

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 171, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—230

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

NAYS—171

Abraham	Babin	Bergman
Allen	Bacon	Biggs
Amash	Baird	Bilirakis
Armstrong	Balderson	Bishop (NC)
Arrington	Barr	Bishop (UT)

Bost	Hagedorn	Reed
Brady	Harris	Reschenthaler
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Buchanan	Hern, Kevin	Riggleman
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Budd	Hill (AR)	Roe, David P.
Burchett	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Byrne	Huizenga	Rooney (FL)
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Rose, John W.
Carter (GA)	Jacobs	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Cheney	Jordan	Schweikert
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cloud	Katko	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Keller	Simpson
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Conaway	King (NY)	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Kinzinger	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Kustoff (TN)	Smucker
Curtis	LaHood	Staubert
Davidson (OH)	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Steil
DesJarlais	Latta	Stivers
Duncan	Lesko	Taylor
Dunn	Long	Thompson (PA)
Emmer	Loudermilk	Tiffany
Estes	Lucas	Tipton
Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Marshall	Upton
Fleischmann	Massie	Van Drew
Fortenberry	Mast	Wagner
Foxx (NC)	McCarthy	Walberg
Fulcher	McCaul	Walker
Gaetz	McClintock	Walorski
Gallagher	McKinley	Waltz
Garcia (CA)	Miller	Watkins
Gianforte	Mitchell	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Wenstrup
Gonzalez (OH)	Mullin	Westerman
Gooden	Murphy (NC)	Williams
Gosar	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Graves (LA)	Norman	Wittman
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Womack
Green (TN)	Palazzo	Woodall
Griffith	Palmer	Wright
Grithman	Pence	Yoho
Guest	Perry	Young
Guthrie	Posey	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—29

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Olson
Amodei	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Banks	Holding	Shimkus
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (LA)	Spano
Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Steube
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Stewart
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Thornberry
Flores	Marchant	Timmons
Gabbard	McHenry	Walden
Granger	Meuser	

□ 1317

Mrs. MILLER and Mr. VAN DREW changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	DelBene (Heck)	Horsford (Kildee)
Barragán (Beyer)	DeSaulnier	Huffman (Kildee)
Bera (Aguilar)	(Matsui)	Jayapal (Raskin)
Blumenauer (Beyer)	Doggett (Raskin)	Johnson (TX)
Bonamici (Raskin)	Engel (Pallone)	(Jeffries)
Brownley (CA)	Escobar (Garcia (TX))	Kennedy (Deutch)
(Clark (MA))	Foster (Beyer)	Khanna (Gomez)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Frankel (Clark (MA))	Kind (Beyer)
Garamendi (Sherman)	Garamendi (Gallego)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)
Case (Cartwright)	Gonzalez (TX) (Gomez)	Kuster (NH) (Clark (MA))
Clay (Davids (KS))	Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Costa (Cooper)	Davis (CA) (Wild)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)	Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Lipinski (Cooper)
		Lofgren (Jeffries)

Lowenthal (Beyer)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)	Sánchez (Aguilar)
Lowey (Tonko)	Schultz)	Schakowsky (Kelly (IL))
McNerney (Raskin)	Peters (Rice (NY))	Schneider (Houllahan)
Meng (Clark (MA))	Peterson (Vela)	Serrano (Jeffries)
Moore (Beyer)	Pingree (Clark (MA))	Sires (Pallone)
Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)	Porter (Wexton)	Speier (Scanlon)
Nadler (Jeffries)	Price (NC) (Butterfield)	Thompson (CA) (Kildee)
Napolitano (Correa)	Rooney (FL) (Beyer)	Titus (Connolly)
Omar (Pressley)	Roybal-Allard (McCollum)	Visclosky (Raskin)
Panetta (Kildee)	Ruiz (Aguilar)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Pascrell (Pallone)	Rush (Underwood)	Welch (McGovern)
		Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

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 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1334

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO THE HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 4003(e) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Pub. L. 114-255), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee:

Mr. Arien Malec, Oakland, California

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, August 21, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker of the House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, pursuant to 42 USC Sec. 300jj-12, I am pleased to appoint the following individual to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee:

Ms. Cynthia A. Fisher, Newton, Massachusetts

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
Republican Leader.

DELIVERING FOR AMERICA ACT

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1092, I call up the bill (H.R.

8015) to maintain prompt and reliable postal services during the COVID-19 health emergency, 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 1092, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-61, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 116-480, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 8015

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 "Delivering for America Act".

**SEC. 2. PROMPT AND RELIABLE POSTAL SERVICES DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the last day of the COVID-19 public health emergency or January 31, 2021, whichever is later, the United States Postal Service may not implement or approve any change to the operations or the level of service provided by the Postal Service from those in effect on January 1, 2020, that would reduce service performance or impede prompt, reliable, and efficient services, including any of the following actions:

(1) Any change in the nature of postal services which will generally affect service on a nationwide or substantially nationwide basis.

(2) Any revision of service standards.

(3) Any closure or consolidation of any post office or postal facility, or any reduction of such office or facility hours.

(4) Any prohibition or restriction on the use of overtime or overtime pay to Postal Service officers or employees.

(5) Any change that would prevent the Postal Service from meeting its service standards or cause a decline in measurements of performance relative to those service standards.

(6) Any change that would have the effect of delaying deferring, or curtailing mail, allowing for the non-delivery of mail to a delivery route, or increasing the volume of undelivered mail.

(7) Treating election mail as any class of mail other than first-class mail, regardless of whether such treatment requires payment of overtime pay to officers or employees of the Postal Service.

(8) Removing, decommissioning, or any other stoppage of mail sorting machines, other than for routine maintenance.

(9) Removing or eliminating any mail collection box that is available to the public.

(10) Enacting any rule, policy, or standard the purpose or effect of which would delay the delivery of mail to or from a government entity.

(11) Instituting any hiring freeze.

(b) REVERSAL OF POLICIES HINDERING DELIVERY OF MAIL.—The United States Postal Service shall reverse any initiative or action that is causing delay in processing or delivery or non-delivery of the mail.

(c) ELECTION MAIL.—

(1) POLICY ON POSTMARKS.—It shall be the policy of the United States Postal Service to postmark, which shall include any imprinted indicia from the Postal Service that indicates the date of receipt, all election mail processed by the Postal Service.

(2) SAME-DAY PROCESSING.—The United States Postal Service shall ensure, to the maximum extent practical, that election mail is processed and cleared from any postal facility or post office on the same day it is received at such a facility or post office.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term "COVID-19 public health emergency" means the public health emergency declared by the Secretary of Health and Human Services on January 27, 2020, with respect to the 2019 Novel Coronavirus;

(2) the term "election mail" means mail consisting of—

(A) voter registration application forms, completed voter registration application forms, and voter registration cards or similar materials;

(B) absentee and other mail-in ballot application forms, blank absentee and other mail-in ballots, and completed absentee and other mail-in ballots; and

(C) other materials relating to an election which are mailed by a State or local election official to individuals who are registered to vote in the election; and

(3) the term "government entity" means the Federal Government or any State (as that term is defined in section 311 of title 5, United States Code) or local government and any subdivision thereof.

**SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE POSTAL SERVICE.**

There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, for an additional payment to the Postal Service Fund (established under section 2003 of title 39, United States Code), \$25,000,000,000, to remain available until expended. Of the amount appropriated in the previous sentence, \$15,000,000 shall be transferred to "United States Postal Service—Office of Inspector General—Salaries and Expenses".

**SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter or otherwise effect the terms and conditions of section 3406 of title 39, United States Code (relating to balloting materials under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act).

**SEC. 5. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amounts provided by this Act are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(b) DESIGNATION IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, this Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4112(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 8015.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Delivering for America Act. I also rise in strong support of the brave postal workers across this Nation who

are continuing to deliver the mail for the American people in the middle of a global pandemic.

The Postal Service is a critical component of America's infrastructure. It provides a lifeline of medication, supplies, and mail for all Americans, everywhere they live, especially in this time of need.

Earlier this year, the Postal Service asked Congress to help. They asked us for \$25 billion in critical assistance to help navigate through this crisis, just like all these other industries did, businesses and entities that received Federal funds from Congress.

This was not a Democratic request. It came from the Postal Service, and it was supported unanimously by the Board of Governors, all of whom were appointed by President Trump.

In response to this urgent request, the House acted. The House said yes. We acted swiftly to help the Postal Service. We voted to include \$25 billion in the HEROES Act, and we passed it on May 15.

Unfortunately, the President would not agree, and the request has languished for more than 3 months. And now we know why, because the President told us why. He admitted on national television that he was blocking the \$25 billion in order to hobble mail-in voting. That is what he said, and I would like to read it to you.

"They want \$25 billion for the post office. Now they need that money in order to make the post office work, so it can take all of these millions and millions of ballots."

Regrettably, it does not end there. Now the new Postmaster General is using this lack of funding to justify sweeping and damaging changes to Postal Service operations, and we have seen the results: national headlines about delays of days and weeks in mail, veterans desperately waiting for their medications, sorting machines being ripped out and put in dumpsters.

Yesterday, some of my Republican colleagues argued at the Rules Committee that there are "no delays." That is right, no delays happening anywhere. They claimed repeatedly that there is no data that proves these delays are real.

But we have eyes, and we have heard accounts from across this Nation, from our districts and every district in this Nation, and we have the Postmaster General himself who admitted yesterday that there are, in fact, delays, that he feels bad about them, and that he is working feverishly to address them.

In addition, this afternoon, we have something else. We have new information. We have received new internal Postal Service documents showing nationwide performance data from July and August, official post office data. These new documents show that the delays we have all heard about are actually far worse than previously expected and told us. And they are across the board. They are across this Nation.

This afternoon, I am making these new documents available to all Members of the House, and I urge you to review them carefully. They will be available on the floor during this debate.

The bill we are considering today is simple. It does two things. First, it provides the \$25 billion the Postal Service requested on a bipartisan basis to help during the coronavirus crisis. Second, it returns delivery standards to the way they were before the Postmaster General recently caused all those delays, which has an impact on the delivery and the ability of Americans to vote by mail.

This is not a partisan issue. It makes absolutely no sense to implement these dramatic changes in the middle of a pandemic less than 3 months before the November elections.

The American people do not want anyone messing with the post office. They certainly do not want it to be politicized. They just want their mail, they want their medicines, and they want their mail-in ballots delivered in a timely way. And that is exactly what our bill does.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act. This is the result of a legislative process only slightly less absurd than the conspiracies, insinuations, and fabrications that gave rise to the purported need for it.

I mean, just this second, the sponsor of the bill says she has data now that we can all receive while we are voting on the bill. I mean, is this data from a whistleblower? We all know their record with whistleblowers.

The process is broken. Regardless, we are here today debating a bill to simultaneously hamstring and bail out the Postal Service. We have had no committee hearings or markups. On Monday, we will hear from the new Postmaster General, after we vote on the bill. It makes no sense. The result is deeply flawed.

Although Dr. Fauci advised that there is no reason Americans cannot vote in person, citizens choosing to vote by mail must have their ballots delivered in a timely manner. The Postmaster General has pledged that is his mission. And on Friday, before the Senate, he pledged ballots would be delivered faster than first-class mail, without rate increases.

I want to turn now and, one by one, debunk the Democrats' conspiracy theories.

First, Democrats claim DeJoy is removing blue collection boxes to sabotage the election. This is an absurd claim. This removal process is routine. The Postal Service has removed 35,000 boxes over the last 10 years. Under President Obama, at least 12,000 mailboxes were removed, and no one cried foul then.

Second, Democrats claim Postmaster DeJoy is removing mail sorters to intentionally slow the mail. These sorters were on track to be removed prior to his appointment and reflect the reality that mail volume is down 33 percent over the past 15 years.

□ 1345

The third Democrat claim is that the Postal Service cannot manage volume resulting from the upcoming election. In 2019, the Postal Service handled an average of 471 million pieces of mail each day. Assuming all 158 million registered voters decided to vote by mail, the total volume of requested and mailed ballots would not exceed a typical day of total USPS mail volume.

Fourth, the Democrats claim the Postmaster General's pilot program and his efforts to reduce excessive overtime were intended to sabotage the election. The Postmaster General testified he never sought to eliminate overtime. Instead, he sought to get postal operations on time so there would be less need to rely on overtime and reduce extra mail truck trips. With overtime costs of \$1.1 billion in 2018 alone, why wouldn't you try to improve on that?

The Fifth Democratic claim is that the Postal Service General Counsel sent letters to the Senate election boards to intimidate and stoke fears. Letters were also sent in May, well before Postmaster DeJoy took over—remember, the Postmaster has only been in office 60 days—saying what the U.S. Postal Service has been saying for years, that some State election boards have deadlines and requirements that simply do not consider the reality of Postal Service operations and logistics constraints.

If a State allows voters to request absentee ballots 1 day before the election, why wouldn't the Postal Service advise there might be a problem.

Sixth, Democrats are acting like any mail delays are new and orchestrated by Postmaster General DeJoy. As I have said time and time again, I have been hearing about postal delays for years. Where there are delays, it makes sense to figure out why, and it makes even more sense to do something to fix them.

And, finally, the false narrative that the Postal Service is running out of money and will cease operations before the election. Currently, the Postal Service has over \$15 billion cash on hand, that's enough to keep it solvent until August 2021, and enough time for us to do the right thing.

Like the Russia hoax and the impeachment sham, the Democrats have manufactured another scandal for political purposes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, first, in response, this is not a Democratic conspiracy theory. Republican officials from across this country, elected and appointed, have expressed their own concerns about postal delays and the President's comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, even during this pandemic with most agencies down, we had not heard complaints from the Postal Service until Louis DeJoy was appointed Postmaster General. On the contrary, the pandemic had not kept our mail from being faithfully delivered.

Almost immediately after DeJoy assumed office, pandemonium broke out. For example, in Ward 8 of my district, there was no mail for 2 weeks. And the District and 46 States have been warned by the Postal Service itself that it cannot guarantee that all mail ballots will arrive in time to be counted.

Mr. DeJoy did not tell the truth at the Senate hearing yesterday. We know that from a July 15 memorandum directing employees explicitly to leave mail behind and to significantly cut overtime. We know that from an August 7 Postal Service action that reassigned 23 top executives with decades of institutional knowledge of postal operations in order to centralize operations. We know and will bring out before this hearing is over today that the Post Office continues to be sabotaged.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), a member of the Education Committee.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during my time in this Chamber I have devoted myself to finding the truth and working toward good governance. That requires gathering the facts and exposing the lies. It is in this light that I rise today to oppose H.R. 8015, the so-called Delivering for America Act.

H.R. 8015 aims to solve a made-up crisis by forcing the Postal Service to double down on the very same activities that have caused it to lose money consistently each year since 2006. Then they give the Postal Service another \$25 billion to lose with no strings attached.

Mr. Speaker, there is no immediate Postal Service crisis. Democrats manufactured this crisis and are using it to create fear and advance their agenda. The Postal Service currently has \$14 billion in cash on hand, which is enough to sustain operations through August of 2021. This comes on top of the fact that the Postal Service has not even touched the \$10 billion loan that Congress extended to it in the recently passed CARES act.

The Postal Service has many long-term problems, but there is no short-term crisis. If Democrats were serious about ensuring the longevity of the Postal Service, we would finally pass bipartisan measures like the Postal Service Reform Act of 2017 that was championed by former Representatives Meadows and Cummings. This bill would enact meaningful reforms, keep mailing costs down, encourage innovation, and not require additional taxpayer bailouts.

Our current Postmaster General DeJoy took the job despite being vilified in public. He was unanimously selected by the bipartisan U.S. Postal Service Board of Governors because the board saw tremendous value in his decades of experience managing and growing a successful nationwide logistics company. He certainly had the qualifications to work with Congress and take on the task of postal reform.

Mr. Speaker, we need long-term solutions to fix the long-term problems of the Postal Service. H.R. 8015 merely aims to score political points on an issue that does not even exist. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, we just heard more of the same on the other side of the aisle, denial and disinformation. And I find it particularly ironic that my friend from North Carolina would cite the unanimous decision of the Board of Governors.

Well, guess what? That same Board of Governors unanimously recommended the \$25 billion you are declining that is in this bill today. It is interesting how we cherry-pick facts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Delivering for America Act.

There is an ongoing and concerted effort to disrupt the timeliness of mail delivery and to erode public confidence in the Postal Service, all leading, if successful, to the largest voter suppression in American history since Jim Crow.

The effort is being directed by the new Postmaster General, Louis DeJoy, a crony and major donor of the President. A President who opposes mail-in voting for everyone apparently but himself and his wife. A President who has called the Postal Service a joke and a scam, and who threatened to veto the CARES Act with \$2 trillion for desperately needed assistance all over this country simply to block this funding.

On August 18, the Postmaster General announced, finally, he put a hold on some of the sweeping operational changes that were not only misguided amid a pandemic, but actually eroded public confidence in America’s favorite government agency, the Postal Service.

All in a day’s work for someone unqualified and unfit to begin with for the office he now occupies.

By now we should all know better than to take the administration at its word. And despite the Postmaster’s reported retreat, the sabotage continues. The Postmaster is still not advocating for additional funding for the Postal Service, despite the recommendation by his own Board of Governors. He is still not committed to using overtime as a tool during the pandemic to compensate for 40,000 postal workers who have had to quarantine or gotten sick.

The Postmaster’s announcement didn’t commit to reversing the cuts to service and capacity, especially restoring sorting machines that absolutely are critical tools in moving large volumes of mail, especially on the eve of a consequential national election.

That is why this bill would restore the service delivery standards and operations in place before Mr. DeJoy took office.

The Postmaster’s announcement didn’t include an agenda to support election mail that demonstrates a commitment to helping the Postal Service fulfill its historic role in this upcoming election in a pandemic. That is why this bill will ensure that election mail is prioritized for expedited delivery, as has been the practice in previous years.

The Postmaster’s announcement did not explain to the public, whom he serves, how an executive could fail so spectacularly and still keep his job. So we still have work to do because the sabotage continues.

We must restore public confidence in the Postal Service and its ability to support voting by mail during the worst pandemic in 100 years. American democracy demands no less.

That is our history. That is the history Mr. DeJoy ignored, and that is the awesome responsibility he betrayed.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to add, there is no evidence of the charges of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, in March, Speaker PELOSI called me a dangerous nuisance for insisting that at least half of Congress come back to vote on a \$2 trillion bailout bill. This week, she has called Congress into session to vote on a post office bill that is nothing but political posturing.

Now, Speaker PELOSI told us we would probably be back in August to vote on a PPP bill. What she didn’t tell us is that the PPP would stand for PELOSI’s political posturing.

Let me read a quote from the chief operating officer of the U.S. Postal Service that might explain what is going on. “The decision to consolidate mail processing facilities recognizes the urgent need to reduce the size of the national mail processing network to eliminate costly underutilized infrastructure.” That was the chief operating officer under Obama and Biden. In fact, that is from a press release in 2012 when they announced they were closing nine processing facilities in the State of Kentucky. In fact, they didn’t remove the equipment, they locked the doors and turned out the lights and shut it down forever, even in Lexington, Kentucky, our second biggest city in Kentucky. A year earlier they closed down a processing facility in my district, the Obama administration did—Obama/Biden.

I include those press releases in the RECORD.

[Feb. 23, 2012]

KENTUCKY MAIL PROCESSING CLOSINGS ANNOUNCED

KENTUCKIANA DISTRICT—As a result of studies begun five months ago, the Postal Service has made the decision to move all mail processing operations from:

Bowling Green, KY Processing and Distribution Facility (P&DF) to the Nashville, TN, Processing and Distribution Center (P&DC).

Campton, KY, Customer Service Mail Processing Center (CSMPC) to the Louisville, KY, P&DC.

Elizabethtown, KY, CSMPC to the Louisville P&DC.

Hazard, KY, CSMPC to the Knoxville, TN, P&DC.

Lexington, KY, P&DC to the Louisville P&DC and the Knoxville P&DC.

London, KY P&DF to the Knoxville P&DC.

Paducah, KY, P&DF to the Evansville, IN, P&DF.

Somerset, KY, CSMPC to the Knoxville P&DC.

Once the transfers are completed, the mail processing operation at the closing sites will cease. There will be no change to any of the retail units, business mail entry units or vehicle maintenance facilities at these locations at this time.

It also has been determined as a result of the study of the Louisville, KY, Annex, that there was no significant opportunity to improve efficiency or service through consolidation of mail processing operations, and no changes will be made at this time.

The Postal Service has experienced a 25 percent decline in First-Class Mail volume since 2006, and receives no tax dollars for its operations, relying instead on the sale of postage, and postal products and services.

“The decision to consolidate mail processing facilities recognizes the urgent need to reduce the size of the national mail processing network to eliminate costly underutilized infrastructure,” said Chief Operating Officer. “Consolidating operations is necessary if the Postal Service is to remain viable to provide mail service to the nation.”

Specific dates have not been set for the transition. Until a specific date has been announced, residential and business mailers will continue to be served through the current facilities.

In December 2011, the Postal Service agreed to impose a moratorium on closing or consolidating post offices and mail processing facilities prior to May 15, 2012, to give Congress and the Administration the opportunity to enact an alternative plan.

This delay was designed to allow Congress sufficient time to enact comprehensive postal legislation. In the meantime, the Postal Service continued all necessary steps required for the review of these facilities, including public notifications, public input meetings and consideration of public comments.

Implementation of this consolidation is contingent upon the outcome of pending rulemaking for a proposal to revise existing service standards. This announcement is provided in advance so that appropriate planning and notification can be made in accordance with existing employee agreements.

A list of mail processing studies and their status is available at [usps.com/ourfuturenetwork](http://usps.com/ourfuturenetwork). Specific information about individual studies, including public meeting summaries and summary briefs, is posted on the website, [usps.com/aremailprocessing](http://usps.com/aremailprocessing), as it becomes available.

[Apr. 28, 2011]

ASHLAND MAIL PROCESSING OPERATIONS MOVING TO CHARLESTON, WV

ASHLAND, KY—As a result of a study begun in September 2010, the Postal Service has

made the decision to move mail processing operations from the Ashland Processing and Distribution Facility to the Charleston WV Processing and Distribution Facility.

Kentuckiana District Manager James W. Kiser said, "Given the drastic 20 percent decline in mail volume the Postal Service has experienced since 2007, we must take action to reduce the size of our mail processing network. Consolidating operations and placing our people where we need them is necessary if the Postal Service is to remain viable to provide mail service to the nation."

I understand our employees' concern over this move," Kiser added, "but the consolidation makes sense given the fiscal realities. The Charleston facility has the capacity to handle the additional workload and we can realize significant savings by shifting operations there."

The transition is expected to be completed by January 2012. Some employees may be re-assigned to the Charleston facility or to other vacant positions as a result of the move.

This move will not cause any changes in local mail delivery," said Kiser. "Letters mailed to local addresses will be delivered the next day, the same as before. I am confident the transition will be smooth and transparent to our customers and they will continue to receive the same excellent service they always have."

There will be no change in service standards for 96.3 percent of mail. However, as a result of the consolidation, service to 403-406, 413-414, 417-418, 430-432 and 456 will change from overnight to 2-day. Service to 246-248, 250-253, 258-259 and 261-266 will improve from 2-day to overnight. "The significant cost savings and productivity gains expected from this consolidation were deciding factors in making this very difficult decision," said Kiser.

Full retail services will still be available at the Ashland Post Office.

The Ashland Business Mail Entry Unit will remain open for large volume business mailers. Large volume business mailers will be able to bring their mail to the Ashland Business Mail Entry Unit at 1140 Carter Ave.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, my mail, if I send it to my neighbor, goes to Charleston, West Virginia, before it comes back to Kentucky. Is this part of some vast conspiracy? No. It's part of a decade's long realignment process where the post office is trying to match the needs of the consumers to the post office infrastructure.

These voter suppression conspiracies, who knows what the Democrats will blame next. Last month they were blaming the Census, this month they are blaming the post office, probably next month they will blame Amtrak.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), the chair of the Subcommittee on National Security for the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, I want to rise in strong support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act.

This urgent legislation would reverse the ill-advised changes to mail delivery that the new Postmaster General has implemented to the injury of every American's right to vote, and at a serious peril to our democracy.

In my own district, in the city of Boston and city of Brockton, the Postal Service has removed at least six high-capacity mail sorting machines in the mail facility in South Boston, and two more from the postal processing and distribution center in the city of Brockton, causing a 4- to 5-day delay right now in the city of Brockton.

□ 1400

Why would someone do that 10 days before a congressional primary in Massachusetts in the midst of a pandemic when people are being asked to vote by mail in order to keep themselves safe?

Mr. Speaker, I was elected on 9/11, the day of the terrorist attacks on our country. As horrific as that day was, I feel proud that our Nation came together, as Americans do in difficult times. We mourned our fallen heroes. We tried to comfort their families. And we turned to face our adversary together, Democrat and Republican.

Looking back, I believe our democracy was less in danger then than it is today. I say that for two reasons. First, because we were united then, and we are divided today. And we know who divides us. Secondly, back then, the threat was external. But today, at this moment, the greatest threat to our democracy is the current administration.

I call on my colleagues: Stand together. Stand together and defend democracy. Defend your own constituents' right to vote. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 8015.

Defend democracy. You will miss it when it is gone.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and my friend for yielding.

I would counter by saying the greatest threat to democracy in the country is the current majority in the House of Representatives. What we are doing even right here today, what we are doing right now, we haven't even had a hearing on this.

We are going to have a hearing on Monday for something we are voting on today. Absolute political malpractice is what we are watching right here. Why do we even debate this? Why don't we have a vote and then debate it? That is the same issue as what we are doing right now.

My Democratic friends over here are blaming the President as though he is involved in voter suppression. We want to talk about voter suppression. We want to talk about influencing the vote.

Our own Speaker PELOSI just a little while ago had a press conference in which she was touting, 100 days ago, the HEROES Act passed. What she did not say was what was in the HEROES Act: forbidding States from having voter ID.

We are going to have universal mail-in ballots, no voter ID. We are going to

have ballot harvesting across the country. So, we have no purging of votes. We are just going to send out millions of ballots, among which deceased people are there, folks who have moved, or ballots just being sent out all over the place. There will be no voter IDs required. Yet, all these ballots, somebody is going to vote for them and send them back in. Talk about political malpractice.

The chairwoman herself ought to be the first to stand up and testify of the disaster of her own election that took over 6 weeks or thereabouts to get the results because these mail-in ballots kept coming and coming and coming, thousands of which were thrown out. It opened doors for lawsuits in your own election.

It is just absolute insanity what we are doing here, to me. It is a representation of why people are so disgusted with Washington.

We talk about the delays in the mail service. In April this year, we had a briefing—not a hearing, a briefing—to inform us of the delays that were going to be brought about in the Postal Service due to COVID. Well, that is happening. We have thousands of postal workers who are not working because of COVID.

We also have great delays—would you not agree?—in cities like Portland, like Chicago. Of course, there are incredible delays. People are scared to death to even deliver the mail in cities like this. Here we come to a place like this to bail out the Postal Service with \$25 billion that the Postmaster General himself says they do not need, with \$14 or \$15 billion cash on hand and another \$10 billion waiting, if needed, in the Treasury.

This is absolutely unneeded. Yet, this bill is going to give an additional \$25 billion without any reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the Rules Committee, the other side kept claiming that there was no data about the slowdown in the mail, absolutely none.

Well, this new report, this data, shows a 10 percent decline in service since July 1 after the new Postmaster General came into office and implemented a slowdown of the mail.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Delivering for America Act. The post office is a lifeline to rural communities. More than 1,000 people in the district that I serve have written to my office desperate to save the Postal Service: a disabled veteran who depends on the post office to deliver lifesaving medication; a small business owner who needs the post office to deliver her products in an efficient and cost-effective way, so she can feed her family; seniors who must self-

isolate because they are at high risk, who depend on the Postal Service for the supplies they need each and every day.

The Postal Service is more than a service; it is part of who we are. For Joseph in Peoria, he was a child waiting for that decoder ring to come through the mail. For Heather in Pekin, it is a care package full of old family photos after losing a loved one. For Joseph in Kewanee, it is a letter from his best friend serving in Afghanistan.

Birth certificates, college acceptance letters, the mortgage paid off, the Postal Service delivers the American Dream. We cannot let it fail.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), the chief deputy whip.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish my mother a happy birthday. Happy birthday, mom. I wish I were there to celebrate with you. But instead, I am in D.C., voting on a senseless bill that was designed strictly for political purposes and will put your beloved grandchildren further into debt.

Now, I have watched my colleagues on the other side of the aisle come up with some intellectually dishonest stuff in the past. I have seen it happen more times than I care to count, but this effort takes the cake. Just look at what Postmaster General DeJoy said when he testified before the Senate last week and clearly addressed the litany of baseless claims.

First of all, he stated that no reforms would be implemented between now and the election. Overtime will not be cut between now and November. And the very thing the USPS needs more than anything else, reform, is going to be delayed.

He said the removal of the drop boxes will cease, something that I remember well because it happened when I was mayor of my hometown of West Point, Georgia, and our town was furious about it then. I just wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle had found religion about this issue back then instead of sitting up here fighting over what color to paint the fire hydrants while Rome burned.

This bill calls for 25 billion additional dollars. The postmaster has already testified there is over \$13 billion cash on hand, another \$10 billion in loans they won't need.

I want someone to explain to me how you are going to spend \$25 billion between now and November. We know how this place works. On an unauthorized appropriation, we all know that before you spend money here, you have to have a plan, and I haven't seen one. Then, that plan has to be reviewed and then commented on and reviewed again. Then one more time, it probably has to be reviewed. Then, there is the whole procurement process, bid process on equipment, background checks on new employees, the lawsuits on the

procurement process because the special interest group said that they weren't notified in time so they could get preferential treatment on the government contract. And surely, there will be the customary environmental review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CISNEROS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, surely there will be the customary environmental review to understand the impact on the spotted blue tail south Georgia armadillo being run over by all the new mail trucks.

This bill is a sham. It is a shame. It is not needed right now. We are piling up money. We might as well put it on The National Mall, have a bonfire, invite Americans to bring their lawn chairs and a cooler of beer to watch the bonfire, so they can see firsthand how this place wastes money.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The other side of the aisle has a double standard. Congress provided hundreds of billions of dollars to all sorts of industries, businesses, large and small entities across the country to help them cope with the coronavirus crisis. We did not require them to come forward with detailed plans of how they are going to spend their money. But they want it for the Postal Service.

Now, the Postal Service made a public request, and they requested it and presented it to the Board of Governors, who are appointed by President Trump, and the Board approved it unanimously. That is far more than all these other entities that we have given billions of dollars to did. And we should support the Postal Service now.

On top of it, the CBO came out with an estimate that this money would be spent in the next fiscal year, and that they needed it. The CBO record can be found online.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I heard someone on the other side said something that disturbed me, so it has actually taken me off my remarks because it can't go unaddressed.

For the gentleman to say that Democrats, the majority party here in the House, are the greatest threat to American democracy that the world has ever known, that means we are more threatening than Putin and the Russians, more threatening than this terrible pandemic around us. It is the sort of thing that I would admonish my side never to say about the other side, and it is the sort of thing that I think takes us away from why we are here.

We are here to have debate and discussion and to reasonably disagree on

things. At the end of the day, we are calling for a vote as we normally do. Things are voted up; things are voted down. That has been the process that I have come to know over all these years.

We are here because Americans who are Democrats and Republicans and independents are not getting their mail on time. We are here because there has been a 10 percent slowdown in the last 66 days. We are here because sorting machines have been dismantled at an accelerated rate, not the normal rate, an accelerated rate all across America.

We are here because mailboxes, without density studies, are being snatched. They have been removed over the years, but it has accelerated. It has accelerated to such an extent that now people are wondering: Where is their medication? Where is their check?

It is veterans. It is our small businesses that are hampered by this. It is senior citizens. So, we are not here mysteriously on a Saturday to point fingers and to call names.

The other side has a right to disagree, but this is a problem. I don't know about your constituents, but all of mine are telling me that they can't get their mail on time. They expect more. If the first Postmaster General looked back at this day, I am sure Ben Franklin would be spinning in his grave.

We have an issue before us. We ought to go at it with vigorous debate. At the end of the day, I may lose and you may win, or I may win and you may lose, but the American public loses without us standing up for this issue.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, obviously the last speaker, the gentleman from Maryland, missed the part where one of his Members proclaimed that the President was the greatest threat to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform's National Security Subcommittee.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is a very interesting debate today. I think it would be a good debate to be reviewed by every political science class in the country as we analyze how Congress has spent us to a \$25 trillion debt.

We have a situation today in which the U.S. Postal Service is sitting on \$15 billion. They have the right to borrow \$10 billion from a stimulus package bill we passed earlier. They are making more money this year than last year because deliveries of packages are up. But despite all these numbers, the majority party has decided to spend an additional \$25 billion.

Now, I like the post office. I really do. But when you have an agency that can spend \$25 billion that is unspent right now, \$24 billion, and you introduce a bill to say they need another \$25 billion, and if you don't vote for that \$25 billion bill, it means you don't want children to get little toys they are



going receive in the mail, or it means that we don't like the post office, that is outlandish.

□ 1415

There are other things we can look at as well.

They talk about getting rid of post offices. In the first 3 years in which President Trump has complete control of the administration, they will be getting rid of less post office boxes than Obama from 2013 to 2016—I don't have the numbers before 2013; it might be 4 years in a row—in the greatest year in which President Trump got rid of mailboxes.

Another thing to point out is, even if every single person in this country votes absentee, which they won't, it would only increase mail that month by 1½ percent. So we have no crisis here. It is something they will easily be able to handle.

The idea that we are even talking about spending another \$25 billion today is indicative of why this country is going to wind up spending itself into oblivion.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the distinguished chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chair for yielding and for her tremendous leadership.

The post office is as American as motherhood, baseball, and apple pie. It is one of the only entities actually mentioned in the United States Constitution. It has been around for hundreds of years. The first Postmaster General was Dr. Ben Franklin. It is part of the heart and soul of this country, and the attacks on the post office by the Trump administration are shameful.

The American people deserve a Postal Service that delivers Social Security checks to senior citizens, delivers medicine to disabled veterans, delivers unemployment insurance checks to displaced Americans, and, yes, delivers ballots to those who choose to vote by mail in the midst of a deadly pandemic, because no American should ever have to choose between their health, safety, and well-being on the one hand and the constitutional right to vote on the other.

This is why we need a fully functional Postal Service. Don't mess with USPS.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 43½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD), another Oversight and Reform Committee ranking member.

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. COMER for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you will never hear me complain about having to come to Washington to vote. After all, it is an

honor to serve the people of this great Nation and our constitutional obligation to be here present to vote on the issues facing America.

So the question today is: Are there issues that need to be addressed in the United States Postal Service?

There certainly are. We all know that there are. After all, the USPS has been on the Government Accountability's High Risk List since the beginning of the Obama-Biden administration.

The systemic issues are not new. They did not creep up all of a sudden in the last few weeks since the new Postmaster has been in office. They have been here for awhile. So, if we are really trying to address the issues, there is room for discussion.

The late Chairman Elijah Cummings and the now White House Chief of Staff MARK MEADOWS have a bill that has some serious effort put into it.

Tomorrow we will be having a hearing with the Postmaster to discuss the bill we are arguing today and voting on.

The White House has offered a \$10 billion package, which the Speaker has rejected.

So there are options if we want to address the real issues, but today is not about a serious effort. Today's effort is yet another smokescreen, another conspiracy theory forced upon the American people to distract us from the real problems facing the American people; to distract from the Speaker's unwillingness to work with the White House to protect schools, hospitals, and small businesses; to extend PPP to mom-and-pop businesses that are on the brink and the families connected to them; to address the heartbreaking violence and destruction in our cities and streets.

The American people are tired of this, tired of lurching from one manufactured crisis to another, tired of leadership by fear-mongering, tired of this House preferring to campaign on issues rather than to fix them.

The bill offered today will not save the USPS or provide for long-term sustainability. Today's effort is another attempt to mask the fact that this House under this leadership is doing very little for the American people.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), another member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise to support the Delivering for America Act, to protect a pillar of our democracy and fortify a lifeline so many Americans count on.

This bill would provide urgently needed Postal Service funding and bar its leaders from compromising its services during this COVID-19 crisis.

We all know the motto: "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the

swift completion of their appointed rounds." But, of course, no one foresaw that any American President would willingly crowbar our mail system to sway an election. So the Delivering for America Act will safeguard our democracy from any Presidential subversion.

This legislation will also allow our mail carriers to do their job by ensuring overtime and proper equipment are available.

It will make sure intentional service delays are avoided so our seniors get their Social Security checks and prescriptions.

It defends our veterans, who count on this noble occupation for work and rely on the postal system to deliver their medicine.

My State, Florida, just completed a primary where nearly 60 percent of the counted ballots arrived by mail. Savvy seniors and residents reeling from a summer of viral outbreaks wanted the safety that only mail-in balloting provided.

This year, our country saw half a million primary ballots rejected, and a main reason they get tossed is due to postal delays.

These brave frontline workers are delivering goods amid a pandemic, and it has taken its toll on their workforce. So in a State like Florida, known for its razor-thin Presidential elections, we can't afford to have 59 sorting machines left on the sidelines.

Blocking postal employees from overtime is not an option, especially when it may hold up hundreds of ballots that decide the Presidency.

The Delivering for America Act helps defend our democracy from the hypocrisy of a President who casts mail-in ballots himself one day, then tries to meddle in our neighbor's mailbox the next.

Don't mess with the USPS. Pass this good bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, that ship has sailed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), another great member of the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, once again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are pulling the wool over the American people's eyes.

We are here today not to debate or conduct public policy for the benefit of the Nation; we are here so they can perform in political theater. If you have any doubt about that, this coming Monday, the Oversight and Reform Committee is having a hearing with the Postmaster General about this same issue.

So we are voting first, then we are having hearings? I think that is you-know-what backwards.

My colleagues on the left are faking outrage over a made-up crisis to score points during an election. The United

States Postal Service is under no greater stress than it was before the coronavirus pandemic and well before this election cycle.

The facts have been laid out by experts, by independent journalists, by regular citizens who do the job the mainstream media refuses to do. Rather than find out and report what is really going on, we have mainstream media parroting Speaker PELOSI's conspiracy theory.

Here are the facts:

The post office is solvent through most of 2021 and will be able to operate for the 2020 election. They have \$15 billion cash on hand. They have a \$10 billion line of credit they have not used.

If every single American voted by mail this cycle, it would be as low as one-quarter of the mail the post office handles daily.

We have heard a lot about the sorting machines. First-class mail has really tapered off and the volume of packages has increased, so that is an efficiency standard that is doing better.

During the 5-year span of the Obama administration, 14,000 blue collection boxes were removed from the streets.

Twice during election years, the Obama administration proposed funding cuts to the Postal Service. Where was the outrage then? There was none.

Removing and relocating collection boxes where they are more useful is common sense, not a conspiracy.

Postmaster DeJoy testified and has come out publicly saying they are not going to do any more cost-cutting measures before the election, so everything is frozen.

What the other side really wants is universal mail voting, not absentee voting, which we all support. They want universal mail voting. We just mail out ballots to anybody, and who knows who they will be. All that is going to do is sow the seeds, if the election doesn't go their way, to create more chaos and more division in this country.

You won't hear any of these facts from the mainstream media.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides funding that is already there. Creating and peddling this conspiracy theory is irresponsible and reckless. At a time when Russia and China are meddling in our elections, we don't need help from Congress peddling fake news.

This is one bill that needs to be labeled, "Return to sender."

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, see this mask? What does it say? "United States Postal Service." Not "business"; "service."

For every American, no matter how remote they live, they can get mail. They can get their prescriptions. They can have a small business in Powers, Oregon, pretty remote from everything, and use the Postal Service.

Now, you can't have it both ways, guys. You say the Postal Service doesn't have a problem. Well, wait a minute. DeJoy is making these cuts because he says it has a revenue problem. He has prohibited overtime because they have a revenue problem. They can't move their delivery vehicle more than four times on a route. Eight-mile-long route, you are going to walk 2 miles each way.

Guess what? Mail is getting delayed all across the country.

The fact is, before the pandemic, they were breaking even or making money if we did away with the stupid prefunding of 75 years of healthcare that was put in in the dark of the night by the Bush administration in a lame-duck Congress, and 309 people in this House, including 87 Republicans, voted for that in February, but it hasn't happened.

So you can't have it both ways.

But there is no doubt that the mail is being delayed. I am hearing it from everywhere.

Ms. Lorey, she cares for a blind elderly veteran: I ordered the VA refills for him. They were so late arriving, we had to ration out his most important medication from two pills a day to one pill a day until the prescription arrived.

Ms. Trudy, Eugene, Oregon: My husband is a Vietnam war veteran. His meds are delivered by mail. I love my husband. I want him to get the meds he needs to survive.

Last year, the Postal Service delivered 125 million VA prescriptions on time, but somehow, with the efficiency measures and the cuts—which I guess they don't need to make, but he is making because of the financial crisis—they can't deliver VA meds on time. They can't deliver prescription drugs for seniors and many other Americans who are required by their insurance plan to get their meds through the mail with just-in-time delivery, which isn't happening.

You cannot deny those things.

Why are they happening? How are you going to fix it?

You are up here blathering about all sorts of crap. Talk about how we are going to restore this Postal Service in the United States of America to efficiency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), another great member of the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to apologize to the American taxpayers for this total sham of a process that the Democrats and this leadership are trying to spread. They con-

tinue to have Trump derangement syndrome.

Here are the questions I would ask my Democrat colleagues:

If the Democrats are so concerned, then why have we not had a hearing about the Postal Service issues since June 15 of 2019?

If the Democrats are so concerned, why have we not had round-the-clock meetings to discuss the bill that we intend to fund at \$25 billion which is being proposed?

We have been out of session for 17 percent of the time since March 15. Why haven't we been called back in to discuss this?

If you do the math, on \$25 billion, and we have got 70 days left, that is roughly \$325 million per day.

You tell the American taxpayer where you are spending that money. You tell the American taxpayer how we are going to come up with it. You tell the American taxpayer this is like dropping money from a helicopter.

If the Democrats are so concerned about the post office, why are we having to vote today when the Postmaster General is appearing at the hearing on Monday? This is just like determining the score of a football game and then playing the game on Monday. It makes no sense.

□ 1430

The Democrats have no interest in hearing the testimony of Mr. DeJoy. The only thing they want to do is berate and not give the Postmaster General the opportunity to answer, just like they did Attorney General Barr, which was a disgrace to this country. The taxpayers deserve better.

The Democrats will have no discussion on the spying of the President since 2016.

The Democrats have no explanation of a failed Mueller Report.

The Democrats have no explanation for the impeachment of the President. The post office will fail as well.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct for the RECORD that the Committee on Oversight and Reform had a briefing on postal on April 9, 2020—right after the COVID crisis struck us—with the Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY), who is another great member of the committee.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I stand with my colleagues today shocked and dismayed by the actions of this administration.

For the past few years, the Oversight and Reform Committee has worked in a bipartisan fashion to modernize the Postal Service with former Representative MARK MEADOWS leading the charge.

Now, like too many things over the past 3½ years, mail has become a partisan issue. The Postal Service is a pillar of our democracy. It is essential for providing critical services such as: life-saving prescriptions, Social Security



benefits, paychecks, tax returns, letters home from military families, and absentee ballots to millions of Americans.

The VA delivers prescriptions to 80 percent of our veterans via the mail. This intentional and ridiculous slowdown means vets are skipping doses while checking empty mailboxes.

While I was back home, one of my businesses told me they hadn't received mail for 10 days. Another person told me they received mail every other day.

This cannot go on, and we cannot trust the word of a Postmaster General who is unqualified and whose sweeping operational changes degrade the Postal Service, delay the mail, and threaten our upcoming election. We must pass the Delivering for America Act so we can return the United States post office to normal and ensure we have a safe election where everyone is counted.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I have to comment on what the chairwoman said about the briefings. A briefing is not a committee hearing. With a briefing, there are no notice requirements. Oftentimes in the beginning we weren't allowed to have witnesses, and there are no transcripts. So there is a big difference between a briefing and a committee hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), who is another member of the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the need for meaningful, long-term reform for the United States Postal Service.

The USPS provides an essential service to every community in the Nation, yet this agency has lost \$78 billion in the last 13 years. In 2009 the Government Accountability Office published a report placing USPS on the high-risk list, doubting the self-sustaining financial viability of this agency. The financial state of the USPS has progressively worsened due to declining mail volume, liabilities, and debt. Proposals to give the USPS \$25 billion in cash without serious reforms will not address the fundamental issues that the agency faces.

The proposals before us today only delay real reform and throw taxpayer dollars at a problem with no clear vision forward. Rather than politicizing the mail, we should be working to give the USPS longevity through comprehensive reforms. Rather than trying to fix a problem by simply spending more taxpayer money, we should be enacting reforms to equip our Nation's outstanding postal workers with the tools they need and deserve to continue delivering the mail. This is the only way we will ensure that Americans continue to receive this vital service without interruption.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), who is another outstanding member of the committee.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, today we vote on a bill that would block an attack on the U.S. Postal Service. By doing so we are blocking an attack on an American institution, on our American way of life, and on democracy. By responding to the unanimous requests of the Trump-appointed Board of Governors of the Postal Service for a funding of \$25 billion and restoring operations to January 1 levels, we will literally be saving lives.

The necessity of this vote and the necessity of this legislation shows the peril to our democracy that this administration has placed us all in, our elders, our veterans, our businesses, and our vote.

We will go further than just voting, and we will have that hearing on Monday on the Oversight and Reform Committee led by Chairwoman MALONEY to speak with the Postmaster General to examine some of his, shall we say, creative decisions.

We want to examine the operational and organizational changes at the Postal Service that have resulted in delivery delays across the country, including the delays of goods and services for small businesses and families, as well as critical medicines.

In my district of the Virgin Islands we are hostage to the U.S. Postal Service. We cannot drive to big-box stores, never mind medicines for our elders or our veterans.

We will review the impact of these changes on the rights of eligible Americans to cast their vote through the mail in the November elections, but we will also have a few closing questions for Mr. DeJoy.

Is Mr. DeJoy thinking about that senior who won't receive their medicine on time due to his policies?

Has he thought about the veteran who served our Nation and can't get their prescriptions to heal?

Has he considered rural Americans who have to drive 20 miles to the nearest post office?

Has he thought about any of these people?

Or is he, like the President, only concerned about his own self-interest?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COMER. That ship has sailed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG) who is another valuable member.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, if there is a bill that more accurately reflects the failure of Democratic leadership for my first 2 years in Congress, I don't know what it is.

I know that because I came to Congress knowing of the problems with the Postal Service. I am the only Republican on the Oversight and Reform Committee who cosponsored the Democrats' bill to remove the prefunding of their pensions. I have been working on this, been curious about it, and have cared about it for a very long time.

I supported former Chairman Cummings' and MARK MEADOWS' bipartisan solution for the Postal Service because I represent a rural State, and privatization is bad for my constituents.

But do you know how important this has been to the Oversight and Reform Committee?

Our last hearing on the Postal Service was in April of 2019. But somehow, we have decided that because the previous Postmaster General who was appointed in 2015 and didn't resign until June and did something unique in this town—made sure just about everybody hated her.

But now we are saying this all blew up last week. But it didn't. I know it didn't because you can Google postal problems in any jurisdiction from one end of this country to the other and you know they have existed before.

But instead we will come to the floor, debate a bill offered and sponsored by the chair of the committee of jurisdiction, we will vote on it today, and then we will have a hearing on Monday about the bill. So before we even talk about the fact that we are giving \$25 billion to an organization that already has \$25 billion cash on hand, and regardless of how you feel about this, \$25 billion does not deliver votes, and we have no ability to do this.

We are doing this in a way that is completely and utterly political theater because anybody who has been paying attention knows that the post office problems are chronic, they are not acute. They have lost \$70 billion since 2007, and they lost \$9 billion in 2019.

So my question is: Why haven't we been having hearings on this in the Committee on Oversight and Reform for the 2 years I have been here?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the gentleman's statement that the money is not needed. The Postal Service sought the \$25 billion from Congress to provide this critical relief, and that request was supported unanimously by a vote by the Board of Governors who were all appointed by President Trump.

Yesterday we received the report from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, and that report estimates that the vast majority of this funding would, in fact, be needed within fiscal year 2021 to provide services to the American people.

This should be a nonpartisan issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS). My good friend is the distinguished chairwoman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ran to the floor when I heard that our Members on the Republican side of the aisle are trying to use as an excuse we have not had a hearing. Oh, yes. You have had a hearing. You have had a hearing from the American people who are shocked that the President and DeJoy are out there dismantling and destroying our Postal Service.

For 3 years I warned the American people and my colleagues that this President was a threat to our democracy. Yet, here we are today voting on a measure to save the Postal Service because it is being sabotaged by a desperate President in order to cheat in the 2020 elections.

Since our country's founding, the people have relied on the Postal Service for everything from delivery of letters to our seniors wanting their medicines delivered on time. Veterans want their disability checks on time. Social Security recipients want and need their money.

So I want to say to the Members on the opposite side of the aisle: You had better get some courage. If you are afraid of the President, you had better step up to the plate on this. We will not allow the United States Postal Service to be destroyed by you.

And another message to the President: Stop removing our blue mailboxes from our neighborhoods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, Ms. WATERS forgets that President Obama removed 12,000 of those blue boxes that she just asked that they quit removing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of frontline, essential rural mail carriers and postal workers across my district and America who have continued to go to work and do their jobs during the pandemic. This is in sharp contrast to many of my colleagues across the aisle who draw a paycheck but don't show up to vote or do their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I also stand in opposition to H.R. 8015 because it is a sham bill that has no future. It doesn't belong on this floor. It belongs in the archives at the election hoax of the month club.

How do the Democrats keep a straight face while proposing a \$25 billion bailout disguised as election integrity when it would equal about \$200 per ballot if every voter voted by mail?

That is preposterous.

With its current over \$14 billion cash on hand and access to \$10 billion from the CARES Act, do we even have to keep explaining that the United States Postal Service is in a more than adequate financial position to remain fully functional well beyond the election?

No. The American people are smarter than Democrats give us credit. I believe most see past the smoke and mirrors. The post office is important. It is not going anywhere, and this bill has nothing to do with a fair election.

The ranking member and I participated in a youth organization, and at the beginning of each meeting the leader would ask: Why are we here?

Many of us are asking that question today: Why are we here?

The answer is because this House is adrift. This House is a ship without a rudder. It lacks vision, it lacks direction, and, most importantly, it lacks leadership. It simply gets tossed to and fro by the political wind of the day.

Mr. Speaker, it didn't just start. It has been that way this whole Congress. At a time when America has legitimate needs with a pandemic and an economy trying to get back on track, it is really no surprise that this is the best the left can do. House Democrats offer no hope. We need change.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Why are we here?

We are here because the President of the United States went on national television on Thursday night and said he was going to defund the post office. That is why we are here.

Further, he said he didn't support mail-in voting when we know that millions of Americans will want to vote, for health reasons, by mail. That is why we are here.

We are here because we wrote numerous letters to the Postmaster General, which he ignored. That is why we are here.

I applaud the Democratic leadership for calling us in for this emergency meeting to make sure that the post office is funded. It was funded before we even had a Constitution. It is one of the pillars of our democracy. It is enshrined in our Constitution, and it provides vital services to Americans who need medication, the ability to conduct business, and to stay in touch. It binds us together as a nation. Most of us do not like the fact that the President of our country would even mention defunding the post office. That is why we are here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), a very distinguished member of the committee who brings valuable experience to us as a former member of the Postal Service.

□ 1445

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8015. This is essential legislation to offset the dangerous actions taken by the Postmaster General over the last 2 months.

We are here today, in addition to that, to fund the Postal Service. For more than two centuries, the United States Postal Service has delivered mail to every house in America across this country—every single home. It is the only Federal organization that touches every American every single day, 6 days a week, confirming that it is an essential government service.

Today, the current administration and the new Postmaster General seem to struggle to understand that the Postal Service is an essential government service authorized by the Con-

stitution. It is not a business to fund the bottom line.

In just the first 2 months of his tenure, without having any postal experience, this Postmaster General has threatened and has taken actions to undermine decades of precedence within the Postal Service.

Today, Congress must act. As my chairwoman said, that is why we are here. We must act. The Delivering for America Act does just that. Along with providing the Postal Service with a desperately needed \$25 billion to offset revenue that has been forgone due to COVID-19, it also—and this is something that is very important—this legislation prohibits the Postmaster General from making any operational changes that will undermine the Postal Service's ability to fulfill its mission.

Its mission is to deliver the mail. Rain, sleet, snow, gloom of night, the Postal Service will deliver the mail.

Mr. Speaker, we have a Postmaster General who has come inside and tried to rip it apart from the inside. We will say: Cease and desist.

In addition to us having the goal of the Postal Service to deliver the mail, our democracy is hinging upon them doing that basic job.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to say that the money was asked for by the Board of Governors—which, by the way, is appointed by the President, and which, by the way, are all Republicans who asked for that money to be appropriated. The Postmaster General approved and said he needed that money as well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for bringing this critical legislation to the floor. I thank the chairwoman for including the language that will prohibit the enactment of any rule or standard or policy with the intent to delay the mail from our government.

We have a real responsibility here today. There is not a Member on either side of the aisle who has not received a letter from our constituents. Let's do our job.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I have the most respect for my friend, the chairwoman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, but I believe she misspoke.

She said the President wanted to defund the Postal Service. That is not what the President wants to do. The only time I have heard the word "defund" lately was by the liberal progressive wing of the majority party that wants to defund the police.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, we are here today because my Democratic colleagues have created a conspiratorial crisis out of thin air in another attempt to dupe Americans with an election hoax. Only this time, instead of Russia, it is the United States Postal Service.

Democrats are intentionally misleading people to believe that the operational changes at the Postal Service,

including the removal of mailboxes and antiquated processing equipment, just started. That is a lie. Nonetheless, Postal Service officials have confirmed that these operational changes, some of which were agreed to by Democrat Members, have already been halted until after the election.

In regard to the delay and delivery of mail over the last few weeks, the national number cited may well reflect delays in cities that have been under siege by anarchists. I will direct my colleagues and the American people's attention to these photos of the burned-out post office in Minneapolis. There is no way to know how many letters to loved ones were lost, or birthday cards or gifts or family heirlooms or that decoder ring that that kid had been waiting for were destroyed and will never be delivered.

I am certain because of the lawlessness that the Democrats are dangerously silent about, the delivery of mail in Portland, Seattle, Chicago, New York, and Minneapolis, and other cities have been delayed.

You want to talk defunding? Instead of Democrat mayors defunding the police, I would submit that we need to make sure that law enforcement in every American city is well funded so that they can protect not just the post office facilities that handle our mail, but also the people who deliver our mail so that those cards, letters, gifts, and election ballots can be delivered.

Instead of pushing a conspiracy farce, we should be here making sure that law enforcement has the resources needed to protect the property and lives of American families in these cities that are under siege. That will help make sure the mail is delivered on time, and people will feel safe in getting it from the mailbox or the post office.

In that regard, the silence of the Democrats in this Chamber is deadly.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her good work on this very issue, and I rise to condemn Postmaster General DeJoy's assault on the U.S. Postal Service.

The organizational and operational changes he has been implementing are a betrayal at this moment of the American people. They are turning their backs on seniors and veterans in Pittsfield, North Adams, Springfield, and Southbridge who rely upon the Postal Service for their medications and other essential services.

The Postmaster General is dismantling a lifeline for people in every community across the Commonwealth, but his actions particularly harm those who live in some of the most rural areas in western Massachusetts. These mail delays and disruptions will be harmful at any time, but they are downright deadly during this pan-

demic. Families and small businesses are desperately trying to stay safe and stay afloat as the crisis rages on, and the Postal Service plays a critical role in their survival.

Who else suffers due to the Postmaster General's actions? The hard-working men and women who process and deliver our mail, essential workers. He is compromising jobs for generations that have been a pathway to the middle class, particularly in marginalized communities.

Our Nation's economy and the people's health rely upon the Postal Service. So, too, does American democracy.

Millions will use this indispensable tool to cast their ballots this year. They should not be discouraged. They should be encouraged by the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General is directly attacking the fundamental rights and well-being of all Americans.

I call upon him to step down now. His removal is urgently needed, as are all the provisions in the Delivering for America Act.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and call on my colleagues to do the same. A reminder: His support right now is urgently needed to reverse what he has been doing and saying.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats talked about a slight delay in mail delivery the last several weeks. Well, of course. Would you want to deliver mail in Portland today, cities that have been under siege for 90-some days? I bet there are delays in Portland, Seattle, Minneapolis, Chicago, and New York. I bet that is where the delays are.

In fact, how do you deliver mail to a CHOP zone, to a CHAZ zone? How do you do that? They won't let them in. I mean, come on. We know the facts here. The facts are the post office has more money today than they had this time last year.

They got a \$14 billion cash reserve. They got a \$10 billion line of credit we gave them in the CARES Act. And oh, the Postmaster General is moving some sorting machines and removing some mail collection boxes, the same thing every Postmaster General has always done. In fact, between 2011 and 2016, the Obama-Biden administration removed 12,000 mail collection boxes. Oh, my goodness. And it is happening again.

We are moving some boxes, and somehow, that is a reason to give \$25 billion to the Postal Service and create all this "conspiracy theory"—not my words; The Wall Street Journal called it—that the Democrats are doing.

What is really going on here? If you really wanted to focus on some concerns the post office has, we have a bipartisan bill that the late Chairman Cummings and MARK MEADOWS worked

on. MARK MEADOWS, I don't even think the Democrats—I know the chairwoman hasn't even talked to him about this, the expert on this issue on our side. Oh, by the way, he happens to have a pretty important job in this town, a pretty important job, and you guys didn't even talk to him.

They had a bipartisan bill. If you really want to work on bipartisan concerns and solutions to some problems in the post office, that is fine, but that is not what this is about. This is all about politics.

You don't want to address real issues, too busy defunding the police, too busy not denouncing the mob that is running so many of our cities. This is all about politics.

First, it was the Russian collusion. In this committee, it was the Michael Cohen hearing. I remember that, when he came, the first big hearing of this Congress. The first-announced witness of this committee came and lied to us seven times. Then, it was the Mueller report. Then, it was the Ukraine fake impeachment. And now, it is the White House is putting mailboxes in cages and whatever you are saying now.

Mr. Speaker, the American people see this for what it is. They see this for what it is. If you want real solutions, we could have had them. You could have worked with Chief of Staff Meadows. You didn't want to do that. You wanted politics.

This was said earlier: If anyone should know, it should be the chairwoman of this committee who had to wait 6 weeks after election day to get the results of her election.

Imagine what the Democrats want to do is throw live ballots out there to everyone. That was just one congressional primary election. Imagine what they want to do—150 million live ballots. That is what the Democrats want. Imagine what that is going to be like. That is where these guys want to go.

Mr. Speaker, we should be working on real solutions instead of this charade that the Democrats are putting us through.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ), the vice chair and an outstanding member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, someone is lying. On one side, you have the White House and the Postmaster General. On the other side, you have the hard-working men and women of the U.S. Postal Service.

The President and the Postmaster General say there is nothing to see here. Nothing to see. They tell us that their operational changes are meant to help the Postal Service.

The Postal Service workers, whose job it is to deliver the mail day in and day out, are saying something different. They are telling us that they are falling behind on processing packages because of these operational changes. As a result, they are seeing

bugs and rodents swimming around containers of rotten food and meat and animals.

Now, my Republican colleagues say that this is a conspiracy theory. But I say to them: You can't smell a conspiracy theory. There are dying animals, rotten food, rotten meat, rats, flies.

You can't see that in a conspiracy theory. I want them to open their eyes because their constituents, my constituents, are suffering because of this deliberate attempt to sabotage the U.S. Postal Service. Their constituents—seniors and veterans who depend on fast delivery of their medicines, the small businesses that depend on the U.S. Postal Service to stay afloat, and every American who wants to partake in our democracy safely during this pandemic.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you which side I believe: the employees of the U.S. Postal Service. It is with them in mind that I strongly support the passage of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. "I urge everyone to be calm. . . . The Postal Service is not incapacitated. It is still fully capable of delivering the mail."

Those aren't my words I speak. Those aren't even words of a Republican. They are the words of Ruth Goldway, a Democrat, a former Postal Commissioner and Clinton appointee who served for 18 years under three Presidents.

Based on the facts, Goldway says the Postal Service is perfectly capable of handling election mail.

□ 1500

Unfortunately, we have got bad news for her. This majority didn't get the message. Instead of listening to the experts or following the facts, Democrats are wasting precious time spreading Speaker PELOSI's mailbox myths.

You had an opportunity to have bipartisanism. I have heard words on this floor today, Mr. Speaker, "essential," "critical" that we are here. I applaud the few Democrats on the other side who were willing to show.

I know if you cannot make it today, you have to sign paperwork that your health will not allow you to be here. And the Speaker is bringing us back on a Saturday because it is so critical to be here right now, in this moment, in this time, but one-third on the other side must think otherwise.

Now, let's go through some of the myths versus facts.

Myth no. 1: The Postal Service is being sabotaged.

The Postal Service is properly funded for the election and beyond. We said it many times here. It is funded completely through August 2021. That is according to the Postal Service.

The Postal Service has long-term challenges, but they predate anything

about this administration. It isn't being sabotaged.

Myth no. 2: Removing mailboxes from public places is uncommon and cause for alarm.

This is shocking. We have got country-western stars putting this up on Instagram. We need to rush back here on Saturday. But little did we know that, during the Obama-Biden years, nearly 12,000 mailboxes were removed from communities. Never once did we rush in on a Saturday to have a bill that you didn't have marked up and one-third of the Democrats would not show.

The Postal Service is actually constantly moving mailboxes from low- to high-volume growth areas, kind of a smart thing to do. In some cases, they replace them with more modern versions. I saw a picture where they actually had a lock in the front.

If you have townhall meetings, you will find out a lot of mail gets stolen, so they were protecting the packages but still allowing you to put the letter in. This isn't voter suppression. It is routine maintenance.

Myth no. 3: The Postal Service doesn't have the capacity to handle more absentee ballots.

The Postal Service delivers 471 million pieces of mail on an average day. Little known fact: People mail less every single year. With all of the advancements we put in the Postal Service, with the technology of our own life, do you know what year equalled 471 million? About exactly what we did in 1985.

But we do it different than 1985. We have more technology. And because of that, the Postmaster General actually refuted the capacity in no uncertain terms to the Senate yesterday.

The Postal Service released this: If all Americans vote by mail, 330 million ballots over the course of this election, it would only be 75 percent of what they deliver in a single day.

Now, I don't want to claim, Mr. Speaker, that all the Democrats think this is a myth. Maybe that is why one-third didn't show today. I am not sure. They said their health was bad. I am not sure if that is the case either.

Even The New York Times isn't buying the House Democrats' obvious untruths. As it was reported earlier this month: Experts agree that the Postal Service has the raw capacity to absorb the additional ballots, even if 150 million people decided to vote by mail.

Myth no. 4: The Democrats' legislation will make the Postal Service fiscally sustainable.

You are not fixing any of the fundamentals. You are not even taking the bill that you spent years on, with a Republican and a Democrat, with Elijah Cummings and MARK MEADOWS, two who would say they come from different walks of life, from a philosophy, but found common ground when it came to the post office, to really fix the core of what the problems are. But that is not why we are here today.

So, as the Democrats perpetuate this sad political stunt, unfortunately, there is serious business that goes unmet. But it shows real priority.

This week, we learned that 71 percent of small businesses have used their entire paycheck protection loan—they spent it all—and 46 percent anticipate that they will need more financial support over the next 12 months. But that wasn't critical enough to be here, because these are real people with real families. They don't expect miracles from us, but they do expect us to at least care. Unfortunately, not one piece of legislation in this so-called emergency session is about the families or their future.

Nor are we working to protect vaccine research and support Operation Warp Speed. No, House Democrats are doing what they have done for the last 2 years: They are putting politics before people.

Last month, Speaker PELOSI said to us: We can't go home until a coronavirus relief package is complete.

I guess we know that is not true. I wonder if she wants to keep her word this time as well, but I guess we will go home this Saturday. But good news for one-third of the Democrats: They don't have to go anywhere. They are already home. When she did not get her liberal wish list, she sent Members home. And I guess good news for some Americans: Those who stayed home and voted, they still got paid.

But those small businesses that are running out, that we are here in this body right now that we could do something about, or those who are on unemployment we could do something about—you have the majority; we don't. We are not allowed to bring it to the floor; you can. But you picked a crisis of something that is already funded.

They can't spend the money you want to give them. Why? Because they have got \$14 billion sitting in the bank and another \$10 billion they could pull from. But the small businesses don't. The families that can't pay their rent, they don't. And what about the vaccine?

But you did do something this week. You extended the shadow voting scheme, granting yourselves permission to vote from home until October 2.

Mr. Speaker, I will take a bet. I will make a bet on this floor right now, maybe even a prediction. I bet that gets extended again and probably goes a few days past the election in November.

Who would like to take that bet with me? How much do you want to get that extended all the way through?

What does that mean to the American people? Well, it means the majority party, the Democrats, have cast over 2,520 votes—and counting—from home. That is just unconstitutional. It doesn't matter that it is such a big crisis that we are called back. There is plenty of room on the floor on the other side.

It means a Democrat Member can dial in from his boat to vote. I am not making that up. That actually happened.

It means another Democrat can play hooky to go watch a space shuttle launch that isn't even in his own district.

It means Democrats collect a paycheck while the hardworking taxpayers have to pay for their vacation.

And today, it means that 68 Democrats—one-third of their Caucus—didn't even care enough to show up for this so-called emergency session.

It is critical. I have heard you say it. We cannot wait. We cannot wait one day. We need to be here and now. Now, I believe that is true, but not about the post office; about those millions of Americans who need us to act.

Every time we brought legislation to this floor dealing with the COVID situation, it seems to me the Speaker has been able to hold it up. I don't know. Maybe you want to try to hold it up past the election. It seems to me that would be playing politics. It seems to me that would be a dereliction of duty. It is not how you empower the people's voice in Washington; it is how you dilute it. This is leadership malpractice. This is shameful and this is embarrassing.

Mr. Speaker, our first Postmaster General, whom I have heard people speak of, Ben Franklin, could have been talking about this majority when he said: "Lost time is never found again."

As a majority, Democrats have been more focused on distractions than solutions for the American people, from the weakest, most partisan impeachment in American history to politicizing the pandemic and stopping relief for workers and families and, now, spreading a debunked conspiracy theory about the Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have failed the American public. They have failed the laid-off workers, the families, the students who are waiting for help; the small businesses, the doctors, the nurses, they are waiting for help; the researchers, the scientists who are developing a vaccine, they are waiting for help. But this majority said no.

They did, however, say yes to China. On this floor, just a few weeks ago, there was a bill to sanction anyone who would hack into our companies, into our institutions that are working on a vaccine faster than ever before—that would only slow it down—to save lives.

We had an opportunity to tell those countries: Work with us; don't steal from us. But your voice was heard loud and clear, all the Democrats who showed up that day. More than two-thirds of you voted "no" on the same day that it was reported that two Chinese were hacking into our vaccine. That is what you said.

I heard the majority leader say it was an MTR. Yes, it was.

Why was it an MTR? Because you don't give us an amendment.

Why was it an MTR? Because at the moment in time, it was essential, it was critical. It was reported on that day. You could act that day. The country needed us to act, but you said no. You stood up for the Chinese that day.

I do not know what the Chinese Communist Party has on the Democrats, Mr. Speaker, but it must be powerful. It must be so powerful.

I know there are bills in the Senate that have passed that would hold them accountable, but they can't come to the floor.

I have read the reports from the FBI that they are playing in this campaign, that they do have a person they want to win, to put a new person in office, but that is not critical to you.

It is critical that we come today to provide \$25 billion to an organization that Republicans and Democrats, that are the commissioners, say they do not need.

Why do they not need it? Because they looked at their own bank account and realized they have \$14 billion. They do not need it because, in the CARES Act, we gave them another \$10 billion to sit there. They do not need it because they said they could deliver every piece of mail, that it would be only 75 percent of what they do in a single day.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say all the Democrats feel that way, because one-third of them didn't show up for work today even though their own leader, the Speaker, said they needed to come, even though, when we passed on this floor something different than we haven't done in more than 230 years, to let somebody stay home, be on a boat, call in, and still get paid, you said you could not do that. You could only do it if your health was at need. I am not quite sure a hospital is on a boat in a lake, but to Democrats it must be.

They won't vote on a bill that I propose to sanction Chinese-affiliated hackers who attack our vaccine research. I am not sure that is partisan. I thought that was pure American.

They won't help working Americans. They won't help protect our vaccines. But, yes, they stood that day proudly supporting of the Chinese Communist Party.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. America's too great for a vision so small with our challenges before us.

We showed up. But you know why we showed up? We showed up for the small businesses. We showed up for those who are unemployed. We showed up for those school districts that want to find a way to open safely. We showed up for the doctors and the nurses.

I know, when I look up on the board, there will be a lot of Democrat votes. I don't know where those one-third are. Maybe they are on the boat. Maybe they are watching a spaceship. I am not sure. Maybe some are watching Oprah.

But one thing I do know, it is essential that we are here. But we should be

here for other reasons. We should be here for the reasons that the American public expect us to.

Mr. Speaker, we can do so much better. This country needs us. We should rise to the occasion, not fall for a vision so small as what I see today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1515

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I had not necessarily intended to speak after the minority leader, but I cannot help but respond to some of what the minority leader had to say.

First of all, he practices the President's favorite tactic. Distract. Speak about that which is not relevant. All the Democrats are voting. They may be voting at that machine. They may be voting at that machine over there. They may be voting at that machine, or they may be voting at that machine back there. They may be voting by proxy, which you didn't like. The minority leader sued, and the Court said it is up to the House to decide its own rules.

Now, when we passed the HEROES Act 100 days ago tomorrow, what did the minority leader say? Let's wait and see what happens. And what has happened since then? Thousands, tens of thousands of people have gotten sick, and thousands and thousands of people have died in those days. Let's wait and see.

And what did the majority leader, who can put a bill on the floor, what did he say? Let the States go bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk on the floor about bring this bill or that bill or the other bill. The Senate is controlled by your party, I tell my minority friends in the House. They haven't passed a single bill in 70 days, in 100 days, not a single bill. Why? Because they would have to compromise.

And you say we need to bring things to the floor. The minority leader, of course, had a man named Garland, from February to January when Obama was the President of the United States, and refused to consider it. Do you think there is a Founding Father who thought that advice and consent meant that they could simply ignore the President's nominations? I think not.

Some people talk about, Oh, there are some very, very important things to do. One of them, the gentlewoman from North Carolina—now, let me, 84,631 deaths since HEROES passed. Let's wait. We passed HEROES. No action in the Republican-controlled and led United States Senate. So don't whine to me about what you want on the floor. Don't whine to me about we could have done this, we could have done that, we could have done the other.

Mr. Speaker, I was just talking to the chief of staff of the White House, and I kidded him, I said, You know, when you were here in the House and we had Republican leadership and they offered solutions, you undermined them.

Who says so? John Boehner says so. You had the opportunity to make a deal.

Now we control the House, and very frankly, the majority leader cannot pass a bill because 20 of your Members in the United States Senate want to do nothing, and just tell the people who are suffering, who are on unemployment, who don't have childcare, you are on your own.

Now, I have heard all this talk about what we could have done. Do it. Do it. NANCY PELOSI and Secretary Mnuchin got four deals done. Most of you voted for them, and they passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion. But you made a decision, nope, no more.

Now we have it speculated that if we don't take action and have a much more robust—and a plan for dealing with COVID-19, which we don't have and haven't had, because this President called it a hoax. You don't have to respond to hoaxes. That is what he called it, a hoax. And, of course, if it is a hoax you don't respond, and he didn't.

And over 175,000—86,000 since we passed HEROES—175,000, and CDC says it may be up to 200,000 by the end of this year. Still, you have passed no bill in the United States.

We sent a bill over there. You don't like it, that is fine, pass your own. You control the Senate. Pass your own, and then we will go to conference. We will see which bill is better, or maybe we will put them together. But what has the Senate majority leader done? He has reduced the \$1 trillion offer down to \$500 billion, which the governor of my State says is only sufficient to help the States because they are hemorrhaging revenue, and they are on the front lines of responding to this crisis.

Now, others of you have said all of this is a feign, this is not real.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Madam Chair, has she spoken about the report from the Postmaster General?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Yes, I have.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat it, notwithstanding that.

It says, "The new documents being released by the committee today are part of the PMG briefing."

Now, I hope the Postmaster General, unlike the President of the United States, reads his briefings.

The President says he doesn't read his briefings, so he didn't know about the Russian payments to kill American soldiers and has not responded to this date on that assertion.

The new documents being released by the committee today are part of the PMG briefing, a presentation prepared directly for the Postmaster General last week on August 12, 10 days ago. They provide a detailed assessment of

service performance trends over the past year.

My friend from Ohio says, Oh, this is a fraud. There is no problem. Not a big deal. Maybe he didn't read the PMG advisory either.

According to these documents, there has been a significant drop in service standards across the board beginning in July, including first-class, marketing, periodicals, and priority mail.

The Postmaster General, of course, has never admitted to the sweeping delays and reductions in service caused by the actions. Instead, here is what he said: "We all feel bad about what the dip in the level of service has been."

So he knows there was a dip in service right after he made these changes.

Now, what do we know?

A, we know he is a big supporter of the President, gave a lot of money to the President.

Secondly, we know he was appointed by the President. Essentially, yes, elected by the Board of Governors—all thanks to the membership appointed by President Trump—who, by the way, unanimously asked for the \$25 billion we are talking about.

We know the President of the United States wants to suppress the vote.

Why?

He says so. He says so.

The first meeting I had with the President of the United States with Republican leaders and Democratic leaders just shortly after he was inaugurated President, the first thing he said was, I got a majority of the votes.

If it hadn't been fraud, if it hadn't been all those people that voted illegally, I would have gotten the majority of votes. He only got 62 million. 70 million voted for somebody else. And 65 million people, the majority of the people of the United States voting for President of the United States, voted for Hillary Clinton.

I challenge one of you to name me two members of the electoral college in 2016. You can't do it. The American people voted for Hillary Clinton.

The President of the United States wants to send, maybe with no name tags and just sort of brown suits on, troops to the polls of America. Never in my life—and I have run probably for office more times than anybody here but DON YOUNG—never have I seen armed troops there at the polls to intimidate people.

My State checks for fraud. And, by the way, all those fraudulent votes that Donald Trump said had been cast, not a conviction. He controls the Justice Department. He controls, presumably, the FBI.

Going back to what I said about this crisis that was occurring that you say doesn't exist in the post office.

On January 15, 2013, we voted for a crisis, 50 million Americans living in the northeast had been savaged by Superstorm Sandy. About 230 of you Republicans were here, you were in charge. Only 49 of you, not Mr. MEADOWS, not Ms. FOXX, 49 voted for that

bill, and 178 of you voted no. No crisis. 50 million Americans. Superstorm Sandy. People being flooded out of their businesses and homes. No crisis.

My suggestion is, wherever you are, you came here and that's great, you are here, you can vote in person. Isn't that wonderful. I think your vote would count just as much if you had voted—but your leadership has told you, no, don't worry about the 86,000 people who have died. The minority leader said, well, the crisis is gone. I don't know where he thinks it went. It is certainly visiting the neighborhoods in my State and the neighborhoods in your State.

So the report says the mail has substantially gone down since the Postmaster General—aiding and abetting, in my opinion, the President of the United States who wishes to suppress the vote—acted.

Now, I don't know how many of you read 18 U.S. Code 1703, but it says, "Whoever being a Postal Service officer or employee"—and says some other things about secrets, destroys, detains, opens, et cetera—"whoever delays mail, which was intended to be conveyed by mail, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

Now, I had a press conference with Senator WARNER, Senator VAN HOLLEN, and six other Members, including ELIZABETH HOLMES NORTON, one of the senior members of the Chair's committee. Five minutes before we held that press conference, the Postmaster General issued his statement that he was going to stop doing what he was doing. I guess it was because he thought, Well, what I am doing is great, everybody will support what I am doing. Or, did he think, I got my hand caught in the cookie jar and I better stop? Which do you think is the more rational determination as to why 5 minutes before he had that press conference he issued his release? That he thought it was fine? He could defend it? It was the right thing to do?

If he thought all of those, why in heaven's name did he change his mind?

I will tell you why. He knew what he did was wrong. He probably read that briefing that service had plummeted since he took that action, and that he was putting the mail, prescription drugs, Social Security checks, veterans' checks, at risk.

That seems to me to be the logical conclusion. And as the law says, if you act and you delay the mail, you commit a crime, subject to 5 years in jail, and a substantial fine.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for her leadership.

The Postmaster General appeared to back down from his attempt to set the Postal Service up for failure just moments before a number of us, as I have said, from the House and Senate were about to speak in front of the Postal Service headquarters right down the street.



In his testimony yesterday, the Postmaster General indicated that he and President Trump are simply hitting pause. They don't care about the diminution of service that the Postmaster General's report said, apparently. They just hit pause. Why? Because they are hoping it will go away, the wrongdoing that they are perpetrating, not what was done in the past by, yes: Should we make service efficient and effective? We should. But that is not why this was done.

All you have to do is look at the President's statement about wanting to suppress the vote, particularly of minorities. He said that if more Blacks had voted in the last election, I would have lost. That is what he said.

In his statement on Tuesday, the Postmaster General indicated that no additional changes would be implemented. In other words, he is not going to back up, even though his report says it is diminishing service. Why? He can pledge all he wants, but if you don't give the post office department and its employees the tools with which to do the job, no matter what he says about voting—I am glad that we make sure that first-class mail treatment—as a matter of fact, there ought to be super-first class.

Voting for the President of the United States has got to be the most important thing a citizen does in this election year, and it ought to be treated as such by the postal department.

Even after 3 months, President Trump and Senate Republicans continue to refuse to take action on the HEROES Act. I talked about that. That is why Congress needs to take action now that will ensure our Postal Service can continue to deliver for America through this pandemic, just as it always has reliably delivered for our people. That is why this legislation is necessary.

Millions depend on the Postal Service to obtain medications, receive paychecks, and access vital services. For rural communities, in particular, the Postal Service—that is the irony. For rural communities, the Postal Service is probably even more important.

This year, in particular, it will play a crucial role, the Postal Service, in helping tens of millions of Americans stay safe from COVID-19. 86,000 Americans have died since we passed the HEROES Act. The minority leader seems to think: Well, people not coming to Congress, not wanting to get on an airplane, not wanting to come to Washington and then go home and have to sequester themselves for 14 days, oh, they are just playing games.

If you doubt the validity of their vote, say so. But whether I cast it far over there or near here, it is the same vote. It is my vote, and it is my people's voice.

It was so angering for Americans across the political spectrum that President Trump and Postmaster General DeJoy openly sabotaged the Postal Service in order to prevent people from

casting votes through the mail. I know you can discount the fact that the President wants to suppress the vote. He said so. I am not making it up. He said so. Oh, we have all the fraud.

By the way, he votes by mail, of course. You all understand that. I don't know that he sends an ID card down when he votes. Well, maybe we ought to check on that. You are so interested in ID cards, let's see if the President of the United States sends an ID card down to Florida.

They employed tactics such as eliminating overtime pay, cutting routes short, reassigning experienced managers, et cetera.

Maybe you guys and gals don't have a constituent office open. But every one of my Members tells me they are hearing from thousands of their people.

Congress, therefore, must take action to prevent them from simply changing their minds and causing massive postal delays in the weeks ahead. Remember, he said he has just delayed his changes, which caused the fall in service.

Delivering for America Act, that is what the postal department has done since before the Constitution was adopted. I am not going to go through what it will require. You know what it will require. But it would particularly require, and I am so pleased, Madam Chair, that you included in your bill first-class treatment because voting is first-class priority in America.

Now, I am going to close with this because so many of you said: This bill is not going to pass. You are wasting your time. You shouldn't send it over there.

If we did that, we wouldn't do anything unless the President said you can do it. Then, we would salute and say: "Yes, sir. We will do it. But if you don't want it, sir, if you don't want FISA—126 of us voted for FISA, but if you don't want it, we will change our minds in 24 hours," which is what you did.

But then again, we wouldn't have sent campaign finance reform over there because MCCONNELL hasn't considered it. We wouldn't have sent investment and infrastructure and jobs, which MCCONNELL has not put on the floor. We wouldn't have sent restoring voting rights or ensuring LGBT equality or protecting Dreamers or ensuring equal pay for women because MCCONNELL hasn't put equal pay for women on the floor.

Requiring background checks for safer communities, only 90 percent of Americans are for that, so I can understand why MCCONNELL said: Look, there is 10 percent against it. I am not going to put it on the floor for consideration.

You say you haven't gotten notice, and you haven't been included in the committee, et cetera. MCCONNELL doesn't allow anybody to vote, your leader.

Meeting the challenge of climate change, well, of course, many of you don't believe climate change is real. I understand that.

Providing for justice in policing, did we send it over there? Yes. Why? Because we want a fair, more just, more equal, more racially conscious Nation. And I say racially conscious in the sense that we don't judge people on the color of their skin.

We strengthened and expanded the ACA, which in a pandemic may well have been very helpful. It hasn't been put on the floor.

Protecting workers' rights to organize and receive their pensions, it hasn't been put on the floor.

So, if you tell me this can't pass, it can't pass perhaps because the President of the United States tells you that he is not for it, and so it doesn't pass.

In closing—and I know many of you have said thank God—in closing, let me say that you ought to vote for this bill. Not for Democrats. You ought to vote for it for your people, for the people in your rural neighborhoods who are counting on the postal department to bring that prescription drug, which is critical to maintain their health or save their lives. You ought to vote for it for the over 1 million people getting Social Security checks in the mail.

That is why you ought to vote for it, not for us.

You ought to vote for it because you want everybody to vote; you want everybody to participate in this democracy; you want an election that has, like so many other countries, 80 percent of our people participating, who don't want to be the 86,001 who die because they went someplace and aggregated together and got COVID-19.

That is what this is about, making our people able to participate safely in their democracy.

Vote for this bill. It is not a partisan bill. It is a bill that says Republicans ought to be safe in voting. Democrats ought to be safe in voting. Independents ought to be safe in voting, if that is what they choose to do.

This is a good bill. It is a bill for America's democracy. It is a bill for making sure that our people are connected through the mail.

I thank the chair for bringing this bill to the floor. Vote "yes." I urge a "yes" vote for all Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 25 minutes. The gentlewoman from New York has 24 minutes.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LATTA.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the ranking member, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, which has not gone through regular order and was put together in

response to misinformation and conspiracies online.

Since the closure of the Toledo, Ohio, processing plant in 2012, mail in north-west Ohio has been sent to the Metroplex Processing Facility in Michigan. As my constituents can attest, this new arrangement has not worked. We have experienced countless delays and destroyed and lost mail for years, including more than 1,000 absentee ballots in the 2016 general election.

That is why I have continuously engaged with the USPS to fix these problems and get our mail sorted in Ohio. They have committed to working with me and officials in Ohio to implement procedures for election materials.

Unfortunately, under H.R. 8015, the USPS would be prohibited from making any changes to their operation if it is determined that the changes would impede prompt, reliable, and efficient services.

It doesn't specifically say who will be making this determination, so it is safe to assume it will be the unelected bureaucrats, individuals who have told me for years that the preferred way to sort mail would be through the Metroplex. Now, this bill could legally prohibit absentee ballots from being processed in Ohio-based sorting facilities.

I cannot in good conscience support this new Democratic political sideshow because it threatens the rights of my constituents to have their voices heard in November.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act. This legislation is vital to protecting the United States Postal Service.

I maintain that the post office is the thread that holds the fabric of our great country together. The Postal Service existed before our Nation's Constitution as the lifeline that connected far-flung communities. The Founders believed so strongly in the importance of the post office that they enshrined it in our Constitution.

The post office provides a critical public service that we cannot allow to become a potential political pawn of a dysfunctional, destructive, and, I dare say, disastrous administration. This administration has demonstrated time and again why government should not be run like a business. Businesses exist to make profits. The post office and the whole of our government exist to provide services. That is why it is called a Postal Service, not the postal corporation.

Today, we are acting to reinforce our Postal Service system, which provides vital services like delivering medica-

tions, Social Security benefits, income and tax payments, veterans benefits, Census forms, and absentee ballots to all American communities, however remote they may be.

Americans' dependence on the Postal Service has dramatically increased during this pandemic as we have watched the on-time delivery of mail decrease significantly. This legislation provides the \$25 billion in emergency COVID funding to the Postal Service that was unanimously requested by the bipartisan Board of Governors.

It also prohibits and even rolls back changes made by the post office since January 1 of this year. That prohibition lasts through January 2021 or until the end of the pandemic, whichever is later.

That means no post office can be closed, consolidated, or reduce hours; no prohibition or restriction of overtime pay; no changes that will delay mail delivery or increase the volume of undelivered mail; and no removal of post office infrastructure, like sorting machines or mailboxes.

This legislation protects the integrity of our democracy by requiring that all election mail be treated as first class, which means ballots must be postmarked, processed, and cleared on the same day that they are received.

□ 1545

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member COMER for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles from periodicals.

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 18, 2020]

DEMOCRATS FUEL POST OFFICE PANIC WITH LIES TO WIN UPCOMING ELECTION

(By Andy Biggs)

There are two almost immutable laws of operation that form the basis of America's political left. The first is that Democrats and leftists foment fear in order to obtain and maintain political power. The other is that they always accuse everyone else, conservatives and Republicans, of acts, words and ideas in which the left is engaged.

If that means that the truth must be adulterated in order to craft a narrative that gins up panic and hysteria, they will shade the truth. Lies beget panic, panic calls for a solution—usually a big spending solution—and the Democrats try to exploit that panic to get more power.

The Democrats are engaged in a disinformation campaign regarding the upcoming election and mail-in ballots that is deceptive and reflective of their goal of winning the election by hook or crook.

Democrats and their left-wing publicists in the media claim that President Trump is going to dismantle the United States Postal Service (USPS). This absurdity typifies both of the Democratic strategies: It is a lie to engender panic, and the stealing of the election is their objective, not the president's.

They claim that Mr. Trump is going to fiscally starve the behemoth USPS in order to prevent all mailed ballots from being counted. Of course, neither claim is true.

The president signed a bill that provided an additional \$10 billion to the USPS just a few weeks ago. At the time, Treasury Sec-

retary Steve Mnuchin said, "While the USPS is able to fund its operating expenses without additional borrowing at this time, we are pleased to have reached an agreement on the material terms and conditions of a loan, should the need arise."

And, White House Chief of Staff Mark Meadows also confirmed on CNN that the White House offered the additional \$10 billion in funding to the Postal Service. Refreshing the left's collective memory about the availability of massive amounts of funding to the USPS ought to have put this phony claim to bed.

But House Speaker Nancy Pelosi is insisting that the House of Representatives return to vote on additional funding for the USPS, which illustrates the Democrats' overarching theme: Just send money; it will always solve the problem, whatever the problem is, even if there is no real problem.

The second deception that the Democrats are using to try and steal the upcoming election is by conflating the long-established practice of absentee balloting with the election-fraud-producing scam that the left is selling of universal mail-in ballots. By consolidating the two, very different voting procedures, they are trying to scare Americans into believing that Mr. Trump is going to cheat in the upcoming election.

This is consistent with Democrats' operating strategy and the methodology that they will accuse you of what they are actually trying to accomplish. In this case, the Democrats are trying to steal the election by sending ballots out to every name on every voter roll. But they are fighting against cleaning up the voter rolls.

Your uncle is dead but still on the voter roll? A ballot comes to his last address in his name. Your cat is somehow on the roll? Fluffy gets a ballot.

Democrats know that their demands will incentivize and produce fraudulent ballots by sending out ballots to those who haven't requested them. They are OK with that because they think they can win the dead voter and pet cat demographics.

They accuse Mr. Trump of defunding the USPS—when the left really wants to defund the police—and their accusation is a lie. They know that the president supports the long-standing practice of absentee voting, but claim he is against that. Another lie.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi is so concerned that she is bringing the House back into session to vote on legislation that means nothing. Oh yeah, it's urgent alright, but only after the Democratic convention is completed. Oh, and it's only to give Democrats the opportunity to further the panic-driven narrative, because the Senate isn't going to hear the speaker's deceptive bill.

Never forget that the Democrats and left always accuse you of what they are actually doing and that they will prevaricate to further that claim. The left will try and stoke panic in the country, then attempt to spend any amount of money to quell that panic in order to arrogate power.

The deception surrounding the USPS "crisis" is just another great example of Marxian-Democrat duplicity.

[From the Blaze, Aug. 21, 2020]

POSTMASTER GENERAL PROMISES TIMELY DELIVERY OF ELECTION MAIL, SAYS USPS DOESN'T NEED BAILOUT MONEY

(By Aaron Cole)

Postmaster General Louis DeJoy denied accusations that the United States Postal Service wouldn't be able to handle increased volumes of election mail in November, and told the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on Friday that the USPS was "fully capable" of getting the job done, CBS News reported.

DeJoy has been a target of Democrats who believe the Trump donor and logistics expert is handicapping the Postal Service at the president's urging in order to discourage or limit mail-in voting.

"As we head into the election season, I want to assure this committee, and the American public, that the Postal Service is fully capable of delivering the nation's election mail securely and on time," DeJoy testified.

DeJoy said even mail-in ballots sent one week before Election Day would be counted, because USPS workers will "scour every plant each night leading up to Election Day" to make sure no ballot is left behind.

Rather than being opposed to mail-in voting, as President Donald Trump is, DeJoy told the committee "I think the American public should be able to vote by mail, and the Postal Service will support it."

DeJoy clarified that the potential issue with mail-in ballots is related to state deadlines that are too close to Election Day, which is why 46 states were notified of that issue in a letter late last month. DeJoy said Americans should vote early, if they can.

The U.S. Postal Service plans to "send a letter to every American" explaining "what our process is" for mail-in voting, DeJoy said Friday.

DeJoy, who has been in his role since June, said he has never spoken to Trump or White House advisers about making changes to service.

The USPS has long been in bad financial shape, and DeJoy was hired as a logistics expert from the private sector to address issues of cost and efficiency. Some of the changes that have reportedly been made, such as the limiting of overtime and the removal of some mail sorting machines and collection boxes, have led to some delays in mail delivery in some areas. Those operational changes were suspended by DeJoy this week to avoid the appearance of tampering with the Nov. 3 election.

Some recent primary elections were disrupted by issues with mail-in ballots. A New York congressional election was delayed by six weeks due to a dispute over some ballots that were not postmarked or that were received after the deadline. Tens of thousands of votes that were mailed in weren't counted for various reasons.

Democrats are pushing for billions of dollars in additional funding for the USPS, partially to help with the election. On Friday, DeJoy told Congress the USPS did not need a federal bailout, but did advocate for reimbursement for service provided during the pandemic even while revenues were down.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, "The Postal Service is fully capable of delivering the Nation's election mail securely and on time." That was the testimony of the Postmaster General.

But they don't trust the Postmaster General.

The post office has taken care of over 400 million pieces of mail every day.

But they don't trust the Postmaster General.

That is intriguing to me, because they are going to give the Postmaster General an additional \$25 billion. They don't trust him, yet they are going to give him \$25 billion when he already has \$15 billion cash on hand and a \$10 billion line of credit. We don't trust this guy, but we are going to give him \$25 billion extra.

But moreover, this is a crisis. We want reforms. We want changes. We don't trust the current Postmaster

General, so what we are going to do is we are going to proscribe any kind of efforts to make the post office, Postal Service, work better. We are going to stop that. Not only are we going to stop that, we are going to give a new cause of action to trial lawyers against the USPS.

That is what is going on in this bill, and I find that intriguing. It reminds me of a Eugene Ionesco play, Luigi Pirandello. We are talking theater of the absurd here. That is what we are talking about.

Democrats call the failures of USPS a crisis, but they are going to prohibit reforms or changes. Think of the irony of that.

I would suggest that this illustrates the Democrats' overarching theme: If you just send money, it will always solve the problem, whatever the problem is, even if there is no real problem.

This is not a money issue. This is not an acute issue. This is a long-term problem that has been there for multiple administrations.

Now, to come in at the last minute—and here is part of the absurdity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, the richest part of this irony, this absurdity, is: Here we are today. We are going to vote on this bill today, and we are going to have the hearing on Monday in the committee. That is the richest part of an absurdity that is going to cost us \$25 billion.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, just as a point of clarification, there is no cause of action in this bill, and it does not in any way hinder any efficiency that would speed up the mail. It merely stops any action that slows down the mail until the end of this pandemic.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), an extremely valuable member of the committee.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say: Enough. In a blatant attempt to suppress the vote, the occupant has continued to attack the legitimacy of our elections, denouncing the very method of voting he and his family have repeatedly used: mail-in ballots.

Hypocrisy: It should look familiar to my colleagues across the aisle.

How dare you refer to this as a sham bill. The only sham here is the patriotism that you allege to espouse while you stand idly by and are complicit in the dismantling of the United States Postal Service, which is impacting the lives of all of our constituents, disrupting services.

Patriotism: They hire more veterans than anyone else. Veterans rely on them to receive lifesaving medication. The only sham here is the patriotism which you espouse.

Enough of the criminal and corrupt mismanagement of the Postmaster General. The changes he has brought to our Postal Service during this pandemic are brazen acts of sabotage intended to slow down operations and to delay mail delivery.

This is a hell of a way to repay 600,000 dedicated letter carriers and postal workers who have put themselves in harm's way in the midst of this pandemic, who find dignity in their work and are worried about the impact on services and fear for their very livelihoods and retribution for the calls that they have made to all of our offices.

How dare you.

While the Trump administration and its allies continue to gaslight the American people, we actually listen to our constituents and their lived experiences and how this has disrupted their lives, what you are referring to as fakes news, constituents like Cassandra, a freelancer from Somerville who waited for 2 weeks for a check from a client to arrive.

"Freelancing is already unstable," she told me, "and post office delays mean I have even less assurance that the money I have worked for will reach me in a timely fashion."

Or Brendan in Charlestown, who requested an absentee ballot more than 3 weeks ago so he and his pregnant wife could vote without risking their health but has yet to receive it because, in the Massachusetts Seventh Congressional District, nine mail sorting machines have been removed.

There must be accountability. It is time to pass the Delivering for America Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8015 and the manufactured crisis my Democratic colleagues have created regarding the U.S. Postal Service.

For the past week, the American people have been told they cannot trust the Postal Service to do their job and that Republicans, along with President Trump, are trying to undermine the agency.

That could not be further from the truth. The Postal Service has more than enough funding to operate for the next calendar year and has not even acted upon the \$10 billion loan the Treasury offered back in July.

The sad truth is that the Postal Service has been financially unsustainable and without reform for over a decade, and the bill we are voting on today will do nothing, absolutely nothing, to improve the shortfalls with this agency.

We should, instead, be working together to address certain problems we have while being conscious of the taxpayer dollars that have been used for bailouts over the years.

Madam Speaker, I have a rural district in Texas, District 25. We rely

upon the Postal Service to fulfill services that my constituents would otherwise go without. I am an advocate for improving this agency, and we should dedicate time to do just that, but there is an actual crisis among us that should demand our immediate attention.

In the car business, you can't charge the sticker price if you don't have a vehicle to deliver, and you don't sell used cars that won't start. We are not delivering results today. The immediate crisis we need to address is caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Main Street America and families across Texas are wanting results, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would rather ignore this truth and, instead, politicize a conspiracy theory. If my colleagues are serious about postal reform, then let's get to work, but the legislation before us today isn't the answer. It is, frankly, a waste of time.

I should be home with my family. I should be home with my grandchildren. As we say in Texas, "This dog won't hunt." Well, let me tell you, this dog won't hunt.

And, P.S., let's make the Postal Service run like a business.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB), another great member of the committee.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, do you hear that? That is our democracy crumbling.

I want all of my neighbors, I want all of America to know why the people's House is here for an emergency vote on Saturday while Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL went on vacation: We are experiencing a global pandemic, and now our U.S. Postal Service is under attack.

Let it be clear: This administration is waging an authoritarian campaign to sabotage this election by manipulating the Postal Service to suppress our votes, and they are threatening the livelihood of our postal workers, our seniors, our veterans, and so many more in the process.

This is not a conspiracy theory. This is fascism. We will not stand for this now or ever.

In Michigan right now, machines capable of sorting 35,000 pieces of mail per hour have disappeared from postal facilities.

Brave workers are blowing the whistle and saying that they have never seen anything like this, Madam Speaker.

We must put an end to it.

Madam Speaker, I say to the White House: Hands off the United States Postal Service.

Let's make it clear through this law to fund our Postal Service and undo these harmful attacks and restore normal operations.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, our presence today, this unserious legislation, even all the yelling across the aisle and the straying off topic, they all underscore a contrast: Democrats whip up hysteria; Republicans show up to work.

They call a Saturday session, supposedly because of an emergency. Republicans are here, but about 70 Democrats don't show up. And that has been the pattern all summer: Republicans come to work; Democrats dial it in, sometimes from the fishing boat.

They say the virus keeps them from congregating to work, but they encourage the throng outside the Postmaster General's personal residence.

Or consider Representative GRIJALVA: not at work today, but joined a postal union protest 4 days ago. They can congregate to whip up hysteria, just not to work.

Now, Louis DeJoy is showing up to work. Testifying yesterday, he calmly debunked apocryphal tales about blue collection boxes and sorting machines.

Monday, he testifies before the House Oversight and Reform Committee, but Democrats fan hysteria today without waiting for facts, even though they don't show up.

Let's drop the hysteria. Let's all show up to work. Americans need our help.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), an outstanding member of the committee.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman of the committee for yielding.

I support this bill strongly.

I want to speak a little bit to what the Postmaster General acknowledged—admitted—yesterday. He called it a dip in service. He finally admitted that after being pressed extensively on it.

I want to tell you what the dip looks like in my district.

So, in all of 2019, our constituent service folks opened 11 cases to deal with delays and service problems with the mail—11 cases in 2019. So far this year, there have been 106.

Now, I am not talking about people who are just calling in and complaining because the mail is late and then they hang up the phone and so forth. This is where they have got real concerns about what is happening and they ask us to open a case. There have been 106 this year compared with 11 last year, and 103 of those in the last 4 weeks.

That is not a dip in service. That is a collapse of service, and it tracks exactly to the time that Louis DeJoy has been on the job.

Here is what is so terrible: When you attack the Postal Service from within, which is what he is doing, it has the effect of trying to separate the postal workers from the public that trusts them.

Over 90 percent of Americans have a favorable opinion of the Postal Service. We have to restore that bond. That is what this legislation does.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member COMER for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I stand today with the hardworking letter carriers and postal workers of the United States Postal Service.

The USPS must be fully funded so that my constituents and millions across our Nation can receive the high-quality and timely service that the post office has always provided us.

Madam Speaker, today I will vote in favor of the Delivering for America Act.

Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, must come together and address the serious challenges that USPS has been facing for quite some time now. I look forward to continuing to work with our colleagues on bipartisan solutions to move all of our heroes forward and support our heroes at the U.S. Postal Service.

□ 1600

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), who is the vice chair of our caucus.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, 99 days ago House Democrats passed the HEROES Act to provide much-needed relief to the American people suffering from this pandemic.

What was the reaction from the GOP?

A shrug.

Funding for State and local governments to protect jobs of first responders and teachers?

MITCH MCCONNELL said: Let them go bankrupt.

Feeding hungry children and families?

They said: Let's hit the pause button.

Funding for testing, treatment, and hospitals as death tolls soared over 175,000?

Donald Trump said: It is what it is.

Unemployment benefits and eviction protection?

Not right now.

In May, we also funded the post office, a critical service enshrined in our Constitution, a lifeline to seniors and veterans, like John, who called me yesterday from my hometown who had to wait an extra week to get his medication.

It is a pillar of our democracy allowing people to vote safely from home this fall. We are here today to defend this institution from slow deliveries and removal of critical mail infrastructure. Twelve mail sorting machines in my home State have been removed.

When Mr. DeJoy was asked about this, he said: They are not needed.

Donald Trump said he didn't want those ridiculous ballots delivered.

We will not stand by while the Postal Service is dismantled and good jobs are lost. We will fight so that every vote is counted.

Vote "yes" for the Postal Service. Vote "yes" for the people. Vote "yes" for democracy.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Speaker, like many of my constituents, I have followed the allegations circling around the Postal Service. These are serious allegations. To get to the heart of the problem, I spoke directly to Utah's postal leadership.

As I asked questions and waded through the rumors, I learned four important facts:

First, it is clear that the Postal Service needs additional funding. How much and under what circumstances is a worthy debate. But let me be clear: the funding solution has no bearing on their ability to handle the upcoming mail-in ballots. The United States Postal Service has enough cash on hand to operate well into 2021.

Second, the increased demand of mail-in ballots does not stretch their capacity. Mail-in ballots will increase the demand on the system by a little over 1.5 percent. In the words of Utah's district director, not even a bump in volume. The day I spoke with him Utah's mail delivery system was 500,000 letters under capacity.

Third, the accusation that they are removing boxes and cutting overtime to thwart mail-in ballots is just plain not true. Boxes have always been moved to adjust to volume. To calm fears, the Postal Service has put a 90-day moratorium on moving boxes.

Likewise, rumors that overtime is being cut so mail-in ballots will be delayed is false. I confirmed this with Utah's district director. In his words: Never in my career have we left mail undelivered because of overtime.

Fourth, the concerns with mail-in balloting have everything to do with the State's preparedness, not the Postal Service. States who have allowed ballots to be requested just 4 days before election are irresponsible and should be accountable for mail-in ballot problems, not the United States Postal Service. Further, mail-in ballots take longer to count and delays can be expected, but not because of the Postal Service.

Madam Speaker, if you are not sure whom to believe, ask your mail carrier. Ask them if there is anything less than 100 percent effort given by them to deliver mail-in ballots and all mail, and then make sure to thank them. I am so grateful for the many men and women who work so hard to deliver our mail every day.

We need a strong and vibrant Postal Service, but this bill thrown together in the middle of the night does not deliver.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), who is the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Health on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I am here today to speak on behalf of the Postal Service in our country.

I am here today because I view it as a Democratic institution in our country.

I am here today because the Framers placed it in the Constitution.

I am here today because my constituents are not receiving their prescription drugs, businesses are not receiving their mail, and people are not receiving their mail.

I am here today to speak on their behalf because they are outraged. They are outraged about two things that have happened, that the President has said and attacked mail-in votes.

Guess how votes are counted? They are carried by the mail service. The Postmaster General, instead of building it up, is dismantling it. It is over the top to see pictures of postal boxes being unhinged.

Vote for the Delivering for America Act. The people deserve it.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), who is the Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

When you think about why we are here on a Saturday, I would think if we are being brought here on a Saturday in the middle of a pandemic, it is to help those millions of families who are struggling, Madam Speaker.

I would think if we are going to come here on a Saturday, it would be to help those millions of small businesses, the restaurants in south Louisiana and New Orleans that don't even know if they are going to open again because of where we are right now.

In this pandemic you would think that is what we would be here for.

But instead, Madam Speaker, why are we here?

For a fabricated crisis.

The Wall Street Journal: "NANCY PELOSI Goes Politically Postal. Congress ought to be embarrassed by this evidence-free conspiracy theory."

The New York Times: "I Was a Postal Service Regulator for 18 Years. Don't Panic. The service is perfectly capable of handling election mail." That was a Bill Clinton-era appointee.

Then you look at, again, this fabricated crisis that, oh my gosh, there are mailboxes being closed.

Let's look at the record. During the Obama-Biden years—just 4 years—11,560 mailboxes removed.

Where were the hearings for that?

Where were the Saturday votes to decry that they were closing mailboxes?

It never happened because it is not a real crisis.

Even the Postmaster General just testified yesterday: "The Postal Service is fully capable and committed to delivering the Nation's election mail fully and on time."

That is the Postmaster General. If you would have listened to him—I know there is a hearing Monday. Maybe if you would have waited to see what he actually said Monday in this committee, Madam Speaker, you would have known that this is a fabricated crisis. But you knew that before.

Madam Speaker, they knew this was a fabricated crisis.

In fact, when we talk about the money, oh my gosh, the post office is going to run out of money. Well, the problem is the facts decry even that. They have got a surplus of over \$12 billion sitting in the bank today and then they have got—this is the Department of Treasury, Madam Speaker, a \$10 billion line of credit that they can't even access because they have too much money in the bank right now.

Imagine small businesses watching on a Saturday because they can't open. They are not even sure if they are going to be in business next week because they have no money in the bank, and they are hearing about this crisis. Congress is coming in on a Saturday.

Then they find out the post office has over \$12 billion in the bank and they have access to a line of credit of \$10 billion from Treasury that they can't get to today because they have got too much money in the bank.

Right now, it is here. This is the letter from Treasury.

It is so important, Madam Speaker, that 68 Democrats chose not even to show up today. Sixty-eight are not even here today because this is a fake crisis. It is a fabricated crisis.

It is a shame that instead of helping small businesses and families, they are trying to scare the American people when everybody knows there is enough money to carry out the mail. Barack Obama and Joe Biden took out over 11,000 mailboxes, and it was never even a problem.

We have got to vote against this.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY), who is the chair of the Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy on the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise as a proud co-sponsor of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act.

Madam Speaker, the USPS is under attack. In the last month, Postmaster General DeJoy has made irreversible changes causing mail delivery backlogs as long as 3 weeks. But don't just take my word for it; 1,612 constituents of mine have contacted us about delayed mail.

Denise Winchar contacted us saying: I run a small business and rely on the

post office to receive payment for my clients. Without payment, I have no income. Any delay in getting paid is a big hardship for me. In the past month, I have had to wait several weeks for payment.

Take Vanesa Deben's word for it. She says: My insurance forces us to get our prescription delivered by mail, I have diabetes and I need to take my meds or risk health problems. The USPS is a service that we all pay for with our taxes and as a paying customer we need to demand that we get our service back now.

The Delivering for America Act includes three important provisions, Madam Speaker.

It reverses the dangerous operational changes implemented by Postmaster DeJoy.

It includes \$25 billion in relief to the USPS.

It requires the USPS to treat all official election mail as first-class mail.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Since the election of President Trump, the most absurd conspiracy theories have been proclaimed as gospel by the entire Democratic Party and their media mouthpieces.

Let's begin with the Russian collusion hoax; the theory that Trump was a secret Russian agent who colluded with Putin to steal the 2016 election from Hillary Clinton. The theory comprised many preposterous sub-conspiracies, including several wild tales.

For example, secret computer servers communicated with Russians.

Secret meetings with Russians occurred in Prague, and secret Russian money laundering from the Trump campaign.

Best of all, Putin had a secret stash of nude pictures of Trump and the now infamous pee tapes that the Democrats and their puppets in the media spent several years searching all over Europe for.

The Russia hoax ultimately imploded. But, Madam Speaker, you have to almost admire the Democrats' amazing ability to jump from one debunked conspiracy theory to another without a hint of shame, embarrassment, or self-reflection.

The Democrats supposedly convened us here today to protect Americans from Trump's latest nefarious plot—his alleged attempt to sabotage the Postal Service to steal the election. In the grand scheme of Democratic conspiracy theories, this one really is scraping the bottom of the barrel.

I suppose we can grant the Democrats that the post office actually does exist, and it does deliver mail. But watching them vent outrage on social media about missing mailboxes and anti-mail theft devices is rather sad.

Good conspiracy theories have rich, false details that tell a story, like Area

51 for example. But the Democrats have grown a little lazy to develop the necessary back story.

The Postal Service hoax is more akin to theories that the Earth is flat, NASA faked Moon landings, that Elvis is alive, and that Paul McCartney is dead. Even the Loch Ness Monster, Big Foot, and the Chupacabra at least yielded photographic evidence.

In closing, I want to thank my Democratic colleagues for inviting us here for a Saturday afternoon matinee in August. I urge them next time to put more effort into their future conspiracy theories. If you no longer have time to properly craft your fake news narratives, you can also have the Democratic National Committee launder money to hire a British spy to go to your Russian friends and develop another set of fake dossiers.

Madam Speaker, have a good afternoon. I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1615

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), a distinguished Member of Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, for several years, I was a letter carrier, working my way through college and grad school, working overtime as mail volume necessitated—and, yes, necessitated. It was understood then that it was a necessity.

I worked with dedicated postal workers, many of whom were veterans who persevered through emergencies—hurricane, blizzards, floods. As the motto says, "gloom of night."

Now, our country faces new emergencies, a pandemic that threatens lives and encumbers our basic rights, like the right to vote safely and in an economic crisis, where 600,000 Postal Service workers battle back, providing economic stimulus and \$1.6 trillion in sales revenues.

The Postal Service is an economic and healthcare lifeline, a lifeline that Donald Trump is trying to sever, all to sabotage mail-in voting he thinks will dampen his chances to cling to power.

He is the gloom of night, and it is our job, our duty, to throw some sunlight his way and to stop him.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 8 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I was told in persuasion class many, many years ago that if you had a weak argument, you

shouted all the more. After hearing some of the leadership on the other side of the aisle, I guess they learned the same approach—a weak argument that isn't holding up.

When I heard the majority leader talk about "this is for the people," this is for "your people," I don't believe that at all because Jeanie, my rural mail carrier, is working today; 68 Democrats are not working today. Yet, this is supposed to be something of importance.

Last week, we heard the convention start this postal deal going on. This is just a continuation of the Democrat convention. I want you to know that nothing that has been said about supposedly what the President is attempting to do in defunding, in deflating, in stopping the vote or the mail service is true. My Democrat colleagues know that as well. I think that is why 68 chose to stay home today as opposed to coming here in a planned event that meant nothing other than politics.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Postmaster General DeJoy's attempts to push forward operational changes that delay the mail are simply unacceptable. My constituents depend on the U.S. Postal Service. In the past week alone, I received over 1,000 constituent letters expressing confusion and anger over these changes that he has planned and implemented.

A senior from Coventry wrote to me, expressing her alarm over what might happen if her diabetic husband failed to receive his medications on time.

A constituent from Wakefield, who has not missed an election since 1956, emailed me to ask if he should vote in person, despite being 85 years old with health concerns.

Madam Speaker, no one should have to wait for lifesaving medications or risk their health to cast a vote. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Millions of Americans are counting on us, and we cannot let them down.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky for yielding.

Madam Speaker, look, I am pleased that Democrats here are upset about what has happened to the post office. My regret is, you didn't get upset during the Obama administration when they were shutting down our post offices, not just getting rid of 12,000 mailboxes, shutting down processing centers. In my district, when they shut down the Overton processing center, it meant mail going from Tyler to Longview, or vice versa, went to Dallas then to Shreveport and back.

The Deputy Attorney General came to my office—I had been demanding a meeting with the Postmaster General—



but, oh, no. No time for that. They had no decency. They tried to say 390 miles would be cheaper and quicker than going 30 miles.

It is an outrage what the Obama administration did, including their Postmaster General, who was in office until June 15 of this year.

Wake up. Let's complain about the post office during the Obama years.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Mr. DeJoy was before a Senate committee on Friday. He was asked if he would put back in the sorters that he had removed, and he said no.

I think that is because he had already done his dirty work. He had already slowed down the mail by taking the sorting machines out, and the flat sorters as well, which my postal people tell me is causing great delays and will cause greater delays.

He had already done it. He refused to put them back in. Why? Because the job was done, and he didn't want to put those sorters back in to see that the mail was delivered. He is no Karl Malone. He does not deliver. He is not the "Mailman."

These postal sorters need to be there. 39,000 letters an hour go through. The flat sorters are necessary for the mail-in ballots. There is no reason he wouldn't put them back in. It wouldn't save any money. It costs money to take them out. He didn't save money by taking them out. He reduced efficiency. He reduced the ability of the Post Office to deliver ballots to elect a person safely in America. This is a shame, and it is a crime.

Madam Speaker, I support the bill, and everyone here should.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), my good friend.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Democrat bill entitled Delivering for America Act. What an irresponsible and dishonest title.

Democratic leadership must take the American people as fools. This bill attempts to deceive the American people by manufacturing a crisis that simply does not exist.

This bill also distracts this body from actually doing something in this Chamber that matters, like condemning violent mobs terrorizing our communities, like helping hardworking families across this country in this unprecedented time of need.

Madam Speaker, here are the facts: The United States Postal Service is a Blockbuster video in a Netflix world. Everyone knows it is a broken business model. It has failed its workers; it has failed its retirees; and it has failed the American taxpayers.

Despite the need for long-term reform, the Postal Service currently has

\$15 billion in cash on hand and \$10 billion more from the CARES Act.

The independent Postal Service Board and the independent Postmaster General have repeatedly assured the American people that they can handle the increased volume in mail-in voting.

Let's be clear. Today's vote is more political theater. It is another scene from the Democrats' one-act play titled Defeat President Trump at All Costs, even if it means peddling a deceitful narrative that undermines the American people's trust in the very institutions of our democratic Republic.

To say the Postal Service is all of a sudden incapacitated, unable to provide a secure, mail-in process, is not intellectually honest. It is downright predatory.

Democrats who falsely call into question the security of our elections to justify a \$25 billion bailout is a scam and a political payoff to their government union bosses.

Madam Speaker, I urge my Democrat colleagues: Stand up to your leadership. Stop this shameful charade. See the grave danger of manipulating the American people to score cheap, political points.

Madam Speaker, let's get back to work.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), the distinguished chair of the Asian Pacific American Caucus.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act, because I will not tolerate sabotage of the U.S. Postal Service.

This week, I went to my local post office to fight back against the attacks on mail delivery that my Republican colleagues now claim never happened. But I stand by those who know better than anyone, our country's postal workers.

They talked about how cuts to overtime are forcing mail carriers to abandon their routes halfway through, and how deliberate reductions to operating capacity mean that they cannot meet their community's needs.

My constituents also know better. Every day, I have heard from seniors whose medications have been delayed, small businesses unable to get orders to customers, and workers waiting to receive a check. Pharmacies in my district have even needed to tell customers to pick their medicine up in person instead of relying on the mail.

No one should have to risk exposure to COVID-19 just to pick up a prescription, especially not so the President can suppress votes in November.

Madam Speaker, vote to save the post office.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, over the last couple of hours, I have

heard my friends on the other side of the aisle say this is not serious. Do you know why this is serious? Madam Speaker, 176,000 dead Americans from COVID-19 and the projection that there may be 300,000 dead by December 1.

Madam Speaker, I left and got on a plane from a hotspot—14 to 20 percent infection. So my constituents who are suffering from stage IV cancer need the mail.

If they want the proof, I read the words of General Counsel and Executive Vice President Thomas J. Marshall of the U.S. Postal Service: "We are currently unable to balance our costs with available funding sources to fulfill both our universal service mission and other legal obligations."

The post office says they have no money. We need to be able to deliver this money to them and vote on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I support the bill and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in strong support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering For America Act.

I thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her leadership in drafting H.R. 8015.

As a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee and member of the House Budget Committee, I am particularly interested in why and how this Administration has tampered with the proper functioning of the U.S. Postal Service.

The drafters of the 1789 Constitution of the United States knew the vital importance of communication to the nation and its people, so they vested authority with the Congress to sustain and maintain a national postal service.

Article I, Section 8, clause 7, in the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress has the power "To establish Post Offices and post Roads . . ."

The Postal Clause was added to the Constitution to facilitate interstate communication as well as to create a source of revenue for the early United States.

The freedoms of the press and of speech are guaranteed in the First Amendment to the Constitution and the establishment of a national postal system, an authority vested by the Constitution in the Congress, are indispensable features of a strong and stable democracy.

A national postal system to collect and distribute mail efficiently, affordably, reliably, and without regard to the sender's or recipient's race, creed, color, national origin, religion, region of residence, or political affiliation strengthens and fortifies democracy by enabling all persons to communicate with any and all other Americans.

A functioning and effective national postal system strengthens the economy by facilitating the efficient delivery of goods and services, promotes the public health by facilitating the timely delivery of needed medical supplies and prescription drugs to senior citizens and veterans, and enriches civil society by facilitating the delivery of letters of greetings, sympathy, congratulations, and love, thus strengthening the mystic bonds of affection of Americans for each other and for the United States.

Fifty years after the Constitution went into effect the population of the United States ballooned at a greater rate than it has ever since.

During that period, the population grew from 3,929,214 in 1790, the year of the first census, to 17,069,453 in 1840.

For those who may think mail tampering is fine so long as it is an absentee ballot or absentee ballot request—they need to know that tampering with the U.S. mail is a federal felony.

Mail theft carries a penalty of up to five years in federal prison and fines of up to \$250,000 for each violation.

It is also a crime to injure, deface, or destroy any mail deposited in a mailbox.

For each act of vandalism, you could be imprisoned for up to three years and fined up to \$250,000.

Communication for the purpose of commerce, linking and strengthening bonds among family, and friends as well as keeping citizens informed was of the utmost importance to the health and wellbeing of the young democracy.

Over the centuries, the arrival of new technology that supported communication did not end the need for an affordable and easily accessible national postal service.

The telegraph, telephone nor the Internet ended the need for the delivery of letters, cards, packages, and newspapers or magazines.

The American people are depending on the House and the Senate, just like they depend on the Post Office to deliver a secure and voter centered November Election that empowers them to cast ballots for the candidates of their choice.

Election Day must not become a victim of COVID-19 through manipulation of the postal service or by any other means foreign or domestic.

I will work with my colleagues to ensure that all available means are provided to ensure that every voter, no matter their party or preference has access to cast a vote that will be counted in the November election.

For over 200 years, the American people have relied upon the National Postal Service to be there—no matter what—they have delivered the mail during a civil war, pandemics, hurricanes, forest fires, and terrorist attacks.

The Postal Service employs 633,108 of our friends and neighbors, including more than 100,000 veterans.

The Postal Service is one of the leading employers of minorities and women, with minorities comprising 39 percent and women comprising 40 percent of the workforce.

The Post Office has become a path to good paying jobs that lifts people out of poverty.

Postal workers have been determined to be essential workers during the pandemic and they have delivered service without complaint or fail during this national crisis.

As of July 2020, nearly 5,400 USPS employees tested positive for COVID-19 among its workforce of 630,000.

A May report stated that of the 130 Federal Employees who had died due to COVID-19, 60 of them were employed at the U.S. Postal Service.

In June, a staggering 17,000 workers, or 3 percent of the United States Postal Service workforce, had been quarantined since the start of the pandemic, according to a recent report by Government Executive magazine.

By the beginning of July, around 70 percent of those quarantined have been cleared to go back to work.

Earlier this summer Postal Service management acknowledged that 2,830 workers had tested positive for COVID-19, out of a total workforce of approximately 630,000.

However, USPS officials have not made publicly available the number of deaths.

With the urgent need to fix the postal service, we must not forget that the Postal Service employees are essential workers in COVID-19, and if they are essential it means that their work is essential.

For 55 cents, anyone can send a first class letter anywhere in the United States and there is no private sector mail service that can do this at this low price.

In 2019, the Postal Service:

Delivered 142.6 billion pieces of mail to 260 million addresses in America;

Delivered 1.2 billion prescriptions, including most of the medications ordered by the VA;

Served 70 percent of businesses with fewer than ten employees; and

Had a 90 percent favorability rating, making it the most popular federal agency.

The Postal Service:

Is often the only delivery option for rural America where service is not profitable;

Delivers 48 percent of the world's mail with one of the world's largest civilian vehicle fleets; and

Is a vital service for the more than 18 million seniors who do not use the Internet.

The Postal Service has become a pharmacy of choice for millions of Americans who live in pharmacy deserts, which are locations where there are no pharmacies to serve communities.

The Postal Service is an essential component to Veterans' and seniors' health because they deliver medicines to our veterans.

The VA has now confirmed to us that the United States Postal Service (USPS), which is responsible for delivering about 90 percent of all VA mail order prescriptions, has indeed been delayed in delivering these critical medications by an average of almost 25 percent over the past year, with many locations experiencing much more significant delays.

In addition to delivering prescriptions and business mail, they are also delivering democracy to millions of voters who will need to cast their ballot by mail this election year to reduce their risk of contracting COVID-19.

The U.S. mail service has provided essential mail service for absentee voting for well over 100 years by enabling Union troops to vote during the Civil War, World War I, World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, Iraqi Freedom, and to this day.

Since that time, absentee or not in-person voting has grown in popularity across the United States and is now a welcomed and valued component for assuring citizen participation in public elections.

In 2016, 20.9 percent of all votes cast in that federal election were done so by absentee ballots and this year that number is expected to be much higher due to COVID-19.

In 2018, there were 153.07 million people registered to vote in the United States, which is lower than the peak of 157.6 million registered voters in 2016.

Montana had the highest voter turnout rate with 45.6 percent for the 2020 presidential primary elections.

The voter turnout rate in Texas for the 2020 presidential primary elections was 21 percent.

More than 4 million Texans voted in the 2020 presidential primary election, with turnout

among Democratic voters at 12.81 percent compared to 12.39 percent of Republican voters.

In Texas, there were 16,211,198 registered voters and 4,084,431 votes for the 2020 primaries. In comparison, in 2016 there were 14,238,436 registered voters and 4,272,383 votes.

The attack on the viability and value of absentee voting should be viewed as just one component of many assaults on our elections system that may make this a very difficult election year.

Over the past several weeks, sweeping operational and organization changes at the Postal Service have resulted in delays in the mail across the country, including in rural communities, among veterans and seniors, and in blue and red states alike.

Some of those changes include curtailing overtime, restricting deliveries, eliminating sorting machines, and removing mailboxes.

Concerns have been raised by both Democratic and Republican officials at the federal, state and local levels.

These changes are being rushed through—in the midst of a global pandemic just months before the November elections—without adequate consultation with Congress, the Postal Board of Governors, the Postal Regulatory Commission, postal employees unions, state election officials, business organizations, and other stakeholders.

The Postmaster General also recently reassigned 23 postal executives in an overhaul that experts warn “deemphasizes decades worth of institutional postal knowledge” and “centralizes power around DeJoy.”

The restructure also proposed a hiring freeze, early retirements, unit realignments, and regional downscaling.

On August 11, 2020, the Postal Service's General Counsel sent a letter to Congress explaining that state election workers had been notified that paying Marketing Mail rates instead of First-Class rates for election mail “will result in slower delivery times and will increase the risk that voters will not receive their ballots in time to return them by mail.”

This breaks from the Postal Service's longstanding practice of prioritizing the delivery of all election mail to meet First-Class delivery times.

The 2011 Canadian RoboCon suppression scandal is the political scandal stemming from events during the 2011 Canadian federal election.

It involved robocalls and real-person calls that were designed to result in voter suppression.

Elections Canada and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police conducted investigations into the claims that calls were made to dissuade voters from casting ballots by falsely telling them that the location of their polling stations had changed.

Further possible electoral law violations were alleged as the evidence unfolded.

Under the Canada Elections Act, it is an offense to willfully prevent or endeavor to prevent an elector from voting in an election.

On Election Day, May 2, 2011, reports of voter suppression, mostly centered on the riding of Guelph, led to the discovery that a computer in the Guelph Conservative campaign office may have been used to make the calls.

While the Elections Canada investigation initially focused on calls sent into Guelph amidst

nationwide complaints, the investigation expanded to complaints in other ridings across the country.

Court documents filed in mid-August 2012 by the Commissioner of Canada Elections indicated that the elections watchdog had received complaints of fraudulent or misleading calls in 247 of Canada's 308 ridings, recorded in all ten provinces and at least one territory.

The deciding margin for control for the government was within the margin of error created by the fraudulent robocalls, which were successful in misdirecting voters resulting in them not being able to cast votes in that national election.

It is my strong view that we must prepare voters from all socioeconomic backgrounds and ethnic cultural experiences to be prepared to deal effectively with efforts to misinform them about their participation in the November Election.

We must focus on the unsuspecting among the voting population who have no idea what is coming their way and prepare them to meet that challenge by linking them to the election protection efforts to allow them to develop the needed resources so they are prepared to exercise the most precious of rights and do the work of citizenship by casting their votes for a government that serves We The People and works to make our union more perfect.

This view is shaped by the decades of elections filled with disinformation and misinformation tactics designed to suppress or repress black, LatinX, and young voters from voting or having their votes counted.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in support of H.R. 8015.

USPS Email from Constituent

Ms. Jennifer

SUBJECT: USPS concerns MESSAGE: First, thank you for having a "post office" category. Neither senator does. Second, this is ridiculous. The postmaster has conflicts of interest. He is dismantling the postal service, which is explicitly required by the constitution. I depend on the USPS as a constituent. My company depends on it for correspondence and service with clients, especially while we work from home due to Covid. My clients depend on it to get services and benefits. Please vote or act to hold the postmaster accountable and to stop these ridiculous changes he is making. They make no business sense for a "business", and they are unethical for a government-provided, constitutionally-mandated service.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act. Our courageous postal workers and letter carriers have been essential in keeping our country on track during this pandemic. More of us than ever are relying on the U.S. Postal Service to safely deliver medication and mail in a timely manner. But now, this handpicked Postmaster General is engineering an unconstitutional assault against the Postal Service from the inside out.

I saw it myself just yesterday in Charlotte. Mail sorting machines have

been reassembled and removed. Workers are being prohibited from working overtime. Letters and packages are piling up.

I was proud to help lead the charge of Chairwoman MALONEY, Chairman CONNOLLY, and Mr. DEFAZIO earlier this month in a letter we wrote to Speaker PELOSI. Now, I am proud to vote in favor of protecting the essential institution. The U.S. Postal Service has been delivering for us our entire lives. Now it is time that we deliver for them and for America.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 8015.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 4 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to speak in strong support of the Delivering for America Act.

I have been here on the floor listening to this debate, and I have heard several of my Republican colleagues describe this as a manufactured crisis. Tell that to my constituents.

Tell that to Kelsey, a small business owner in Loveland, Colorado, who is worried about her ability to get packages delivered on time to her customers because of delays at the Postal Service.

Manufactured crisis? Tell that to Marsha, my constituent in Boulder, who depends on mail-order prescriptions, which this month took nearly 2 weeks to arrive.

This is not a manufactured crisis. There is a real crisis at the Postal Service under this Postmaster General, and we, here in the House, strive to fix it.

That is why I am a strong supporter of the bill that is before the House today, ultimately to ensure that the current standards of the Postal Service are protected and provide \$25 billion in emergency funding.

Let us get this done for the American people.

□ 1630

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is shameful and sinful that history will record that, on the great issues of our time, many of them, the Senate failed to act. On issues concerning life and death, the Senate of

the United States of America refused to act.

On the great issue of the HEROES Act, which has lifesaving implications—some 86,000 have died since it was passed—the Senate has failed to act.

On the issue of delivering lifesaving medications by way of the Postal Service, when the Postal Service needs our help, the Senate has refused to act.

And a Senate that refuses to act puts the actions of the House at risk, because the truth is this: It takes an act of Congress to help these entities; it takes an act of Congress to help the people of the United States of America; and you cannot get an act of Congress if the Senate refuses to act.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the chair of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise as a former letter carrier in support of H.R. 8015, to prevent the dangerous budget and service cuts proposed by Postmaster General DeJoy.

The Postmaster General claims he has not taken any steps to limit overtime for postal employees. His statement is hollow, because internal Postal Service documents show how policy changes prohibit "extra" or "late" trips, which means you finish delivering the mail in your bag that day, and they mandate that carriers "return on time," which means they can't finish the job.

In normal times, the Postal Service is crucial, but during a pandemic, on-time and efficient mail delivery is a matter of life and death.

Today's legislation will not just protect the Postal Service, but, given that people's homes are now polling places, the service protects the very essence of our democracy.

Don't mess with USPS.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, we see across the country the dismantling of the Postal Service, which has been a lifeline in American life.

My constituents are terrified, and they are angry because they are not receiving their medications on time; delays are hurting our small businesses; and they are outraged that their constitutional right to vote could be taken away.

This is not only an attack on our democracy but also on our workforce heroes, who, in spite of the pandemic, deliver our mail. Forty percent of these heroes are people of color. My grandfather retired as a letter carrier after 35 years of service.

I urge an “aye” vote to support, rather than to destroy, our Postal Service.

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

Mr. Speaker, despite the passionate arguments made by supporters of H.R. 8015, the truth is simple: The new Postmaster General is not trying to sabotage the election. He is doing the exact opposite. In fact, he is ensuring that States are educated on the reality of the Postal Service operations so that enough time is given for American citizens to vote by mail if they choose to do so.

Just yesterday, the Board of Governors announced a bipartisan committee to focus on election mail issues. Voting by mail is a crucial way that American citizens can exercise their constitutional right to vote, and it is important that all ballots be counted.

The Postal Service will be able to handle an increase in mail volume ahead of the election as they have already handled a larger volume of Census forms and stimulus checks earlier this year.

This increase in mail will also bring in revenue, strengthening the U.S. Postal Service’s fiscal outlook. Let’s not forget that the Postal Service already has approximately \$15 billion in cash on hand, which will allow it to be operational through August of 2021. It also has a \$10 billion line of credit from the CARES Act that it has not drawn down.

The USPS clearly does not need a bailout for the 2020 election season. To provide these funds without a concrete business reform plan that modernizes the post office for long-term viability would be reckless.

We all want to see an operational, efficient Postal Service that best serves every American. My grandmother was a rural mail carrier for 27 years. As both her grandson and as a Representative elected by rural Kentuckians, I know firsthand the importance of a reliable Postal Service in helping small businesses thrive, ensuring Americans get their medications on time, and allowing folks to share greeting cards with loved ones.

Americans deserve an improved Postal Service, but this bill potentially makes things worse.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, delivering the mail and medications and ballots, this is a part of our Constitution. It is important to our democracy.

And numbers don’t lie. This internal report from the Postal Service shows that services are down 10 percent since this Postmaster General took charge.

I want to publicly thank the Speaker of this great body for her leadership and for calling this emergency meeting and emergency vote. And there was no change in service until she called the meeting and vote.

I thank you for standing up to the American people and fighting for their

services and their democracy and their vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the United States Congress, the first woman in history, as we celebrate the 100th anniversary of women gaining the right to vote.

We are so proud of you and your leadership.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her kind words of introduction, but I most importantly want to thank her for being the champion, the champion in defense of the Postal Service. I rise to join her in support of the Delivering for America Act, to protect lives, livelihood, and the life of our American democracy during a critical moment for our Nation.

I thank you, Madam Chair, again, for the intellectual resource you have been in shaping the legislation, for making us current in terms of the reports from the Postal Service, what is at stake, and why this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is so important.

I salute House Democrats for their enthusiasm, energy, and insistence on delivering for America. Since day one of the postal crisis, they have conveyed the concerns of their communities to Congress, holding events, accelerating a drumbeat, and shining light on this crisis.

I am going to talk about three things, Mr. Speaker and Madam Chair and Mr. Ranking Member. This is about the provenance of the postal system and how important it has been to America, also what the challenges are in delaying service and, therefore, why this legislation is so necessary.

First, let me say that, in the Constitution of the United States, it says that Congress shall have the power to establish post offices and post roads, Article I, Section 8. So the post office is there in the Constitution.

But even before that, it has been a pillar of American democracy. It is an all-American institution, which enjoys the overwhelming support of the American people for a reason. Again, enshrined in the Constitution, an inseparable part of our national story, helping transition America from colonies to country.

In the early 1770s, our Founders relied on the precursor of the Postal Service, the Committees of Correspondence, to educate people about the abuses of the British and to build support for independence.

Even before the Declaration of Independence was signed, the Continental Congress had established the Postal Service as one of the first and most important offices that would be part of the new government.

Two of our U.S. Presidents, Abraham Lincoln and Harry Truman, would proudly hold the title of postmaster. One of our Founders, Benjamin Franklin, was the Postmaster General. Actually, he established the Postal Service.

So this goes to the heart of our country and the connection that the Postal

Service, throughout our history, from the very start, has been in tying our country together.

In the early 19th century, when visiting America to write his great book, “Democracy in America,” Alexis de Tocqueville praised the Postal Service as being the great link between minds, writing that not “in the most enlightened rural districts of France there is an intellectual movement either so rapid or on such a scale as” this, as the Postal Service.

So it has been excellent from the start, part of the unity of America.

As we all know, the postal motto states: “Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.”

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to ensure that those courageous couriers are not stayed from their constitutional duty to serve the American people.

I join you, Madam Chair, in saluting the patriotic men and women who risk their health and safety to serve the American people every day: our postal workers, our letter carriers, and all who may bring us together.

There is a second postal motto inscribed above the original Washington, D.C., Post Office, and this is really so clearly what the Postal Service has been about:

Messenger of Sympathy and Love  
 Servant of Parted Friends  
 Consoler of the Lonely  
 Bond of the Scattered Family  
 Enlarger of the Common Life  
 Carrier of News and Knowledge  
 Instrument of Trade and Industry  
 Promoter of Mutual Acquaintance  
 Of Peace and of Goodwill Among Men and Nations.

Our Postal Service is the beautiful thread that connects our country, delivering sympathy and love, news and knowledge, peace and goodwill. And as a grandmother, I will say, we have seen our children and grandchildren write their letters to Santa; we have seen messages come from the tooth fairy; we have seen photos and drawings of families taking joy in each other that no amount of social media can convey.

So, again, we must honor their service with our full support and protection and gratitude for what they mean in our lives.

Today, the Postal Service—and this is why this is so important that we have this legislation—provides critical services for Americans in every corner of the country: for our workers, delivering paychecks and tax returns; for our seniors, ensuring Social Security benefits; for small businesses, providing shipping and essential services; for millions of Americans, particularly rural Americans, delivering 1.2 billion prescriptions, including most of the medications delivered by the VA.

In 2019, 1.2 billion prescriptions were delivered by the Postal Service, and that was before the coronavirus hit.

□ 1645

That was before the coronavirus hit.

And for voters: Delivering absentee ballots and election mail, which is essential, especially during the coronavirus epidemic. No one should be forced to choose between his or her health and the right to vote.

Across the Nation, though, the Postmaster General is pushing sweeping new operational changes that degrade service, delay the mail, and threaten to disenfranchise voters, particularly in communities of color.

Now the Postmaster says he will postpone any further changes until after the election, that is what he says. But this is about more than the election. This legislation is written in a timely fashion to be about the coronavirus, and these changes should be there until the end of January or the end of the raging epidemic, whichever is later.

It is in that regard that I rise as Speaker to support the legislation. But as a representative of my district where I am not called Madam Speaker, I am called NANCY, this is what they have told me.

Michael said, he is a veteran with epilepsy. He reports that prescriptions sent by the VA through the mail are taking twice as long to arrive.

Walker says, he is a senior with debilitating health conditions, is now struggling to send and receive his mail after his closest mailbox was suddenly removed.

Claire, an 83-year-old with serious chronic illness, who does not have a car and is afraid to use public transport during the pandemic, is in a panic because she is utterly dependent on USPS for her medication and other vital deliveries, and of course, her ballot.

Another San Franciscan, Charlotte, warns that the Postal Service is vital to our country, not only when it comes to mail and voting, but also for fundamental needs of Americans.

And as Mark, another constituent, puts it, not only does what Trump is doing put the integrity of the November elections at risk; people are suffering every day, and they are not receiving their critical medications.

That is what I am hearing from my constituents, and they are told to go to the drug store. Well, they really can't in some cases. It endangers them to go to the drugstore, instead of getting it through the mail. Go to the drugstore.

So, again, this is immediate in their lives. We are their representatives. That is our job title and our job description. In representing my constituents, I wanted to convey some samples of concern that we have heard.

Earlier this week, in response to the activism of the American people, people have risen up, I have never seen anything quite like it. The Postmaster General announced changes that are wholly insufficient and do not reverse damage already wreaked. He said to me, frankly—and I have to give him credit for his honesty—he said, I have no intention of replacing the sorting

machines that were removed from the post offices;

I have no intention of replacing the blue mailboxes that have been ripped from our neighborhoods; and

He has no plans for ensuring adequate overtime, which is critical, critical for the timely delivery of the mail.

He said he has no intention of treating ballots as first-class mail. Now, yesterday he said something different, but that is what he told me a couple of days ago.

And I said to him, We will have the provision in the bill that requires you treat ballots as first-class mail. And he said, Well, if it is in the bill, then I will have to do it. Hence, his change of attitude.

He has not adequately addressed America's concerns about the slowdown and the delivery of medicine to veterans. He just didn't even seem to know about it. Really?

Today, Chairwoman MALONEY released new internal post office documents that expose the severity of the service declines and delivery delays caused by the Postmaster General's drastic changes.

These documents make clear that the Postmaster General has deliberately misled Congress and the American people about the extent of the damage, brushing them off as a dip in service or as unintended consequences. These revelations show that we cannot have confidence that the Postmaster General is prioritizing the Postal Service or the millions who rely on it.

Now, the House is moving forward with a, hopefully, bipartisan vote, and I think it will be, on Delivering for America Act, which will reverse the Trump damage and provided \$25 billion to the United States Postal Service.

Sadly, the administration has already threatened to veto this legislation, which contains the same amount of funding, the \$25 billion, that was recommended by the United States Postal Service Board of Governors. They are bipartisan. They are 100 percent appointed by Donald Trump, and they unanimously recommended the \$25 billion that is contained in this bill.

So for the sake of every senior who is delayed in getting his or her Social Security check, every veteran who is delayed in getting his or her medication, every working family who is delayed in getting their paycheck, and every voter now facing the prospect of choosing between their vote and their health, we need to pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge a strong bipartisan vote for H.R. 8015, the Delivery for America Act. Let's pass this under the leadership of distinguished Chairwoman MALONEY for the people.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8015.

This upcoming 2020 general election will be like no other we have witnessed. Americans

will cast their vote to elect a new government amidst a dangerous pandemic that has devastated countless American families. To date, over 170,000 Americans have died due to COVID-19 and over 5.6 million Americans have been infected. The pandemic has disrupted our health, economy and our way of life, including our democratic traditions. Americans are rightfully worried about how to safely cast their vote this November.

Public health experts agree that voters will be empowered to protect themselves and their families by having safe voting options, which includes absentee voting. Having the option to vote by mail ensures that voters who cannot vote in person don't have to choose between their health and their right to vote.

The engine of voting by mail is the United States Postal Service. In every election, postal workers provide an essential service to our democracy by processing and delivering millions of absentee ballots for domestic, overseas and military voters. This November, several million Americans will depend on the Postal Service to exercise their right to vote.

But in recent months, new leadership at the Postal Service directed drastic operational policy changes that disrupted mail processing and slowed mail delivery nationwide. The impact of the delays has been harmful to Americans, especially senior citizens, veterans and the sick, who depend on the Postal Service to receive medications, retirement checks and other essentials. Former Postal Service executives, election administrators and voter advocacy groups have warned that ongoing delays in mail services will likely disenfranchise voters that will cast absentee ballots this November.

The Delivering for America Act will work to restore prompt and reliable mail delivery services to the American people. The bill rolls back the recent disruptive operational changes at the Postal Service and prohibits the Postal Service from implementing any further changes that will delay mail and reduce delivery standards.

The bill also works to protect access to absentee voting and prevent voter disenfranchisement caused by delayed mail. It does this by ensuring that all election mail, including absentee ballots, will be treated as first-class mail, and will receive a postmark, or other indicia indicating date of receipt. In addition to protecting the absentee voting system, these changes will help maintain trust and confidence in the Postal Service.

And lastly, the bill will appropriate much needed funding support to the Postal Service in the amount of \$25 billion which will help ensure the long-term financial stability of the agency, and was requested by the Board of Governors appointed by President Donald Trump.

As November 3rd nears, and the COVID-19 pandemic continues to threaten American life and health, our duty today, as representatives of the American people, is to safeguard the American people's right to essential mail services and the right to vote. The Delivering for America Act, if enacted, will put into the place the necessary measures to ensure we fulfill this duty, and so I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service is a lifeline to rural communities. While some Americans have had the opportunity to work from home during this

pandemic, our letter carriers and postmasters do not. They're working tirelessly to ensure people in every corner of the country are getting their mail and packages, which for our at-risk population, has been especially critical.

I've been supportive of the \$25 billion in emergency funding included in this legislation and I'm relieved that at the urging of members like myself and the postal workers, a dangerous private right of action provision, which would have allowed trial lawyers to take advantage of the 2020 election, was removed.

As someone who has worked across the aisle to support the Postal Service, I was disappointed when it recently became a political weapon.

We should not be politicizing the Postal Service and in turn, the thousands of hard-working employees that serve each of our districts.

As Ranking Member of House Administration, I'll tell you that, while I'm supportive of this bill, it is not going to solve our election administration problems.

Despite early warnings from the Postal Service, at least eighteen states still have ballot request and return policies that are incompatible with their delivery standards, which significantly increases the risk of disenfranchising voters.

We saw hundreds of thousands of ballots during recent primaries across the country go uncounted for this very issue. NPR estimates nearly a half a million were rejected—disproportionately disenfranchising minority and younger voters.

Despite early warnings from the Postal Service, unrealistic ballot request and return policies continue to be one of the biggest impediments to ensuring every vote is counted.

A recent poll found 59 percent of Americans still prefer to vote in person, yet there's nothing in this bill to help states allow people to safely go to the polls.

So I'm not voting for this bill because I think the post office is trying to sabotage our elections, I'm voting for this bill because we're in the middle of a pandemic, the Postal Service is vital to our society, and they need our help.

And while I'm glad we're back here for a special session to help the Postal Service, I wish we were also voting on a deal to help our schools, small businesses, and the millions of people still out of work because of the pandemic.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Delivering for America Act (H.R. 8015), which would restore normal U.S. Postal Service (USPS) operations and prohibit the Trump Administration from implementing or approving any changes that would impede service during the COVID-19 pandemic. The bill also provides \$25 billion in emergency funding, matching the level requested by the bipartisan Board of Governors, and which the House passed as part of the Heroes Act in May.

For over two and a half centuries, our nation's Postal Service has stood as an independent, neutral entity focused solely on connecting Americans and providing essential services. This independence has allowed the Postal Service to maintain its status as the country's most trusted government agency for decades.

Over the past several weeks, the Trump Administration has turned the Postal Service into an instrument of partisan politics by enabling

Postmaster General DeJoy to implement harmful and unprecedented operational and service changes at the Postal Service, such as reducing overtime, restricting deliveries, and eliminating sorting machines and mailboxes. These actions have resulted in unacceptable wait times for mail across the country, delaying timely delivery of prescription medication and other vital mail, and endangering our upcoming election.

Following heavy criticism, the Postmaster General issued a wholly insufficient and misleading pause in operational changes. But it is now clear after his testimony before the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, that he has no intention of taking meaningful action to reverse the damage that the Postmaster General's sweeping changes have inflicted. Additionally, the pause does nothing to ensure voters that their election ballots will be delivered in time if they mail their ballots account to their state's deadlines. Finally, the pause is only temporary, and the damaging changes are set to return after the election. Two weeks ago, I called for the Postmaster General to resign. Today, I repeat that call and stand firm that he must step down.

The Trump Administration's efforts to sabotage the Postal Service have endangered the lives and livelihoods of millions who rely on the USPS for essential services like delivering life-saving medications, medical equipment, Social Security benefits and paychecks. The Postmaster General's decision to impose these dangerous changes in the middle of an ongoing pandemic has magnified the disruption of many of these vital services.

The use of mail-order prescriptions, for instance, has increased by 20 percent during the pandemic. Due to the degradation of service, mail-order medications are reportedly taking weeks to be delivered, forcing patients to skip doses of life-saving medicines. Veterans throughout the country have reportedly faced wait times of three weeks or more for mail-order medications, which has left the Department of Veterans Affairs scrambling to find alternative delivery services.

Stopping these changes and reversing the damage already done is not enough. We must provide the additional funding in this bill to ensure services continue uninterrupted through the election and the pandemic. But in the President's own words, he opposes any emergency funding because he believes that without it, the Postal Service will not be able to handle the estimated influx of mail-in ballots in the upcoming general election. The President himself has voted by mail in the last three elections but continues to attack mail-in voting as rife with fraud. In reality, voting fraud of all forms is extremely rare, and that's especially true with mail-in voting, whose fraud rates are immeasurably small. Oregon, the first state to expand mail-in ballots to general elections, has sent out more than 100 million mail-in ballots since 2000, and has documented less than a dozen cases of fraud.

With the number of Americans voting by mail for the election expected to more than double from the last due to the pandemic, Congress must protect the right of every American to vote. If Congress fails to act, we risk permanent damage to the integrity of our elections and our government institutions; we risk the livelihoods of farmers and workers around this country who rely on the USPS;

and we risk the health and lives of our seniors, veterans, and millions of other patients who rely on mail-order medications during a pandemic that has now claimed the lives of nearly 175,000 people in the U.S. Finally, we risk the disenfranchisement of seniors and other higher-risk individuals whose safest option is casting mail-in ballots.

Protecting the integrity of the Postal Service should never be a partisan issue. Congress must pass the Delivering for America Act, and work quickly to reverse the substantial damage inflicted by the Trump Administration.

I urge my colleagues to vote Yay and the Senate to take up this bill immediately.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, at a time when the United States Postal Service is needed more than ever before, I am proud to stand in support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act.

Ahead of the November elections, we must focus all efforts and resources to ensure that voting is safe, fair, and accessible for all. That's why I am pleased that the Delivering for America Act includes a requirement for election mail to be considered first-class, a ban on the removal of mail sorting machines, and a total reversal of any policies hindering the delivery of mail.

Election mail is not the only mail impacted by the recent changes. In my district, I have heard stories from my constituents about delays in delivery for vital medications, bills, and other important packages through the mail. At a time when seniors and those with preexisting conditions are unable to go out in public to pharmacies, or when those who lost their jobs see the bills piling up, timely deliveries should be the least of their worries.

This past week, I had the opportunity to meet with the Dallas County Postal Service and Union leaders to address the role of the federal government in protecting the processes, operations, and service standards for the USPS. There, I was glad to hear that everything was running up to speed thanks to the hardworking men and women—who risk their health day in and day out—to guarantee that our mail is delivered.

The USPS boasts one of the most diverse workforces in the country. In Texas, African Americans and Latinos make up a significant percentage of employees, and more than 50 percent are women. Because minority communities are disproportionately affected by COVID-19, proper PPE is necessary for their safety—which this bill provides funding for. It also prohibits a restriction on the use of overtime pay for USPS employees and prevents the institution of a hiring freeze, to ensure that they are equitably compensated for their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure and hope for its immediate consideration in the Senate.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act. This legislation will put a stop to Postmaster General Louis DeJoy's sabotage of the U.S. Postal Service and help reverse the damage that has already been done. H.R. 8015 will prohibit operational or service changes during the COVID public health emergency and ensure the level of service that was in place on January 1, 2020. The bill also includes \$25 billion to help shore up postal operations that have been badly impacted by the pandemic.



I have been deeply disturbed by recent operational and organizational changes at USPS designed to sabotage mail delivery service ahead of our 2020 presidential election. In his brief tenure as Postmaster General, Mr. DeJoy—a major contributor to the President's reelection campaign—has pushed through sweeping changes to mail delivery processes and procedures, dismantled vital mail sorting equipment, and undertaken a major restructuring intended to sideline career postal officials. This nakedly partisan attempt to subvert democracy and undermine confidence in the integrity of our election process is unconscionable and unacceptable. The Postmaster General should be ashamed of himself.

The USPS is a vital lifeline to millions of people across our country, especially now. Veterans and seniors rely on the mail to get prescriptions, people are staying connected with loved ones through mail while sheltering at home, and more voters will cast their ballots by mail this year than ever before. Fast, reliable postal service is critical to providing these essential services. Yet, my office has received numerous complaints of late or inconsistent mail service since the Postmaster General's changes went into effect. One constituent, a senior from Napa, wrote to me afraid her necessary medication would be useless by the time it arrived. The medication, which is temperature sensitive and usually takes 2–3 days to deliver, hadn't shown up in more than 10.

Our letter carriers are dedicated to providing our communities the highest level of service. Since the founding of our Post Office, they have lived by the motto: "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." The Delivering for America Act will help ensure postal employees can keep this oath. That's why I am proud to support and to be a coauthor of the legislation. I urge a yes vote.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our Postal Service and in support of its mission to serve our people, in support of its role in our democracy, in our elections, in support of its role in delivering vital goods and services critical to the health and well-being of our people and our economy and in support of the men and women of the Postal Service who have added the pandemic to the list of barriers they cast aside each day in their daily rounds.

Mr. Speaker, I note that we do not require that our government departments and agencies show a "profit." That is not their purpose. We do not defend our country for a "profit." We do not educate our children for a "profit." We do not protect our environment for a "profit."

Mr. Speaker, we long ago rejected the Luddite movement which advocated breaking machines in a futile effort to turn back scientific and technological progress. Breaking and discarding postal sorting machines is sabotage today, just as it was in the 1800s.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by the alarming delays in First-Class, marketing, and Priority Mail documented by the Postal Service's own briefing packet for the Postmaster General from last week. I have seen evidence of these delays in the pictures sent and the stories told to me by postal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly cast my vote in support of the request from the Postal Board of

Governors for \$25 billion in aid and in support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to House Resolution 1092, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COMER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 8015, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add after section 2(c) the following:

(d) PENALTIES FOR POSTAL SERVICE EMPLOYEE FEDERAL ELECTION TAMPERING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An employee of the United States Postal Service may be subject to disciplinary action consisting of removal, reduction in grade, debarment from Federal employment for a period not to exceed 5 years, suspension, or reprimand if the employee—

(A) knowingly and willfully obstructs or retards the passage of election mail products, or any carrier or conveyance carrying election mail products; or

(B) uses his official authority for the purpose of interfering with, or affecting, the nomination or the election of any candidate for Federal office.

(2) APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to any act that would be a violation of such paragraph taken on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

In section 3, add at the end after the period the following: "Such funds may only be used for operating expenses and may not be used to pay any outstanding debt of the Postal Service: *Provided further*, That during the COVID-19 emergency, the Postal Service shall use a portion of such funds to prioritize the delivery of postal products for ballots related to Federal election mail and medical or pharmaceutical delivery purposes and may establish temporary delivery points, in such form and manner as the Postal Service determines necessary, to protect employees of the Postal Service and individuals receiving deliveries from the Postal Service."

Mr. COMER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have shown immense passion today for both their constituents and the integrity of this upcoming national election. There is no doubt that voting by mail will be

more relied upon than it has been in previous elections.

The Postal Service will be a crucial link in the chain of custody between voters and State or local election boards. For the Americans who choose to cast their vote via mail, they need to be sure that their ballot, their voice, will be safe. We, therefore, need the proper measures in place to ensure that integrity is maintained.

In addition, if we are going to give the Postal Service funding, I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle need assurances that it will be spent where Americans need it more. The prioritization of medical deliveries and ballots for this election.

My motion contains reasonable additions to H.R. 8015 that ensure that this funding gets to where it needs to go. These provisions ensure that funds must only be spent on operating expenses to keep our postal workers paid and to keep them safe with personal protective equipment.

These provisions will also ensure that a portion of these funds go to prioritizing pharmaceutical deliveries to get life-saving medicines to Americans quicker. Lastly, these provisions ensure that these funds are used to prioritize ballots as well as establish penalties for postal employees who tamper or interfere with election mail.

For instance, any postal employee will face penalties if they knowingly and willfully slow down the processing of mail or use their official authority to interfere with the election of a Federal candidate. This upcoming election will put millions, possibly hundreds of millions of votes, in the literal hands of Postal Service workers who we must trust to deliver ballots safely and on time.

The election will put our collective faith in our Postal Service like we have never seen before, and those who break the trust of the Americans need to face the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, obviously, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not aware that fraud is a Federal—voter fraud is a crime. We have already established and funded the United States Postal Inspection Service.

Little do they know, whenever an employee is in a postal facility, there are internal galleys in every facility where you are observed for 24 hours a day by postal inspectors. Mr. Speaker, I am very comfortable that we will adhere to those laws. We have clerks who have sworn duties to protect elections.

But let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, 3 months ago this House passed the HEROES Act, and I ask my colleagues to

open their mail because we sent them a letter that will protect the Postal Service. We sent them a letter saying that we need to send funding to the States and local governments so they will not defund the police departments.

If you want to know who is defunding the police department, the lack of a movement in the Senate to send that necessary money to cities who must balance their budget. And the only way they can balance their budget is to cut because they don't have the funding that has been taken away from them because of COVID.

So you have the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have on their hands the defunding of our police department. I wanted, too, to be very clear that we have heard repeatedly that the Democrats had manufactured a crisis at the expense of this President, and that the emergency funding is "an unnecessary bailout plan."

We do not need to help the current President to create a crisis. We have seen every single day statements from the White House about what we are doing and what we should not do with the Postal Service. I want everyone here to know that every postal employee takes an oath that they will adhere to the Constitution, that they will serve and protect.

The majority of the postal workers are veterans who have served in the military, who continue their service in the Postal Service. I want it to be very clear that this election that is being held hostage right now by the Postal Service's internal decisions to tear it apart, where you have over 600,000 employees reporting to work who want to uphold their oath of office.

I want to say today, Mr. Speaker, that the Postal Service motto is neither rain, snow, heat or gloom of night you will not deter these carriers from their mission. And we are standing here today saying, no. Return to sender this unnecessary MTR. That we, as Democrats, we are putting forth this bill to ensure that we are not in that place where we are going to try to deter the Postal Service from doing their job.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to wake up, to understand that this is not a Democrat or Republican issue, because the ballots that are going to be moving through the Postal Service, some of them may even go to them, they better protect the Postal Service.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COMER. 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 182, nays 223, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—182

- Abraham Gooden Palazzo
Aderholt Gosar Palmer
Allen Graves (LA) Pence
Armstrong Graves (MO) Perry
Arrington Green (TN) Posey
Babin Griffith Reed
Bacon Grothman Reschenthaler
Baird Guest Rice (SC)
Balderson Guthrie Riggelman
Banks Hagedorn Roby
Barr Harris Rodgers (WA)
Bergman Hartzler Roe, David P.
Biggs Hern, Kevin Rogers (AL)
Bilirakis Herrera Beutler Rogers (KY)
Bishop (NC) Hice (GA) Rooney (FL)
Bishop (UT) Hill (AR) Rose (NY)
Bost Holding Rose, John W.
Brady Hollingsworth Rouzer
Brindisi Horn, Kendra S. Rutherford
Brooks (AL) Hudson Scalise
Buchanan Huizenga Schweikert
Buck Hurd (TX) Scott, Austin
Bucshon Jacobs Sensenbrenner
Budd Johnson (OH) Simpson
Burchett Johnson (SD) Smith (MO)
Burgess Jordan Smith (NE)
Byrne Joyce (OH) Smith (NJ)
Calvert Joyce (PA) Smucker
Carter (GA) Katko Spanberger
Carter (TX) Keller Stauber
Chabot Kelly (MS) Stefanik
Cheney King (NY) Steil
Cline Kinzinger Stivers
Cloud Kustoff (TN) Taylor
Cole LaHood Thompson (PA)
Comer LaMalfa Tiffany
Conaway Lamborn Tipton
Crawford Latta Torres Small
Crenshaw Lesko (NM)
Cunningham Long Turner
Curtis Loudermilk Upton
Davidson (OH) Lucas Van Drew
Davis, Rodney Luetkemeyer Wagner
DesJarlais Marshall Walberg
Duncan Massie Walker
Dunn Mast Walorski
Emmer McAdams Waltz
Estes McCarthy Watkins
Ferguson McCaul Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick McClintock Webster (FL)
Fleischmann McHenry Wenstrup
Fortenberry McKinley Westerman
Foxy (NC) Miller Williams
Fulcher Mitchell Wilson (SC)
Gaetz Moolenaar Wittman
Gallagher Mooney (WV) Womack
Garcia (CA) Mullin Woodall
Gianforte Murphy (NC) Wright
Gohmert Newhouse Yoho
Golden Norman Young
Gonzalez (OH) Nunes Zeldin

NAYS—223

- Adams Cicilline Deutch
Aguilar Cisneros Dingell
Allred Clark (MA) Doggett
Amash Clarke (NY) Doyle, Michael
Axne Clay F.
Barragan Cleaver Engel
Bass Cohen Escobar
Beatty Connolly Eshoo
Bera Cooper Espallat
Beyer Correa Evans
Bishop (GA) Correa Finkenauer
Blumenauer Costa Fletcher
Blunt Rochester Foster
Bonamici Cox (CA) Frankel
Boyle, Brendan Craig Fudge
F. Crist Gallego
Brown (MD) Crow Garamendi
Brownley (CA) Cuellar Garcia (IL)
Bustos Davids (KS) Garcia (TX)
Carbajal Davis (CA) Gomez
Cárdenas Davis, Danny K. Gonzalez (TX)
Case Dean Gottheimer
Carson (IN) DeFazio Green, Al (TX)
Cartwright DeGette Grijalva
Case DeLauro Haaland
Casten (IL) DelBene Harder (CA)
Castor (FL) Delgado Hastings
Castro (TX) Demings Hayes
Chu, Judy DeSaulnier Heck

- Higgins (NY) McBeth Scanlon
Himes McCollum Schakowsky
Horsford McEachin Schiff
Houlahan McGovern Schneider
Hoyer McNeerney Schrader
Huffman Meeks Schrier
Jackson Lee Meng Scott (VA)
Jayapal Mfume Scott, David
Jeffries Moore Serrano
Johnson (GA) Morelle Sewell (AL)
Johnson (TX) Moulton Shalala
Kaptur Mucarsel-Powell Sherman
Keating Murphy (FL) Sherrill
Kelly (IL) Nadler Sires
Kennedy Napolitano Slotkin
Khanna Neal Smith (WA)
Kildee Neguse Soto
Kilmer Norcross Speier
Kim O'Halleran Stanton
Kind Ocasio-Cortez Stevens
Kirkpatrick Omar Suozzi
Krishnamoorthi Pallone Swalwell (CA)
Kuster (NH) Panetta Takano
Lamb Pappas Thompson (MS)
Langevin Pascrell Thompson (CA)
Larsen (WA) Payne Titus
Larson (CT) Perlmutter
Lawrence Peters Tonko
Lawson (FL) Peterson Torres (CA)
Lee (CA) Phillips Trahan
Lee (NV) Pingree Trone
Levin (CA) Pocan Underwood
Levin (MI) Porter Vargas
Lieu, Ted Pressley Veasey
Lipinski Price (NC) Vela
Loeb sack Quigley Velázquez
Lofgren Raskin Vislosky
Lowenthal Rice (NY) Wasserman
Lowe y Richmond Schultz
Lujan Rouda Waters
Luria Roybal-Allard Watson Coleman
Lynch Ruiz Welch
Malinowski Ruppertsberger Wexton
Maloney, Carolyn B. Ryan Wild
Maloney, Sean Sánchez Wilson (FL)
Matsui Sarbanes Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

- Amodei Graves (GA) Shimkus
Brooks (IN) Higgins (LA) Spano
Collins (GA) Johnson (LA) Steube
Cook Kelly (PA) Stewart
Diaz-Balart King (IA) Thornberry
Flores Marchant Timmons
Gabbard Meuser Walden
Gibbs Olson
Granger Roy

□ 1754

Messrs. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, DEUTCH, JEFFRIES, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Miss RICE of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GOSAR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

- Axne (Raskin) DeSaulnier Jayapal (Raskin)
Barragan (Beyer) (Matsui) Johnson (TX)
Bera (Aguilar) Doggett (Raskin) (Jeffries)
Blumenauer Engel (Pallone) Kennedy
(Beyer) Escobar (Garcia (Deutch)
Bonamici (TX)) Khanna (Gomez)
(Raskin) Foster (Beyer) Kind (Beyer)
Brownley (CA) Frankel (Clark (Kirkpatrick)
(Clark (MA)) (Gallego)
Cárdenas Garamendi Kuster (NH)
(Gomez) (Sherman) (Clark (MA))
Case Gonzalez (TX) Lawson (FL)
(Cartwright) (Gomez) (Evans)
Clay (Davids Grijalva (García Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
(KS)) (IL)) Lipinski (Cooper)
Costa (Cooper) Hastings (Wasserman Lofgren (Jeffries)
Davis (CA) (Wild) Schultz)
DeGette (Blunt Schultzt)
Rochester) Horsford (Kildee) (Beyer)
DelBene (Heck) Huffman (Kildee) Lowey (Tonko)

McNerney (Raskin)  
 Meng (Clark (MA))  
 Moore (Beyer)  
 Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)  
 Nadler (Jeffries)  
 Napolitano (Correa)  
 Omar (Pressley)  
 Panetta (Kildee)  
 Pascrell (Pallone)  
 Payne (Wasserman Schultz)

Peters (Rice (NY))  
 Peterson (Vela)  
 Pingree (Clark (MA))  
 Porter (Wexton)  
 Price (NC)  
 Rooney (FL)  
 Roybal-Allard (McCollum)  
 Ruiz (Aguilar)  
 Rush (Underwood)  
 Sánchez (Aguilar)  
 Schakowsky (Kelly (IL))

Schneider (Houlahan)  
 Serrano (Jeffries)  
 Sires (Pallone)  
 Speier (Scanlon)  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Titus (Connolly)  
 Vislosky (Raskin)  
 Watson Coleman (Pallone)  
 Welch (McGovern)  
 Wilson (FL)  
 (Hayes)

Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Phillips  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Porter  
 Pressley  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Raskin  
 Reed  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Rose (NY)  
 Rouda  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppersberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan  
 Sánchez  
 Sarbanes  
 Scanlon  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider

Schrader  
 Schrier  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Shalala  
 Sherman  
 Sherrill  
 Sires  
 Slotkin  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Soto  
 Spanberger  
 Speier  
 Stanton  
 Stauber  
 Stefanik  
 Stevens  
 Stivers  
 Suzzo  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tlaib

Tonko  
 Torres (CA)  
 Torres Small (NM)  
 Trahan  
 Trone  
 Turner  
 Underwood  
 Upton  
 Van Drew  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Vislosky  
 Wagner  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wexton  
 Wild  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth  
 Young

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes due to circumstances beyond my control. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 179, “nay” on rollcall No. 180, “yea” on rollcall No. 181, and “nay” on rollcall No. 182.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, due to a long-standing prior commitment, I was unable to return for votes on Saturday, August 22. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 179 (PQ); “nay” on rollcall No. 180 (Rule); “yea” on rollcall No. 181 (MTR); and “nay” on rollcall No. 182 (H.R. 8015).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, under the advice of my physician, due to a bulging disk in my back, I could not get on a plane to return to Washington to vote on H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 179, “nay” on rollcall No. 180, “yea” on rollcall No. 181, and “nay” on rollcall No. 182.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend today’s roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 179, “nay” on rollcall No. 180, “yea” on rollcall No. 181, and “nay” on rollcall No. 182.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on August 22, 2020 due to not being in DC. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “no” on rollcall No. 179; “no” on rollcall No. 180; “yes” on rollcall No. 181; and “no” on rollcall No. 182.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	Huffman (Kildee)	Peters (Rice (NY))
Barragan (Beyer)	Jayapal (Raskin)	Peterson (Vela)
Bera (Aguilar)	Johnson (TX)	Pingree (Clark (MA))
Blumenauer (Beyer)	(Jeffries)	Porter (Wexton)
Bonamici (Raskin)	Kennedy (Deutsch)	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Khanna (Gomez)	(Butterfield)
(Clark (MA))	Kind (Beyer)	Rooney (FL)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	(Beyer)
Case (Cartwright)	Kuster (NH)	Roybal-Allard (McCollum)
Clay (Davids (KS))	(Clark (MA))	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Costa (Cooper)	Lawson (FL)	Rush (Underwood)
Davis (CA) (Wild)	(Evans)	Sánchez (Aguilar)
DeGette (Blunt)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Schakowsky (Kelly (IL))
Rochester)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Schneider (Houlahan)
DelBene (Heck)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Serrano (Jeffries)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Sires (Pallone)
Doggett (Raskin)	(Beyer)	Speier (Scanlon)
Engel (Pallone)	Lowey (Tonko)	Thompson (CA)
Escobar (Garcia (TX))	McNerney (Raskin)	(Kildee)
Foster (Beyer)	Meng (Clark (MA))	Titus (Connolly)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Moore (Beyer)	Vislosky (Raskin)
Garamendi (Sherman)	Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Gonzalez (TX) (Gomez)	Nadler (Jeffries)	Welch (McGovern)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Napolitano (Correa)	Wilson (FL)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Omar (Pressley)	(Hayes)
Horsford (Kildee)	Panetta (Kildee)	
	(IL))	
	Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	
	Horsford (Kildee)	

NAYS—150

Gohmert  
 Gonzalez (OH)  
 Gooden  
 Gosar  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Green (TN)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guest  
 Guthrie  
 Hagedorn  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hern, Kevin  
 Hice (GA)  
 Hill (AR)  
 Holding  
 Hollingsworth  
 Hudson  
 Huizenga  
 Jacobs  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson (SD)  
 Jordan  
 Joyce (PA)  
 Keller  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kinzinger  
 Kustoff (TN)  
 LaHood  
 Lamborn  
 Latta  
 Lesko  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Marshall  
 Massie  
 Mast  
 McCarthy  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 Miller  
 Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (NC)

NOT VOTING—24

Amodei  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Collins (GA)  
 Cook  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Flores  
 Gabbard  
 Gibbs  
 Granger  
 Higgins (LA)  
 Johnson (LA)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 Marchant  
 Meuser  
 Olson

□ 1839

So the bill was passed.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. COMER. 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 257, nays 150, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—257

Adams  
 Aguilar  
 Allred  
 Axne  
 Bacon  
 Balderson  
 Barragan  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Bera  
 Beyer  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt Rochester  
 Bonamici  
 Bost  
 Boyle, Brendan F.  
 Brindisi  
 Brown (MD)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Buchanan  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Carbajal  
 Cárdenas  
 Carson (IN)  
 Cartwright  
 Case  
 Casten (IL)  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Cisneros  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Cooper  
 Correa  
 Costa  
 Courtney  
 Cox (CA)  
 Craig  
 Crist  
 Crow  
 Cuellar  
 Cunningham  
 Davids (KS)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny K.  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Dean  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro

Kim

Kind  
 King (NY)  
 Kirkpatrick  
 Krishnamoorthi  
 Kuster (NH)  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamb  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lawrence  
 Lawson (FL)  
 Lee (CA)  
 Lee (NV)  
 Levin (CA)  
 Levin (MI)  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 Loebsack  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lujan  
 Luria  
 Lynch  
 Malinowski  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn B.  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui  
 McAdams  
 McBath  
 McCaul  
 McCollum  
 McEachin  
 McGovern  
 McKinley  
 McNerney  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Mfume  
 Moore  
 Morelle  
 Moulton  
 Mucarsel-Powell  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Neguse  
 Norcross  
 O’Halloran  
 Ocasio-Cortez  
 Omar  
 Pallone  
 Panetta  
 Pappas  
 Pascrell  
 Payne

EMERGENCY STOPGAP USCIS  
STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on the Budget be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8089) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to expand premium processing for certain immigration benefits, 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8089

*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 “Emergency Stopgap USCIS Stabilization Act”.

**SECTION 2. EXPANSION OF PREMIUM PROCESSING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 286(u) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356(u)) is amended to read as follows:

“(u) PREMIUM FEE FOR CERTAIN IMMIGRATION BENEFIT TYPES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to establish and collect a premium fee for the immigration benefit types described in paragraph (2). Such fee shall be paid in addition to any other fees authorized by law, deposited as offsetting receipts in the Immigration Examinations Fee Account established under subsection (m), and used for the purposes described in paragraph (4).

“(2) IMMIGRATION BENEFIT TYPES.—Subject to reasonable conditions or limitations, the Secretary shall establish a premium fee under paragraph (1) in connection with—

“(A) employment-based nonimmigrant petitions and associated applications for dependents of the beneficiaries of such petitions;

“(B) employment-based immigrant petitions filed by or on behalf of aliens described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 203(b);

“(C) applications to change or extend nonimmigrant status;

“(D) applications for employment authorization; and

“(E) any other immigration benefit type that the Secretary deems appropriate for premium processing.

“(3) AMOUNT OF FEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), with respect to an immigration benefit type designated for premium processing by the Secretary on or before August 1, 2020, the premium fee shall be \$2,500, except that the premium fee for a petition for classification of a nonimmigrant described in subparagraph (H)(ii)(b) or (R) of section 101(a)(15) shall be \$1,500.

“(B) OTHER IMMIGRATION BENEFIT TYPES.—With respect to an immigration benefit type designated for premium processing but not described in subparagraph (A), the initial premium fee shall be established by regulation, which shall include a detailed methodology supporting the proposed premium fee amount.

“(C) BIENNIAL ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary may adjust a premium fee under subparagraph (A) or (B) on a biennial basis by the percentage (if any) by which the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the

month of June preceding the date on which such adjustment takes effect exceeds the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the same month of the second preceding calendar year. The provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to an adjustment authorized under this subparagraph.

“(4) USE OF FEE.—Fees collected under this subsection may only be used by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to—

“(A) provide the services described in paragraph (5) to premium processing requestors;

“(B) make infrastructure improvements in adjudications processes and the provision of information and services to immigration and naturalization benefit requestors;

“(C) respond to adjudication demands, including by reducing the number of pending immigration and naturalization benefit requests; and

“(D) otherwise offset the cost of providing adjudication and naturalization services.

“(5) PREMIUM PROCESSING SERVICES.—The Secretary—

“(A) may suspend the availability of premium processing for designated immigration benefit requests only if circumstances prevent the completion of processing of a significant number of such requests within the required period; and

“(B) shall ensure that premium processing requestors have direct and reliable access to current case status information as well as the ability to communicate with the premium processing units at each service center or office that provides premium processing services.”.

(b) EXPANSION TO NEW BENEFIT REQUESTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the requirement to set a fee by regulation under section 286(u)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356(u)(3)(B)), as amended by subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security may set a fee under that section without regard to the provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code, if such fee is consistent with the following:

(A) For a petition for classification under section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(C)), or a petition for classification under section 203(b)(2) involving a waiver under section 203(b)(2)(B) of such Act, the fee is set at an amount not greater than \$2,500 and the required processing timeframe is not greater than 45 days.

(B) For an application under section 248 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1258) to change status to a classification described in subparagraph (F), (J), or (M) of section 101(a)(15) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)), the fee is set at an amount not greater than \$1,750 and the required processing timeframe is not greater than 30 days.

(C) For an application under section 248 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1258) to change status to be classified as a dependent of a nonimmigrant described in subparagraph (E), (H), (L), (O), (P), or (R) of section 101(a)(15) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)), or to extend such classification, the fee is set at an amount not greater than \$1,750 and the required processing timeframe is not greater than 30 days.

(D) For an application for employment authorization, the fee is set at an amount not greater than \$1,500 and the required processing timeframe is not greater than 30 days.

(2) CLARIFICATION.—The required processing timeframe for each of the applications and petitions described in paragraph (1) shall not commence until the date that all prerequisites for adjudication are received by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(c) OTHER BENEFIT REQUESTS.—In implementing the amendments made by subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop and implement processes to ensure that the availability of premium processing, or its expansion to additional immigration benefit requests, does not result in an increase in processing times for immigration benefit requests not designated for premium processing or an increase in regular processing of immigration benefit requests so designated.

SEC. 3. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the appropriate Committees a 5-year plan, including projected cost estimates, procurement strategies, and a project schedule with milestones, to accomplish each of the following:

(1) Establish electronic filing procedures for all applications and petitions for immigration benefits.

(2) Accept electronic payment of fees at all filing locations.

(3) Issue correspondence, including decisions, requests for evidence, and notices of intent to deny, to immigration benefit requestors electronically.

(4) Improve processing times for all immigration and naturalization benefit requests.

(b) SEMI-ANNUAL BRIEFINGS.—Not later than 180 days after submission of the plan described in paragraph (1), and on a semi-annual basis thereafter, the Secretary shall advise the appropriate Committees on the implementation status of such plan.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate Committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

**SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF FRANKLIN D. RAINES AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 88) providing for the appointment of Franklin D. Raines as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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