

Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarella
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed

Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart

Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiffany
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Roy
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

Moore (Beyer)
Mucarsel-Powell
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Payne
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Pingree (Clark
(MA))

Pocan (Raskin)
Pressley (García
(IL))
Richmond
(Davids (KS))
Roybal-Allard
(Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Serrano
(Jeffries)

Thompson (CA)
(Kildee)
Titus (Connolly)
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Wilson (FL)
(Adams)

consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1630

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1161, providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 925, America's Conservation Enhancement Act.

The rule makes in order a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House: One, concur in the Senate amendment to the title; and, two, concur in the Senate amendment to the text with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-66, which is identical to H.R. 8406, the Heroes Act.

Finally, the rule provides for 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because the American people are tired of waiting.

It has been more than 4 months since this House passed the Heroes Act in response to the coronavirus pandemic to help our first responders, healthcare workers, struggling businesses, and local governments.

This bill passed this House on May 15, Mr. Speaker. But what did the Senate do, Mr. Speaker? Nothing.

They apparently couldn't be bothered to bring this bill up for a vote in over 4 months, but it took MITCH MCCONNELL roughly 80 minutes after Justice Ginsburg passed away to announce a vote on a Supreme Court nominee.

Now, you can't make this stuff up. Something is terribly, terribly wrong here.

More than 205,000 Americans have lost their lives due to coronavirus and more than 7 million more have been affected.

Millions of people are out of work, small businesses are struggling, and some have had to shut their doors forever. Our economy hasn't taken a hit like this since the Great Depression. Many families are struggling every day to make ends meet. Kids are going hungry.

This pandemic isn't going to just disappear overnight, as the President has suggested. It is going to take a whole-of-government response for quite some time, and that requires Congress to act.

The Republicans in the Senate may be able to sleep at night telling the American people to wait and then wait some more and then wait some more

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 925, NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION EXTENSION ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-556) on the resolution (H. Res. 1161) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 925) to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 925, NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION EXTENSION ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1161 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1161

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 925) to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order or question of consideration, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House: (1) concur in the Senate amendment to the title; and (2) concur in the Senate amendment to the text with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-66. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During

NOT VOTING—16

Abraham
Brady
DeGette
Diaz-Balart
Emmer
Gabbard

Graves (GA)
Hagedorn
Lamb
Mitchell
Mullin
Nadler

Rooney (FL)
Simpson
Staubert
Wright

□ 1625

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 4764.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Beatty
(Lawrence)
Butterfield
(Kildee)
Chu, Judy
(Takano)
Cohen (Beyer)
DeSaulnier
(Matsui)
Frankel (Clark
(MA))
Fudge (Bass)
Garamendi
(Sherman)

Grijalva (García
(IL))
Hastings
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Hayes (Courtney)
Huffman (Kildee)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kaptur (Dingell)
Kennedy (Kuster
(NH))
Kirkpatrick
(Stanton)

Langevin
(Lynch)
Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Lowe (Tonko)
McEachin
(Wexton)
Meng (Clark
(MA))

while they rubber stamp another judge, but I cannot ask our people, our communities, our small businesses, our workers and their families to wait any longer. No one in this majority can.

Our country is suffering, and our people are in pain. That is why we have tried over these past 4 months to strike a fair and commonsense deal with Senate Republicans, but they couldn't even come to an agreement on a package among themselves. Republicans are fighting with Republicans over there, so they just abandoned doing anything at all.

Doing nothing is unconscionable.

I am proud that our Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, has never given up. She has spoken with Treasury Secretary Mnuchin again and again and again and again trying to come up with an agreement.

Her offer to this administration was simple: let's meet halfway. Let's take the \$3.4 trillion in relief contained in the initial Heroes Act and reduce it by \$1.2 trillion. We would still fund our first responders, our small businesses, and our State and local governments, but we would meet Republicans in the middle. We would come down \$1 trillion and they would come up \$1 trillion.

That is called compromise. That is what you do, and it is what you have to do from time to time in divided government. The bill included in this rule, H.R. 8406, reflects that give-and-take.

There is funding here for State and local governments to avert layoffs and continue critical services; for coronavirus testing, tracing, and treatment; for our hospitals and for our healthcare providers; for continuing unemployment insurance; and for families to pay for necessities like food, utilities, and rent during this pandemic.

This revamped Heroes Act totals \$2.2 trillion. Many Democrats, including myself, favored the original larger bill. My friends on the other side wanted something much smaller. But disagreement should never result in inaction.

One in four children in this country are at risk of going hungry this year because of this pandemic, Mr. Speaker. The lines for food banks in some communities already go for miles.

People are hurting today, right now. We all know that. And if you don't know that, you don't go back to your district.

We all know what it takes to truly do something about it.

We have pleaded with the Senate to take this bill up for months, we have negotiated over and over again, and today we are back with a compromise proposal.

The only question, Mr. Speaker, is whether my Republican colleagues are finally ready to take "yes" for an answer.

On behalf of the most vulnerable among us, those who are out of work, going hungry, and struggling to get by, I pray the answer is finally "yes."

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, all my colleagues, to sup-

port this rule and the underlying Heroes Act so we can finally, finally get relief to where it is so badly needed.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider a rule that provides for consideration of a single item, the Senate amendment to H.R. 925, the majority's second attempt to pass a partisan wish list under the guise of a coronavirus relief bill.

There are two quotes that sum up how I feel about today's rule, Mr. Speaker. The first, widely misattributed to Albert Einstein, is that: "The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results"; the second, accurately attributed to Yogi Berra, is that today's action feels like: "It's *deja vu* all over again."

Today, the House majority is bringing up again a partisan coronavirus relief package, just as they did in May.

As in May, today's bill was written with only Democratic input.

Like in May, today's bill has a massive price tag. This sits at \$2.4 trillion.

As in May, today's bill contains a plethora of provisions that are completely unrelated to coronavirus relief.

Indeed, just like in May, today's bill is more akin to a Democratic policy wish list than to an actual relief bill.

And just as in May, we all know what the end result will be: the Senate will not pass this bill and the President will not sign it into law.

But it doesn't have to be this way, Mr. Speaker.

For whatever reason, the majority is refusing to truly negotiate on a bipartisan coronavirus relief bill that would provide real relief for millions of Americans.

I grant them, discussions have taken place. But when the majority continues to insist that it is their way or no way and refuses to meet Republicans halfway, one begins to understand how we got to this point.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind both this Chamber and the American people that it has been the Democrats who have blocked a second coronavirus relief bill. Just last week, House Democrats blocked Republicans from bringing up a simple bill to extend the Paycheck Protection Program. In the Senate, Democrats blocked the majority from bringing up a clean extension of PPP, and later, Democrats blocked a Republican-led coronavirus relief bill from being considered, not because they disagreed with anything in the bill, but because they just thought other things should be in the bill.

All of these bills are bills that the President would have signed into law.

At a time when so many Americans are truly suffering, why the House ma-

jority insists on blocking these measures and bringing up their own partisan wish list instead does not make sense to me.

But what makes even less sense is the egregious process they followed in considering this bill. The process, if you can even call it that, violated House rules and any notion of fairness.

The bill was introduced on Monday night after being drafted in secret in Speaker PELOSI's office without any Republican input whatsoever. No committee held a hearing on it and no committee marked it up. That is violating the McGovern rule, which requires any bill coming before the Rules Committee to have a hearing and a markup in the committee of jurisdiction.

The bill is 2,152 pages long, and I highly doubt that most Members have had time to read, review, and digest it in that short amount of time.

I will say this, though: it does set a record. It spends \$1 billion a page. That is pretty remarkable spending.

When your process is that bad, no wonder the output is as bad as the bill we are considering today.

The majority claims that today's bill is a scaled-down version of the Heroes Act, a bill we considered back in May. If the majority's funding calculations on the amount of money we are spending in this bill are accurate, that may be technically correct, but it still has the exact same policies and problems as the Heroes Act.

This bill includes massive spending even in areas where we appropriated funds as part of the CARES Act in March and haven't fully spent them yet: funding for Democratic policy priorities at the expense of bipartisan ones; inclusion of provisions that are completely unrelated to coronavirus relief, like a complicated and controversial multiemployer pension bill, a provision revealing an existing provision of law requiring the auction of T-Band spectrum, massive student loan forgiveness, and the mandating of a national vote by mail.

Some of these may deserve consideration, but what they are doing in a bill that is supposed to be about providing relief to Americans affected by the coronavirus pandemic is beyond me.

Mr. Speaker, in any bill this size, it is inevitable that all Members will find at least one provision that they like, but it is the package as a whole that is offensive and objectionable.

Drafted without Republican input and with nothing but Democratic ideas and extraneous policy priorities, it is doomed to the same result as happened the last time the majority tried this approach.

With their actions today, we will not move the ball forward, we will not draw closer to a final deal that actually helps Americans. And what they will do is to continue to pass on the chance to actually work together as a bipartisan institution and to provide real help to the American people.

Just as in May, the majority is putting up a partisan bill, when what we

need is a bipartisan deal. We did that four times before, Mr. Speaker. If we chose to, we could do so again.

They are doing the same thing again and expecting a different result.

Mr. Speaker, it didn't have to be this way. There are many areas where we agree: Paycheck Protection Program; additional money for schools to reopen; a one-time payment of \$1,200 per individual, \$500 per child in households making less than \$75,000 a year; additional money to speed the distribution of vaccines.

Those are areas we could bring out one at a time or bundled together and pass. Instead, my friends have chosen to use a formula they know is doomed to failure.

As to the amount, the President has actually been flexible. The original Senate proposal was \$1 trillion, no inconsiderable sum of money, I might add. The President moved that up to \$1.5 trillion. That wasn't good enough, even though many members of my friend's party actually supported that, the so-called Problem Solvers Caucus.

So I don't want to belabor the point, but I know the difference between a serious effort to pass legislation that has a chance of passing in the Senate and being signed by the President and a messaging exercise, and that is all we are engaged in today. So it is indeed, Mr. Speaker, *deja vu* all over again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that when my friend says this is a Democratic wish list of things, I mean, the fact of the matter is, we are trying to respond to a pandemic. We haven't had to deal with something like this since 1918.

□ 1645

It has basically impacted our economy in ways that have resulted in millions of people losing their jobs. We have schools that have not fully reopened because it is not safe. We have had shortages of PPE. We don't have adequate testing. I can go on and on and on.

But the wish list that this bill addresses has things like we support small businesses. We improve the Paycheck Protection Program. That is hardly—I would like to think Republicans share that, too.

Additional assistance for the airline industry workers: Is that so controversial?

More funds to bolster education and childcare: Given what we are going through, is that controversial?

We honor our heroes. We provide assistance to State, local, territorial, and Tribal governments that desperately need funds to pay first responders. Is that a point of contention?

It supports testing, tracing, and treatment; provides additional direct payments for those who are unem-

ployed; protects payrolls; ensures worker safety; preserves health coverage; restores unemployment benefits; bolsters housing assistance; strengthens food security at a time when a record number of Americans are going hungry.

Again, just to put this in context, we passed something 4 months ago. Four months ago, we sent it over to the Senate. Now, they should have passed something, and then we could have negotiated the differences. That is the way it usually works.

The Republicans are fighting with Republicans over in the Senate. There is a big chunk of Republicans who don't want to appropriate one more penny for the American people. No, they don't have the time. But they have the time to rush through another Supreme Court Justice, in record time.

I guess what is so frustrating is that some of my friends act like this is not an emergency, like, you know, we can just kind of go along and everything will be fine. This is an emergency.

We haven't faced a crisis like this in our lifetime, and if we don't have an all-out comprehensive approach, not a scalpel approach—it is not just about PPP. It is also about our schools, our healthcare workers, our first responders. It is about a whole bunch of stuff. But if we don't have an all-comprehensive approach, then this economy is going to have a very difficult time recovering.

It is just frustrating to me. I was home in Massachusetts. I did tours of restaurants in my district, and people have been visiting some of our restaurants, eating outside. But in Massachusetts, we get winters. It is going to get cold soon, and pretty soon, people are not going to want to eat outside. They won't be able to.

If people don't feel safe going inside because, as we are seeing now in a number of States that aren't following some of the recommendations of the CDC, we see case numbers going up. So if we had another surge, how are these restaurants going to survive? They are going to shut their doors forever.

We have an opportunity to provide a lifeline until we get through all of this. I mean, there are so many aspects of our economy that have been impacted by this, so many people who are just struggling to get by.

It is unconscionable to me that this hasn't occupied a greater sense of urgency in the Republican leader's mind over in the Senate. I just don't get it. It really is so disappointing to me.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself such time as I may consume just to quickly make a couple of points and then move to my friend from Arizona.

Far be it for me, Mr. Speaker, to defend the upper body. I am a very proud Member of this House, as I know all of us here are.

But it is worth noting for the RECORD the Senate actually had 52 votes to

pass a bill. It was my friend's party that kept them from considering it.

As to the Supreme Court, thank goodness they don't have to deal with the House of Representatives. That is why they are able to move quickly. They could move pretty quickly if they had somebody they could deal with here as well.

It is my friends who have chosen to craft legislation that they know will be unacceptable, that they know the President will not sign, and then rail at them for not passing it and the President for not signing it. That is the height of chutzpah, if you will.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my distinguished friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. COLE for yielding me the time.

I agree with Chairman MCGOVERN that we need to help the American people. There are still people hurting out there, and they need help from us.

That is why it is so frustrating to me that we have this bill in front of us because it is just a very similar version to the partisan bill that the Democrats pushed out of here just a few months ago that they know is not going to get anywhere.

I remember seeing in the media how Democrats in the House in swing districts were asking, pleading with Speaker PELOSI, to please negotiate with the Republicans and the President to actually get a bill that will be passed and signed into law because, after all, you all know that if you really want to help the American people, you have to have a bill that is actually able to get signed into law, and this bill is not it.

Unfortunately, this bill, once again, highlights a lot of the priorities that my Democratic colleagues have that have nothing to do with coronavirus, quite frankly.

One of the things that I found very interesting in this bill is that, in the original Heroes Act that was passed a few months ago, they had \$600 million in there for the COPS hiring program. That is to help State and local law enforcement. Curiously enough, it is not in this version of the bill.

So I was wondering, is this how they are planning to save some money on the bill, to take away funding for police and law enforcement?

Also in this bill, once again, is extending the extra \$600 a week in unemployment assistance into the beginning and through spring of next year. Well, many businesses, multiple businesses, have told us that they are having trouble hiring workers back because workers are getting paid more to stay at home and not work. This is right here in that bill, in this bill, right now.

We cannot pay people more to stay home and not work. We need to incentivize them to come back to work.

This bill also allows illegal immigrants to get \$1,200 stimulus checks

and their children \$500 stimulus checks. That is right here in this language, right here in this bill. American citizens, my taxpayers in Arizona, do not want to subsidize illegal immigrants.

This bill also removes safeguards in the Paycheck Protection Program.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Arizona an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. LESKO. This bill also removes any protections from using taxpayer dollars to fund abortions. That is right here in this bill.

This bill, as Representative COLE also said, federalizes elections. In fact, it prohibits States from requiring voter ID. Arizona requires voter ID. This bill would take that away.

It also legalizes ballot harvesting. Arizona opposed—the legislature said no ballot harvesting. This would bring it right back, right here in this bill.

Again, it would also provide tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires in blue States that require taxpayers in low-tax States, like Arizona, to subsidize them.

That is why we can't support this bill. There are too many poison pills. Please come up with something that we can agree on to help the American people.

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

Before I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas, I just want to say a couple of things for the RECORD.

I guess the new Republican tactic—if anybody watched the debate yesterday—is to try to twist and turn and confuse people.

The gentlewoman implied that this somehow defunds police. I mean, there is \$436 billion in here to provide assistance directly to State and local governments to support the police.

If my friend was so interested in supporting the police, she should know that the bill that Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL brought up provided no money for State and local governments. I mean nothing.

In fact, that bill didn't provide money for a lot of the most needy people in this country who are suffering as a result of this virus: no money for nutrition to help our families who are going hungry, no money for a lot of the priorities that I know are priorities not only in my district but all over the country.

The bottom line is, my friends can come up with excuse after excuse after excuse to not support this. But by not supporting it, we are not supporting the American people at a time of desperate need.

Again, we have come down \$1.3 trillion from what we originally put forward, not because we think it is necessarily the right thing to do, because the need is so great. We are doing it to try to find ways to accommodate, to move this process forward. And obvi-

ously, my friends make up ways to justify their voting "no" on this.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the American people cannot take this anymore.

And my good friend from Oklahoma, I know the compassion that he has. We have worked together, as well as my friends from Ohio and Arizona.

But yesterday, I stood with the mayor of the city of Houston, and we announced a mental health hotline for people being impacted by COVID-19. Yes, the stress of COVID-19 is taking a toll on the American people. They need relief.

A very proud, brave parent got up to talk about how difficult it is to virtually teach her children while she works and how concerned she was. Why? Because the mandate comes from on high—the White House—that if you are not having your children in school in some form, meaning in the buildings, because that is the decision she was grappling with, then you don't get money.

They have no money. They have no money to have expanded buildings or temporary buildings so that they can help parents who work have children safely in school. They have no money for testing. They have no money to be able to provide for sick employees from COVID-19.

So I rise today to say: The American people cannot take it anymore. The stress is enormous. What we have done here is a very merciful response to the bill we already passed, that our friends, conflicted with each other and the White House, cannot seem to get a grip on.

I support \$225 billion for education and childcare, \$436 billion in assistance to our State and local governments.

I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for making it clear. Those are our municipal workers. Those are police and fire, and we need it because who has gotten sick? Police officers, firefighters. And we need this money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we need the testing. We are doing testing on the last pennies of the money that we were granted through the leadership, our Speaker and others.

They need testing. I will be in a stadium this coming week, trying to get people tested. That is how much we need it.

Then, of course, \$28 billion in procurement, distribution, education, materials for the vaccine.

But I want to focus on the \$600 for unemployment, the money for the \$1,200, as well as the money for rental and mortgage to prevent mortgage

foreclosure. The restaurant money, I want it for the independent pizza shops who hire people, for the workers who are going to be out of work, like airport workers or airline workers. The food insecurity, people are standing on line to get food.

What don't my good friends understand? That people are desperate, and they are in need?

I wish we were not discussing questions about white supremacy and whether or not someone believed it or not. I wish we would stay focused on getting this bill passed for the desperate people, no matter what backgrounds they are.

I want to rise in enthusiastic support for this Heroes bill, H.R. 8406. Let's pass it now.

□ 1700

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up H.R. 8265, a bill to extend the Paycheck Protection Program through the end of the year and release \$137 billion in unspent funds for that program.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress can agree we need to enact relief for the millions suffering from the pandemic, but we should only move forward on legislation that can actually be signed into law. The measure the majority is attempting to pass today simply doesn't fit that bill. Absent a comprehensive bipartisan package, we should pass smaller pieces where there is broad consensus, such as the Paycheck Protection Program.

PPP is of great importance to our constituents. It is helping keep millions of Americans employed and receiving a paycheck. Members on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers agree that this crucial program needs to be extended, and it could be extended today if the majority were to bring a bipartisan bill extending PPP to the floor.

But you don't have to take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. Many House Democrats agree we need to pass a true relief bill now rather than just another political messaging bill.

A bipartisan letter recently sent to the Speaker stressed that "failing to reach a deal is unacceptable and is a failure of duty to the American people."

A separate letter sent to the Speaker by eight Democrats last week demanded "a vote on a clean relief package that has direct assistance for those in need."

Perhaps the most telling is a third letter sent just a few days ago and signed by 23 Democrats. These Members correctly point out to their leaders that, absent a bipartisan deal, a "discharge petition is the only potential option for COVID-19-related action on the House floor."

As my colleagues know, House Republicans have such a discharge petition ready to be signed, and we look forward to these Members joining us.

However, I would point out, Madam Speaker, to my colleagues that we don't have to wait for a discharge petition to succeed. We can take a clear step right now by defeating the previous question and bringing H.R. 8265 up for an immediate vote.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is my good friend and the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, to explain more about this critical bill.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Paycheck Protection Program, or PPP as many of us refer to it, has been shut down now for over 50 days. That is nearly 2 months that small businesses have been unable to access approximately \$137 billion that still remains in the program that was supposed to go for their relief.

Small businesses and their workers need our help. Small businesses employ nearly half of the workers in this Nation, one out of two. Think of that. One out of every two people employed in this Nation works for one of America's small businesses. Not only do they represent millions of workers, but they also are the Nation's job creators. They create approximately two out of every three new jobs in America.

Of course, these aren't just statistics. One example of an outstanding small business owner is Lacie Sims. Recently, I had the opportunity to visit Lacie's business, the Village Family Restaurant, in Waynesville, Ohio, back in my district.

Lacie spoke with me about how she used the Paycheck Protection Program to keep her 25 workers employed so that they could continue to serve the community and, most importantly, continue to support their families. Lacie went on to tell me about how she quickly adapted her business to accommodate pickup, delivery, and safe indoor dining.

Like Lacie, many small business owners have adapted and persevered through the pandemic. Unfortunately, COVID-19 continues to challenge their very existence.

Now is the time for us to act, and we have an option before us here today. If we defeat today's previous question, we can move directly to my legislation to reopen the Paycheck Protection Program, the PPP program. H.R. 8265 would provide targeted assistance to small businesses that truly need the Federal Government's help.

This legislation gives small businesses the opportunity to receive a sec-

ond PPP if they can demonstrate a significant revenue reduction or a first-round loan if they didn't get one the first time. Additionally, it adds more flexibility in how the PPP dollars can be spent and still be eligible for loan forgiveness.

Many small businesses are still struggling across this country. We need to act now to help these small businesses, the people that they employ, and the families that they, in turn, support.

Let's defeat the previous question and restart the Paycheck Protection Program. The Nation's economy is at stake. We still have \$137 billion sitting there that was intended to go to these small businesses. We don't have to allocate any more funding. The funding is there.

Now, my Democratic colleagues have said that they are for small business. This is the time not just to talk the talk but to walk the walk. You get two opportunities, Madam Speaker, you can vote against this previous question or you can sign the discharge petition. Either one of them gives us another vote.

Let's save these small businesses.

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

The gentleman would be happy to know that, in this bill that we are bringing before here, we have most of what he requested but more. Our PPP language is more expansive, because a lot of businesses didn't qualify under the old formula.

But I do have to say that it really pains me that my friends don't understand that it is not just about small businesses. It is about our cities and towns and our first responders.

We have communities that are about to fire firefighters and police officers. Isn't that important to my friends?

Or helping to pay for schools to reopen safely or to be able to help kids get an education remotely or in a hybrid way, doesn't that fall on the top list of my Republican friends?

Healthcare coverage, the airline industry, which is about to lay off thousands of workers, we provide some help for them, but yet that doesn't make the cut.

So, yes, we can have a scalpel approach to this. We will do a little bit here and maybe we will do a little bit there, but that fails to recognize the severity of the crisis that we are now in.

Open your eyes and look at what is happening in this country, in large part, due to the mismanagement of this President, which is unconscionable.

But here in Congress, we can't deal with him. We can't fix the way he approaches his job. But we can provide direct resources to businesses and to local governments that can help keep our economy afloat until we can get by this.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this.

I commend our leadership, the Speaker, for again putting forward legislation to support working families, local government, and healthcare as we deal with the COVID-19 pandemic.

This updated Heroes Act provides for another round of cash payments, housing and food assistance, help for unemployed workers, and targeted relief for small businesses who need it most, like independent restaurants.

I would like to speak on that for a moment because I am very proud that this legislation includes \$120 billion from our RESTAURANTS Act for saving 500,000 independent restaurants and their 11 million employees. This sector of the economy totals \$1 trillion when you deal with all those organizations, all their supply chains, and ancillary effects.

Local, independent restaurants are the cornerstone of communities large and small, your community and mine. I think it is hard to imagine what life would be like in Oklahoma City or Cincinnati or Portland, Oregon, without those vital institutions. That is where communities come together. They provide a disproportionate avenue for economic success for minorities, immigrants, and women-owned enterprises. A restaurant for many of us was the first job, and it is an avenue for moving forward.

They are, unfortunately, hurting more than any other industry. They are the largest contributor to unemployment. One in four job losses is in this industry. We have a chance to do something about it. They are the largest contributor of unemployment of any sector—one in four job losses. In fact, they were half the unemployed in April. Already one in six restaurants have closed their doors permanently, but this legislation provides relief for those who are hanging on by a thread.

The evidence is that if we don't take action like this that is targeted for independent restaurants, we are going to have 85 percent of them close by the end of the year permanently.

The Heroes Act targets \$120 billion of our RESTAURANTS Act that would generate \$250 billion in economic impact. It would support millions of restaurant workers, truck drivers, farmers, and fishermen—people who support this critical industry. It is not just the fruits and vegetables and the linens. Think about it for a moment, Madam Speaker. All of those are involved.

This legislation would, by giving \$120 billion of direct relief, provide \$250 billion in economic savings by having people not filing bankruptcy and not adding to the unemployed ranks, but keeping them in business paying taxes, paying employees, and keeping those essential food supply chains going.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, independent restaurants are the true and quintessential embodiment of small businesses. What this legislation is geared for is the small, independent restaurants. That assistance is more important now than ever.

It is sad that we have not had much bipartisan support in the House for this, although in the Senate there are 40 cosponsors including a number of Republicans led by Senator WICKER from Mississippi. I would hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would see fit to vote for this legislation, vote to save independent restaurants, and be able to move forward in a way that will benefit every community across America.

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

Madam Speaker, I just want to respond quickly to my friends and point out something that is striking to me in listening to the debate. There is almost nothing that any of my friends have mentioned that we don't support—almost nothing. All these worthy programs for restaurants, all this relief for individuals, and all this help, we all agree with that. It is the things my friends don't mention that they have in their bill that we don't agree with.

We don't agree with more money for Planned Parenthood. That has no place in this bill.

We obviously have very serious objections to federalizing the election system of this country, which is State based. That has no place in this bill.

We obviously don't want to give a tax break to millionaires and billionaires in blue States by getting rid of the State and local tax limitations that were placed in.

Those are the things, none of which have anything to do with coronavirus, that we object to. Those are the things that my friends are insisting on that they cannot pass in the United States Senate and that the President will not sign.

If they want to actually pass all these other wonderful things, we agree with them, and we have been very generous in terms of the amount of money. The President has moved up on that.

Money is a negotiable item here. Policy positions—poison pills, as my good friend from Arizona said—are not, and that is what is keeping us from acting.

Frankly, that is a tragedy and a travesty, in my view, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge opposition to the rule. Today's bill is nothing more than a Democratic wish list masquerading as a coronavirus relief bill, roughly the same as the partisan bill the majority passed back in May and it was never taken up by the Senate, would never be signed by the President.

As in May, today's bill is ultimately doomed. It will not pass the Senate. The President has made it clear he will not sign it.

Madam Speaker, the majority is missing a real chance here. The American people are suffering as a result of the coronavirus. It is past time for the two parties to do what we did very successfully four times in a row in a 10-week period and work together and actually provide a package that provides real relief for the American people.

There are plenty of things we agree on, such as the extension of the Paycheck Protection Program, such as ensuring that more funds are provided for testing and tracing, such as one-time payments of \$1,200 per individual and \$500 per child to every household making less than \$75,000 a year. We disagree about the exact amount, but we agree every American who is unemployed, through no fault of their own, should get at least \$400 more a week.

Frankly, because the Democrats did not take up that offer, those people have gotten zero since the end of July. We absolutely agree that we need additional money for the opening of schools.

Madam Speaker, so why don't we put on the floor—it is a novel suggestion—the things we agree on, the things we know the Senate will pass and we know the President would sign. The only reason we have failed to do that is because the Democratic leadership has made the decision that we have to agree on everything before we do anything. That is no way to legislate in a body that has a Democratic majority in the House, a Republican majority in the Senate, and a Republican President.

The majority is not in the position to dictate to either the Senate or the President what is going to happen, but they are in a powerful position to negotiate, and negotiate in good faith, and focus on the areas where we agree.

Madam Speaker, I think that would move us forward productively. I think that would be in the best interests of the American people. So I call on the majority to end this charade and engage with Republicans in the House, the Senate, and the administration and come to an agreement on a real bipartisan relief package. I know my friends can do it because we did it together four times in a row.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule, and "no" on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I have served in this House for many years. I have been here through unimaginable tragedies, like September 11. Every time this Nation has been challenged, we came together—not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans. Never could I have imagined that after a shock like the coronavirus, that has taken more than 205,000 lives, that we would struggle to reach a compromise.

The House did its job more than 4 months ago when we passed the original Heroes Act; the Senate abdicated its responsibility. But we have not walked away. We have not stopped trying to help protect the lives and livelihood of people that we represent. We are back today with a bill that puts on paper the compromises that we are willing to make, not to get a win for one side or the other, but to help the American people in the middle of a pandemic. That is what this is all about.

Madam Speaker, to my friends on the other side of the aisle, I beg, please don't abandon the American people. Don't throw up your hands and walk away because you don't like every line of this bill. Take "yes" for an answer.

Madam Speaker, this bill doesn't Federalize elections. It provides safeguards for elections and provides funding to States to be able to carry out elections safely in the middle of a pandemic. To object over the fact that this bill protects Americans from losing their health coverage is startling to me, although it shouldn't be, because the President, as we speak, is in court trying to get the Affordable Care Act repealed outright, where millions of people would lose their healthcare, people with preexisting conditions would lose that protection, and you wouldn't be able to keep your kids on your insurance until they are 26.

Think about it: In the middle of a pandemic, that is the priority of this White House—to rip healthcare away from people. It takes my breath away what a disconnect there is about what the American people need and what some of my friends' priorities are.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join us in compromising to get something done. I get it. This is an election year and people are used to running to their political corners, but this crisis demands more than just business as usual. It demands action. And it demands more than a scalpel approach: "Well, let me do a little bit here," or "let me do a little bit there."

I am told that the White House doesn't want to fund nutrition programs to help make sure that no one in this country goes hungry. I can't believe anybody would take that position, but we are told that is one of the hot button items that people don't want to fund, that it is one of the Democratic priorities that is so controversial.

Really? Even before this pandemic, we had 40 million people in this country who didn't know where their next meal was going to come from; and every year it is a battle to make sure they don't cut nutrition programs. But now we are in a pandemic and hunger has increased dramatically in this country. Every one of us should not only be concerned about that, but we should be ashamed that that is a reality in the richest country in the history of the world.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to come together. This is an

opportunity to meet this moment. Vote “yes” on this rule and on the underlying bill.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1161

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 8265) to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to establish a program for second draw loans and make other modifications to the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8265.

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

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

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

Mr. COLE. Madam 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 229, nays 185, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

YEAS—229

Adams	Cooper	Garcia (TX)
Aguilar	Correa	Golden
Allred	Costa	Gomez
Axne	Courtney	Gonzalez (TX)
Barragán	Cox (CA)	Gottheimer
Bass	Craig	Green, Al (TX)
Beatty	Crist	Grijalva
Bera	Crow	Haaland
Beyer	Cuellar	Harder (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Cunningham	Hastings
Blumenauer	Davids (KS)	Hayes
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Danny K.	Heck
Bonamici	Dean	Higgins (NY)
Boyle, Brendan	DeFazio	Himes
F.	DeLauro	Horn, Kendra S.
Brindisi	DelBene	Horsford
Brown (MD)	Delgado	Houlahan
Brownley (CA)	Demings	Hoyer
Bustos	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Butterfield	Deutch	Jackson Lee
Carbajal	Dingell	Jayapal
Cárdenas	Doggett	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	Doyle, Michael	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	F.	Johnson (TX)
Case	Engel	Kaptur
Casten (IL)	Escobar	Keating
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX)	Españillat	Kennedy
Chu, Judy	Evans	Khanna
Cicilline	Finkenauer	Kildee
Cisneros	Fletcher	Kilmer
Clark (MA)	Foster	Kim
Clarke (NY)	Frankel	Kind
Clay	Fudge	Kirkpatrick
Cleaver	Gabbard	Krishnamoorthi
Clyburn	Gallego	Kuster (NH)
Cohen	Garamendi	Lamb
Connolly	Garcia (IL)	Langevin

Larsen (WA)	Norcross	Sewell (AL)
Larson (CT)	O'Halleran	Shalala
Lawrence	Ocasio-Cortez	Sherman
Lawson (FL)	Omar	Sherrill
Lee (CA)	Pallone	Sires
Lee (NV)	Panetta	Slotkin
Levin (CA)	Pappas	Smith (WA)
Levin (MI)	Pascrell	Soto
Lieu, Ted	Payne	Spanberger
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Speier
Loeb sack	Peters	Stanton
Lofgren	Peterson	Stevens
Lowenthal	Phillips	Suozzi
Lowe y	Pingree	Swalwell (CA)
Lujan	Pocan	Takano
Luria	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Lynch	Pressley	Thompson (MS)
Malinowski	Price (NC)	Titus
Maloney,	Quigley	Tlaib
Carolyn B.	Raskin	Tonko
Maloney, Sean	Rice (NY)	Torres (CA)
Matsui	Richmond	Torres Small
McAdams	Rose (NY)	(NM)
McBath	Rouda	Trahan
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Trone
McEachin	Ruiz	Underwood
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Vargas
McNerney	Rush	Veasey
Meeks	Ryan	Vela
Meng	Sánchez	Velázquez
Mfume	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Moore	Scanlon	Wasserman
Morelle	Schakowsky	Schultz
Moulton	Schiff	Waters
Mucarsel-Powell	Schneider	Watson Coleman
Murphy (FL)	Schrader	Welch
Nadler	Schrier	Wexton
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Wild
Neal	Scott, David	Wilson (FL)
Neguse	Serrano	Yarmuth

NAYS—185

Aderholt	Gianforte	McHenry
Allen	Gibbs	McKinley
Amash	Gohmert	Meuser
Amodei	Gonzalez (OH)	Miller
Armstrong	Gooden	Moolenaar
Arrington	Gosar	Mooney (WV)
Bacon	Granger	Murphy (NC)
Baird	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Balderson	Graves (MO)	Norman
Banks	Green (TN)	Nunes
Barr	Griffith	Olson
Bergman	Grothman	Palazzo
Biggs	Guest	Palmer
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Perry
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Posey
Bost	Hern, Kevin	Reed
Brady	Herrera Beutler	Reschenthaler
Brooks (AL)	Hice (GA)	Rice (SC)
Brooks (IN)	Higgins (LA)	Riggleman
Buchanan	Hill (AR)	Roby
Bucshon	Holding	Rodgers (WA)
Budd	Hollingsworth	Roe, David P.
Burchett	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Byrne	Hurd (TX)	Rose, John W.
Calvert	Jacobs	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Roy
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Cheney	Jordan	Schweikert
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Katko	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	Keller	Smith (MO)
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Cook	King (IA)	Smucker
Crawford	King (NY)	Spano
Crenshaw	Kinzinger	Stefanik
Curtis	Kustoff (TN)	Steil
Davidson (OH)	LaHood	Steube
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Stewart
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Stivers
Duncan	Latta	Taylor
Dunn	Lesko	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Long	Thornberry
Ferguson	Loudermilk	Tiffany
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Timmons
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
Flores	Marchant	Turner
Fortenberry	Marshall	Upton
Fox (NC)	Massie	Van Drew
Fulcher	Mast	Wagner
Gaetz	McCarthy	Walberg
Gallagher	McCaul	Walden
Garcia (CA)	McClintock	Walker

Walorski	Westerman	Woodall
Waltz	Williams	Yoho
Watkins	Wilson (SC)	Young
Webster (FL)	Wittman	Zeldin
Wenstrup	Womack	

NOT VOTING—16

Abraham	Emmer	Simpson
Babin	Graves (GA)	Stauber
Buck	Hagedorn	Weber (TX)
Davis (CA)	Mitchell	Wright
DeGette	Mullin	
Diaz-Balart	Rooney (FL)	

□ 1821

Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. COLLINS of Georgia and CARTER of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Beatty	Kennedy (Kuster	Payne
(Lawrence)	(NH))	(Wasserman
Butterfield	Kirkpatrick	Schultz)
(Kildee)	(Stanton)	Pingree (Clark
Chu, Judy	Langevin	(MA))
(Takano)	(Lynch)	Pocan (Raskin)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lawson (FL)	Pressley (Garcia
DeSaulnier	(Evans)	(IL))
(Matsui)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Richmond
Frankel (Clark	Lipinski (Cooper)	(Davids (KS))
(MA))	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Roybal-Allard
Fudge (Bass)	Lowenthal	(Aguilar)
Garamendi	(Beyer)	Rush
(Sherman)	Lowey (Tonko)	(Underwood)
Grijalva (Garcia	McEachin	Serrano
(IL))	(Wexton)	(Jeffries)
Hastings	Meng (Clark	Thompson (CA)
(Wasserman	(MA))	(Kildee)
Schultz)	Moore (Beyer)	Titus (Connolly)
Hayes (Courtney)	Mucarsel-Powell	Watson Coleman
Huffman (Kildee)	(Wasserman	(Pallone)
Johnson (TX)	Schultz)	Wilson (FL)
(Jeffries)	Napolitano	(Adams)
Kaptur (Dingell)	(Correa)	

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

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam 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 225, nays 188, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—225

Adams	Cisneros	Doggett
Allred	Clark (MA)	Doyle, Michael
Axne	Clarke (NY)	F.
Barragán	Clay	Engel
Bass	Cleaver	Escobar
Beatty	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bera	Cohen	Españillat
Beyer	Connolly	Evans
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Finkenauer
Blumenauer	Correa	Fletcher
Blunt Rochester	Costa	Foster
Bonamici	Courtney	Frankel
Boyle, Brendan	Cox (CA)	Fudge
F.	Craig	Gabbard
Brindisi	Crist	Gallego
Brown (MD)	Crow	Garamendi
Brownley (CA)	Cuellar	Garcia (IL)
Bustos	Cunningham	Garcia (TX)
Butterfield	Davids (KS)	Golden
Carbajal	Davis (CA)	Gomez
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny K.	Gonzalez (TX)
Carson (IN)	Dean	Gottheimer
Cartwright	DeFazio	Green, Al (TX)
Case	DeLauro	Grijalva
Casten (IL)	DelBene	Haaland
Castor (FL)	Delgado	Harder (CA)
Castro (TX)	DeSaulnier	Hastings
Chu, Judy	Deutch	Hayes
Cicilline	Dingell	Heck

Higgins (NY) McEachin
Himes McCollum
Horn, Kendra S. McGovern
Horsford McNeerney
Houlahan Meeks
Hoyer Meng
Huffman Mfume
Jackson Lee Moore
Jayapal Morelle
Jeffries Mucarsel-Powell
Johnson (GA) Murphy (FL)
Johnson (TX) Nadler
Kaptur Napolitano
Keating Neal
Kelly (IL) Neguse
Kennedy Norcross
Khanna O'Halleran
Kildee Ocasio-Cortez
Kilmer Omar
Kim Pallone
Kind Panetta
Kirkpatrick Pappas
Krishnamoorthi Pascarell
Kuster (NH) Payne
Lamb Perlmuter
Langevin Peters
Larsen (WA) Peterson
Larson (CT) Phillips
Lawrence Pingree
Lawson (FL) Pocan
Lee (CA) Porter
Lee (NV) Pressley
Levin (CA) Price (NC)
Levin (MI) Quigley
Lieu, Ted Raskin
Lipinski Rice (NY)
Loebach Richmond
Lofgren Rose (NY)
Lowenthal Rouda
Lowe Roybal-Allard
Lujan Ruiz
Luria Ruppersberger
Lynch Rush
Malinowski Ryan
Maloney, Sanchez
Carolyn B. Sarbanes
Maloney, Sean Scanlon
Matsui

NAYS—188

Aderholt Fitzpatrick
Allen Fleischmann
Amash Flores
Amodei Fortenberry
Armstrong Foxx (NC)
Arrington Fulcher
Bacon Gaetz
Baird Gallagher
Balderson Garcia (CA)
Banks Gianforte
Barr Gibbs
Bergman Gohmert
Biggs Gooden
Billirakis Gosar
Bishop (NC) Granger
Bishop (UT) Graves (LA)
Bost Graves (MO)
Brady Green (TN)
Brooks (AL) Griffith
Brooks (IN) Grothman
Buchanan Guest
Buck Guthrie
Bucshon Harris
Budd Hartzler
Burchett Hern, Kevin
Burgess Herrera Beutler
Byrne Hice (GA)
Calvert Higgins (LA)
Carter (GA) Hill (AR)
Carter (TX) Holding
Chabot Hollingsworth
Cheney Hudson
Cline Huizenga
Cloud Hurd (TX)
Cole Jacobs
Collins (GA) Johnson (LA)
Comer Johnson (OH)
Conaway Johnson (SD)
Cook Jordan
Crawford Joyce (OH)
Crenshaw Joyce (PA)
Curtis Katko
Davidson (OH) Keller
Davis, Rodney Kelly (MS)
DesJarlais Kelly (PA)
Duncan King (IA)
Dunn King (NY)
Estes Kinzinger
Ferguson Kustoff (TN)

Schakowsky Schiff
Schneider Smith (MO)
Schradler Smith (NE)
Schrier Smith (NJ)
Smucker Spanberger
Spanberger Spano
Stefanik Steube
Stell Stewart
Stivers Taylor
Sires Slotkin
Soto Smith (WA)
Speier Soto
Stanton Stevens
Stevens Suozzi
Swalwell (CA) Takano
Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS) Titus
Tlaib Tonko
Torres (CA) Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Pocan Trahan
Trone Underwood
Vargas Veasey
Vela Velázquez
Visclosky Wasserman
Wasserman Schultz
Cohen (Beyer) Waters
DeSaulnier Watson Coleman
Matsui Welch
Frankel (Clark Wexton
(MA))
Fudge (Bass) Wild
Garamendi Wilson (FL)
(Sherman)
Yarmuth

Sensenbrenner Shimkus
Smith (MO) Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ) Smucker
Spanberger Spano
Stefanik Stell
Steube Stewart
Stivers Taylor
Taylor

Thompson (PA) Thornberry
Tiffany Timmons
Tipton Turner
Upton Van Drew
Wagner Walberg
Walden Walker
Walorski Waltz

Watkins Weber (TX)
Webster (FL) Wenstrup
Westerman Williams
Wilson (SC) Wittman
Womack Woodall
Yoho Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—17

Abraham Emmer
Aguilar Gonzalez (OH)
Babin Graves (GA)
DeGette Hagedorn
Demings Mitchell
Diaz-Balart Moulton

Mullin
Rooney (FL)
Simpson
Staubert
Wright

□ 1859

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

Beatty Kennedy (Kuster
(Lawrence) (NH))
Butterfield Kirkpatrick
(Kildee) (Stanton)
Chu, Judy Langevin
(Takano) (Lynch)
Cohen (Beyer) Lawson (FL)
DeSaulnier (Evans)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer) Lipinski (Cooper)
Lipinski (Cooper) Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lofgren (Jeffries) Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Lowey (Tonko) McEachin
(Wexton)
Meng (Clark (MA))
(MA)) Moore (Beyer)
Hayes (Courtney) Mucarsel-Powell
Huffman (Kildee) (Wasserman)
Johnson (TX) Schultz
(Jeffries) Napolitano
Kaptur (Dingell) (Correa)

Payne (Wasserman
Schultz)
Pingree (Clark (MA))
(MA)) Pocan (Raskin)
Pressley (Garcia (IL))
Richmond (Davids (KS))
(Davids (KS)) Roybal-Allard
Roybal-Allard (Aguilar)
(Aguilar) Rush
(Underwood)
Serrano (Jeffries)
Thompson (CA) (Kildee)
Titus (Connolly) Watson Coleman
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Adams)

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1952. An act to amend the Inter-country Adoption Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of State to report on intercountry adoptions from countries which have significantly reduced adoption rates involving immigration to the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8337. An act making continuing appropriation for fiscal year 2021, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4762. An act to designate the airport traffic control tower located at Piedmont Triad International Airport in Greensboro, North Carolina, as the "Senator Kay Hagan Airport Traffic Control Tower".

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
SERGEANT AT ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE) laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2020.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 1(b)(2) of House Resolution 965, following consultation with the Office of Attending Physician, I write to provide you further notification that the public health emergency due to the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 remains in effect.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. IRVING,
Sergeant at Arms.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's further extension, pursuant to section 1(b)(2) of House Resolution 965, effective October 3, 2020, of the "covered period" designated on May 20, 2020.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS
TO NATIONAL ADVISORY COM-
MITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL
QUALITY AND INTEGRITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment pursuant to U.S.C. 1011c, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for a term of 6 years:

Upon the recommendation of the minority leader:

Dr. Arthur E. Keiser, Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Ms. Jennifer Blum, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Robert G. Mayes, Jr., Elberta, Alabama

Upon the recommendation of the majority leader:

Ms. Kathleen Sullivan Alioto, New York, New York

Mr. Robert Shireman, Berkeley, California

Dr. Roslyn Clark Artis, Columbia, South Carolina

RECOGNIZING BARB IVES

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank and celebrate someone who has been a dedicated member of my team for many years now. Barb Ives, a field representative and office manager, recently surpassed a 20-year milestone representing our district.

Barb has selflessly served the district since September of 2000, initially with