

We have some great healthcare providers, and I would like to thank them for their efforts, especially during the pandemic, to keep everyone safe and healthy.

As great as it is to live in our State, we have a severe shortage of physicians, and recruiting new ones has proven to be a challenge.

The 12 community health centers and teaching health centers serve over 200,000 patients alone. These medical facilities provide much-needed short-term care but also help train physicians who will plant their roots, hopefully, in underserved areas and be available for their patients long term.

Community-based programs with stable funding are sometimes the only way that people in rural areas can get the care they need.

Let's hope we can have a stronger push and use National Rural Healthcare Day to spotlight more of this issue.

GALAXY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

(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 congratulate and celebrate a local business in my district. The Galaxy Federal Credit Union in Franklin, Pennsylvania, is celebrating its 80th anniversary.

The credit union was founded in 1940 by a dozen employees of Joy Manufacturing. For four decades, the credit union operated out of the Joy Manufacturing Factory, serving employees by helping them save and establish credit.

In 1981, the credit union opened its doors to other local companies in Venango County. In 2002, it became a community credit union.

The employees of Galaxy Federal Credit Union pride themselves on a "people helping people" approach to business.

Today, Galaxy Federal Credit Union serves nearly 5,000 members, including 400 youth members.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Linda Lusher Antonucci, as well as the employees, members, and volunteers who serve the residents of Venango County through the credit union.

Congratulations on 80 years.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8294, NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 2020

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1224 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1224

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the bill (H.R. 8294) to amend the National Apprenticeship Act and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. House Resolution 967, agreed to May 15, 2020 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 1107, agreed to September 15, 2020), is amended—

(1) in section 4, by striking "November 20, 2020" and inserting "the remainder of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress";

(2) in section 11, by striking "legislative day of November 20, 2020" and inserting "remainder of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress"; and

(3) in section 12, by striking "legislative day of November 20, 2020" and inserting "remainder of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress".

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1224, providing for consideration of H.R. 8294, the National Apprenticeship Act of 2020, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule self-executes a manager's amendment by Chairman SCOTT, makes in order 17 amendments, and provides en bloc authority.

Additionally, the rule provides one motion to recommit and extends recess instructions, same day and suspension authority through the remainder of the 116th Congress.

Before I begin my formal remarks, I would like to take a point of personal privilege to thank Mr. WOODALL for his friendship during my time on the Rules Committee. We don't always agree, but even in our disagreements, he is never disagreeable. I admire his wit, his passion, his love for this institution, and his love for our country.

I wish him the very best in the future and hope this is not the end of his public career. I am always delighted to spend time, not only in our lengthy Rules Committee discussions, but also on the floor with him, so I thank Mr. WOODALL so much.

Madam Speaker, the National Apprenticeship Act is critical workforce development legislation that will invest \$3.5 billion to create nearly 1 million new apprenticeship opportunities over the next 5 years.

This is an historic investment in workforce training, and I am so pleased to support this effort. Amid this challenging and catastrophic pandemic, I am grateful that this body is not only addressing the needs of the American people as they grapple with the COVID-19 virus, but also looking ahead and preparing for the challenges our Nation will face as we recover economically.

Skilled workers are the backbone of our economy, and apprenticeships provide a unique opportunity to grow and expand access to this workforce. The success of apprenticeship programs is

well-established. According to the Department of Labor, 94 percent of apprentices are employed after completing apprenticeship programs, earning an average starting wage of \$70,000.

Not only do apprenticeship programs provide pathways to meaningful and sustainable careers, they are critical to expanding our Nation's skilled workforce.

When I meet with local business leaders in my district of Rochester, New York, I regularly hear that their greatest challenge is finding skilled labor to fill positions and keep their businesses thriving. Apprenticeships provide an invaluable pathway to engage workers, establish connections with high-demand industries, and set workers on a path to a rewarding and sustainable career.

I am proud that a bill I introduced with my colleague, Congresswoman TRAHAN, H.R. 8317, has been included in the text of the National Apprenticeship Act. Our bill helps scale up participation among populations not typically engaged in apprenticeships, particularly small- and medium-sized businesses. Together, we can create new opportunities in high-demand industries.

This critical piece of legislation will bolster our Nation's apprenticeship programs, build up a much-needed labor force, and open doors for businesses and workers alike.

Through my position on the Education and Labor Committee, I have seen the months and years of bipartisanship that has led us to this day. While we don't agree on every aspect of the bill, I believe the legislation before us is the best course of action to support apprenticeship programs that have proven the most successful for both working families and employers. Now, more than ever, these programs are critical to grapple with the long-term economic impacts of COVID-19.

I applaud my colleague, Congresswoman DAVIS, for her work on the National Apprenticeship Act. This comprehensive legislation is a testament to her leadership as chair of the Higher Education and Workforce Investment Subcommittee, and she will be sorely missed in the days and weeks and years ahead as she leaves us at the end of this term.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend from New York, not just for his kind words, but for the time today.

We always say, Madam Speaker, that time is yielded for the purpose of debate only, and for folks who don't follow what the Rules Committee does, that just prevents the shenanigans that could occur if the gentleman from New York wanted to give me 30 minutes unlimited and I could start calling measures to the floor.

But we do need more debate, less vitriol and more debate. As my friend from New York pointed out, the apprenticeship program is one of those programs that really does bring people together.

The track record speaks for itself when we talk about the 90 percent employment retention rate that these apprentices bring forward, when we talk about the \$300,000 in lifetime earnings that apprentices generate compared to their nonapprentice peers.

This really is a partnership opportunity that I am afraid the House is missing again today.

Lameduck sessions, Madam Speaker, are strange things. Sometimes we bring the biggest bills that Congress is going to work on during lameduck sessions; sometimes we bring the smallest. Sometimes it provides that extra time to bring people together; and, candidly, on this bill, I thought that is what we would be doing because, exactly as my friend from New York points out, this is a partnership issue.

But we find ourselves here today with a base text that passed out of committee on a party-line vote. I think we can do better than that. I know we can do better than that. And to the majority's credit, because this is a majoritarian institution, the majority can do absolutely anything they want to.

Oftentimes, a minority substitute is excluded from the rule. In the wisdom of Rules Committee members like Mr. MORELLE and our chairman, Mr. MCGOVERN, the Republican substitute was made in order by the Rules Committee, so we will have an opportunity to debate different visions of the apprenticeship program.

But I wonder, in this exceptional time where folks are exceptionally worried about the future, if maybe this isn't the time to have more of those Republican-alternative, Democratic-alternative debates and not one of those times that we should be speaking with one voice to the American people.

There were amendments made in order and, candidly, more amendments than are traditionally made in order for a bill like this. Again, I can't fault my Rules Committee colleagues for trying to get out of some of the closed amendment process ruts that we have been in, but we were so close to being able to make this a truly bipartisan process; and I am concerned, having excluded about half of the Republican amendments that were offered, we are going to fall a little bit short of that today.

At its core, Madam Speaker, our disagreement is about how easy should it be to have these apprenticeship programs certified. We absolutely have, through the Department of Labor, an official process for putting apprenticeships on the official U.S. Government list. It comes with lots of benefits and privileges and also comes with many burdens.

As we sit here today, Madam Speaker, this is a process that has been in

place for 80 years and is in need of a modernization in the 21st century. Many of the numbers we look at, Madam Speaker, suggest that there are more apprenticeships happening outside of the official Department of Labor program than inside the official Department of Labor program.

One of the amendments we have made in order today is one from my friend from Washington State (Mr. KILMER) that is going to make computer science programs, computer programming programs eligible for the first time.

Well, of course, anybody who has been in that field—I happened to be in one of the first computer science classes that America had back in the 1980s—knows that you learn more from your friends, more from your colleagues, more from being in the process together than you ever learned from reading a book or sitting in the classroom.

Of course, computer science ought to be on that list of programs, yet it has taken us well into 2020 to get to that place. I would argue we may be a decade or two late in that process, but better late than never.

As my friend from New York referenced, I am on my way out of the institution; and, candidly, I am pleased that we have a process that, even though the result is a partisan result, has more bipartisanship in it than many of the bills that I have had to represent here in the Rules Committee minority position that I hold.

It is my great hope that, as this institution shrinks the distance between the majority and minority heading into 2021, it is going to provide opportunities to remind us how much we need each other to get things done.

The best votes I took as a young freshman Member, Madam Speaker, were not the ones that John Boehner jammed through with all of the Republicans voting "yes" and all of the Democrats voting "no."

□ 1230

The best votes that I took freshman year were the ones that John Boehner jammed through with NANCY PELOSI's help that had about 50 percent of the Democrats and about 50 percent of the Republicans and did the big things that you just couldn't do alone, Madam Speaker, that required Members to stand up and get outside of their ideological comfort zone and get into that space of how can we really make a difference.

Is this bill going to make a difference for American workers and young people trying to get started in their career and businesses trying to recruit good talent?

Of course, it is. Of course, it is. It is a modest step in the right direction, but it is a step in the right direction.

I am going to encourage my colleagues to defeat the rule so that we can take a larger step in the right direction. Sometimes, Madam Speaker,

you have to play small ball to get the gears of success turning at the appropriate speed. Sometimes you are up against crises like COVID-19 where you don't have time for small ball, and you have got to take those big steps.

I will mention just one to you, Madam Speaker. I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee to make in order an amendment by my friend from Pennsylvania, whom you saw on the floor here earlier, Mr. THOMPSON. His amendment simply said this: During the COVID-19 crisis, while we are seeing the economy evolve in ways that we could have never predicted and still cannot predict, let us give the Secretary of the Department of Labor the ability to be nimble in terms of designating new apprenticeship programs.

Now, for the next 40 days, that Department of Labor Secretary is going to be a Trump appointee. After those 40 days, we are going to have a different scenario happening there.

Is this an issue of our being in the rut of voting "no" on the administration that is not of our political persuasion?

Is this an example of our starting to reclaim some Article I power and to stop delegating things down to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and instead retaining those authorities here?

We didn't get to have that debate because we didn't make that amendment in order, and we are not going to be able to have that conversation. It is a conversation that needs to be had. We need to get out of our habits of voting "no" on the other team that sits in the White House, and we need to get into the habit of being so nimble ourselves that we don't have to delegate authority to the executive in order to get things done, that we are able to get those things done.

It is difficult for me, Madam Speaker, to be this close to the kind of legislative process that I came here to be a part of and our not reaching that goal. I do want to recognize success where success lives, and we had a more successful Rules Committee process this time than many times in the past, but it only reminds us of how close we are to that process that I believe all of our constituents expect of us, and that is bring all the ideas into the room, vote "no" on the bad ideas, vote "yes" on the good ideas, bring all 435 of our collective experiences to the floor, and let's put the best of it into the lawbooks to serve those whom we are sworn to serve.

If my colleagues are willing to work with me to defeat the previous question today, I think we are going to have a chance to move in that direction. I look forward to talking with my friend from New York and the rest of my colleagues about that more to come.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

There are just a couple of points that I would make. First of all, with regard

to amendments, I do note that there were substantial amendments made in order that were offered by Republicans. I do know that some amendments offered by Republicans were withdrawn because they are essentially part of the large amendment in the substitute bill which will be on the floor. So there will be, I think to Mr. WOODALL's point—and I appreciate his sentiments here—I think there will be an opportunity, given the way we structured this rule and given the latitude that I think the majority gave, in making certain that there will be an adequate opportunity for a real debate about some of the distinctions between the minority's and the majority's perspective on this particular bill.

So I actually think this was an opportunity and will be an opportunity for Chairman SCOTT and Mrs. DAVIS who is the chair of the subcommittee and I suspect will be debating the bill and amendments in just short order. So I think there will be that fullness and that richness of debate that my good friend from Georgia has talked about.

I do want to just make a point, though, about the process over the last several years plus. I think in the last year and a half there were four different hearings held by the Higher Education and Workforce Investment Subcommittee which Mrs. DAVIS heads, there were months of intensive negotiations. There was a bipartisan Member-level roundtable, there were at least four hearings on the subject, and there was a real effort and I believe even an opportunity for us to reach bipartisan compromise to expand access to these high quality apprenticeship programs.

Unfortunately, I think, at what I would describe as nearly the eleventh hour, the White House made clear it would not support the bill unless the Department of Labor and the White House were granted a much broader opportunity to approve apprenticeship programs in ways that we don't believe safeguard the interests of businesses or the people who would apply for those apprenticeship programs.

It brings to mind an experience I had—I think I have shared it on this floor, and certainly with Mr. WOODALL in Rules Committee meetings—my experience previous to this in the State legislature. One of my responsibilities during my career there was to chair the committee on insurance, and I often would find myself in the position—even though I had a friendly Democratic administration—where the legislation would have, sort of at the end of it, sort of a blanket ability for at the time the superintendent of insurance to do whatever he or she felt was appropriate and give wide latitude. I would always strike that from the bills before passage saying that I thought it was the responsibility of the legislature to set policy to enact legislation.

So what I believe we ought to be doing here—and I think Mr. WOODALL

would generally agree with me—relative to our Article I responsibilities of legislation being passed by both Houses of the Congress that giving, in my view, too wide a latitude to the Department of Labor, whether it is in the current outgoing administration or the incoming, makes little sense, that it is the rule and the responsibility and the duty of the Congress to make sure that those standards are set in law, in statute, not in rule, not in regulation, and not at the whim of the Department of Labor or any other agency of the government.

So I think what we seek to do is not only to promote and expand apprenticeship opportunities, because—for all the reasons my distinguished colleague from Georgia and friend mentioned, the ability for apprentices to make more during their career, the quality of those programs—we believe standards need to be continued, that they need to be strengthened, that we can expand these programs into the kinds of industries that heretofore have not really availed themselves of apprenticeship opportunities, that we can do that, meet all of those goals, still set those standards and make sure that they are delineated in statute.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate his comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, there are a lot of issues out there, certainly student loans and educating young people for 21st century skills is one of those, and I am glad we are taking this time out today to focus on that before the end of this Congress.

There are other issues out there, though, that we all know in a bipartisan way need attention, whether it is COVID testing, vaccines, and therapeutics, that are in the newspaper every day but on which Congress has not acted recently, we know that needs attention; whether it is the Paycheck Protection Program, those programs that were supporting employers and employees that have expired that in a bipartisan way we know need attention but the Congress has not acted on that; whether it is on police reform, again, in the paper and in the media every day and we know in a bipartisan way we can do better to serve our citizenry, and yet we have not acted on that.

If we defeat the previous question today, Madam Speaker, it will not slow down the apprenticeship conversation that we are having. What it will do is make sure that in the limited time we have remaining in this Congress that we do tackle those three issues that I mentioned: COVID, vaccines, therapeutics, and testing; police reform, ways that we can act together in a bipartisan way to serve the country; and the Paycheck Protection Program, helping employers and employees to survive into 2021 as we all know they need to do.

I ask unanimous consent, Madam Speaker, to include the text of my amendment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I led talking about therapeutics as it relates to COVID. I am very fortunate on the Rules Committee, as is Mr. MORELLE, to be able to serve with a gentleman who spent his lifetime in the service of others through medicine, Dr. BURGESS.

Dr. BURGESS also sits on the Energy and Commerce Committee which has had jurisdiction over this issue, and which has had numerous bipartisan bills and opportunities to move forward. Defeating the previous question today would make in order the gentleman from Texas' bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) to talk about the real impact that could have on the American citizenry.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and truly it has been a privilege to serve with the gentleman from Georgia on the Rules Committee. I have learned a lot from occupying that seat beside him there.

Madam Speaker, there is still a pandemic raging through our country. Every community in this country has been affected, and community spread is unfortunately going in the wrong direction as the virus rages across our land. My home State of Texas has had over 1 million cases of this novel coronavirus. We have been awaiting relief packages for months and passing partisan packages does not help when our Nation needs us most.

Where has the sense of urgency been from House Democratic leadership?

In February I called for hearings on the coronavirus at the Energy and Commerce Committee, and my requests were dismissed. Congress has since provided support in the form of funding for vaccines, testing, and more, but we should continue to support our Nation's pandemic response in these ways, especially as cases are now raging across the country.

We could come together to provide our country with the resources to fight this invisible enemy. House Democratic leadership does not seem to be up to this task.

My legislation, H.R. 8086, provides funding for the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund to develop additional medical countermeasures and vaccines. In fact, in the past 2 weeks we have received incredibly encouraging news that early data shows two of the coronavirus vaccine candidates to be more than 90 percent effective. A safe and effective vaccine is the strongest arrow we could have in our quiver to allow our people to re-

turn to normal. We also have new antibody treatments that could be used in nonhospitalized mild to moderate coronavirus patients.

At this point I would give credit to the administration that recognized the need for these medical countermeasures, antivirals, antibodies, and vaccines and really put the entire strength of the whole of government response into Operation Warp Speed. The public sector and private sector are now delivering on that promise, and we are likely just days away from the Food and Drug Administration providing emergency use authorization for one or both of these new vaccines—again, vaccines that are over 90 percent effective—when we didn't even have the genetic sequence of this virus until the end of January. That is a phenomenal accomplishment.

But now is not the time to take our foot off the gas. The House continues to waste its time on partisan bills that are going to be dead on arrival in the Senate instead of delivering results for Americans. There are commonsense, bipartisan ways to help our Nation respond to the coronavirus, including my bill to increase funding for the coronavirus response, Mr. CHABOT's bill to improve the Paycheck Protection Program, and Mr. STAUBER's bill to fund better training for law enforcement. But House Democrats have turned their backs on the needs of America.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to vote against the previous question so we may take up these important measures.

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

Madam Speaker, I do want to note that we are here to discuss the National Apprenticeship Act, and that is the subject of the discussion in front of the House.

But I would note, parenthetically, however, the irony in the subject that was brought up by my dear friend from Texas. The President of the United States has not met with his own coronavirus task force in 6 months and has barely spoken in the last 2 weeks while this Nation is engulfed with the virus' spread throughout the Midwest. We have now surpassed 250,000 Americans dead of the coronavirus. One-quarter of one million Americans have lost their lives, and yet there is no discussion out of the White House.

I would encourage perhaps my colleagues to ask the President if he might meet with Dr. Fauci and the leaders in this country who are on the front lines of fighting this illness.

I do also note, also parenthetically, that 7 months ago this House passed the \$3.4 trillion Heroes Act to address contact tracing, testing, and support for our frontline workers, hospital systems, and State and local governments. We had no action from the United States Senate.

□ 1245

We came back and, about 6 weeks ago, took up the updated Heroes Act—\$2.2 trillion—again, to try to address the suffering of millions of Americans. Yet, no action from the United States Senate. So I think we have more than stepped up to address the concerns of the American people as it relates to the issue not before the House right now.

I do understand that the good people of Georgia, my dear friend, will go home in a few weeks, and the great folks in the State of Georgia will perhaps have something to say about the direction of the United States Senate going forward. But I do note that I think this House's record has been exemplary in addressing this. I now get back to the issue at hand.

Madam Speaker, for the purpose of further discussion, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and in strong support of the act. As I listened to the discussion relative to the coronavirus, the pandemic, I am very optimistic now with the advent and the announcement of vaccines that may very well prove to be effective. It means that as we gain control of the pandemic, as we gain control of the virus, we are going to need a well-trained, skilled workforce ready and available to work if we are going to rebuild and redevelop our economic status. Having this workforce available, increasing apprenticeship training and opportunities is one of the best possible things that we could do.

Madam Speaker, I commend Representative SCOTT and the Committee on Education and Labor for their work on this bill. I urge strong support for it and I will vote to pass it, and I can hardly wait to do so.

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

Madam Speaker, I have worked with the gentleman from New York long enough to know that it is true that we sometimes measure our success by what the House does. But working with the gentleman from New York, I have seen him measure his success by what he actually gets done for folks. You never see him trying to take credit for getting the work done. He is just doing the work. And too often, I think, all of us have come to talk about what it was that we passed in a partisan way and how that absolves us of any more responsibility.

It is true, the House jammed through a partisan COVID package 7 months ago, and absolutely nothing has happened to it since then. That is what happens when you jam through partisan packages. If we jam through a partisan apprenticeship package, that is also what is going to happen to a partisan apprenticeship package.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business, who crafted the last bipartisan package. And when that bipartisan package was crafted, it didn't just pass this House, it didn't just pass the Senate, it was signed into law by the President of the United States. And it made the difference in the life of our constituents that my friend from New York and I would like to make.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question today, we will have the chance to, again, go to that bipartisan well of support that my friend from Ohio has generated.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from New York suggested that we, on this side of the aisle, should talk to the President of the United States about what he has or hasn't done.

Well, he is all the way down on Pennsylvania Avenue. I would suggest the gentleman from New York might want to talk to a lady, probably in this very building right now, and that is the Speaker, who can bring up a second round of PPP loans. We have got the votes.

Republicans and Democrats both agree we ought to do this, but she wouldn't bring it up for a vote. So we tried to go through the discharge petition process. And no Democrat in this House would sign it and let us have a vote. So we are trying again, because a lot of small businesses really need this.

Madam Speaker, an important holiday is coming up. Next Saturday is Small Business Saturday. It is the day when we take time to support the restaurants and shops and other small businesses that create two out of every three new jobs in America. Normally, this is an occasion to eat a delicious meal, get a head start on Christmas shopping, and say hello to friends and neighbors. Unfortunately, this year, an awful lot of those small businesses are struggling due to COVID-19.

A recent NFIB survey indicated that over half of small businessowners expect to seek additional financial assistance over the next year. If they can't access that help, they may be forced to lay off employees again or cease operations. That is just unacceptable, because we can help them.

We have a program that has already supported over 50 million jobs all across this country. It even has over \$130 billion ready to go. We already have the money. We don't have to appropriate additional dollars at all. The money is there. That program, the PPP, or Paycheck Protection Program, stopped accepting applications back in August.

Instead of quickly passing a bill to reopen the program, the Democratic leadership in this House used it as a political football for over 3 months while small businessowners had to drain the

last of their funds to stay in existence and to continue to pay their employees, and they nervously continued to worry about how they are going to make payroll.

Madam Speaker, today, we have a chance to do the right thing and do right by these small businesses. They are, after all, the heartbeat of each and every one of our communities.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, which is before us now, we can move directly to the legislative package that includes the bill that I just mentioned, my bill, the PPP, again, to reopen and improve the Paycheck Protection Program.

Madam Speaker, let's defeat this previous question and send aid to those small businesses all across the country who desperately need it. I can think of no better way to celebrate Small Business Saturday.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, again, thinking about things that the American people are looking for and the opportunities we have to craft those in a bipartisan way, Mr. STAUBER brings his lifetime of law enforcement experience to this Chamber, giving us an opportunity to do those things that we all know need to be done.

How can we serve our constituency better?

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) to share not just his partnership effort in trying to work across the aisle to get that done, but also his vast experience in that area.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I am worried that, once again, we are not rising to the occasion as the American people continue to suffer from both this health crisis and the subsequent economic disaster. As the American people continue to call for justice for their fellow Americans, we are back here in D.C., for the first time in 7 weeks, and not one item on the Speaker's docket is to answer the American's people call or provide them relief. I am disappointed because I know that we can do better.

Madam Speaker, 2020 has been a tough year, but we have seen some wonderful moments of bipartisanship. In the early months of this pandemic, Republicans and Democrats came together to pass the CARES Act, which created lifesaving programs for small businesses and helped provide families financial relief.

Additionally, in response to calls for nationwide justice reform, I introduced the bipartisan JUSTICE Act, legislation cosponsored by both Republicans and Democrats that will improve our policing and reestablish trust between our law enforcement officers and the communities they serve.

Unfortunately, despite the JUSTICE Act's bipartisan nature, Democrat leadership does not want to address this issue. Despite the CARES Act's bipartisan nature, Democrat leadership

continues to walk away from relief package discussions. Partisanship has once again taken priority over the needs of the American people.

Madam Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, we will take up legislation that I introduced that will provide \$850 million for better training of police officers; \$500 million to increase the number of body cameras; and \$1.2 billion in grants to police departments to invest in community policing, which is the philosophy that you don't police your community, you police with your community.

Madam Speaker, I said this on the House floor in August, and it is unfortunate that I am saying this here once again in November: It is time for this Congress to get back to work.

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

Madam Speaker, I just want to note that I feel a little bit like Alice in "Alice through the Looking Glass," where in is out and up is down. I just reiterate that this House has addressed in a significant way reform for policing. We have, indeed, in this House, addressed on two separate occasions the impact of COVID on healthcare workers and State and local governments and the millions of Americans who struggle to put food on the table and face unemployment.

So all of the things that my friends on the other side of the aisle have just discussed are things that this House has done. And it is really the recalcitrance of the United States Senate and their unwillingness not only to not adopt our measures, but adopt their own that would allow us to then settle into a conversation or discussion about the differences that separate us and to try to reach that bipartisan/bicameral compromise that I know Mr. WOODALL very much believes in.

Madam Speaker, I also want to make one other point, if I might, which is the Apprenticeship Act that we have before us, if you had dropped in from somewhere and saw on our program that we were discussing the National Apprenticeship Program and listened to my friends on the other side of the aisle, you would be confused why they weren't on the subject. But I do want to get to the subject, which is that this is, in part, a response—not certainly totally a response to, because we were working on this for some time before COVID, but this has, at its heart, a response to the economic fallout of the virus and is entirely on point because the economic impacts will be felt for years.

Some economists are saying this country will feel the impacts of COVID for another 3 or 4 years. The apprenticeship programs and the reason we are here having this conversation is to be able to expand them dramatically and give people who are either in transition from other careers or getting into careers will give them the opportunity to earn not only a living wage,

but to advance, get career opportunities on a career ladder, particularly to those industries that have really not been involved in the apprenticeship program in the past.

Madam Speaker, again, I reiterate what we are doing here, the importance of what we are doing, how critical this is. Obviously, we always want to seek a bipartisan compromise, because, as my dear friend from Georgia rightly points out, it is not about what we pass in this House, it is what we pass in the Congress and send to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, hopefully, for signature.

So it is very much the conversation here, and I hope that not only my colleagues here, but our friends across the floor and in the Senate will take up this much-needed legislation before we are done, in a lameduck session, the session in front of us, and that the President can be persuaded to act on it. That is the work before us and it is critical and important work, indeed.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, when you reach the end of your service in Congress, you start thinking about those things that you are really, really proud of, and you start thinking about those things that you wish had gone differently.

I have only gotten to override one of President Trump's vetoes since I have been here in Congress. And I will tell you—and I will tell President Trump—I thoroughly enjoyed that, thoroughly enjoyed it, because I didn't come here as a Republican, I came here as a United States House Member. And any time the Article 1 branch comes together and speaks so loudly and proudly in a single voice that it can even swamp the voice of the most powerful leader of the free world, the President of the United States, that tells me something about how our Republic is functioning. And I am excited about that. I don't think I am going to have a chance to do that in our next 3 weeks here, but I appreciated the opportunity to do it the one time I did.

Madam Speaker, we have to get back into that habit of speaking with one voice. We are stronger not just as an institution when we speak with one voice, we are stronger as a nation when we speak with one voice. This apprenticeship bill should have been one of those things.

□ 1300

Instead of having me on the House floor saying, "We are taking a small step in the right direction, and that is great, but why didn't we go big?" it would have been nice if the chairman and the ranking member could have negotiated that middle ground first and I could have been down here talking about how it didn't go as far as I wanted it to go, but we did the best we could with what we had to work with, and so let's all vote "yes."

We can do that, and we have had some experience doing that. Our initial response to COVID was exactly that.

Candidly, this is as close as we have come in quite some time. I know that the ranking member, VIRGINIA FOXX from North Carolina, wanted to get over the finish line there.

We have made two Republican amendments in order in this rule, Madam Speaker, and we have made two bipartisan amendments in order, and we have made 13 Democratic amendments in order, all on a bill that passed on a party-line vote out of committee.

Sometimes the process works that way. Sometimes the House needs to put down a marker. But late November of an election year is not the time for putting down markers. It is the time for putting points up on the scoreboard for the American people, and this bill fails in that regard.

If we defeat this rule, and I ask my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on it, I know—I don't think, Madam Speaker, I know—that the chairman and the ranking member can come back together and we can bring that partnership bill to the floor that I am talking about.

My friend from New York talks about expanding the apprenticeship program. That is the crux of the problem: He expands it a little; we want to expand it a lot, because we all recognize what the needs of the American worker and the American economy are. Defeat this rule, and we will have that chance.

Defeat the previous question, Madam Speaker, and we are going to have a chance to talk about these three bills. My friend from New York is absolutely right; they are extraneous to what we are talking about today. But the three gentlemen who spoke spoke truth when they said we have been trying to bring these up through the regular process and we can't.

We know a vote to extend and reform the Paycheck Protection Program would pass this House with a huge bipartisan majority today, but the House leadership has not given us an opportunity to have that vote.

We know that an investment in community policing, a goal championed by Republicans and Democrats for decades, could pass this floor in a bipartisan basis, but the House leadership hasn't given us that opportunity.

We know, as every single one of our constituents is concerned about their health and their business and their children, that if we passed a COVID therapeutics program, a testing program, a program targeting vaccines, getting the rest of that job done, we know it would pass in a bipartisan way, but we have not had a chance to bring up such bipartisan legislation.

I have served in this institution when the House and the White House were held by one party and the Senate was held by another party. What I found during that time is that the negotiation happened between 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and Constitution Ave-

nue, and those of us on Independence Avenue were largely left out of that conversation.

For my colleagues who remain, I worry about that for you, because I believe that we operate differently than the Senate, and for good reason. I don't want to change the majoritarian nature of our institution. I am glad that it is passionate and it is deep and it is messy and sometimes the fights spill out of the committee room and onto the House floor. I value that. I value the Senate's go-slow approach and the larger voice given to the minority there.

We don't often get opportunities to fix our bad habits. While Paul Ryan was Speaker of the House, we had not one open rule, not one chance in his entire Speakership for the House to come together and have everyone have a chance to contribute and have their voice heard—not once. And during Speaker PELOSI's second Speakership, we have had not one opportunity either.

For years now, this House has gotten in the habit of deciding that every voice is not worthy of hearing. Certainly, there are bills and there are measures where that needs to be true. A partnership issue like the apprenticeship program, a partnership issue like serving our young people, a partnership issue like jump-starting our economy, this is one of those opportunities where the bad ideas would be rejected in a bipartisan way and the good ideas would be adopted in a bipartisan way and we would speak to America in a single voice, bipartisan way about the pathway that we have crafted to go forward.

Madam Speaker, if you would surrender your gavel and allow Mr. MORELLE and me to sort out all of the issues I have mentioned today, I think by the end of November, certainly the first week of December, we could crack all of those nuts. For whatever reason, our Framers did not believe that it should be given to two bipartisan folks who want to solve problems. They believe that all 435 voices should be heard.

It is hard. I worry when we miss chances like the one we had today to demonstrate to the American people what we know to be true about the way that we work together. When we miss an opportunity to demonstrate that to folks from the floor of this House, we do some bit of damage to the fabric of our Republic. That damage happens under Republican leadership and that damage happens under Democratic leadership, and I fear one day that damage will be so great that neither party is going to be able to turn it back.

I do want to urge defeat of this rule today, and I want to urge defeat of the previous question. But I want to recognize Members like Mr. MORELLE from

New York and Members like our chairman, Mr. McGOVERN from Massachusetts, who have made sincere and difficult efforts to move us in that partnership direction.

Defeat this rule. Defeat the previous question. Let's give them a chance to move us even further in that bipartisan direction going forward.

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

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

Just to take a moment to wax philosophical on bipartisanship, I think I agree with almost everything my distinguished friend had to say.

If you are frustrated, Mr. WOODALL, imagine our frustration that, for the last 7 months, we have continued to try to engage in conversations with the other House, only to be met with silence.

We hear, as you do, when you go home, from thousands of constituents in each district, millions of Americans who struggle because they have lost their job, because they have lost their restaurant, as a small business owner that they struggle. We have heard from healthcare workers who continue to struggle to have personal protective equipment. We have talked to people who desperately need stimulus checks or some other support to put food on the table.

So we hear all of that, and I wish that the conversation that could happen between both sides of the aisle here in this Chamber would answer those questions. They can't, because we do need to have support and engagement and a dialogue with our friends in the other House. So I understand and feel your frustration.

Our frustration is even greater. I would love that we could work out the issues here in this Chamber, you and I and the members of the Rules Committee and all of the Members of the House, and have that be a settled question. I think we would be in a better place.

Having said that, Madam Speaker, let me just, again, note, this is perhaps the last time I will have the great opportunity to serve on this floor and have a discussion on a rule with my distinguished friend from Georgia. Again, I want to just indicate how much I appreciate him and how much admiration and affection I have for him and wish him all the best.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank all of the colleagues who have spoken in the various committees for their words in support of H.R. 8294, the National Apprenticeship Act. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1224

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state

of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8086) to provide additional appropriations for the public health and social services emergency fund, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 8086, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration 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. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 8. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 8265, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8088) to provide funding to law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the

Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 9. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8086, H.R. 8265, and H.R. 8088.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HOULAHAN). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. WOODALL. 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 227, nays 169, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

YEAS—227

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Levin (MI)
Aguilar	F.	Lieu, Ted
Allred	Engel	Lipinski
Axne	Escobar	Loeb sack
Barragán	Eshoo	Lofgren
Bass	Espallat	Lowenthal
Beatty	Evans	Lowe y
Bera	Finkenauer	Luján
Beyer	Fletcher	Luria
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Lynch
Blumenauer	Frankel	Malinowski
Blunt Rochester	Fudge	Maloney,
Bonamici	Gabbard	Carolyn B.
Boyle, Brendan	Gallego	Maloney, Sean
F.	Garamendi	Matsui
Brindisi	Garcia (IL)	McAdams
Brown (MD)	Garcia (TX)	McBath
Brownley (CA)	Golden	McCollum
Bustos	Gomez	McEachin
Butterfield	Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern
Carbajal	Gottheimer	McNerney
Cárdenas	Green, Al (TX)	Meng
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	Mfume
Cartwright	Haaland	Moore
Casten (IL)	Harder (CA)	Morelle
Castor (FL)	Hastings	Mucarsel-Powell
Castro (TX)	Hayes	Murphy (FL)
Chu, Judy	Heck	Nadler
Cicilline	Higgins (NY)	Napolitano
Cisneros	Himes	Neal
Clark (MA)	Horn, Kendra S.	Neguse
Clarke (NY)	Horsford	Norcross
Clay	Houlihan	O'Halleran
Cleaver	Hoyer	Ocasio-Cortez
Clyburn	Huffman	Omar
Cohen	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Connolly	Jayapal	Panetta
Cooper	Jeffries	Pappas
Correa	Johnson (GA)	Pascrell
Costa	Johnson (TX)	Payne
Courtney	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Cox (CA)	Keating	Peters
Craig	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
Crist	Kennedy	Phillips
Crow	Khanna	Pingree
Cuellar	Kildee	Pocan
Cunningham	Kilmer	Porter
Davids (KS)	Kim	Pressley
Davis (CA)	Kind	Price (NC)
Davis, Danny K.	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
Dean	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin
DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)
DeGette	Lamb	Rose (NY)
DeLauro	Langevin	Rouda
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Delgado	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
Demings	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
DeSaulnier	Lawson (FL)	Rush
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Ryan
Dingell	Lee (NV)	Sánchez
Doggett	Levin (CA)	Sarbanes

Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto

Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone

NAYS—169

Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden

Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hurd (TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Norman
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer

Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—33

Abraham
Aderholt
Amodei
Carter (TX)
Case
Cheney
Collins (GA)
Duncan
Ferguson
Flores
Gianforte

Green (TN)
Holding
Huizenga
King (NY)
Lamborn
Lesko
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Meeks
Mitchell
Moulton

Newhouse
Olson
Pence
Richmond
Riggleman
Rogers (KY)
Sensenbrenner
Walberg
Waltz
Wright
Young

□ 1405

Messrs. TAYLOR, WALKER, and VAN DREW 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

Barragán (Beyer)
Beatty (Fudge)
Blumenauer
(Beyer)
Bonamici (Clark
(MA))
Boyle, Brendan
F. (Jeffries)
Brownley (CA)
(Clark (MA))
Bustos (Kuster
(NH))
Carson (IN)
(Cleaver)
Castro (TX)
(Garcia (TX))
Clay (Cleaver)
Cohen (Beyer)
Costa (Cooper)
Courtney (Hayes)
DeGette (Blunt
Rochester)
DeSaulnier
(Matsui)
Escobar (Garcia
(TX))
Frankel (Clark
(MA))
Garamendi
(Sherman)
Gonzalez (TX)
(Gomez)
Grijalva (García
(IL))

Hastings
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Higgins (NY)
(Sánchez)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Keating (Kuster
(NH))
Kirkpatrick
(Stanton)
Langevin
(Lynch)
Lawrence
(Kildee)
Lawson (FL)
(Demings)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Lowe (Tonko)
McEachin
(Wexton)
Meng (Kuster
(NH))
Moore (Beyer)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Payne
(Wasserman
Schultz)

Perlmutter
(Neguse)
Peterson
(McCollum)
Pingree (Kuster
(NH))
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Price (NC)
(Butterfield)
Rooney (FL)
(Beyer)
Rose (NY)
(Golden)
Roybal-Allard
(Bass)
Ruiz (Dingell)
Rush
(Underwood)
Ryan (Kildee)
Schrier (Heck)
Serrano
(Jeffries)
Speier (Scanlon)
Titus (Connolly)
Vargas (Correa)
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Welch
(McGovern)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

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

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

Mr. WOODALL. 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.

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEM-
BRANCE OF AMERICANS WHO
HAVE PASSED AWAY FROM
COVID-19 VIRUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks that all Members in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol, rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the more than 250,000 Americans who have passed away from the COVID-19 virus.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 8294, NATIONAL APPREN-
TICESHIP ACT OF 2020

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1224) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8294) to amend the National Apprenticeship Act and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 170, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—229

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciocline
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.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)

Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebback
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross

O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarelli
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
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 (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—170

Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs

Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett

Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford