

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6395, WILLIAM M. (MAC) THORNBERRY NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7027, CHILD CARE IS ESSENTIAL ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7327, CHILD CARE FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1957, TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1053 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1053

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6395) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, 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 Armed Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-57 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) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (2) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 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, each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of 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debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments 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 Armed Services 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. All points of order against the further amendments printed in the report of the

Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7027) making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-58 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. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. 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) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7327) making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Natural Resources or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 8. House Resolution 967, agreed to May 15, 2020 (as amended by House Resolution 1017, agreed to June 25, 2020) is amended—

- (1) in section 4, by striking “July 31, 2020” and inserting “September 21, 2020”;
- (2) in section 11, by striking “legislative day of July 31, 2020” and inserting “calendar day of September 20, 2020”; and
- (3) in section 12, by striking “July 31, 2020” and inserting “September 21, 2020”.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gen-

tleman 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. PERLMUTTER. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee met on Friday and reported a rule, House Resolution 1053, providing for consideration of H.R. 6395, known as the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021, under a structured rule which makes in order 407 amendments. The rule provides for en bloc authority with en blocs debated for 30 minutes each.

The rule also provides for consideration of this Senate amendment to H.R. 1957, the Great American Outdoors Act.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 7027, the Child Care is Essential Act, and H.R. 7327, the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act, under closed rules.

Finally, the rule provides for suspension authority through September 20, 2020, and recess authority as well as same-day authority through September 21, 2020.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by commending Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member THORNBERRY for their leadership and calming influence that they bring to the appropriately named Mac Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021. This will be the 60th consecutive year that Congress enacts this important legislation, and I think it is a direct testament to the hard work and collegiality of these two gentlemen.

The NDAA fulfills our constitutional obligation of protecting our Nation by providing our military the tools they need to provide for our national defense, confront terrorism, and defend our democratic values overseas.

The legislation also provides essential care for the backbone of America's fighting force, our servicemembers and their families. The bill includes a 3 percent pay raise for our servicemembers and makes key investments in military infrastructure.

The bill allows our military to maintain readiness, expand capabilities, and invest in the software and technologies required to secure our country.

Additionally, the COVID-19 pandemic has affected all of us, including our military. This NDAA would authorize funding to strengthen the DOD and the country's ability to respond to this and future pandemics by creating \$1 billion pandemic preparedness and resilience national security fund.

H.R. 6395 does all of this while abiding by the budget agreement from last

year and incorporates hundreds and hundreds of bipartisan ideas.

The Armed Services Committee adopted 475 amendments during their markup, and this rule makes in order another 407 amendments for the House to consider and work its will. This legislation exemplifies exactly how this institution is supposed to work.

Another bill included in this rule is H.R. 1957, the Great American Outdoors Act. Since its creation in 1964, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has protected millions of acres of land across the U.S. It has funded national parks like the Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado as well as tens of thousands of State and local park projects in all 50 States. LWCF ensures all of us can enjoy fishing, hiking, and other outdoor activities and preserve our public lands for future generations.

I have long supported the LWCF, and I was proud to see the LWCF permanently reauthorized last year. Now, with H.R. 1957, the House can pass the Great American Outdoors Act and make the funding for the LWCF permanent.

As the Trump administration continues to slash protections for our public lands and natural resources, it is now more important than ever to permanently fund the LWCF. I am glad the Senate has finally acted and passed this important bill so we can send this to the President's desk for his signature.

□ 1030

The last two bills addressed in this rule focus on important gaps in our economic recovery from COVID-19.

The Child Care is Essential Act, H.R. 7027, creates a \$50 billion stabilization fund to help childcare providers which have been particularly hard-hit by the pandemic, with over 40 percent of providers in danger of closing. Access to childcare is absolutely necessary for our economic recovery. This bill will stabilize childcare providers so we can ensure parents can get back to work as the States reopen.

But we must also ensure this childcare is affordable for working parents hit hard by the economic downturn. That is why our next bill, the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act, H.R. 7327, expands and makes refundable the childcare tax credit and includes additional resources to improve childcare facilities. By filling the gaps to make childcare more accessible to working families, this bill helps parents who would otherwise reduce their hours or delay reentering the workforce due to childcare.

I urge all my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

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

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

I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding me the time.

One of these days, Mr. Speaker, he is going to come down here and he is

going to leave out that he yields the time for the purposes of debate only, and he and I are going to solve most of the ills that confront this institution. I think we could do that together. I appreciate him, because he is my friend. I appreciate his friendship and his yielding me the time today.

Mr. Speaker, as the first Georgian to take the floor today, I want to tell my colleagues, on behalf of the entire Georgia delegation, that we appreciate the prayers and the thoughts that you all have been sending, not just to Mr. LEWIS' family and his staff, but to all of us as well.

One of my favorite parts of this job, Mr. Speaker, is talking to young people. I will speak to any student group that wants to come through that will invite me out because I love having an opportunity to influence young minds and answer those completely without shame, questions that folks ask. But the one thing I have always asked my staff to do is not schedule me after JOHN LEWIS has talked to those young people, because once JOHN LEWIS has entered a room and had a chance with those young minds, anybody else is going to be a distant second at best.

Mr. LEWIS has been a leader in Georgia on causes good and right for my entire lifetime. In fact, Mr. LEWIS was elected to Congress before I even graduated from college. Most of the time I spent with him was as a staffer on Capitol Hill.

And I remember after getting elected, he was sitting over to my left, as he often was, and I went up and I said: Mr. LEWIS, I just want to introduce myself. I am ROB WOODALL. I just came in in John Linder's seat, and I just am excited to be with you.

He said: ROB, I know exactly who you are, and please don't call me Mr. LEWIS. Call me JOHN.

JOHN would invite the delegation over to his home to visit and talk about things—not the things that divide us, but the things that unite us. We can't afford to lose the uniters in this institution or in this country, and we have lost one in JOHN LEWIS.

I will have a chance, as part of the Georgia delegation, to recognize him more later today. I am grateful to the Speaker for making that time available, but please know how much we all appreciate your outreach to JOHN's staff and all of us.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting, thinking about being a uniter, that we are down here talking about the NDAA today. If you will recall, last year, when we were doing the NDAA, I had very few nice things to say. It had generally been a partnership exercise here, and for myriad reasons that both the chairman and the ranking member on Armed Services regretted, it became a partisan exercise last year. It came out of committee on almost a strictly partisan vote. It came across the floor on almost a strictly partisan vote.

This is a bill that it has not mattered who led the United States House or

who led the United States Senate or even who was in the White House. For 60 years now, each and every year, the Congress comes together and we produce a blueprint for our Nation's national security.

I love that about this bill, and I love that about this institution. I love that about what it means for the leadership of the civilian government that we get past partisanship every single year.

And to my Democratic friends' credit, as they lead this institution, by the time the NDAA bill got back to the floor after conference, it passed on a voice vote here in the House. We had brought ourselves back together again.

This year, Mr. Speaker, it has returned to that partnership bill that it has always tried to be. We had the chairman, Mr. SMITH, and our ranking member, Mr. THORNBERRY, up in the Rules Committee last Friday, and they both attested to that fact: this is not the bill that either of them would have drafted, but it is the bill that they have come together and passed unanimously out of their committee.

And, again, to my Democratic colleagues' credit, they have named the bill after our ranking member, MAC THORNBERRY, to recognize his lifetime of service to our men and women in uniform.

That is the kind of thing that doesn't get a lot of publicity back home. Folks aren't going to sit around and celebrate that, but it is a big deal that Republicans are in the minority on Capitol Hill, but that leadership in service to others, as MAC THORNBERRY has done for our men and women in uniform, doesn't have a partisan label on it; and our Democratic colleagues have seen fit to honor him in this way, and I am grateful to them for that.

We have a lot of amendments here, as you have heard already, Mr. Speaker, and I wish that we had been able to do this in two separate rules so that we could have come together and supported NDAA and then had our differences on the other measures that are also included in this rule.

Coming out of Coca-Cola country, it would be okay with me if the grocery stores decided that, in this time of pandemic, they only had time to just stock the Coca-Cola on the shelves and they weren't going to make time to stock the Pepsi because it was just too dangerous and not enough time to make that happen. But they haven't. They have decided they are going to put it all on the shelves, and they are going to try to get back to normal. We have got to try to get back to normal, too.

I know my friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, is on the floor today, and he has got a lot of responsibility on his shoulders. We have gotten into the habit, during this pandemic, of putting a lot more things in a single rule than we used to do. I am hoping that we will start to swing that pendulum back as we all grapple collectively to get to a new normal because, besides the National Defense Authorization Act, we have got a lands bill

here today. It came to us from the Senate. I understand my friends don't want to amend it because it has come to us from the Senate. I would like to put the House stamp of approval on it. I would like to put some House improvements on it.

We had an opportunity in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. This lands bill is exactly as my friend from Colorado described. It provides a new funding stream, a mandatory funding stream for land acquisition through the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a fund that I support, funding that I have supported.

But we have a maintenance backlog on our Federal lands, and this year we are not going to have the resources to fund those maintenance backlogs at our normal paltry level, much less at the elevated level that they need to occur, and this bill is going to exacerbate that problem. Rather than funding a maintenance backlog, it is going to purchase more land that we don't have enough money to maintain already.

We had an opportunity to massage that around to make sure that we were funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund and we were also providing the stewardship to those lands that the Land and Water Conservation Fund has already acquired. We didn't have a chance to do that in the Rules Committee.

We are going to have a previous question opportunity, when we defeat the previous question, to come back and further improve this lands bill. I hope that my colleagues will give us that opportunity. I appreciate that the Senate has sent us this language, but I do believe we can improve it before we send it to the President's desk.

And then, finally, we have bills that again, with the best of intentions, affect our Nation's childcare system. It is absolutely, positively true that we cannot get our parents back to work if we can't get our children back into the classroom or back into the childcare center. We must make all of these things work in concert together.

These bills are coming to us under an emergency designation. I sit on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker, and what that means is the normal rules don't apply.

Childcare has been a challenge in this country, not just during the pandemic, but for decades. It is an issue that is worthy of this Congress' attention. It is also worthy of getting it done right, because we can only spend each dollar once. Once that dollar is gone, if we don't spend it efficiently, we are not going to be able to serve children as well as we would like to. We are not going to be able to serve parents as well as we would like to. These childcare provisions did not go through a process that gave us an opportunity to participate.

Both bills that were testified on before the Rules Committee had Budget Committee referrals. The Budget Com-

mittee has been meeting, but we have not had one word of conversation about these priorities. That does not produce the best product.

Again, it may be done with the best of intentions, but it cannot possibly produce the best product to ignore committees of jurisdiction and to ignore disparate voices as we are all grappling with childcare challenges back in our district, COVID-related challenges back in our district.

So, Mr. Speaker, as you take time today and, hopefully, for many days into the future to celebrate the difference-making that JOHN LEWIS did—not just for my community, not just for my State, not just for our country, I would argue he made a difference on the global stage—take a moment to celebrate that, for all the partisan headlines that are in the news, there is a lot of good partnership, collaborative give-and-take going on behind the scenes to try to make the world a better place, to try to make American policy better policy.

I hope my colleagues will support the NDAA bill when it gets to the floor of this House after this very aggressive amendment process, and I do hope my colleagues will defeat this rule so that we can separate the NDAA from these items that require much more of the House's attention, and then we can rush those to the floor as soon as we have had an opportunity to perfect those, as well.

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

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

I want to say first to my friend, Mr. WOODALL, I would never neglect to provide you with the 30 minutes because I honestly enjoy watching your gestures and listening to your arguments. Often we disagree, but the way you present things is really something that I enjoy listening to and watching.

And I couldn't agree with you more about what you said about JOHN LEWIS. Now, JOHN was not very big—about my size—but his personality, his commitment, and his intellect would fill this Chamber whenever he spoke, whenever he came in. So our loss is big with his passing, and I just want to thank the gentleman for the remarks he made about Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman, from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the chair of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished member of the Rules Committee, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for yielding me the time.

I also want to associate myself with the comments of all my colleagues who have remembered our dear friend JOHN LEWIS, the conscience of the Congress, indeed, the conscience of the country. JOHN LEWIS was a man of action who never gave up on fighting for a more just, fair, and decent country, and I think all of us can pay tribute to him not just with words but with actions.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of good ideas being considered as part of this debate. There will be a lot of debate over the next couple of days, but I want to discuss one in particular here today, an amendment by my colleagues MARK POCAN and BARBARA LEE.

Because of their leadership, Congress will finally vote on whether to cut the Pentagon's bloated budget and reinvest that money in the American people here at home. All I can say is: It is about damn time.

COVID-19 has laid bare our Nation's failure to invest in programs that support our families and keep them healthy, but this debate was needed long before this pandemic hit because, for years and years, we have been told there simply isn't enough money to invest in our communities, in universal childcare, Medicare for All, or repairing our crumbling infrastructure.

We have been told that a Green New Deal is too expensive and that it is unreasonable to ask to cancel crushing student loan debt. But there is always enough money lying around to raise the Pentagon's budget. Decade after decade after decade, we shortchanged the American people while we shoveled more money into building more nukes or more military bases halfway around the world.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired of it. This amendment is the least—and I mean the least—we can do. Since the start of the Trump administration, in just the last 3 years, our defense spending has gone up every single year, over \$100 billion in total. That is crazy.

Now, don't misunderstand me, Mr. Speaker. I support our troops. This amendment exempts from cuts military personnel, defense healthcare, and our Federal civilian workforce. But I do not support military spending so wasteful that it weakens our Nation; I don't support Congress funding weapons our troops don't want; and I don't support Congress funding forever wars that our country shouldn't even be involved in.

For me, this all boils down to a simple question, Mr. Speaker: What do we mean by "national security"?

Now, some here in Washington think our national security ought to be measured solely by the number of bombs we have, but those of us who support this amendment think our national security must also be measured by the prosperity of our people, by whether our families have enough money to buy groceries, and whether we are investing in our schools and our libraries and our roads and all the things that strengthen our communities.

If we continue failing to invest in our people, what kind of country will be left for our military to defend 20, 40, 60 years down the road? What will we tell our children and their children when our military budget continues to balloon, yet our citizens cannot afford even the most basic necessities?

Budgets, Mr. Speaker, are moral documents. They represent our values, what we think is important. It is time for America to do the right thing and fundamentally alter our national priorities. That is what this proposal is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule. There will be lots of debate on lots of subjects, but I urge them to support this amendment when it comes up for a vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know the heart of which my chairman speaks. I believe it is wrongheaded to craft a military budget and then figure out what kind of mission that budget can support.

I think the question is what are we asking of our men and women in uniform, what is the mission, and then let's commit to funding that mission in a full-throated way.

We had an opportunity in this bill to vote on what the definition of the mission is, whether or not we were going to allow the Authorization for Use of Military Force from 2001 to continue to perpetuate the forever wars that my friend who chairs the Rules Committee mentioned. We are not going to have an opportunity to vote on that today, and I regret that, as I know the chairman does.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we are hoping to have an opportunity to discuss that in the future in a more full-throated way, but I would urge my colleagues—and I sit on the Budget Committee—please don't craft a budget and figure out then what you can ask our men and women in uniform to do. Figure out what it is you are asking our men and women in uniform to do, and then fund that to the best of our abilities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend, for yielding. I thank him for his very eloquent remarks about our departed colleague, JOHN LEWIS, as well. It was very appropriately done.

Mr. Speaker, this rule brings just a very mixed bag before the Congress of the United States. It covers four different bills. Two of those bills, quite frankly, shouldn't be on this floor at all. The Democrats actually broke their own rules in bringing those bills, the two bills dealing with childcare.

It is not that the subject isn't important. It is extraordinarily important. That is why it should have gone through the committee process and been marked up. Probably since this deals with COVID-19, it is more appropriately dealt with in what I hope will be another supplemental, but these bills simply aren't ready for the floor.

The other bill, which my friend referred to at length, the lands bill out of the Senate, is a good bill. Now, I would

have preferred, as my friend would, that we would have put some other amendments there, some that our good friend, the ranking member, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, brought forward. I think we could have made it more prudent and had a better chance of having a sustaining bill.

But getting that authorization done is a rare opportunity this late in the cycle in a divisive year, and I don't want to miss that opportunity. We can come back later and try and make it better, but I certainly intend to support that legislation. It is an important step forward in our environment.

I am going to reserve most of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, for the NDAA. And I, too, like everybody up here, want to thank our colleagues, the chairman and the ranking member, Mr. SMITH and Mr. THORNBERRY, for working together so well and bringing us a really well-crafted product.

That bill came out of committee 56-0. There weren't a lot of amendments. There were 600-odd amendments in the committee, another 700, I guess, that we are going to deal with here on the floor. So this has been working, but the point is they found a way to come together.

Now, we as a House are going to have an opportunity to make their work even better or, frankly, make it worse. I hope we choose the latter.

I am going to disagree very respectfully with my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee. We don't overfund defense. As a matter of fact, if you look at it historically, in 1960, the height of the Cold War, we spent 9 percent of our gross national product on defense and 50 percent of the Federal budget. That fell to a third of the Federal budget and 6 percent under Ronald Reagan in a great defense buildup. It fell to 3½ percent under President Clinton. It is down to between 3½ and less than 4 percent today.

So we don't overspend. And we have dangerous adversaries overseas that are modernizing rapidly—certainly, the Chinese are; certainly, the Russians are—and making enormous investments. So I think it would be a huge mistake to adopt the amendment that my friend intends to support; although, again, that is what we have these debates for.

It is important to remember that, in the world we live, when it comes to military power, first place is the only safe place. This bill will keep the United States where it belongs: preeminently in first place.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank, again, my friend and thank everybody here for their remarks about Representative LEWIS, a giant amongst all of us. He will be sorely missed. His voice would have been a wonderful voice today.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PERLMUTTER for yielding me the time.

I am proud to rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. I believe that each of the underlying bills that we consider in this rule will benefit not only people across the country but, in particular, residents of Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District in a meaningful and tangible way.

The NDAA provides a 3 percent pay increase for our servicemembers and their families, expands paid family leave, and makes long-overdue changes in how the Department of Defense addresses the needs of servicewomen.

The NDAA also makes necessary investments in our ability to handle future deadly infectious diseases and key investments in military infrastructure to support our troops overseas, but for the residents of my district, the benefits go even further.

More than 4,600 people in my region are proudly employed in building the Chinook helicopter, our country's premier heavy-lift aircraft, as well as the Osprey, one of the Navy's most innovative and invaluable assets. Our neighbors who build these incredible aircraft are immensely proud of both their record of producing these aircraft on time and on budget and their craftsmanship, which correctly supports our national security around the world. I am proud to continue our region's bipartisan tradition of Federal support for this critical program.

This bill is also important to the brave Federal firefighters in our region who protect some of our country's most valuable assets.

Two of the first people who visited my office after I was sworn in were firefighters Joe Love and Brian Collison. They told me that they love their jobs, but the schedule imposed on firefighters in our region was unworkable, leading to low morale, high rates of divorce, high requests to transfer to other stations, and difficulty filling vacancies. I have worked with my friend and colleague Congressman DON NORCROSS to secure language in this bill that will allow our local Federal firefighters to adopt the alternative work schedule already being used by the vast majority of their peers across the country.

Today's rule also provides for the Great American Outdoors Act, which the House will send to the President's desk this week. This bill benefits every region of the country by permanently funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund and investing heavily in the maintenance backlog at our national parks, both of which are important to our regional economy.

I regularly visit many of the special places in Pennsylvania's Fifth District that will directly benefit from this legislation, including the Heinz Wildlife Refuge and Bartram's Garden.

Funding for the LWCF does not come from taxpayer dollars. It relies on offshore drilling royalties. For every million dollars invested, the program supports 16 to 30 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the Members who worked so hard on crafting these critical bills.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise with concerns about the troubling pattern of legislating national chemical policy based upon emotions rather than scientific fact, including in this NDAA. I am referring specifically to certain anti-science, anti-practicality, and potentially anti-soldier provisions involving this bill related to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, otherwise known as PFAS.

PFAS is not one well-known substance; it is actually a class of thousands of different chemicals of which we know very little about. According to the Environmental Protection Agency, there is no precise, clear definition of what constitutes a PFAS substance, with the lowest total of several estimates of PFAS encompassing more than 5,000 substances.

The dots on this chart represent the scope of 5,070 substances identified on the Environmental Protection Agency's current PFAS master list. The 29 dots that are highlighted represent those individual PFAS for which EPA has a reliable scientific method to test their presence in drinking water. Finally, the two red dots are the only two that we think are problematic to human health, and that is PFOA and PFOS.

Some of the uses of specific PFAS chemicals the Federal Food and Drug Administration has approved for use: heart stents, in this case, for patients suffering from artery blockage; and occluders for infants suffering from the congenital heart condition known as an atrial septal defect, which plugs a hole in the heart.

I don't have a poster for the next chart on health, but 40 new fluorine-containing drugs were introduced to the market from 2001 to 2011, including those that treat cancer, respiratory illnesses, cardiovascular conditions, and infectious diseases.

Regardless, section 331 of this NDAA prohibits DOD from buying any personal care items, dental floss, or sunscreen that carries PFAS. This doesn't mean just the two PFAS we know about; it means the thousands for which we know nothing. This includes any safer alternative product with a different PFAS.

We should know what this means for our troops sitting in the desert Sun in far-off places before Congress summarily takes these products away, some of which have already been approved for use by other Federal agencies.

Separately, section 332 of this NDAA requires certain DOD PFAS cleanups

under the Superfund to use the strictest standards, nullifying Superfund, which relies on cleanups "assuring" protection of human health and the environment and being "relevant and appropriate under the circumstances." In other words, for only DOD, section 332 in this NDAA disregards site characteristics; prevents more practical, protective cleanups; and focuses only on being more stringent. This kind of policymaking is punitive; it is wasteful; and it is unscientific.

Later we will debate the Delgado amendment, which some suggest is a technical fix to the Toxic Release Inventory language Congress added in NDAA 2020. This amendment, however, is not a technical fix, and it raises serious policy questions that regular order would have done a much better job of settling.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't have to be this way, with Congress playing scientist. EPA has been working diligently to understand the health effects of the seven most common PFAS while simultaneously investigating the hazards of another five.

EPA also just released the Toxic Release Inventory mandates for 172 PFAS and is finalizing a Safe Drinking Water Act regulatory determination, is completing regulation preventing market access for long-chain PFAS, and is evaluating the need for Clean Air Act and Superfund regulation of certain PFAS.

Mr. Speaker, I hope conference negotiation will remove these troublesome provisions, or at least significantly modify them to align with the realities of our fighting men and women, their needs in the field, and not arbitrarily restrict things based upon anxiety and the lack of science.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

□ 1100

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, as we stand here right now, our brave men and women overseas and our returning veterans continue to suffer the horrific health effects of their exposure to toxic burn pits.

Burn pits are fields where tons of waste like jet fuel, plastics, and medical waste were burned right next to military bases, exposing servicemembers to an array of toxic pollutants, particulate matter, and known carcinogens like dioxin.

For too long, servicemembers have inhaled black fumes from burn pits. To make matters worse, their symptoms, like subtle shortness of breath that progresses, headaches, or dry cough, have been dismissed.

As a physician, I know these symptoms can signal serious health conditions, like severe pulmonary diseases, chronic fibrosis, chronic bronchiolitis, and others.

For years, the Department of Defense has been dismissing the serious health effects of burn pits, hiding behind promises about "ongoing studies." Promises about studies are not enough. It is time to act.

Our heroes cannot afford to wait. That is why we must pass four of my bipartisan bills included as amendments to the NDAA.

First, H.R. 7596, the DOD Burn Pits Health Provider Training Act, will require DOD to implement mandatory training for all their medical providers on the potential health effects of exposure to open-air burn pits. No longer can we allow symptoms of burn pit exposure to be dismissed.

Second, H.R. 7597, the DOD Burn Pits Research Status Act, will require DOD to report to Congress on the status and timeline for completion of all ongoing studies conducted or funded by DOD related to the health effects of burn pits.

Third, H.R. 7598, the Post-Deployment Burn Pit Question Act, will require DOD to include a question about burn pit exposure in the post-deployment health assessment form to increase reporting of burn pit exposure.

Fourth, H.R. 7600, the Burn Pit Registry Expansion Act, will require DOD and VA to expand the burn pits registry to include Egypt and Syria.

In order to comprehensively address the military's use of burn pits, prevent exposure, and improve timely care for servicemembers, we must find alternatives to burn pits usage, educate military healthcare providers about the variety of illnesses due to toxic burn pit exposures, expand the burn pits registry, and understand gaps in scientific research.

Toxic burn pit exposure continues to threaten the health of servicemembers. Many servicemembers and veterans continue to become severely sick, permanently disabled, or die from respiratory failure, cancers, or autoimmune or other diseases due to toxic burn pits exposure. This is an urgent problem that must be addressed right now.

My 2020 burn pits bill package will help bring us closer to providing the attention that this DOD self-inflicted public health crisis requires: identify at-risk servicemembers and give them the timely care they need, and end the use of military toxic burn pits once and for all.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee for including my legislation in the NDAA for 2021. I would also like to thank my good friend from Maine, Congressman JARED GOLDEN, for introducing the legislation with me

and championing its amendment during markup.

My bill holds Federal agencies accountable for paying businesses for work already performed due to contract modifications made by Federal agency clients.

As ranking member of the House Committee on Small Business' Subcommittee on Contracting and Infrastructure, I think it is important to speak up for the small businesses that support the Federal Government and procurement marketplace.

When small businesses work with the Federal Government, they choose to do so risking their livelihoods on the promise that they will be paid for the work that they have agreed to perform. Access to steady and stable cash flow is the lifeblood of a small business, and they trust that they will be paid timely and fairly each and every time they sign on the dotted line.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government has not been holding up their end of that bargain, particularly when it comes to contract modifications or change orders issued unilaterally by an agency on Federal construction projects. These delays in the approval and payment of change orders have a disproportionate impact on small construction contractors.

My legislation provides a measure of financial stability to our small contractors by requiring the government to pay for at least half of the work the small business has completed, at the time an invoice is submitted, pursuant to the change order work requested by the agency.

This will ensure that our small businesses obtain at least some fair and timely compensation for the work performed, without having to wait for the change order payment approval to work its way through miles of government red tape and bureaucracy. This legislation holds agencies accountable for the changed work they request, which is simply the right thing to do.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for including this legislation in the NDAA.

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

I want to take a moment to speak about two amendments this rule makes in order that I have offered which are focused on the health and environmental safety for those willing to put their lives on the line for our country—first, for former nuclear weapons workers, and, second, for our firefighters.

My first amendment affirms Congress' commitment to the success of the Department of Labor's Office of the Ombudsman for former nuclear weapons workers.

Over 600,000 Americans worked on our Nation's nuclear weapons in the 20th century, including at the former Rocky Flats Plant in my district, which produced the plutonium triggers for many of our nuclear weapons. Many of these workers were exposed to toxic sub-

stances and chemicals and, as a result, developed terrible and often terminal illnesses.

Congress created the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program, or EEOICPA for short, which is not very short, to provide compensation and healthcare to these workers under the fiscal year 2001 NDAA. Unfortunately, the illness compensation program has been troubled for years, preventing workers from successfully submitting their claims and assessing their hard-earned benefits.

The Office of the Ombudsman serves as an important resource for claimants, helping them navigate the complicated claims process. Unfortunately, this office sunsets this October.

As we work to find a path forward on long-term funding, my amendment, which is cosponsored by Representative JOE WILSON and you, Mr. Speaker, reinforces the importance of the ombudsman to these nuclear weapons workers and to the EEOICPA program.

My second amendment requires the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, to work in cooperation with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health to study the effects of PFAS—we heard Mr. SHIMKUS discussing that earlier—on the health and well-being of our firefighters.

PFAS chemicals are found in the protective gear firefighters wear, making it more water- and oil-resistant, so beneficial kinds of effects. But we know PFAS exposure can lead to an increased risk of cancer, which is already the leading cause of death among firefighters.

My amendment, which is cosponsored by Representatives BILL POSEY, DAN KILDEE, BRIAN FITZPATRICK, MADELEINE DEAN, and HARLEY ROUDA, would evaluate the use of PFAS chemicals in firefighting equipment and make recommendations on improvements to this gear to avoid unnecessary exposure to PFAS chemicals.

We owe it to our brave firefighters who put their lives on the line every day to minimize their exposure to these dangerous chemicals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support these amendments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier that if we defeated the previous question today that we would have an opportunity to add some additional language to the lands bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment I am about to discuss in 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, when we have a natural disaster on our public lands, we have an opportunity, right

after that disaster, to go in and salvage some of the timber that has fallen, some of the timber that has been affected. But there is a clock on how long we have to get that done, and so many of the processes that are in place normally, to seek approval for harvesting timber on public lands, remain in place in these natural disasters, in these times of crisis.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will add an amendment to the rule to make in order a discussion on creating a categorical exclusion for salvage operations.

Now, I know there are differences between Department of the Interior lands and Department of Agriculture lands. Former Governor of the great State of Georgia Sonny Perdue, now the Secretary of Agriculture, the lands that he is in charge of are not lands designed to be preserved; they are lands designed to be managed. It is an agricultural product that is supposed to produce timber for the American people.

Even though it is a catastrophe that damages that timber, that encroaches upon the productivity of those lands, an opportunity to salvage what little may be available to be salvaged should be one that we avail ourselves of or, at the very least, should be a topic of discussion today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to help me to defeat the previous question. Let's add this amendment to the rule.

As I mentioned earlier, we already have everything and the kitchen sink in this rule already. One more section 7 isn't going to disadvantage us or slow us down more than a single hour, and we will be able to have this very important conversation about maximizing the asset that the American people have entrusted us to manage and to protect.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just briefly. I am prepared to close, I would say to my friend from Georgia.

The rule that we presented today does span a number of bills. The reason we are putting them all together is because time is of the essence, and there is no reason to delay any further in presenting these particular bills to the vote of the Congress.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to again thank my friend from Colorado, both for his partnership on the Rules Committee and his courtesy here on the floor today.

I understand the urgency about which he just spoke. I offered an

amendment in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, that we withdraw what they call martial law. That is the ability for the House to move with great haste.

The House rules require that we pace ourselves so that the body has an opportunity to review the rules that the Rules Committee produces, the legislation that comes out of committees. We have these timelines in place.

Since the COVID crisis began, over 100 days ago, we have been operating under what they call martial law, where the Speaker, in his or her wisdom, can do almost anything with great haste on the floor of the House. Both parties do that in times of crisis so that the House can be responsive in the way that my friend from Colorado has discussed.

□ 1115

There comes a time, however, Mr. Speaker, when we need to recognize that if we have been sacrificing efficacy in the name of efficiency, that might have been the right answer on day one of the crisis and that might have been the right answer on day 30, maybe even day 60, maybe even day 90, but there is going to come a time in the same way that we have asked our food service personnel, our sanitation personnel, our law enforcement personnel, and our first responder personnel—you go right down the list of folks doing critical jobs in America. We are not asking them to shortcut those jobs. We are asking them to perform those jobs to the very best of their abilities.

We can do better here.

Now, my friend from Colorado mentioned that we stuff these things all into a single provision, and it does save us 1 hour of additional debate. It does save us 1 hour.

Now, in the grand scheme of things, I might say having a more deliberative process would be worth 60 minutes of this body's time. We didn't have our first day of session in June until the very last week of June, so I think we could find the time. But that is not really my biggest concern.

My biggest concern, as the ranking member of the Rules Committee mentioned, is the bills that have been stuffed into this bill that haven't been the product of regular order. And I don't mean regular order where we have to talk about everything and delay it ad infinitum. I am talking about regular order where thoughtful, serious legislators actually have a chance to make a difference and things aren't written by a select few in leadership behind closed doors.

In a crisis, leaders have to lead. And I don't fault the majority for circling the wagons and doing what they needed to do to respond in the way that they thought was appropriate. I might have disagreed with them, but they have a responsibility and an obligation to lead.

We are entering a time, Mr. Speaker, where we need to recognize that we are

the deliberative body. This is where the American people come to have their voices heard, and we must open up the process so that that can happen.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier that we did a pretty good job on the National Defense Authorization Act. Again, it passed out of committee 56-0. That is not because everybody agreed. That is not what happens in legislating. It is that everybody came to a place where they were comfortable and they did the negotiating they had to do to satisfy that higher priority of defining America's national security needs and goals.

I have the list of amendments that have been made in order by this bill, Mr. Speaker. You can see the list of bipartisan amendments. I feel pretty good about that. There are a lot of numbers you see on this page, bipartisan amendments that are going to be made in order in the National Defense Authorization Act. There are almost as many—in fact, as many as the Democratic amendments that were made in order under this rule. You see that is a lot of Democratic amendments that were made in order, too, and I am glad we had bipartisan, and I am glad the majority was able to continue to improve upon what they have done.

This is the list of Republican amendments that have been made in order. It is not a screen tear, Mr. Speaker. It is just that this is only how many there are. We in the Republican majority, 2017 when I had an opportunity to lead a subcommittee there and 2018, we would make more Democratic amendments in order than Republican amendments because Republicans were leading, so, by definition, fewer Democratic voices could be included in the regular process. We weren't able to do that today, and I regret that.

But I want to recognize, because I think it is important to recognize, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of constructive counsel for my friends on the other side of the aisle about how they can do better, and any time they want to come to me and partner with me on that leadership, I am available to them to do that. I don't think we are going to get to where I want to go by the end of this Democratic majority, and I think when the Republican majority takes over in January, that is going to be my opportunity to get us back to where I want us to be.

But this bill, this National Defense Authorization Act, this bipartisan work product, this collaborative effort to support our men and women in uniform, as my ranking member mentioned, can be improved on the floor of this House or that partnership can be destroyed on the floor of this House.

The leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle on the Rules Committee has a very difficult job trying to find those amendments that can help to improve the bill without destroying the bill, and I want to recognize the real sweat equity that folks put in to trying to keep the poison pills away

and trying to find those ideas that needed to be discussed and not to destroy our partnership.

Let's support this National Defense Authorization Act, Mr. Speaker. Let's defeat this rule but support the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to begin with responding to my friend's, Mr. WOODALL's, concerns about the numbers of amendments, what the percentages are and all that stuff.

We have authorized and made in order 407 amendments to be debated on the floor of this House. That is after some 475 amendments were debated in the Committee on Armed Services. Of the ones that we have today, let's see, 53 percent are bipartisan or Republican, and 46 percent are Democratic amendments. So, among all of these amendments, there is plenty of opportunity for all of us to have some say as to how the NDAA is going to be shaped for this coming year.

The second thing that the gentleman mentioned was the Great American Outdoors Act. That is a bipartisan bill. The ranking member, Mr. COLE, stated his support for this thing which can and will preserve millions and millions of acres of public land and national parks through funding. We know the Senate has passed it. We consider it a major matter where time is of the essence for the benefit of beautiful places all across America, and we want to get that done.

The two other bills are the childcare bills. In this pandemic that we face, childcare has been turned upside down like so many other things that have been dealt a blow by the virus. Time is of the essence in trying to correct that so America can get back to work, but without assistance in the childcare arena, that is just not going to happen. So we want to get these things moving.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia and my other colleagues for joining me here today to speak on the rule, the National Defense Authorization Act, the Great American Outdoors Act, the Child Care Is Essential Act, and the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act.

Passage of this rule today will allow the House to continue our important work for the people. We will uphold our oath of office to protect the United States through consideration of the Mac Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act. We will complete the step we took last year to support full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund by passing the Great American Outdoors Act, and we will take meaningful steps to help hard-working Americans who have been hit hard by the COVID-19 pandemic by ensuring that they have access to affordable childcare so they can get back to work as soon as possible through passage of these two acts.

Over the next few days and weeks, we will take action on these important bills; we will begin our work to fund the government through the passage of the House fiscal year 2021 appropriations bills; and we will renew our calls for the Senate to act and pass the next pandemic relief package, the HEROES Act, to help Americans across the country as we respond to this miserable virus and its effects on our Nation. So I hope all my colleagues can join us in getting started with that work by passing the rule here today.

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

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1053

Strike section 7 and insert the following:

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Natural Resources or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the title and concur in the Senate amendment to the text with the amendment printed in section 9 of this resolution. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

At the end, add the following new section:

SEC. 9. The amendment referred to in section 7 of this resolution is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate, add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION TO EXPEDITE SALVAGE OPERATIONS IN RESPONSE TO CATASTROPHIC EVENTS.

(a) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION ESTABLISHED.—Salvage operations carried out by the Secretary of Agriculture on national forest land or the Secretary of the Interior on public lands are a category of actions hereby designated as being categorically excluded from the preparation of an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior may use the categorical exclusion established under subsection (a) in accordance with this section.

(c) ACREAGE LIMITATION.—A salvage operation covered by the categorical exclusion established under subsection (a) may not contain treatment units exceeding a total of 10,000 acres.

(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) STREAM BUFFERS.—A salvage operation covered by the categorical exclusion established under subsection (a) shall comply with the standards and guidelines for stream buffers contained in the applicable forest plan unless waived by the Regional Forester, in the case of National Forest System lands, or the State Director of the Bureau of Land Management, in the case of public lands.

(2) REFORESTATION PLAN.—A reforestation plan shall be developed under section 3 of the

Act of June 9, 1930 (commonly known as the Knutson-Vandenberg Act; 16 U.S.C. 576b), as part of a salvage operation covered by the categorical exclusion established under subsection (a).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. 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 220, nays 162, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—220

Adams	Foster	McEachin
Agullar	Frankel	McGovern
Allred	Fudge	McNerney
Axne	Gabbard	Meeks
Barragán	Gallego	Meng
Bass	Garamendi	Mfume
Beatty	Garcia (IL)	Moore
Bera	Garcia (TX)	Morelle
Beyer	Golden	Moulton
Bishop (GA)	Gomez	Mucarsel-Powell
Blunt Rochester	Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Bonamici	Gottheimer	Nadler
Boyle, Brendan	Green, Al (TX)	Napolitano
F.	Grijalva	Neal
Brindisi	Haaland	Norcoss
Brownley (CA)	Harder (CA)	O'Halleran
Bustos	Hastings	Ocasio-Cortez
Butterfield	Hayes	Omar
Carbajal	Heck	Pallone
Cárdenas	Higgins (NY)	Panetta
Carson (IN)	Himes	Pappas
Cartwright	Horn, Kendra S.	Pascarell
Case	Horsford	Payne
Casten (IL)	Houlihan	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Peters
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Phillips
Chu, Judy	Jayapal	Pingree
Cicilline	Jeffries	Pocan
Cisneros	Johnson (GA)	Porter
Clark (MA)	Johnson (TX)	Pressley
Clay	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Keating	Quigley
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Cohen	Khanna	Rice (NY)
Connolly	Kildee	Rose (NY)
Cooper	Kilmer	Rouda
Correa	Kim	Roybal-Allard
Costa	Kind	Ruiz
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Cox (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Rush
Craig	Kuster (NH)	Ryan
Crist	Lamb	Sánchez
Crow	Langevin	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Scanlon
Cunningham	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Davids (KS)	Lawrence	Schneider
Davis (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Schrader
Davis, Danny K.	Lee (CA)	Schrier
Dean	Lee (NV)	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Levin (CA)	Scott, David
DeLauro	Levin (MI)	Serrano
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
Delgado	Lipinski	Shalala
Demings	Loebbeck	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Sherrill
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sires
Dingell	Lujan	Slotkin
Doggett	Luria	Smith (WA)
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Soto
F.	Malinowski	Spanberger
Engel	Maloney,	Speier
Escobar	Carolyn B.	Stanton
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Stevens
Españat	Matsui	Suozzi
Evans	McAdams	Swalwell (CA)
Finkenaue	McBath	Takano
Fletcher	McCollum	Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)	Underwood
Titus	Vargas
Tlaib	Veasey
Tonko	Vela
Torres (CA)	Velázquez
Torres Small	Visclosky
(NM)	Wasserman
Trahan	Schultz
Trone	Waters

NAYS—162

Aderholt	Gohmert	Nunes
Allen	Gonzalez (OH)	Olson
Amash	Gooden	Pence
Amodei	Gosar	Perry
Armstrong	Granger	Posey
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Reed
Babin	Graves (LA)	Reschenthaler
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Rice (SC)
Baird	Green (TN)	Riggleman
Balderson	Grothman	Rodgers (WA)
Banks	Guthrie	Roe, David P.
Bergman	Hagedorn	Rose, John W.
Biggs	Harris	Rouzer
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Roy
Bishop (NC)	Hern, Kevin	Scalise
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Schweikert
Bost	Hice (GA)	Scott, Austin
Brady	Higgins (LA)	Shimkus
Brooks (AL)	Hill (AR)	Smith (MO)
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Smith (NE)
Buck	Huizenga	Smith (NJ)
Budd	Hurd (TX)	Smucker
Burchett	Johnson (LA)	Spano
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Staubert
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Stefanik
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Steil
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Steube
Chabot	Joyce (PA)	Stivers
Cheney	Keller	Taylor
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Thompson (PA)
Cloud	Kelly (PA)	Thornberry
Cole	King (NY)	Tiffany
Collins (GA)	Kinzing	Tipton
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Turner
Conaway	LaHood	Upton
Cook	LaMalfa	Van Drew
Crawford	Lamborn	Wagner
Crenshaw	Latta	Walberg
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Walden
Davis, Rodney	Long	Walker
DesJarlais	Lucas	Walorski
Duncan	Luetkemeyer	Waltz
Emmer	Marshall	Watkins
Estes	Massie	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	Mast	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	McCaul	Williams
Foxx (NC)	McKinley	Wilson (SC)
Fulcher	Meuser	Wittman
Gaetz	Mitchell	Womack
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Woodall
Garcia (CA)	Mooney (WV)	Wright
Gianforte	Murphy (NC)	Yoho
Gibbs	Norman	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—47

Abraham	Holding	Palmer
Barr	Hudson	Peterson
Blumenauer	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Brown (MD)	Katko	Roby
Buchanan	Kennedy	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Byrne	Loudermilk	Rooney (FL)
Clarke (NY)	Lowe	Rutherford
Curtis	Marchant	Schakowsky
DeGette	McClintock	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	McHenry	Simpson
Dunn	Miller	Stewart
Flores	Mullin	Timmons
Fortenberry	Neguse	Westerman
Griffith	Newhouse	Young
Guest	Palazzo	

□ 1221

Messrs. FITZPATRICK and COMER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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	Case	DeFazio
(Sánchez)	(Cartwright)	(Bonamici)
	Clay (Grijalva)	

DeSaulnier (Matsui)
 Deutch (Rice (NY))
 Frankel (Clark (MA))
 Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)
 Gomez (Gallego)
 Horsford (Kildee)
 Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
 Khanna (Sherman)
 Kind (Beyer)
 Kirkpatrick (Gallego)
 Kuster (NH) (Brownley (CA))
 Lawson (FL) (Evans)
 Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
 Lipinski (Cooper)
 Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)
 Lowenthal (Beyer)
 McEachin (Wexton)
 Moore (Beyer)
 Nadler (Jeffries)
 Napolitano (Correa)
 Pascrell (Sires)
 Payne (Wasserman)
 Schultztz
 Pingree (Cicilline)
 Porter (Wexton)

Pressley (Omar)
 Price (NC) (Butterfield)
 Rush (Underwood)
 Serrano (Jeffries)
 Thompson (MS) (Fudge)
 Trone (Beyer)
 Watson Coleman (Pallone)
 Welch (McGovern)
 Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

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

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

Mr. 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.

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING REPRESENTATIVE JOHN LEWIS

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, William Cullen Bryant said:

So live, that when thy summons come to join

The innumerable caravan which moves
 To that mysterious realm where each shall take

His Chamber in the silent halls of death,
 Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
 Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed

By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
 Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
 About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, it has become my solemn duty as dean of the Georgia delegation of the United States House of Representatives to announce and include in the records and proceedings of this august body notice that since we last convened, and specifically, on Friday, July 17, 2020, the Honorable JOHN ROBERT LEWIS, Representative of the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia, our hero, our colleague, our brother, our friend received and answered his final summons from God almighty and at that moment transitioned from labor to reward.

The world is a better place because JOHN LEWIS spent his life pursuing freedom, justice, opportunity, love, and peace for all of humanity. While he is an icon in the history of America for his courage and his sacrifice in making "good trouble," his enduring humility reflected the true timbre of his character. He inspired us as the conscience of the Congress, and we have all been truly blessed to know, love, and share the life and legacy of this extraordinary human being.

I ask that you join my wife, Vivian, and me, along with the Members of the Georgia delegation, in extending our deepest condolences to JOHN's family; friends; staff, including his faithful and devoted chief of staff, Michael Collins; and all those around the world who mourn his loss.

JOHN, rest in peace and lie down with pleasant dreams, knowing that this current generation will continue the fight for the ultimate realization of your beloved community.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I first met JOHN LEWIS just a few feet from where we are right now in the well of the House. I was a special elect Member-to-be, and it was JOHN who welcomed me down in the well.

I will never forget that day. It was his thunderous voice that filled the Chamber as he welcomed me and introduced me to each of you. He honored me that day. Afterward, he embraced me, and then he stood by me as I put my hand up and took the oath of office.

□ 1230

It is truly a privilege now for me to be able to stand before you and to honor him not far from where he honored me as we remember the life and the legacy of one who is known as a gentle, gentle giant; a man whose courage and strength in the face of injustice and violence will forever be remembered; a man whose kindness and humility was apparent to anyone who had the opportunity to meet him.

Our Nation has indeed lost a giant, and it is times like these that we must be reminded of the shoulders that we stand on, the shoulders of giants like JOHN.

I am better off because of JOHN LEWIS. We are all better because of JOHN LEWIS. Our Nation is so much better because of JOHN LEWIS.

So, in the days to come, we should all strive to be a little bit more like JOHN: humble, grateful, and thankful for the opportunity to leave this Nation in better shape for the next generation.

May God bless JOHN LEWIS and bring peace to his family in the days to come.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask that all Members rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the Honorable JOHN ROBERT LEWIS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks that all those present in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol, and all who love JOHN LEWIS wherever you are, rise in a moment of silence in remembrance of the conscience of the Congress, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS.

EXPRESSING THE PROFOUND SORROW OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1054

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable John Lewis, a Representative from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That a committee of such Members of the House as the Speaker may designate, together with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of applicable accounts of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6395, WILLIAM M. (MAC) THORNBERRY NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7027, CHILD CARE IS ESSENTIAL ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7327, CHILD CARE FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1957, TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CROW). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1053) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6395) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7027) making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7327) making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal