day with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States; and

(B) history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1015

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, INVESTING IN A NEW VISION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION IN AMERICA ACT

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1028 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 1028

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-54, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; (2) the amendments en bloc described in sections 2 through 7 of this resolution; (3) the further amendments described in sections 8 and 9 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer an amendment en bloc consisting of the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The amendment en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. At the conclusion of the consideration of the amendment en bloc described in section 2 of this resolution, it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer an amendment en bloc consisting of the further amendments printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The amendment en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of the consideration of the amendment en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer an amendment en bloc consisting of the further amendments printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The amendment en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of the consideration of the amendment en bloc described in

section 4 of this resolution, it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer an amendment en bloc consisting of the further amendments printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The amendment en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 6. At the conclusion of the consideration of the amendment en bloc described in section 5 of this resolution, it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer an amendment en bloc consisting of the further amendments printed in part F of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The amendment en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 7. At the conclusion of the consideration of the amendment en bloc described in section 6 of this resolution, it shall be in order for the ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer an amendment en bloc consisting of the further amendments printed in part G of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The amendment en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 8. At the conclusion of the consideration of the amendment en bloc described in section 7 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part H of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 9. (a) Prior to the offering of an amendment en bloc pursuant to sections 2 through 7 of this resolution, the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee may designate amendments that shall not be considered as part of the amendment en bloc to be offered pursuant to such section.

(b) Any amendment designated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be in order at the conclusion of the consideration of the further amendments pursuant to section 8 of this resolution if offered by a Member designated in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

(c) All points of order against amendments en bloc described in sections 2 through 7 of

this resolution, the further amendments described in section 8 of this resolution, and the further amendments described in this section are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1028, providing for consideration of H.R. 2, the Moving Forward Act, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 2 hours of general debate on the bill, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The rule self-executes a manager's amendment offered by Chairman DEFAZIO, makes in order six en bloc amendments in total, and makes in order three further amendments.

Prior to the offering of an en bloc amendment, the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure may designate amendments that shall not be considered as part of the en bloc and shall be considered separately.

And, lastly, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the Moving Forward Act provides more than \$1.5 trillion to rebuild American infrastructure. The state of disrepair of our roads cost Americans \$160 billion in 2014, and 200,000 of our Nation's bridges are more than 50 years old.

Our aging water system loses trillions of gallons of treated water each year and leaves some families without clean water to drink at all.

Children across the Nation are trying to learn in classrooms that are falling apart, without climate control in extreme temperatures, and without reliable internet access.

At the same time, more than 200 million Americans are facing unemployment during a global pandemic.

Our Nation is facing long-term economic repercussions of our inability to stem the spread of COVID-19. We must do something.

Nearly a century ago, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt lifted this Nation up during the height of the Great Depression by putting Americans

back to work. By investing in good-paying jobs and public works to improve our communities across the Nation, we were able to provide direct help for working families and invest in much-needed infrastructure. This shaped the face of America for generations to come.

The time has come again to invest in desperately needed infrastructure projects that can put Americans to work right now in their own communities.

There has been tremendous bipartisan agreement from leaders at every level of government, from our village mayors to the President of the United States, that this country must invest in infrastructure that will carry the next generation. The Moving Forward Act is the first step in meeting that need.

With H.R. 2, we will be investing not only in transportation, housing, schools, and broadband, but in families, workers, and communities across this country. This legislation supports American manufacturing and ingenuity, and together we will create millions of jobs right here at home. We will secure the future of our children by forging a path toward zero carbon emissions, making our streets and transit safer, and bringing a better learning environment to every child.

This legislation provides more than \$300 billion to repair and upgrade existing roads and bridges, railways, and ports. We are going to provide \$100 billion to put zero-emission buses on American roadways, cutting congestion, providing new options for families and workers. We are working to make roads smarter and safer for all users, including children, pedestrians, and cyclists.

We will also provide over \$100 billion to create or preserve 1.8 million affordable homes, reducing housing inequality, creating local jobs, and increasing resiliency in the face of natural disasters.

I am proud to support provisions to triple funding for Amtrak to allow long-awaited upgrades and expansion of our Nation's passenger rail network. America has long lagged behind in accessible and efficient rail travel, and this funding will improve safety and assist local traffic congestion.

The Moving Forward Act represents a true partnership between the Federal Government and American States and localities.

The bill also permanently reinstates Build America Bonds and advance refunding bonds as well as increasing the issuance of private activity bonds, spurring private investment in community projects that our Nation desperately needs.

We have \$70 billion for clean energy and a plan to upgrade America's electrical grid to make it more efficient and more resilient.

H.R. 2 also delivers affordable high-speed internet access to all parts of the country by investing \$100 billion to

promote competition for broadband internet infrastructure to unserved and underserved rural, suburban, and urban communities.

□ 1030

As our Nation battles this global pandemic, and so many of our hospitals have been stretched to the brink, the Moving Forward Act invests \$30 billion to upgrade hospital facilities to increase capacity, strengthen care, and prepare for future health emergencies.

This bill invests \$25 billion to modernize postal infrastructure and operations, including a zero emissions postal vehicle fleet, and puts Americans to work strengthening our coast with a \$3 billion grant program for shovel-ready projects to restore Great Lakes, coastal habitats, and marine ecosystems.

As we discuss the far-reaching benefits of the Moving Forward Act, I would like to note the significance of one particular provision that I was proud to advocate for along with my colleagues in the Education and Labor Committee, the Reopen and Rebuild America's Schools Act.

Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, chronic neglect of America's public schools forced students and educators across the country to learn and work in outdated and hazardous school buildings. Now the pandemic is exacerbating this crisis and making abundantly clear how unprepared and under-resourced many of our Nation's school districts are.

The Reopen and Rebuild America's Schools Act takes great strides to move beyond the traditional brick and mortar school infrastructure to support schools and designing the types of building and classrooms needed to serve students, especially those from low income families. This critical legislation is needed now more than ever.

Today, we can work to not only help teachers and students get back to school, but commit serious investment in high poverty schools with facilities that pose health and safety risks to students and staff, expand access to high-speed broadband to ensure that all public schools have the reliable and high-speed internet access that students need for digital and distance learning.

This legislation, the Moving Forward Act, represents a significant step we must take to invest in the future of American infrastructure from our highway systems to our classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the rule and support H.R. 2.

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

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

I serve on the Transportation Committee as well as the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, so I always get excited when there is a transportation bill that is coming to the floor. I am less excited today.

My friend from New York is a wonderful leader for his constituents and a

wonderful bipartisan leader in this institution. I look forward to his time when we get to question witnesses in the Rules Committee because invariably he asks a question that I might have asked or should have asked, and invariably I learn something from the gentleman and his line of questions that I believe is going to benefit this institution and benefit the Nation.

And, candidly, as you know, Mr. Speaker, that is not always the way it is. Some folks are asking questions to get their next 30-second film clip so they can send it out on social media for purposes that perhaps are less valuable to the institution and to the Nation. And so I look forward to an opportunity to be down here and talk about a partnership issue, like transportation, with the gentleman from New York.

He mentioned that this bill is designed to be a partnership between the Federal Government and the States and localities. Sadly, I must tell you that is where any suspicion of partnership ends.

I went back and pulled the video from 2015 when we did our last transportation bill. As the gentleman from New York knows, we are assigned, so often, our Rules Committee legislation based on our other authorizing committee assignments, so I got to carry that bill back in 2015. I was reminded how long it has been since I got to tell the Speaker that I will, by order of the Committee on Rules, call up a resolution. I miss that opportunity. I hope to get that back in January.

But I had this big smile on my face, Mr. Speaker, because the speech that I got to deliver that day in 2015 was that the House was bringing the most open Transportation Committee bill in decades to the House floor. The bill I got to bring that day, Mr. Speaker, talked about how the bill passed out of committee on a voice vote, a voice vote, because Republicans and Democrats, as is so often true on the Transportation Committee, were arm-in-arm moving forward on an issue that is important to all of our constituencies.

I had not even finished my Rules debate time, these 30 minutes, before I had to offer an amendment to the rule to make even more amendments in order than the amendments we had already made in order. And then we came back the next day and made even more amendments in order. At that time, Mr. Speaker, having had a bill that was worked through the process in a bipartisan way, that passed out of committee on a voice vote, we then brought rules to the floor that made in order about equal number of Republican amendments, Democratic amendments, and bipartisan amendments. To be precise, it was 45 Democratic amendments, 47 Republican amendments, and 34 bipartisan amendments after the process had been worked in a bipartisan way already, after the bill had passed out of committee on a voice vote already.

Today, that is not the kind of rule we are bringing. And I recognize that COVID has made our voting requirements different today. But this bill didn't pass out of committee, the committee on which I sit, the Transportation Committee, on a voice vote with everybody in agreement. This bill passed out of committee on a strictly party line vote, because this bill, unlike the bill that had been worked through in a bipartisan way when last we reauthorized service transportation, this bill had been worked in a purely partisan way.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that at that time we made in order, roughly, a number of Republican amendments and Democratic amendments and bipartisan amendments. The rule before us today makes in order a roughly equal number of bipartisan amendments and Republican amendments, 17 bipartisan amendments and 19 Republican amendments. Less than half the number that we had made in order when last we worked this bill when we did in it in a partnership way.

But while the bill makes in order an equal number of Republican amendments and bipartisan amendments, again, 19 Republican amendments, 17 bipartisan amendments, it makes in order 134 Democratic amendments. Now, mind you, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that this process has been a partisan process from the beginning in the Transportation Committee, meaning, it was worked entirely through on the Democratic side of the aisle. So as Republicans come to the floor, those Republicans who don't serve on the Transportation Committee for their only opportunity to influence this process, and I said it, and the gentleman from New York knows it to be true.

Back in 2015, I said what is wonderful about opening up the process is that every single one of us has something to contribute. The more than 700,000 people that sent each one of us here have something to contribute. The wonder and uniqueness of this institution comes from the variety of Members who come here to serve and the varied experiences that they bring.

Seventeen bipartisan amendments, 19 Republican amendments, and 134 Democratic amendments made in order by this rule. Even the Democrats were shut out of the partnership process, because any serious legislator on Capitol Hill knows the right time to get your language included isn't in an amendment on the House floor, it is by going to your chairman or your ranking member.

If I want to get something done on the Transportation Committee, I go to my ranking member, SAM GRAVES, and I talk to him about it, and he talks to the chairman about it, and then we get it done together because that is the partnership in which the committee works, or at least the way that it used to work.

It is unbelievable to me that in a time of great national distress that one

of the sole remaining vestiges of bipartisanship on Capitol Hill, the Transportation Committee, and one of the primary vehicles for moving those partnership ideas, the highway transportation bill, has devolved into the partisan exercise that we find ourselves in today. It is not too late to fix that.

Mr. Speaker, I will be urging defeat of this rule. If you listen to the reading clerk read it, you will know that if you have been watching this institution for any period of time, 2 years, 4 years, 8 years, 10 years, 20 years, 30 years, you have never heard a reading clerk read a rule that looks like this. We have just never seen one that looks like this.

So partisan have things become, Mr. Speaker, that the Rules Committee historically has offered en bloc authority to the chairman, because the chairman has been working in partnership with the ranking member. Because the way to dispose of amendments on the floor of the House in an expeditious manner, which we absolutely positively need in a COVID-19 environment, is through partnership. In this case the partnership never started.

I would like to tell you the partnership eroded, but that is just not true, the partnership never began. There was never an opportunity for erosion, and thus, we have the kind of en bloc authority that you see today, not designated to the chairman to enact, but created by the Rules Committee, and the chairman has an opportunity to oppose it if he would like.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed. But for my colleagues who are also disappointed, this doesn't have to be the end of the conversation. My ranking member—I haven't talked to him in the last 2 or 3 days, but when last I heard him speak—said he was still committed to working in a partnership way. That he was absolutely available. From day one, he said, make me a part of this conversation, don't rule anything out. In fact, the chairman said exactly that last night, that the ranking member approached him early on in the process, and said, don't count us out for anything, we want to work in a partnership fashion.

Mr. Speaker, we can defeat this rule. And defeating this rule isn't going to slow down surface transportation. Anybody who believes this bill is going anywhere is kidding themselves. This is a partisan messaging exercise. This is not legislating that we are doing here today, but we can move on to legislating. We can defeat this rule, and we can go back and—you know, just one crazy idea—we can make the Transportation Committee the partnership place it has always been.

We can make infrastructure the partnership issue it has always been. We can make a difference, instead of just making a point.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am always excited to be with my friend from Georgia, and we

do get to sit through long hours of the Rules Committee and question back and forth our witnesses. And he is right, I am not particularly media savvy, I have a face for radio, as they say. But we do find that time to be very informative. I struggle a little bit, I was not here in 2015, but I do know what has happened over the last 18 months or so.

First and foremost, I just note that in the midst of a pandemic, I think we can hardly be excused had we just done a closed rule. Put the bill before us for a vote without a structured rule, which is in front of us.

I also note, and this is one of the challenges of trying to engage in bipartisanship, which I am not only a big fan of, but I engaged in in my previous life as a member of the New York State Assembly where we had a Republican Senate and a Democratic House, much as we find ourselves in here today, and we worked across the aisle to find common ground when we could.

But I will say that I think that the difference between 2015 and now is the opposition of the minority, particularly as it related to a number of issues that dealt with climate change, and made it, as I understand listening to the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, effectively mitigated any chance of having a bipartisan agreement on this. But that is not to say that there aren't Republican amendments before us.

I know Ms. FOXX will have an amendment here later. The ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee on which I serve, as well as the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will advance an en bloc amendment. So there will be, and there continues to be an effort on our part to work across the aisle. But I do find it hard to be bipartisan, and I think if it was a voice vote, then I think there was general agreement. Clearly, there were differences of opinion here that we could not get past, and we felt the need very much to advance this.

Mr. Speaker, I also will say, just to note—and I hate to keep hearkening back to my experience in State government, but I will, nonetheless, even though I hate it, I will do that, which is to say, I served under Republican and Democratic Governors. And something that would have been this important would clearly have engaged the Governor of either party in discussions with the members of the legislature in both houses.

□ 1045

And I note that while the President has indicated support for an infrastructure bill, I think it was over a year ago, back in May of 2019, where the President hosted a meeting at the White House after having talked about a \$2 trillion infrastructure package and broke up the meeting in anger and left, and as far as I know has not engaged either House in substantive discussions moving forward.

So I don't disagree with my friend from Georgia. I know that he is profoundly interested in this institution and in working across the aisle, but there are times when, unfortunately, for various reasons that is not the case, and we have it in front of us today. And I feel compelled that we move forward on the Moving Forward Act because this is vital to the interests of the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for H.R. 2, the Moving Forward Act.

America cannot remain competitive in the 21st century without modern, efficient infrastructure. Unfortunately, our roads, bridges, airports, and schools are falling behind.

H.R. 2 makes transformational investments in our country's infrastructure that will revitalize America's backbone while improving safety, reducing pollution, and getting Americans back to work.

To address our crumbling roads, the bill provides \$300 billion for construction and maintenance of Federal highways and bridges. In Sacramento, my hometown, this will mean money for more projects like the new I Street Bridge that will help move people and goods safely and effectively.

H.R. 2 also provides provisions to reinforce our commitment to fighting the climate crisis. It provides more than \$70 billion to expand renewable energy sources and strengthen clean energy infrastructure.

Additionally, the State of California and transportation authorities in my district will benefit from this bill's funding to increase walking, biking, and public transit options, all with the goal of cleaning up our air and limiting human contributions to climate change.

H.R. 2 also accelerates the use of zero emission vehicles and ensures we keep up with demand by installing necessary charging infrastructure across the country.

In addition, to keep Americans connected to the internet, this bill provides broadband payment support for low-income households and the recently unemployed. The COVID-19 pandemic has required our schools to fundamentally change the way they engage with students, and H.R. 2 ensures children have access to digital equipment and affordable broadband options for remote learning.

For America to remain the global center of innovation and growth, we must have 21st century infrastructure. This bill makes the forward-looking investments to help get us there.

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

I think my friend from New York is right that in the time of a healthcare pandemic that having a closed rule could have been a possibility. In fact, I

have no doubt that the only reason we have any amendments at all available on the floor of the House today is because my friend from New York, and particularly my chairman from Massachusetts, fought on behalf of having a more open process.

I have no doubt that there are folks all across this institution who would have loved to have shut out all the voices altogether. And had we moved this bill out of committee with my ranking member's consent on a voice vote the way we did it last time, I would have supported the majority in trying to be more expeditious on the floor, because when you move things in a bipartisan way you get bipartisan partnership to get them across the finish line. But that is not the way this bill has moved.

It is a valuable thing to be the chairman of a bipartisan committee, Mr. Speaker, and I would tell you it comes with a stewardship obligation to make sure it remains so.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), who will be the next chairman of the Transportation Committee, the current ranking member.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say to my colleagues that we were putting our time to good use today, but we all know that we have an incredibly important obligation, and we have got a lot of work to do when it comes to infrastructure.

We need to pass a long-term surface transportation bill to provide States and local communities the certainty to plan and execute highway, bridge, and transit projects across this country.

If we don't do that, or if we pass short-term extensions, it throws their plans into chaos and it jeopardizes needed improvements.

But that is exactly what we are going to do because the infrastructure bill in this entire process got highjacked by a partisan agenda that has more to do with pushing the Green New Deal than it does fixing our infrastructure.

During all my time serving on the committee, Republicans and Democrats have always been able to work out their differences and find common ground to pass a surface transportation bill. We have always been able to do that.

It is the most important legislative product that we produce on the committee, and members have always treated it as such.

Time and again, that has been our committee's hallmark because that is the only road to actually getting something done for the good of our infrastructure, for transportation workers, and for the economy.

But on this bill, that didn't happen. And I can assure you that wasn't my choice. This highjacked process began with a \$500 billion my-way-or-the-highway bill developed exclusively by one party.

At a time when entire industries, workforces, and our States still face in-

credible uncertainty over the COVID pandemic, our committee passed a partisan bill to completely upend the functions and programs of the transportation system.

Then immediately after the committee approved the majority's bill along party lines just over a week ago, the Speaker took the bill and tripled the size with so many air-dropped provisions that the only thing that isn't included is the kitchen sink. But, please, don't quote me on that, Mr. Speaker, because as far as I know the kitchen sink could be funded in this, as well.

Although we do know one green thing that is not in this bill, and that is the money to pay for it. This \$1.5 trillion climate bill, camouflaged as an infrastructure bill, piles another mountain of debt onto the backs of future generations.

This irresponsible bill very well might pass the House, but that is as far as it is going to go. The Senate is never going to take up this unserious, progressive wish list. The Speaker may earn praise of her most liberal Members for this bill, but she is failing the American people and wasting the House's time on an issue that we all know could garner bipartisan support.

We could be getting something done to improve America's infrastructure and provide the stability and certainty that workers and stakeholders need right now, if only the Speaker of the majority hadn't unnecessarily chosen partisanship over partnership throughout this entire process.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

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

Very briefly, I do note that we certainly could have entered into a bipartisan agreement if we didn't care about climate change, if we weren't interested in the greatest impact on our carbon footprint by transportation and automobiles, and we create a number of provisions in this bill which we could not get support on, which is why we had to go on our own way.

I do also note for my great friend from Georgia, 17 bipartisan amendments are included in this package. So there is bipartisanship, despite the feelings that the White House has given as it relates to this bill.

Before I yield, I insert in the RECORD a May 8 Industry Week article titled, "Crumbling Infrastructure is Hurting America's Competitive Edge."

[From Industry Week]

CRUMBLING INFRASTRUCTURE IS HURTING AMERICA'S COMPETITIVE EDGE

(By Michael McGarry)

With unemployment rates in the U.S. at historic levels due to the economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is more important than ever to invest in areas that help get more people back to work. Today, lawmakers should prioritize the passage and implementation of a comprehensive infrastructure program, as part of a future round of stimulus funding that would immediately

provide employment opportunities for many Americans.

Even before we started feeling the economic impacts of COVID-19, our country was in dire need of these upgrades. Data from the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) reveals that underinvestment in U.S. infrastructure worsens by the year, and infrastructure investment before the pandemic was only one-third of what it was in 1960.

Manufacturers, who today continue to provide essential resources to the medical community and other front-line workers, are currently relying on outdated roads, bridges, waterways, ports, runways and drinking water systems, many of which are more than 50 years old. More than 54,000 bridges across the U.S. are rated "structurally deficient" according to NAM. Roadways, ports and waterways are in disrepair. The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) released a report card in 2017 of infrastructure in the country and gave the nation a rating of D+. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, 65% of major U.S. roads are rated as "less than good condition."

In addition to the challenges we will now face due to the current economic environment, these deficiencies take an additional toll on manufacturers' bottom lines, causing unreliable delivery times and increased fleet maintenance costs. Congested highway networks add \$74.5 billion to transportation costs for manufacturers moving goods and raw materials by truck, according to the American Transportation Research Institute.

In order for America to remain globally competitive now and after this pandemic, our leaders must be committed to improving our infrastructure. China's infrastructure investment is almost double the size of the infrastructure spending in the U.S., and India's infrastructure investments are growing at a rate that triples the infrastructure outlays of the U.S., Canada and Mexico combined. Manufacturing workers in the U.S., and all Americans, should refuse to settle for infrastructure that lags behind the rest of the world.

Many have acknowledged that the current economic challenges bring an opportunity to upgrade the nation's neglected transportation systems. Stay-at-home orders covering nearly the entire country in March and April kept Americans off the road, and gas tax revenues have plummeted as a result. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, state and local governments need \$50 billion to ensure that they can continue existing transportation construction and maintenance programs without disruption. The nation's airports also need a backstop to make up for lost user fees. Keeping current infrastructure projects afloat is only a start.

Our deteriorating national infrastructure is not solely a state or federal issue. It is not a small or large business issue. It is not a Democratic or a Republican issue. Infrastructure is an American issue that directly affects our ability to compete in the global marketplace and provide financial security for millions of American families.

Once it is safe to work, the U.S. government should mobilize to rebuild our nation's infrastructure. It would ensure that the nation emerges on the other side with a stronger, competitive economy. Infrastructure projects put people to work at high wages, create demand for materials and equipment and generate tax revenues for governments at all levels. They build systems of lasting public benefit, improving the safety, convenience and efficiency of commerce, communication and travel.

Making substantial investments in America's infrastructure will not only put Americans back to work, but it will improve the

lives of workers, while helping all manufacturers better serve their customers and communities. It will bolster the security of our nation, and it will strengthen the ties that bind us together as a country, improving commerce and communication and paving the way for the success of the next generation.

Congress must invest now. I urge our elected leaders to work together to prioritize a bold vision for improving infrastructure. Congress's next stimulus bill must include aggressive investments in infrastructure such as highways, bridges and airports. It's good for our citizens, our economy, and our country to remain globally competitive. We cannot afford to wait.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think it is important for the American people to know that it has been 5 years since we have been able to put pen to paper and develop a massive infrastructure bill going out to desperate Americans who can't find good roads, who need mass transit, who need housing, need better schools, and, yes, even in urban areas like the one I represent that is a combination of urban and rural broadband.

When we went into COVID-19, our children in our school districts did not have access to be able to have online classes. Yes, we need the Moving Forward Act and I rise to support it. As well as I rise to support and thank the Rules Committee for my amendment dealing with asking the Federal Aviation Administration to deal with all of those satellite aspects of aviation that have not been helped by COVID-19 funding.

In particular, I know for a fact that the parking companies at the airports have not received any COVID-19-related funding and that requires prioritizing of funding to those areas. My amendment would ask them to report on those areas that have not gotten funding, like the parking areas where there are a lot of employees, but then to be able to prioritize those areas.

We are going to continue working, however, on some very vital issues that I believe are important. And those are, in particular, large highways that destroy minority and African American neighborhoods. For example, the I-45 extension in my community is about to destroy 158 houses, 433 apartments or condos, 486 public housing, 340 businesses, 5 churches, and 2 schools.

There must be the implementation of the requirements under the environmental aspects, and that is why I also support the climate change aspects in this bill. But the environmental aspects must be looked at as well as the historic aspects to ensure that when you build, you build with the involvement of the community. I will ensure that that is going to happen.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. My amendment creates a national program to reduce pedestrian-motor vehicle accidents by identifying locations where deaths have occurred and supports local efforts to address those conditions. It is very important to the Nation, very important to the State.

I look forward in going forward to be able to continue to work on these vital issues that were supported by any number of safety entities called under the umbrella of the road advocates. And I know that they will encourage us to work diligently on this.

To my constituents in Houston, we will work together on making sure that I-45 is not intrusive.

I support the Moving Forward Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this particular Houston Chronicle article of June 9.

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 9, 2020]  
INTERSTATE 45 REALIGNMENT WOULD CUT THROUGH A HISTORIC BLACK NEIGHBORHOOD IN HOUSTON

(By James Brasuell)

The construction of America's downtown highways destroyed thousands of black neighborhoods during the height of the urban renewal era in the 1940s and '50s—and a new impact study of a controversial highway project in Houston serves as a reminder that the racist policy never ended.

The latest estimates of the human cost of the Interstate 45 project reveal that the highway expansion would require the destruction of 158 houses, 433 apartments or condos, 486 public housing units, 340 businesses, five churches and two schools; the Houston Chronicle reported. The buildings that the Texas Department of Transportation seeks to demolish are disproportionately located in low-income communities of color, including many within the borders of Texas's first black-formed municipality, Independence Heights, a region of major historic significance.

BIPOC activists have long cited displacement and the destruction of black communities in their fight against the \$7 billion megaproject, which would functionally rebuild most of the downtown freeway system in the process of expanding and rerouting the interstate. But the scale of the estimated destruction hits particularly hard after a week of civil unrest and consequent police brutality in response to the killing of George Floyd by Minneapolis police. The Black Lives Matter movement is demanding that cities across the country defund their bloated law enforcement budgets and make reparative investments in black communities—precisely the opposite of projects like the I-45, which would raze black neighborhoods and destroy black wealth.

The relationship between highways and racial injustice exemplifies the kinds of systemic issues that many protesters are now seeking to challenge. Linda Poon wrote at Citylab last week. Policies that on their face may have appeared to be about easing transportation barriers and revitalizing cities were—and still are—often rooted in long-standing racial prejudice, and carried with them cascading effects that worsened pre-existing inequalities.

The highway would almost certainly result in an increase in traffic violence, too—a phenomenon that disproportionately impacts black communities. Black drivers are at serious risk, as well; three of Houston's highways already ranked among the most dangerous roads in the nation in 2018. The state

of Texas itself warned that the I-45 project would cause disproportionate high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations; and that the project's [d]isplacement of bus stops could affect people who do not have access to automobiles or that are dependent on public transportation.

And that's not even to mention how the project will increase air pollution in black communities—a direct contributor to fatal COVID-19 outcomes that are contributing to the disproportionate death toll among black Americans—exacerbate flooding, and reinforce segregation, which Streetsblog has explored in depth in the past.

If the destructive potential of the I-45 project is all too clear, the benefits of it are dubious at best. Decades of studies of the effect of induced demand show that highway expansions do not relieve congestion or stimulate meaningful economic development—facts of which Houston advocates have been reminding officials since the earliest days of the project.

The I-45 project has always been a massive boondoggle that perpetuates structural racism—and our national conversation over the last week (and the much longer-standing conversation among BIPOC activists over the past decades) only underscores how deeply misguided it has always been. But as activists push to defund all the institutions that kill, harm, and destroy black communities and black lives, there is perhaps no better moment to stop it, once and for all.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of this body and an original cosponsor of the legislation, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of the rule governing debate of H.R. 2, the Moving Forward Act, and the underlying bill.

H.R. 2, the Moving Forward Act, is a more than \$1.5 trillion plan to rebuild American infrastructure—not only our roads, bridges, and transit systems, but also our schools, housing, broadband access, and so much more.

The bill makes a bold down payment on sound investments that address resiliency and climate change to address the impact of extreme weather events on a wide range of critical infrastructure.

By investing in families, workers, and communities across the country, we can support American manufacturing and ingenuity and create millions of jobs that cannot be exported, all while putting our country on a path toward zero carbon emissions, making communities and roads safer, and addressing long-standing disparities.

Mr. Speaker, this transformational legislation makes robust investments in the infrastructure necessary to support the well-being of all Americans and connect them with the services and opportunities needed to succeed in the global economy, which will create millions of American jobs rebuilding our country, so desperately needed in light of its wreckage by the COVID-19 pandemic.

It is way past time to act on a major effort to improve our nation's infrastructure.

The World Economic Forum ranked the United States is ranked thirteenth among nations with a score of 87.9 percent.

The infrastructure score is calculated based on the following factors: road connectivity index, quality of roads, railroad density, efficiency of train services, airport connectivity, efficiency of air transport services, linear shipping connectivity index, efficiency of seaport services, electrification rate, electric power transmission and distribution losses, and exposure to unsafe drinking water, reliability of water supply.



It is essential that our nation make investments in infrastructure because it enables trade, powers businesses, connects workers to employment, creates opportunities for struggling communities, protects the nation from an increasingly unpredictable natural environment, and allows the country to respond to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Mr. Speaker, our nation's airports experienced a significant economic impact due to COVID-19 and the level of support to airports and airlines has been generous, but not enough, especially regarding what I have learned about airport parking service areas.

I thank the Rules Committee and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for allowing the Jackson Lee amendment that requests a report on all areas at airports that have not received funding and asks that funding be prioritized for these areas, which include airport parking.

There are two Jackson Lee Amendments H.R. 2 that are important to the constituents I serve, so I will continue to work with the Committee and leadership as the bill moves through Congress to have these concerns addressed.

The Jackson Lee resolutions were intended to protect documented and locally recognized historic places in the areas planned for development in anticipation of the designation of a National Historic Trail that would traverse the area of Houston where planned I-45 construction will occur.

Earlier this year, H.R. 434, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Report Act became law and it paves the way for the establishment of only the second nationally, recognized historic trail that chronicles the experience of African Americans in their struggle for equality and justice.

The law directs the National Parks Service to conduct a study of 51 miles starting at the historic Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, Texas, the location where news spread of the Emancipation Proclamation finally freeing the last slaves in the United States.

The historic trail will follow a path along Highway 3 and Interstate 45, north to Freedmen's Town, which will include Independence Heights, and Emancipation Park in Houston, Texas where freed slaves settled.

Local preservationists have labored for generations to secure historic sites in and around the planned route of the proposed new national historic trail and have lost significant buildings to past highway projects, specifically to those projects related to past I-45 construction, which cuts through Independence Heights the first black town to receive a charter from the state of Texas.

The project, which has not begun yet is scheduled to begin in 2021 and is expected to cost at least \$7 billion and will rebuild most of the downtown freeway system along I-45, Interstate 10, Interstate 69 and Texas 288 and assorted ramps.

These plans for I-45 construction should trigger National Historic Preservation Act obligations because the National Parks Service has a Study to conduct regarding the history of the area.

Unfortunately, some may consider that once a historic place is removed, the ability of researchers, historians or preservationists to tell a complete history is limited-and in some essential ways they are correct.

History is best experienced and not just heard or read, which is why we must preserve and protect the places that are left for future generations.

I will continue to work with the Committee of Jurisdiction on the Jackson Lee Amendment that compliments the programs described in section 1619 Nationwide Road Safety Assessment of H.R. 2.

Section 1619 establishes a program for states to focus on the issue of pedestrian and bicycle safety.

The Jackson Lee Amendment seeks to include in this program a role for local governments who are foremost at the head of efforts to reduce pedestrian and bicycle deaths and injuries.

On a national basis, about 25 percent of pedestrian fatalities in 2018 occurred at intersections or were intersection-related.

Most pedestrian fatalities occurred at non-intersection locations.

The total number of pedestrian fatalities for the 10 largest cities increased by about 7 percent from 2017, with 613 fatalities to 2018 with 655 fatalities.

During the 10-year period 2009-2018 the number of pedestrian fatalities increased by 53 percent, while the number of all other traffic deaths increased by 2 percent.

On average, about 17 pedestrians and two cyclists were killed each day in crashes. Together they accounted for one-fifth of traffic deaths. (NYT)

The Jackson Lee Amendment broadens the section to address safety and the emerging popularity of other forms of personal transportation such as electric scooters.

The Jackson Lee Amendment supports local efforts to address the conditions that may contribute to deaths to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.

A rough count by The Associated Press of media reports turned up at least 11 electric scooter rider deaths in the U.S. since the beginning of 2018.

In Austin, Texas, public health officials working with the Centers for Disease Control counted 192 scooter-related injuries in three months in 2018. Nearly half were head injuries, including 15 percent that were traumatic brain injuries like concussions and bleeding of the brain. Less than 1 percent of the injured riders wore a helmet.

According to a Consumer Reports survey conducted in March 2019, 22 percent of people who have spent time in an area where they saw e-scooters available for rent said they had used one at least once.

They found that many scooter riders (27 percent) are uncertain of the traffic laws they should follow.

Among people who have ridden an e-scooter, 51 percent ride on the sidewalk, 26 percent in a bike lane, and 18 percent in the street but not in a bike lane.

The role of local government is essential to addressing the problem of pedestrian and bicycle injuries and deaths.

This Jackson Lee Amendment is supported by: Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety, Transport Workers Union, Consumer Federation of America, Center for Auto Safety, Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety, Truck Safety Coalition, Citizens for Reliable and Safe Highways, Parents Against Tired Truckers, and the Trauma Foundation.

More generally, I support the Moving Forward Act because it provides:

1. \$100 billion for affordable housing to create or preserve 1.8 million affordable homes;
2. \$10 billion for child care facilities, designed to generate additional state and private investments;

3. \$130 billion for school infrastructure targeted at high-poverty schools; and

4. \$30 billion for health care facilities, including hospitals, community health centers, and laboratories.

Mr. Speaker, the Moving Forward Act connects all Americans to essential services and economic opportunity by providing:

1. \$500 billion to rebuild and reimagine the nation's transportation infrastructure;

2. \$100 billion for affordable high-speed broadband internet for all Americans;

3. \$25 billion for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund and other programs to provide clean drinking water; and

4. \$25 billion for the United States Postal Service to modernize postal infrastructure and operations.

All of this infrastructure funding I have fought for. Also, there are additional provisions in the bill that will help put us on the path to becoming a stronger, safer, better and more prosperous America, including:

1. Ameliorating hazardous living conditions and building a more environmentally sustainable housing stock;

2. Removing contaminants like PFAS from drinking water; and

3. Modernizing our energy infrastructure with an emphasis on renewable energy.

While this legislation would be necessary under any circumstances, the coronavirus crisis has magnified and accentuated the need for federal investments to put Americans back to work building a long-lasting foundation for a stronger and more equitable America.

I urge all Members to vote for the rule governing debate on H.R. 2 as well as the underlying bill.

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

My friend from New York is absolutely right. There are 17 bipartisan amendments made in order to this bill that moved through committee in a completely partisan fashion.

When we did this bill last time around, the bill that passed on a voice vote because of its bipartisan nature coming out of committee, we made 34 bipartisan amendments in order to improve it further. The now chairman of the Transportation Committee, then the ranking member, said this about the rule as I was presenting it: "Mr. Speaker, in terms of what the gentleman from Georgia just said, I appreciate the fact that we are debating so many policy amendments. This is the way the process should work, both sides of the aisle contribute, and this is great." Stark contrast from what you heard from our ranking member today about the process.

At that time, the ranking member, now chairman, said: "I was willing to stay here later last night and stay here later tonight so that everybody who wanted an amendment could have a chance." That is not the process we have this year as voices are shut out one right after another, primarily Republican voices and bipartisan voices.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), a great conservative leader in our conference who has never been afraid to reach across the aisle to get the work done, and she has done it successfully.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue before us today.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. Unfortunately, this is another example of the Democratic majority putting politics over people. It is a missed opportunity to reach an agreement on many solutions that have bipartisan support.

The Energy and Commerce Committee on which I serve is historically the most bipartisan committee in Congress. Our record of results with both Chairman WALDEN and Chairman UPTON proves it. No other committee sent more bills to the President's desk than Energy and Commerce during their tenure.

This record of bipartisan results for the people has unfortunately faltered under this current majority. And the process and the politics of H.R. 2 are a perfect example of why.

It is hard, it is actually impossible, for this historic results-oriented committee to reach an agreement when there is no regular order and we, the minority, are left out of the process.

It is easy to pass a partisan wish list for my friends across the aisle to campaign on when you don't expect that they are going to become law.

Instead of using the committee process to advance solutions like rural broadband deployment, vehicle safety improvements, and American leadership in clean energy, the majority is continuing to take the easy way out and is more interested in scoring political points.

□ 1100

We see the continued consolidation of power and decisionmaking within the Speaker's office.

Last Congress, this House unanimously passed the SELF DRIVE Act—unanimous—which would have ensured the most important vehicle safety technology of our lifetime is deployed here in America.

Autonomous vehicles have the potential to save tens of thousands of lives, restore independence to our seniors and people with disabilities, and create a cleaner environment with less road congestion.

Autonomous vehicles are our future. America could lead, America should lead in this new era, but sadly, the majority is content to let other countries lead. In fact, the U.S. has fallen behind since our work on the SELF DRIVE Act. We will continue to fall behind because we lack a national strategy and a viable path to deployment.

Other countries, like China, are not waiting for us. They are moving full speed ahead with testing, and it is happening in our own backyard.

Last Congress, every single Democrat on the Energy and Commerce Committee agreed that we needed to modernize the SAFETEA Act, to lead on this transformative technology. What has changed?

If the majority was serious about addressing the nearly 40,000 deaths on our roads each year, they would tell the well-funded trial bar enough is enough and pursue meaningful legislation to unleash American innovation in our auto sector, a part of a new era of American innovation. But, no. They are more concerned with the trial bar and their special interest groups.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to abandon this partisan messaging exercise and work with us for a new era of innovation that will help save lives.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I would just note that bipartisanship is a two-way street. While some may suggest that the majority is at fault, I would argue that there was a lack of a good-faith effort on the part of the minority to engage in meaningful dialogue on things like climate change and the importance of making sure we have infrastructure investments in our schools and in our healthcare systems.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2, which reflects years of hard work with my staff, with hundreds of advocates, innovators, and local officials to deal with the challenges of a sustainable transportation future, especially in a time of upheaval. I appreciate the committee and staff reflecting these opportunities.

It includes a national clearinghouse to research the secondary impacts of autonomous vehicles that my friend from Washington just talked about.

It adds bikeshare as an eligible expense for CMAQ funding.

It provides Federal funds for cities and States to establish and implement Vision Zero plans to protect quality of life and reduce the carnage on the highways.

It increases funding for State road user charge pilot projects that is the vision for the future of how to fund transportation.

It increases small starts reauthorization.

It increases the volume cap on private activity bonds issued for surface transportation.

It increases the value of the historic tax credit and makes it more accessible for different types of projects.

Most critically, when we are dealing with renewable energy projects, it provides for direct payment in lieu of tax credits for renewable energy projects at a time when there is less appetite for traditional tax credits.

It clarifies that energy storage projects qualify for investment tax credits to spur the development.

It increases the value of section 179D energy efficient commercial buildings

that we have worked on with them for years.

It reinstates the bicycle commuter tax, increases the value of the benefits, and allows them to be used with transit funds.

These are the nuts and bolts of often technical elements that form the basis for action and progress in the future.

I look forward to working with the vast array of stakeholders that are counting on us to make this visionary document a reality.

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

Mr. Speaker, I encouraged my colleagues to defeat the rule so we could have a bipartisan process here, but if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order H. Res. 1031.

The resolution expresses a sense of the House of Representatives condemning the cyberattacks perpetrated by China and other rogue states on American institutions in an effort to disrupt our response to COVID-19 by stealing our economic property that could be used for treatments and vaccines.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we have talked so much about bipartisanship. This is a chance to actually do something in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the former chairman of the Homeland Security Committee and the current ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, to discuss the amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding time.

We have known for years that the Chinese Communist Party has been conducting cyberattacks on the United States aimed not only at stealing vital data but also at destabilizing our economy.

Recently, the FBI and DHS discovered that the CCP has taken their cyberattacks to a new low by attempting to hack into U.S. research facilities, in an effort to steal COVID-19 vaccine research.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, at a time when scientists around the world are working together in an epic race against time to develop a lifesaving vaccine to rescue the world from the grips of the coronavirus, the CCP is trying to steal that research for their own selfish purposes.

This news comes when the evidence has shown that the Chinese Communist Party is responsible for allowing this virus to spread into a pandemic.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee Republicans spent the last several months investigating the origins



of this pandemic, in the hopes of learning vital lessons that would help us prevent the next one. This report details how the CCP chose to cover up the virus and lie to the world at every turn, allowing the coronavirus to spread not only throughout their own country, Mr. Speaker, but around the world in a global pandemic.

They silenced doctors trying to sound the alarm about the virus and disappeared journalists who were reporting the truth about Wuhan. They shut down laboratories and ordered that virus samples be destroyed. They repeatedly lied about the virus spreading human to human, that it was transmitted human to human, that it was contagious. They allowed mass travel throughout China and internationally despite knowing that the virus was spreading human to human.

Mr. Speaker, this week has served as a bleak reminder of what the Chinese Communist Party really is. Last night, the CCP sham legislature passed its so-called national security law for Hong Kong, destroying their autonomy and oppressing a freedom-loving people and violating the Sino-U.K. treaty. Yesterday, the world was made aware that the CCP is using forced sterilization, forced abortion, and coercive family planning against ethnic minorities, including the Uighur Muslims.

These disturbing realizations are unfolding as the world is still grappling with the coronavirus pandemic that the CCP helped create.

Now that millions of people around the world have been infected and more than half a million have died, we learned that the CCP isn't helping to fix the pandemic they are responsible for creating. Instead, Mr. Speaker, according to the FBI and Department of Homeland Security, they are conducting cyberattacks on American scientific organizations and hospitals in an attempt to steal research being used to develop a vaccine for the virus.

In other words, they are trying to steal our research to develop a vaccine to save the world from the very pandemic that they created. This is absolutely unacceptable and must be condemned.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in opposing the previous question so we can consider the Kinzinger resolution to do just that.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle should come together and say, in one united voice, that we condemn these attacks by the Chinese Communist Party and that we believe that those who are responsible should be held accountable.

This is the issue of our time, so let's move forward together on calling out the CCP for their continued outrageous and dangerous misbehavior.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do note, while this is certainly a very, very important issue,

cyberattacks on the United States, both on government and our private sector, I think what is equally troubling are physical attacks and bounties placed by Russian leaders on U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan. I don't see any note of that in the resolution.

But the bigger issue here is that we have a \$1.5 trillion infrastructure bill in front of us. I would certainly join with my colleagues in any resolutions on Chinese and Russian interference in American activities. The work in front of us, however, is a \$1.5 trillion transportation bill desperately needed for American citizens throughout this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MORELLE for yielding to me, and I second his remarks regarding Russian bounty. I am proud to rise in support here today of H.R. 2.

H.R. 2 will make meaningful, long-overdue investments in our roads, bridges, airports, ports, and transportation systems. It will invest billions in zero-emission, and modernize road systems to reduce gridlock, something we can all cheer about in my district.

This is game-changing, economy-altering legislation. So when I hear my colleagues talk about the price tag on a bill like this, I have to wonder where exactly they think this money is going. This bill invests directly in American families, in workers, and in the communities in which we live.

Stakeholders in my district have been crying out for a comprehensive infrastructure bill for years. I represent Pennsylvania's Fifth District, which is the gateway to the Philadelphia region. My district is home to the Philadelphia port and shipyard, home to one of the busiest airports in the country, home to the Eastern Seaboard's passenger and freight rail lines, plus commuter rails, streetcars, subways, and a network of interstate bridges and roads, all of which are in serious need of upkeep.

But this bill is not just about the concrete that will be poured to fix potholes or the steel used to renovate a bridge. It is an investment in the American people at a time when it is needed most.

H.R. 2 will provide good-paying, stable jobs that can support American workers and their families. At a time when we are facing double-digit unemployment in the United States, a massive investment in our people is exactly what we need.

This bill will put people back to work, prevent further erosion of our environment, and give children and families the support they desperately need.

In doing so, this bill lays down the important principle that when we invest in our infrastructure and our economy, we must do so in a way that builds for the 21st century and beyond

rather than trying to re-create an unsustainable or inequitable past.

H.R. 2 also includes one of my priorities, the Reopen and Rebuild America's Schools Act, which will invest \$130 billion into rundown, obsolete, and often dangerous school facilities that pose risks for students, teachers, and staffs.

Many of the communities I represent are in dire need of these funds, and I would be willing to bet that many of your communities are as well.

This isn't an urban vs. rural issue. Public schools nationwide have been underfunded for decades, and our children have paid the price.

In the last 18 months and before being sworn in, in my prior career, I had visited far too many schools that lack basic facilities, like working water fountains, space for physical education, or a library. I have visited schools that have crumbling plaster and lead paint on the walls and asbestos in the insulation, schools that have exposed radiators and pipes in classrooms that can give a child second-degree burns. This legislation is critical, and I am proud to support it.

□ 1115

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

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

Mr. Speaker, to be fair, this bill is not about us investing in the future; it is about us borrowing money from our children to invest in the future.

I will read from the current chairman of the Transportation Committee. These were his comments during our last reauthorization. He says: "... the biggest and most glaring omission by the Rules Committee is of not allowing any attempt by this House to fund the bill."

At that time, you remember, Mr. Speaker, we only provided 3 years of funding for a 6-year bill. We went back and found the remaining 3 years later.

He goes on to say: "The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports an increase in the user fee." That is the gas tax. "The American Trucking Association supports an increase in the user fee. We are virtually being begged by interest groups out there representing consumers and commercial users of the system to do something, vote on something."

I talked about all of the differences between the way we handled the process last time and the way we handled the process this time, Mr. Speaker. I will note that there are also differences in the way that the chairman wanted to handle the process last time, which is voting to fund this bill. When we funded half of it, he wanted to fund all of it. This time we are funding none of it, Mr. Speaker. That is the heavy lifting that needs to be done, and it can only be done in a bipartisan way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I just note that in the last Congress, the majority invested \$2 trillion in a tax cut

that 83 percent went to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, and despite that, we see no lasting benefit of that. It has added substantially to the deficit of the United States, to the tune of over \$1.3 trillion. We prefer to make these investments in American families and in American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, for too long, communities of color, Black and Brown communities, have suffered environmental injustice.

For too long, these same communities have been on the front lines of environmental air pollution that has caused higher rates of cancer and asthma and, with COVID-19, more deaths. For too long, these communities have literally said: I can't breathe.

My very own district is surrounded by three freeways and the Port of Los Angeles. Ports are critical jobs. They provide movement of goods. They are a huge economic engine. But they also are the cause of air pollution on the docks, not to mention the truck traffic that goes to and from ports.

Today, I am proud to say that my bill, the Climate Smart Ports Act, is included in this infrastructure package. It will make a significant difference to air quality in my district and for the 40 percent of Americans who live near a port.

This bill will invest billions in zero-emission technology at ports and clean trucks that go to and from ports. That is right, zero emissions.

Bottom line is it will save lives, create jobs, and fight the climate crisis. Today I ask you to join me in voting for H.R. 2: to invest in our Nation's infrastructure, to invest in greening our ports, to invest in fighting the climate crisis, and to invest in improving air quality for the people.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2. This vital legislation rebuilds our Nation's infrastructure, invests in American workers, and bolsters our Nation's economy, all at a critical juncture in our fight against COVID-19.

This pandemic has cost thousands of Americans their lives and many more millions their jobs. It is essential that we do everything in our power to drive investment and boost our economy, and this bill does just that.

I am particularly pleased that H.R. 2 includes my legislation, the GREEN Act, which invests over \$150 billion in reducing car emissions and expanding clean energy technologies. That bill extends and expands Federal tax incentives, promoting investment in solar, wind, geothermal, and fuel cell technologies, all with the goal of decarbonizing our atmosphere.

The bill also increases Federal support for energy efficiency, including in

commercial buildings, and revives the energy manufacturing credit, a successful Recovery Act program designed to spur investment in renewable energy jobs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2 represents the kind of bold, forward-thinking investment our planet and our economy desperately need.

I urge everyone to vote for this bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I share with my friend from New York that I don't have any speakers remaining, and I am prepared to close.

Can I ask how much time is remaining, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 5½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from New York has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am a positive guy. I love coming down here and talking about the great things we are doing as a country, the amazing steps forward that we are making, the way we are exceeding the expectation of our constituents, and that was the speech I got to give when Republicans were in the majority and I got to bring the bipartisan package.

At that time, Janet was sitting to my left and Caitlin would have been sitting right behind Mr. MCGOVERN. A lot of things haven't changed much since that time. But some things have.

One of the things that has changed is COVID-19 is ravaging the Nation, and I want to say to my Rules Committee friends, because we have got a lot of work left to do in this cycle, I recognize that there is an inclination among some in leadership in this House to shut down this process, to keep folks off the floor, to keep votes from happening with great frequency, all in the name of public health.

I would tell you that may protect the health of the Members generally, but it undermines the health of the institution specifically. And I am grateful to my friends on the Rules Committee for fighting those urges and advocating for a more open process on the floor of the House.

Again, I know I can attribute that sentiment to my friend from New York, and I know I can attribute that sentiment to the chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

But the transportation bill, Mr. Speaker, is different from most of what we do. I hope we will have an opportunity to bring a bipartisan bill to the floor, and then we can have that bipartisan conversation about limiting debate so that we can move the bipartisan idea forward so that we can get a signature on the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, every good thing you heard mentioned that this bill does on the other side of the aisle today, every good thing you have heard mentioned,

I want to stipulate that the bill absolutely does that. And I ask my friends to stipulate that the bill has absolutely no chance of ever becoming the law of the land, so none of those things are ever going to happen.

Hear me, Mr. Speaker, it does every single one of those things if it becomes law, but because it is moved in a partisan process when we have bipartisan government, it will never become law and it will never happen. Not one of those things that my colleagues earnestly believe their constituencies need and are demanding is going to be delivered.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make the point. I do want to make the difference. I recognize that in divided government sometimes you have to put out the party line. Sometimes you have to stand up and say, "This is where I am; now let's figure out where you are," and then the negotiation happens later.

That happens on a lot of bills in this institution. It doesn't usually happen on transportation, it doesn't usually happen on infrastructure, because the way transportation and infrastructure usually happen is we partner from day one.

In the last Congress, Mr. Speaker, last time we moved this bill, roughly an equal number of Republican ideas, Democratic ideas, and bipartisan ideas were considered to improve the bill. This time around, Mr. Speaker, we will consider 17 bipartisan amendments, 19 Republican amendments, and 134 Democratic amendments. Last time around, roughly one to one; this time around, seven Democratic ideas for every one Republican idea.

Last time around, the bill was crafted in a partnership way so that more ideas and everyone was included in the beginning. This time around, the bill moved in a strict party-line vote.

I understand we can't be the best version of ourselves as an institution every day of the week, Mr. Speaker. I recognize that. And it is not even our goal every day of the week. Sometimes we have a partisan priority, an itch that needs to be scratched. But good habits are hard to keep; bad habits are easy to make.

There is a reason the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is special. There is a reason Mr. DEFAZIO stood in line so long waiting on his opportunity to lead. It is a special place where you can make a huge difference on behalf of not just your community, but your country.

We are squandering that opportunity today. There were lots of good ideas that we could have moved forward in a partnership way.

I hope that the extraordinary partisanship that represents a dramatic change from anything that we have ever done in this transportation environment before is the aberration, and that as soon as that partisan itch gets scratched, my colleagues will then turn their attention to being able to get

something done. Because when my friends talked about road safety and the needs America has, they were right. When my friends talked about crumbling infrastructure and the needs America has, they were right. When my friends talked about investing in us as a nation, my friends were right.

I want to join with them to make those things happen; but today, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and to vote “no” on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking my colleague and friend on the Rules Committee (Mr. WOODALL), who is really one of the thought leaders in this Chamber and has always committed to bipartisanship, always committed to what is best for our Nation and for the people blessed to call this Nation home. I want to thank him, as always, for his partnership and his hard work in his diligence to the cause.

I take a slightly different view of what we do here today than my friend because this isn't, in my view, strictly a partisan issue or a party issue or a platform issue or a messaging issue. This is an issue of what we value as Americans, what we believe and what the majority believes is important to the citizens of this country.

We do face, as Mr. WOODALL notes, the greatest pandemic this country has faced in at least a century. We have 125,000 Americans who have lost their lives to it. So this is an extraordinary time, and it calls for extraordinary measures and a \$1.5 trillion plan to move America forward to address our transportation crisis, to address our climate change crisis, to address our healthcare crisis, to address the challenges brought on by crumbling schools across this country.

One of the learnings of this pandemic, in my view, has been the digital divide. Whether it is in telehealth, in telemedicine, we know that those communities of color that already face disparities face even greater disparities. So the broadband initiative included in this is so vitally important to all of us.

We see that when it comes to distance learning in our schools. Crumbling schools, yes, but the inability of schoolchildren to get to online classes and distance learning because of broadband challenges is great, as well, and we need to do everything we can to limit those disparities.

And those are the great learnings, perhaps, of this pandemic and things we can do about it.

□ 1130

That is why we believe so strongly in investing those dollars in meeting the challenge of climate change, the defining challenge of our time. Transportation is the leading cause of U.S. carbon pollution. So these are the values we embrace.

While certainly I take as an article of faith what Mr. WOODALL said, which is,

perhaps it is not likely this bill, every word and every comma will become law unless, all of a sudden, there is enlightenment in the United States Senate, which I frankly have some doubt about. But make no mistake, much of what is in here will become law because it is important to us as a majority and it is important to the American people.

We are going to continue to stand and fight for these things in the midst of these great crises because they are important, we need to put Americans back to work to build our infrastructure and to build an infrastructure for the next generation. This isn't about now. This isn't about digging a hole and filling it back up, digging another hole and filling it back up. These are great needs. They are needs that we have, frankly, ignored for decades now. The time has come to address them.

So this is a question of values. It is a question of what we believe Americans need, what our families need, and what our communities need.

We will get there. I have faith that we will negotiate a bill, and much of what is included today, hopefully, will pass, will be included in the final package, and will be signed by the President because it is too important for America not to do.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all my colleagues for their words in favor of H.R. 2, the Moving Forward Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and a “yes” vote on the previous question.

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

#### AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1028

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 10. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 1031) condemning the cyber attacks on American persons and organizations conducting research related to COVID 19 and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that those responsible for perpetrating such belligerent acts should face consequences. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 1031.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 180, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—230

Adams	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Omar
Allred	Gottheimer	Pallone
Axne	Green, Al (TX)	Panetta
Barragan	Grijalva	Pappas
Bass	Haaland	Pascarell
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bera	Hastings	Perlmutter
Beyer	Hayes	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Heck	Peterson
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pingree
Bonamici	Horn, Kendra S.	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horsford	Porter
Brindisi	Houlihan	Pressley
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Quigley
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Butterfield	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Jeffries	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rose (NY)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (TX)	Rouda
Cartwright	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Case	Keating	Ruiz
Casten (IL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Rush
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Ryan
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Sánchez
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cisneros	Kim	Scanlon
Clark (MA)	Kind	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Clyburn	Lamb	Schrier
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Correa	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Shalala
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Cox (CA)	Lee (NV)	Sherrill
Craig	Levin (CA)	Sires
Crist	Levin (MI)	Slotkin
Crow	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Cunningham	Lipinski	Spanberger
Davids (KS)	Loeb sack	Stanton
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Stevens
Davis, Danny K.	Lowenthal	Suo zzi
Dean	Lowe y	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Luján	Takano
DeGette	Luria	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Malinowski	Titus
Delgado	Maloney,	Tlaib
Demings	Carolyn B.	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Torres (CA)
Dingell	Matsui	Torres Small
Doggett	McAdams	(NM)
Doyle, Michael F.	McBath	Trahan
Engel	McCollum	Trone
Escobar	McEachin	Underwood
Eshoo	McGovern	Vargas
Espallat	McNerney	Veasey
Evans	Meeks	Vela
Finkenauer	Meng	Velázquez
Fletcher	Mfume	Visclosky
Foster	Moore	Wasserman
Frankel	Morelle	Schultz
Fudge	Moulton	Waters
Gabbard	Mucarsel-Powell	Watson Coleman
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Garamendi	Nadler	Wexton
Garcia (IL)	Napolitano	Wild
Garcia (TX)	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Golden	Neguse	Yarmuth
	Norcross	
	O'Halleran	

NAYS—180

Aderholt	Barr	Budd
Allen	Bergman	Burchett
Amash	Biggs	Burgess
Amodei	Bilirakis	Byrne
Armstrong	Bishop (NC)	Calvert
Arrington	Bost	Carter (GA)
Babin	Brady	Carter (TX)
Bacon	Brooks (AL)	Chabot
Baird	Brooks (IN)	Cheney
Balderson	Buchanan	Cline
Banks	Bucshon	Cloud

Cole Johnson (LA)  
 Collins (GA) Johnson (OH)  
 Comer Johnson (SD)  
 Conaway Jordan  
 Cook Joyce (OH)  
 Crawford Joyce (PA)  
 Crenshaw Katko  
 Curtis Keller  
 Davidson (OH) Kelly (MS)  
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (PA)  
 DesJarlais King (NY)  
 Diaz-Balart Kinzinger  
 Duncan Kustoff (TN)  
 Dunn LaHood  
 Estes LaMalfa  
 Ferguson Lamborn  
 Fitzpatrick Latta  
 Fleischmann Lesko  
 Flores Long  
 Fortenberry Lucas  
 Foxx (NC) Luetkemeyer  
 Fulcher Massie  
 Gaetz Mast  
 Garcia (CA) McCarthy  
 Gianforte McCaul  
 Gibbs McClintock  
 Gohmert McHenry  
 Gonzalez (OH) McKinley  
 Gooden Meuser  
 Graves (GA) Miller  
 Graves (LA) Mitchell  
 Graves (MO) Moolenaar  
 Green (TN) Mooney (WV)  
 Griffith Mullin  
 Grothman Murphy (NC)  
 Guest Newhouse  
 Hagedorn Norman  
 Harris Nunes  
 Hartzler Olson  
 Hern, Kevin Palmer  
 Herrera Beutler Williams  
 Hice (GA) Perry  
 Higgins (LA) Posey  
 Hill (AR) Reschenthaler  
 Holding Rice (SC)  
 Hollingsworth Riggleman  
 Hudson Rodgers (WA)  
 Huizenga Roe, David P.  
 Hurd (TX) Rogers (AL)

NOT VOTING—20

Abraham Granger  
 Bishop (UT) Guthrie  
 Buck King (IA)  
 Deutch Loudermilk  
 Emmer Marchant  
 Gallagher Marshall  
 Gosar Palazzo

□ 1215

Messrs. LAHOOD and STIVERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. NEGUSE and DEFAZIO changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Gomez) Lawson (FL)  
 Cleaver (Clay) Lee (CA)  
 DeSaulnier (Matsui) Lewis (Kildee)  
 Frankel (Clark (MA)) Lieu, Ted (Beyer)  
 Hastings (Wasserman Schultz) Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)  
 Johnson (TX) Lowenthal (Beyer)  
 Khanna (Gomez) Lowey (Tonko)  
 Kirkpatrick (Gallego) Meng (Tonko)  
 Kuster (NH) Moore (Beyer)  
 Langevin (Lynch) Nadler (Jeffries)  
 Napolitano (Correa)  
 Payne (Wasserman Schultz)

Rogers (KY) Rose, John W.  
 Rouzer  
 Roy  
 Rutherford  
 Scalise  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Shimkus  
 Simpson  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smucker  
 Spano  
 Stauber  
 Stefanik  
 Steil  
 Steube  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Taylor  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiffany  
 Timmons  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Meuser  
 Van Drew  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Waltz  
 Watkins  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Wright  
 Yoho  
 Young  
 Zeldin

Reed  
 Roby  
 Rooney (FL)  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Speier  
 Weber (TX)

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 183, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—222

Adams Gomez  
 Aguilar Gonzalez (TX)  
 Allred Gottheimer  
 Axne Green, Al (TX)  
 Barragán Grijalva  
 Bass Haaland  
 Beatty Harder (CA)  
 Bera Hastings  
 Beyer Hayes  
 Bishop (GA) Heck  
 Blumenauer Higgins (NY)  
 Blunt Rochester Himes  
 Bonamici Horsford  
 Boyle, Brendan Houlihan  
 F. Hoyer  
 Brindisi Huffman  
 Brown (MD) Jackson Lee  
 Brownley (CA) Jayapal  
 Bustos Jeffries  
 Butterfield Johnson (GA)  
 Carbajal Johnson (TX)  
 Cárdenas Kaptur  
 Carson (IN) Keating  
 Cartwright Kelly (IL)  
 Case Kennedy  
 Casten (IL) Khanna  
 Castor (FL) Kildee  
 Castro (TX) Kilmer  
 Chu, Judy Kim  
 Cicilline Kind  
 Cisneros Kirkpatrick  
 Clark (MA) Krishnamoorthi  
 Clarke (NY) Kuster (NH)  
 Clay Lamb  
 Cleaver Langevin  
 Clyburn Larsen (WA)  
 Connolly Larson (CT)  
 Cooper Lawrence  
 Correa Lawson (FL)  
 Costa Lee (CA)  
 Courtney Lee (NV)  
 Cox (CA) Levin (CA)  
 Craig Levin (MI)  
 Crist Lewis  
 Crow Lieu, Ted  
 Cuellar Lipinski  
 Cunningham Loeb sack  
 Davids (KS) Lofgren  
 Davis (CA) Lowenthal  
 Davis, Danny K. Lowey  
 Dean Luján  
 DeFazio Luria  
 DeGette Lynch  
 DeLauro Malinowski  
 DelBene Maloney, Sean  
 Delgado Matsui  
 Demings McBath  
 DeSaulnier McCollum  
 Dingell McEachin  
 Doggett McGovern  
 Engel McNeerney  
 Escobar Meeks  
 Meng  
 Espallat Mfume  
 Evans Moore  
 Finkenauer Morelle  
 Fletcher Mouton  
 Foster Mucarsel-Powell  
 Frankel Nadler  
 Fudge Napolitano  
 Gabbard Neal  
 Gallego Neguse  
 Garamendi Norcross  
 García (IL) O'Halleran  
 García (TX) Ocasio-Cortez

NAYS—183

Aderholt Arrington  
 Allen Babin  
 Amash Bacon  
 Amodei Baird  
 Armstrong Balderson

Bishop (NC) Hagedorn  
 Bost Harris  
 Brady Hartzler  
 Brooks (AL) Hern, Kevin  
 Brooks (IN) Herrera Beutler  
 Buchanan Hice (GA)  
 Buchson Higgins (LA)  
 Budd Hill (AR)  
 Burchett Holding  
 Burgess Hollingsworth  
 Byrne Horn, Kendra S.  
 Calvert Hudson  
 Carter (GA) Huizenga  
 Carter (TX) Hurd (TX)  
 Chabot Johnson (LA)  
 Cheney Johnson (OH)  
 Cline Johnson (SD)  
 Cloud Jordan  
 Cole Joyce (OH)  
 Collins (GA) Joyce (PA)  
 Comer Katko  
 Conaway Keller  
 Cook Kelly (MS)  
 Crawford Kelly (PA)  
 Crenshaw King (NY)  
 Curtis Kinzinger  
 Davidson (OH) Kustoff (TN)  
 Davis, Rodney LaHood  
 DesJarlais LaMalfa  
 Diaz-Balart Lamborn  
 Duncan Latta  
 Dunn Lesko  
 Estes Long  
 Ferguson Lucas  
 Fitzpatrick Luetkemeyer  
 Fleischmann Massie  
 Flores Mast  
 Fortenberry McAdams  
 Foxx (NC) McCarthy  
 Fulcher McCaul  
 Gaetz McClintock  
 García (CA) McHenry  
 Gianforte McKinley  
 Gibbs Meuser  
 Gohmert Miller  
 Golden Mitchell  
 Gonzalez (OH) Moolenaar  
 Gooden Mooney (WV)  
 Graves (GA) Mullin  
 Graves (LA) Murphy (FL)  
 Graves (MO) Murphy (NC)  
 Green (TN) Newhouse  
 Griffith Wright  
 Grothman Norman  
 Guest Nunes  
 Guthrie Olson  
 Palmer

NOT VOTING—25

Abraham Gosar  
 Bishop (UT) Granger  
 Buck King (IA)  
 Cohen Loudermilk  
 Deutch Maloney,  
 Doyle, Michael Carolyn B.  
 F. Marchant  
 Emmer Marshall  
 Gallagher Palazzo

□ 1255

Ms. KAPTUR changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes due to circumstances beyond my control. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 130 and “nay” on rollcall No. 131.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Gomez) Johnson (TX)  
 Cleaver (Clay) Khanna (Gomez)  
 DeSaulnier (Matsui) Kirkpatrick (Gallego)  
 Frankel (Clark (MA)) Kuster (NH)  
 Hastings (Wasserman Schultz) Langevin (Lynch)  
 Lawson (FL) (Evans)  
 Lee (CA) (Huffman)  
 Lewis (Kildee) (Lieu, Ted (Beyer))  
 Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)  
 Lowenthal (Beyer)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUIGLEY). The question is on the resolution.

Lowey (Tonko) Pingree  
 Meng (Tonko) (Cicilline)  
 Moore (Beyer) Price (NC)  
 Nadler (Jeffries) (Butterfield)  
 Napolitano Rush  
 (Correa) (Underwood)  
 Payne Sánchez (Roybal-  
 (Wasserman Allard)  
 Schultz) Serrano  
 (Jeffries)

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1312

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.

### INVESTING IN A NEW VISION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION IN AMERICA ACT

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1028, I call up the bill (H.R. 2) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1028, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-54, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-438, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

## H.R. 2

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the "Moving Forward Act".*

**SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

*The table of contents for this Act is as follows:*

- Sec. 1. Short title.
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.
- Sec. 3. References.

#### DIVISION A—FEDERAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

- Sec. 100. Short title.
- Sec. 101. Extension of Federal surface transportation programs.
- Sec. 102. Federal Highway Administration.
- Sec. 103. Federal Transit Administration.
- Sec. 104. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Sec. 105. Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.
- Sec. 106. Definitions.

Vargas (Levin (CA))  
 Watson Coleman (Pallone)  
 Welch (McGovern)  
 Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

#### DIVISION B—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

Sec. 1001. Applicability of division.

#### TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

##### Subtitle A—Authorizations and Program Conditions

- Sec. 1101. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 1102. Obligation limitation.
- Sec. 1103. Definitions and declaration of policy.
- Sec. 1104. Apportionment.
- Sec. 1105. Additional deposits into Highway Trust Fund.
- Sec. 1106. Transparency.
- Sec. 1107. Complete and context sensitive street design.
- Sec. 1108. Innovative project delivery Federal share.
- Sec. 1109. Transferability of Federal-aid highway funds.
- Sec. 1110. Tolling.
- Sec. 1111. HOV facilities.
- Sec. 1112. Buy America.
- Sec. 1113. Federal-aid highway project requirements.
- Sec. 1114. State assumption of responsibility for categorical exclusions.
- Sec. 1115. Surface transportation project delivery program written agreements.
- Sec. 1116. Corrosion prevention for bridges.
- Sec. 1117. Sense of Congress.

##### Subtitle B—Programmatic Infrastructure Investment

- Sec. 1201. National highway performance program.
- Sec. 1202. Increasing the resilience of transportation assets.
- Sec. 1203. Emergency relief.
- Sec. 1204. Railway crossings.
- Sec. 1205. Surface transportation program.
- Sec. 1206. Transportation alternatives program.
- Sec. 1207. Bridge investment.
- Sec. 1208. Construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities.
- Sec. 1209. Highway safety improvement program.
- Sec. 1210. Congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program.
- Sec. 1211. Electric vehicle charging stations.
- Sec. 1212. National highway freight program.
- Sec. 1213. Carbon pollution reduction.
- Sec. 1214. Recreational trails.
- Sec. 1215. Safe routes to school program.
- Sec. 1216. Bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways.

##### Subtitle C—Project-Level Investments

- Sec. 1301. Projects of national and regional significance.
- Sec. 1302. Community transportation investment grant program.
- Sec. 1303. Grants for charging and fueling infrastructure to modernize and reconnect America for the 21st century.
- Sec. 1304. Community climate innovation grants.
- Sec. 1305. Metro performance program.
- Sec. 1306. Gridlock reduction grant program.
- Sec. 1307. Rebuild rural grant program.
- Sec. 1308. Parking for commercial motor vehicles.
- Sec. 1309. Active transportation connectivity grant program.

##### Subtitle D—Planning, Performance Management, and Asset Management

- Sec. 1401. Metropolitan transportation planning.
- Sec. 1402. Statewide and nonmetropolitan transportation planning.
- Sec. 1403. National goals and performance management measures.
- Sec. 1404. Transportation demand data and modeling study.
- Sec. 1405. Fiscal constraint on long-range transportation plans.

##### Subtitle E—Federal Lands, Tribes, and Territories

- Sec. 1501. Territorial and Puerto Rico highway program.

- Sec. 1502. Tribal transportation program.
- Sec. 1503. Tribal High Priority Projects program.
- Sec. 1504. Federal lands transportation program.
- Sec. 1505. Federal lands and Tribal major projects program.
- Sec. 1506. Office of Tribal Government Affairs.
- Sec. 1507. Alternative contracting methods.
- Sec. 1508. Divestiture of federally owned bridges.
- Sec. 1509. Study on Federal funding available to Indian Tribes.

##### Subtitle F—Additional Provisions

- Sec. 1601. Vision zero.
- Sec. 1602. Speed limits.
- Sec. 1603. Broadband infrastructure deployment.
- Sec. 1604. Balance Exchanges for Infrastructure Program.
- Sec. 1605. Stormwater best management practices.
- Sec. 1606. Pedestrian facilities in the public right-of-way.
- Sec. 1607. Highway formula modernization report.
- Sec. 1608. Consolidation of programs.
- Sec. 1609. Student outreach report to Congress.
- Sec. 1610. Task force on developing a 21st century surface transportation workforce.
- Sec. 1611. On-the-job training and supportive services.
- Sec. 1612. Work zone safety.
- Sec. 1613. Transportation education development program.
- Sec. 1614. Working group on construction resources.
- Sec. 1615. Numbering system of highway interchanges.
- Sec. 1616. Toll credits.
- Sec. 1617. Transportation construction materials procurement.
- Sec. 1618. Construction of certain access and development roads.
- Sec. 1619. Nationwide road safety assessment.
- Sec. 1620. Wildlife crossings.
- Sec. 1621. Climate resilient transportation infrastructure study.
- Sec. 1622. Elimination of duplication of environmental reviews and approvals.
- Sec. 1623. AMBER Alerts along major transportation routes.
- Sec. 1624. Natural gas, electric battery, and zero emission vehicles.
- Sec. 1625. Guidance on evacuation routes.
- Sec. 1626. High priority corridors on National Highway System.
- Sec. 1627. Guidance on inundated and submerged roads.
- Sec. 1628. Dry bulk weight tolerance.
- Sec. 1629. Highway use tax evasion projects.
- Sec. 1630. The United States opposes child labor.

#### TITLE II—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

##### Subtitle A—Federal Transit Administration

- Sec. 2101. Authorizations.
  - Sec. 2102. Chapter 53 definitions.
  - Sec. 2103. General provisions.
  - Sec. 2104. Miscellaneous provisions.
  - Sec. 2105. Policies and purposes.
  - Sec. 2106. Fiscal year 2022 formulas.
  - Sec. 2107. Metropolitan transportation planning.
  - Sec. 2108. Statewide and nonmetropolitan transportation planning.
  - Sec. 2109. Obligation limitation.
  - Sec. 2110. Public transportation emergency relief funds.
  - Sec. 2111. General provisions.
  - Sec. 2112. Certification requirements.
- ##### Subtitle B—Improving Frequency and Ridership
- Sec. 2201. Multi-jurisdictional bus frequency and ridership competitive grants.
  - Sec. 2202. Incentivizing frequency in the urban formula.