

(Jeffries)Sires
(Norcross)
Speier (Scanlon)
Thompson (CA)
(Kildee)

Titus (Connolly)
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Welch
(McGovern)

Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch

Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young

NAYS—164

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. McCOLLUM). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mrs. LESKO. 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 228, nays 164, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

YEAS—228

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

Amodei	Griffith	Posey
Armstrong	Grothman	Reed
Arrington	Guest	Rice (SC)
Babin	Guthrie	Roby
Bacon	Hagedorn	Rodgers (WA)
Baird	Harris	Roe, David P.
Balderson	Hartzler	Rogers (AL)
Banks	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (KY)
Barr	Herrera Beutler	Rooney (FL)
Bergman	Hice (GA)	Rose, John W.
Biggs	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Billirakis	Holding	Roy
Bishop (NC)	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Scalise
Bost	Huizenga	Schweikert
Brady	Hurd (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Brooks (AL)	Jacobs	Shimkus
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Buck	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Burchett	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Bustos	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Byrne	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Chabot	Katko	Spano
Cheney	Keller	Staubert
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik
Cloud	Kelly (PA)	Steube
Cole	King (NY)	Stivers
Comer	Kinzing	Taylor
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Thompson (PA)
Crawford	LaHood	Thornberry
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Tiffany
Cuellar	Lamb	Timmons
Curtis	Lamborn	Tipton
Davidson (OH)	Latta	Turner
Davis, Rodney	Lesko	Upton
DesJarlais	Lipinski	Van Drew
Diaz-Balart	Long	Walberg
Duncan	Lucas	Walden
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Walker
Estes	Marshall	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Waltz
Fleischmann	McCaul	Watkins
Flores	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Meuser	Webster (FL)
Fulcher	Miller	Wenstrup
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Westerman
Garcia (CA)	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Gibbs	Murphy (NC)	Wilson (SC)
Gohmert	Nunes	Wittman
Gonzalez (OH)	Olson	Womack
Gooden	Palazzo	Woodall
Gosar	Pappas	Yoho
Granger	Pence	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Perry	
Rush	Peterson	
Green (TN)		

NOT VOTING—38

Abraham	Cox (CA)	McHenry
Aderholt	Dunn	Mitchell
Allen	Ferguson	Mullin
Brooks (IN)	Fox (NC)	Newhouse
Bucshon	Fudge	Norman
Budd	Gianforte	Palmer
Burgess	Graves (LA)	Reschenthaler
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Richmond
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Carter (TX)	King (IA)	Stewart
Clay	Loudermilk	Wagner
Collins (GA)	Marchant	Wright
Cook	McCarthy	

□ 1308

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on December 3, and 4, 2020, due to not being in town. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “no” on rollcall No. 230; “no” on rollcall No. 231; “no” on rollcall No. 232; “no” on rollcall No. 233; “yes” on rollcall No. 234; and “no” on rollcall No. 235.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 233, I am not recorded because of circumstances which caused me to miss the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

On rollcall No. 234, I am not recorded because of circumstances which caused me to miss the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

On rollcall No. 235, I am not recorded because of circumstances which caused me to miss the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	Kaptur (Dingell)	Payne
Bera (Aguilar)	Kennedy (Kuster)	(Wasserman)
Bonamici (Clark)	(NH)	Schultz)
(MA)	Kim (Davids)	Peters (Kildee)
Boyle, Brendan	(KS)	Pingree (Kuster)
F. (Jeffries)	Kirkpatrick	(NH)
Brownley (CA)	(Stanton)	Pocan (Raskin)
(Clark (MA))	Lamb (Golden)	Porter (Wexton)
Carson (IN)	Langevin	Pressley
(Cleaver)	(Lynch)	(Trahan)
Castor (FL)	Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)
(Demings)	(Demings)	(Butterfield)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lee (NV) (Kuster)	Rooney (FL)
Costa (Cooper)	(NH)	(Beyer)
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Roybal-Allard
(Matsui)	Lipinski	(Garcia (TX))
Deutch (Rice)	(Schrader)	Ruiz (Dingell)
(NY)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Rush
Doggett (Raskin)	Lowenthal	(Underwood)
Doyle, Michael	(Beyer)	Schneider
F. (Cartwright)	Lowey (Tonko)	(Casten (IL))
Escobar (Garcia)	McEachin	Schrier
(TX)	(Wexton)	(DelBene)
Frankel (Clark)	McNerney	Serrano
(MA)	(Raskin)	(Jeffries)
Garamendi	Meng (Kuster)	Sires (Norcross)
(Sherman)	(NH)	Speier (Scanlon)
Grijalva (Garcia)	Moore (Beyer)	Thompson (CA)
(IL)	Mucarsel-Powell	(Kildee)
Hastings	(Wasserman)	Titus (Connolly)
(Schultz)	Schultz)	Watson Coleman
Higgins (NY)	Nadler (Jeffries)	(Pallone)
(Sánchez)	Napolitano	Welch
Jayapal (Raskin)	(Correa)	(McGovern)
Johnson (TX)	Pascarell	Wilson (FL)
(Jeffries)	(Pallone)	(Hayes)

□ 1315

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring to the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and the majority leader of the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that votes are expected as early as 2 p.m.

I want to repeat that. We are going in at 12 p.m. Votes can be as early as 2 p.m.

This is unusual for the first day of the week. I have advised and urged Members to stay here this weekend—most of them I have talked to are—because, clearly, we are trying to get two critical pieces of legislation done, which we will speak to, I think, in a little bit.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning—

hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

I advise Members that we still have to pass an omnibus and we have to pass a COVID-19 relief bill, and we will not adjourn the Congress until such time as we can accomplish those two objectives.

I was hopeful that we would accomplish those objectives by next Thursday. Unfortunately, things are not moving as rapidly as I think they ought to—I would like them to, but as they ought to be moving—so that Members need to be advised that they need to keep their schedules very, very flexible until such time as we pass both of those pieces of legislation.

We will, in addition, consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business today.

I will say something further on suspensions. Somebody said: Oh, well, we are not passing important bills.

That is not accurate. Somehow, when we have agreement, it is not looked as important. On suspensions, it simply means we have an agreement between the parties that we can pass those bills because they are bipartisan and the overwhelming majority of Members agree on them. So we are passing bills that are good bills but not controversial, and that is a good thing.

But we will consider several bills under suspension. As I said, the complete list will be available at the close of business today.

The House will consider the fiscal year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act conference report. I am very pleased that we have a bipartisan, bicameral agreement on NDAA and look forward to it overwhelmingly passing both Chambers next week and, if necessary, overriding a threatened veto by President Trump.

This is a critically important bill to pass. It always passes, and I am hopeful that we will come together on this bill. It was a tough conference but a good conference, and the result, I think, can be supported by both sides of the aisle, signed, obviously, by the Senate Republican chairman and our chairman here in the House.

As Members know, the continuing resolution expires on December 11; therefore, the authority for spending to keep government running will expire on the 11th. The Committee on Appropriations is hard at work on reaching an agreement on an omnibus, and I hope to bring that to the floor as early as possible. I am hopeful that will be next week.

Frankly, I have had a discussion with Senator MCCONNELL. I am told there is no agreement that we cannot make on the 11th that will be easier to make on the 18th, which is the end of the following week. I would urge Members, however, to ensure that they are available for the week of the 14th if we have not completed our business by next week.

The House may also consider additional legislation to address the coronavirus pandemic, as I have already said. The House has passed two different Heroes bills.

We passed the bill on May 15th, 6 months ago, to deal with this extraordinary crisis placing millions of Americans at risk, causing deep emotional and physical distress and a challenge not only to their health, but also to their psychological welfare, and to educating our children and keeping our schools safe and providing the resources necessary that, if we can get children back in school—which I think all of us want to do—that we can accomplish that objective.

The House has also passed, on October 1, some 2 months ago, a \$2.2 trillion bill. That was not taken up by the Senate. The Senate has passed no legislation since May 15th. They did not consider our bill either time, neither the Heroes 1 bill nor the Heroes 2.

It is unfortunate, in my view, that Senate Republicans have failed to act, even if they didn't act on what we wanted to do. I am pleased that the Speaker and Senate majority leader spoke yesterday. I have spoken to him three times this week, and I hope that we can get an agreement. The House stands ready to act next week.

Lastly, as everybody understands, when you get to the end of a session, we don't contemplate everything that might be on the agenda, so other pieces of legislation may be on the agenda next week or the week thereafter.

Again, I reiterate, I am very hopeful that we can get this business done by next week.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I scheduled the 11th as the CR day is because I wanted to make sure we could get Members home. With the COVID crisis, the pandemic has exploded.

Members ought not to be aggregating here on the House floor or aggregating here in Washington. They ought to be home. And if we got out on the 11th—I want to get through on the 10th so we can send a bill to the Senate. However, if we left on the 11th, it will be 14 days before Christmas, and, therefore, if Members leaving Washington had to quarantine themselves, they would have sufficient time to do so so that they could be with their families on Christmas Day.

I would hope that everyone on the Committee on Appropriations, the leadership—myself included—would feel the urgency of passing this needed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

There are a few items relating to legislation that I want to bring up with the gentleman, but before that, I did want to mention that it is my understanding that the floor director for the majority leader, Ms. Shuwanza Goff—the last thing I would want to do is embarrass her here on the House floor, but

it is my understanding she may be leaving.

Mr. HOYER. It is a vicious rumor that has been spread abroad in the country.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield time to her if she would like to deny that rumor, but while that may create some issues, I would like to say that, if this is the last time that we do this colloquy before the end of this year, it has been a true pleasure to work with Shuwanza Goff.

My whole staff has enjoyed working with her, and especially on those areas where we agree—the CARES Act and USMCA come to mind as recent major accomplishments that this legislative body has done together, Republicans and Democrats—and she, I know, has been that conduit who works with our staff on the Republican side. We considered it a true joy to work with her. She doesn't schedule every bill I ask her to schedule, but I will blame that on the majority leader, not on Shuwanza.

Mr. Speaker, if I can, in all seriousness, say, it has truly been a treat and a joy, and she is one of the people who makes this place work when it does work.

We can always talk about the things that we would like to achieve that we can't, but there are many important things we achieve, like those important pieces of legislation I talked about and many others that don't get that same kind of attention, but they wouldn't happen without the work and the great leadership that Shuwanza has demonstrated here. She will be missed here, and I just wanted to mention that.

I know the gentleman feels probably even stronger, because she has worked for him for the whole time I have been in leadership, but, I think, going back to maybe 2008.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I may get into this next week, and I am hopeful that the gentleman is right that we don't have a colloquy next week, that we would have completed our business, as I have been talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I have been blessed, the House has been blessed, the country has been blessed by Shuwanza Goff's leadership on this floor on my behalf and on the majority's behalf, working closely with the minority. And I know that Shuwanza would want me to say that she looks forward to the same kind of cooperation in her new job that she has gotten in her old job, and if the gentleman wants to assure her of that, I will yield to him.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I will give this assurance to the majority leader, that if you are looking for a replacement, I would be happy to provide recommendations and even participate in the interview process, if that would be helpful to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is most generous.

Mr. SCALISE. I think the generosity probably ends there with today's colloquy. I am sure we will have that opportunity next week to have a longer conversation, but I truly do want to pass that on to Shuwanza, and not just on behalf of myself, but on behalf of the minority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, and his staff, as well as mine, and all of us in leadership who get to work with her.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to mention, on the schedule next week, one of the items that I know we have worked on together and talked about that I believe the gentleman has scheduled for next week is S. 578, which is the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act, something that we have worked on, a number of these items, for people with ALS.

The Steve Gleason Act was one of those items we worked on a few years ago, passed to help people with ALS, and has been a tremendous, tremendous benefit to people struggling with ALS.

Steve Gleason is a constituent and a dear friend, somebody whom we have worked with on many things. He received earlier this year—it seems like years ago, but just January of this year, he was the recipient of the Congressional Gold Medal, and deservedly so.

He and I were communicating earlier this week about this legislation, which I am a cosponsor of, and I just want to thank the gentleman for scheduling that for the floor next week.

One of those areas, as you were talking about earlier, that might not get a lot of attention but an issue that both Republicans and Democrats have worked on is to help people with ALS who, right now, under current law, even after the diagnosis with ALS—as we know, it is just a devastating diagnosis—have to wait 5 months to get the normal benefits that they are entitled to. And time is very, very critical to people with ALS. This eliminates that 5-month gap where they would have to wait, one of those additional occasions where it takes an act of Congress to fix this.

The Senate acted, and quickly, now, the House will be acting to address this deficiency that needs to be fixed. I think you will see both sides come together with a very large vote, but I thank the gentleman for scheduling that for the floor next week.

I yield to the gentleman, if you have anything to add on that.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I was pleased to schedule this. Obviously, as you know, it passed the Senate the other day. Hopefully, we will pass it on suspension next week and it will be sent to the President. Hopefully, the President will sign it.

Obviously, ALS is just a terrible, terrible disease, and a disease that acts very, very quickly, which means that there is a premium on the govern-

ment's response to assisting people with ALS be quick as well.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, what this bill does is it provides an acceleration for people who are suffering from and afflicted with ALS to get assistance. So, hopefully, the House will pass it and will send it to the President.

I appreciate the gentleman's cosponsorship of the bill.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as relates to the schedule next week, as well as the schedule we have had this week, I want to bring up a piece of legislation that we have talked about here in this colloquy and in other venues for months now, and that is the bill by Congressman CHABOT, H.R. 8265, which is the Paycheck Protection Program Extension Act.

We have seen over these last few months our small businesses have struggled tremendously. Some industries have done better during this pandemic where they have seen increased sales for various reasons, but we have mostly seen and heard from so many of those businesses and industries that have been devastated, some harder than others, but so many devastated to the point of bankruptcy. Daily, we see stories of businesses that closed their doors for good.

Mr. Speaker, in the State of New York alone, it was reported that one-third of all small businesses—one-third—will never open again. We came together to do the CARES Act, to pass that lifeline to so many small businesses—saved probably 50 million jobs in America, saved millions of small businesses—but it expired; and when it expired, we learned a lot more about where our economy was at that time.

When we passed it, it was at the very beginning of the pandemic. We now saw over those months which businesses were doing better, which weren't, and came back in September with a piece of legislation that would free up money that is not going to have to be borrowed, money that is actually sitting in that account, frozen, \$137 billion that we already appropriated. But the program expired so it can't be used anymore unless we change the law.

So, we are not talking about creating a new program. We are talking about going back to a program that was maybe one of the most successful things that we have done to help people in need—not just those small businesses, but the millions, 50-plus million people whose livelihoods depend on those jobs.

The bill was brought forward, had a lot of bipartisan interest, but for various reasons hasn't been scheduled on this House floor. And there were reports that maybe it was tied to waiting on the election or whatever other things.

In fact, the Speaker of the House, just today, made a comment that one of the reasons a certain relief package bill wasn't brought to the House floor

is because she was waiting on a "new President." I hope that was a quote that was made out of context or maybe needs to be revised.

□ 1330

There are millions of people that are literally facing the elimination of their livelihoods, and we have a bill that, if it was put on the floor today, yesterday, or September, when we first had this conversation, there would be hundreds of thousands of businesses still open today that are now bankrupt, that will never open again. Every day we wait, more businesses don't reopen.

Clearly, we are negotiating to try to get an agreement on bigger issues. We are not there. We weren't there last month; we weren't there the month before. The Senate has tried to take up votes on things. It wasn't the Republicans; it was the Democrats that blocked those bills coming up. This, by the way, was one of those in the package that would have been voted on by the Senate, if not for Senate Democrats blocking even the debate on the Senate floor. So they never had that debate.

On this floor, just today, we saw a bill to legalize marijuana. You saw items in there where it would give additional money to people in the marijuana industry. This is something that Congress, I am sure, will continue to debate.

But there is a pandemic where, today, we have businesses that are shutting their doors. Tomorrow, businesses will go bankrupt forever, small businesses. We can help them. Not with a new program that we need to negotiate the details over, but something we already did that was so highly successful that we have a track record to show what it can do.

Our small banks, local community banks, were part of that process and are ready to go again. Again, we don't need to reinvent the wheel here. This is an existing program that has got existing, remaining money, but the program is frozen and expired. This bill just renews it and could pass on the suspension calendar, and it still hasn't been brought up.

While we are negotiating other things, why not release this hostage and let this bill pass. It could have been done today. It wasn't a lack of time. When we are debating legalizing marijuana instead of saving small businesses, that is a misplaced priority of this Congress. We should have come together months ago. September 16, it was introduced. September 17, I brought it up to the majority leader at this colloquy. The following week brought it up again.

Then we filed a discharge petition. You had, I think, 23 Democrats sign a letter saying they would sign that discharge petition if we didn't get a bipartisan agreement, recognizing that the Heroes Act is not a bipartisan agreement. Unfortunately, not one of those Members who signed the letter saying

they would sign the discharge have signed the discharge. Talk is cheap around here.

Livelihoods are being lost. Businesses are shuttering for good. Why can't this bill be scheduled for the floor while we work on the other things that we are not in agreement on? This is something we are in agreement on. But it won't be scheduled for the floor.

Maybe we can get an agreement to schedule that Monday when we are coming in at 2 o'clock to vote on other items. This would be something that would get 400-plus votes, if it was just scheduled.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations. He is right; we are for this.

We are also for making sure that children have food on their tables. We are also supportive of making sure that education facilities have the money to keep their venues safe and to keep education flowing. We are also for making sure that childcare is available to parents who can go back to work, when and if their children go back to school.

We are also for having critical money for testing and tracing and, yes, for delivering the vaccinations. Yes, we are for that, and we are also for States and localities that are hemorrhaging revenue to have the resources to continue to be on the front line of fighting the battle against COVID-19.

We are also for resources, not only to have created the vaccine—almost all of which is being funded by the Federal Government—but we are also for making sure we can deliver that vaccine and have vaccinations as well as having a vaccine.

We are very strongly for helping the extraordinary number of unemployed, who are on unemployment insurance, and who, at the end of this month, are going to find it goes away. We are for having an additional enhancement of that unemployment insurance, which so many economists will tell you from the CARES Act, was absolutely essential to keep the economy afloat.

And the fact that we have kept the economy afloat, as shown by—apparently, the stock market thinks we are okay—the millions and millions and millions of families who are in deep distress and are not okay. I am appalled by the fact that we have not acted.

We have acted twice. You say it was partisan. That is true; you chose not to vote for it. It wasn't much different than the CARES Act, which you did vote for. But, apparently, shortly after we passed the Heroes Act, your leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, said, Let's wait and see what happens. And Senator MCCONNELL said, Let the States go bankrupt.

Well, they are on that road. And we have seen what happened by waiting. We have thousands of our fellow citizens dying every week, now over 260,000 Americans; millions afflicted.

So I tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, that we care about PPP, and we took care of

it in both bills we passed. It wasn't a question that they were partisan or not partisan. They weren't taken up in the United States Senate. We passed them. They were not taken up.

Yes, the Senate leader offered a bill that every economist with whom I have talked said was not substantive enough, not sufficient resources to stop the hemorrhaging, and to help fight COVID-19.

So I tell my friend, we are for that bill. What we are not for is forgetting the kids, the families, the hospital workers, the researchers, the States, the localities. We are not for forgetting them. We believe that if we pass one part of a multifaceted response to COVID-19 and the implication for our economy, that will not be what our economy, nor our people, need.

We would ask you to talk to the Senate or to offer your own bill. Offer your own bill that deals with all of those millions of people that I just referenced that are in deep, deep distress. We need to deal with the small businesses, and we do. We need to deal with the unemployed and we do.

We have a lot of things expiring on December 31, PPP—your bill, does not deal with any of that. We need to deal with all of it. We ought to do it. Mr. CHABOT's bill ought to be a part of that, and it will be, because we are committed to that. But we are also committed to not forgetting all of those people and elements that I mentioned.

I want to help the airlines. And, hopefully, that will be in any deal that we come to. I want to help the restaurants. These are people who, through no fault of their own, are devastated.

So I tell my friend, he is right, but only partially so. He is right that we ought to be helping the small businesses. But I don't think there is a small businessman in America that would say let the nutrition issue go, as we see lines of cars and lines of people getting food boxes so they can put food on their table for their kids and themselves, people who never, ever, expected in their lives to be in a food line. I think the small businessmen would say, take care of them. I think the small businessmen would say, I haven't been able to pay taxes, and I know the State is still operating hospitals, still fixing the roads, still hiring police and fire, and hiring nurses in public hospitals. They need help, too.

We are all in this together. That is my response to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

We want to have a comprehensive bill that will deal with a comprehensive threat to our economy and to the health of our people and to the welfare of our people. We think that is the responsible thing to do.

I am hopeful that we can get an agreement in the near term. When I say, "the near term," by next week. I have been talking to Senator MCCONNELL towards that end. The Speaker is

talking to Senator MCCONNELL towards that end.

The Senators are working on an effort to get that done. I am hopeful they are successful. The Speaker and Mr. SCHUMER said it was a place that they could negotiate from, which means we are closer than we have been, and I hope it gets done.

Mr. SCALISE. Let me remind the gentleman that in the CARES Act, we addressed many of those issues that the gentleman already brought up, starting with the States.

In fact, I don't know of a single State in this country who has spent all of the money we sent them. Educational opportunities for schools to reopen safely and educate kids are being denied in some places but not in others, but it is not from a lack of money. There is not a single school system I have heard from, where we sent them the money—and by the way, they still have millions, and in some cases, billions of those dollars sitting in their account, idle, that can be used today to safely reopen schools.

If the State chooses not to do it or if the school system chooses not to do it, that is on them. But they are denying those kids opportunities. We are seeing report after report, scientific studies, the American Academy of Pediatrics, talking about the damage that is being done to our young children by being denied the opportunity to go back to school in classroom and learn. It is devastating to those kids.

Suicides are up and opioid abuse is up, because of all of these things, and it is the small businesses that are paying the biggest price.

If you look, people that are getting unemployment insurance at the State level—we did enhanced unemployment insurance for a period of time, and in most cases we were paying people more money not to work than they were making before they lost their job.

What they ask me is not that they want to stay on unemployment. They want to go back to work. They want their business to be alive when they go back to work. But if a small business closes for good, the cost to us is going to be dramatically higher.

If we can right now throw that lifeline, again, to those businesses—not with a new program, not with things that we don't agree on, like \$900 billion to bail out failed States, which is the Heroes Act. We already spent hundreds of billions of dollars that we gave to States. Like I said, I think every single State has some of that money left. Some have billions of dollars of that money left.

So the idea that we are going to hold up relief to small business, who are closing every day, hundreds of thousands—a third of every small business in the State of New York is gone for good. How many more need to die before this problem is recognized by this Congress?

So those States are sitting on money, and the gentleman wants to hold up relief to small businesses to give another

\$900 billion to bail out States, not for the COVID damage, but the problems they had before. That is what the Heroes Act disagreement was about. We agreed on giving States money. They still have some of that money, and it can be used to reopen schools safely, still today.

What is not there right now is relief for those small businesses. So when you look at all of these different things—the vaccine, they are not waiting on approving a vaccine based on more money coming in. We put money in the CARES Act, and President Trump spent it effectively on Operation Warp Speed to get us to the point where we have not one, but two—Pfizer and Moderna—ready to go.

The FDA is about to approve two different vaccines, and it is being mass produced today. We are not waiting on money to mass produce it. The Department of Defense is actually involved in helping distribute it. Airlines have already been contracted to get it out. Some need to be air-conditioned more than others. All of that is put in place.

If we need more money, we will come together and get more money. But a vaccine is not waiting on us to send them more money. We need to get it out. We need the FDA to follow their process, which they are doing. They are the gold standard in the world for approving vaccines, and it is unheard of, in the history of mankind, for a virus, that we didn't even know of until a year and two days ago in the world, to now be on the brink of not one, but two FDA-approved vaccines. That is happening because of what we did coming together with the CARES Act and then President Trump's Operation Warp Speed.

These aren't items that are waiting on our relief. What is waiting is relief for small businesses.

Now, the Heroes Act, again, it was a partisan exercise, not because it was mostly like the CARES Act. It was very different from the CARES Act. In the Heroes Act, there are billions of dollars in that bill to give checks to people here illegally. That wasn't part of any agreement. It wasn't in the CARES Act. That is new policy that is not going to be signed into law.

If you want to negotiate and hold small businesses hostage on that, we may never get relief for small businesses. But that was one of the items in the Heroes Act where we had no agreement.

□ 1345

But the areas where we had agreement, can we at least agree to pass the things we have agreement on?

And what did we have more agreement on than anything? The PPP, proven to be so successful that literally every day we hear from small businesses that say they would not be alive today if not for the PPP. But we also hear from small businesses every day who are about to close.

Some States are talking about shutting their whole State down again.

We know that is going to lead to businesses that will never come back. And we have a bill ready to go that would get massive bipartisan support without a new dime of money, money sitting frozen in an account that would help those small businesses. The criteria is you have to have at least 25 percent loss.

So your small businesses that are doing well today—again, we know there are some that are doing better today than they were a year ago, but we also know some are about to close for good. We can help them, not with new policy that we are not in agreement on. That is where the negotiations are continuing to go back and forth on.

But if there is something we all agree on, do we really need to hold that hostage, when that means that many of those businesses will never come back?

We could have done this in September. It was brought up in September. It is not a new item.

How many thousands of businesses died from the day that that bill was introduced to today and will die again between now and Monday?

It can be put on the schedule Monday. It is not going to stop the negotiations on the other things. There are other things that we are both in agreement on that aren't part of that bill. Bring that as a stand-alone. Let's bring each of those items that we are in agreement on.

But the idea that we hold everything hostage to things that aren't going to happen, hundreds of billions to failed States, giving checks to people who aren't here legally, is that really a priority?

Is that really the things we are getting called on every day?

The folks that are on unemployment want to be able to go back to their job. If the company is dead and gone, there will be nothing to go back to. And so we are working on so many items that we are in agreement on. We have given money to our health experts to continue to focus on the virus, to continue to get the vaccine, and we may have another two—could be four—vaccines by the end of this year. That is something we all ought to applaud because of what we did when we came together.

But here is an area where we already came together. It was so successful that that money now is frozen, and those businesses that did well are still doing well. The ones that aren't will or will not be alive in a month from now, based on whether or not we confront this. It is not new policy. It is something we already agreed on, and something we already celebrated as a success. Let's do that one more time while we negotiate on the things we are in disagreement with.

Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest that, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for suggesting that. I didn't hear him talk about the children who are having trouble getting food on

their tables every morning and every evening. I didn't hear him talk about the unemployed, the 12 million American workers who are going to run out of unemployment as of the end of this month.

Mr. Speaker, I did hear him talk about the failed States. Let me tell you, Maryland is not a failed State, and our Governor is a Republican. His name is Hogan. His father served in this body. He, along with Mr. Cuomo, the Governor of New York, said the States, meaning all the States, need substantial assistance or they are going to have to make substantial cuts. In my State, we have made cuts, and we are a wealthy State. We have made cuts, which have undermined the States's ability to respond as robustly as they need to do to COVID-19.

Now, the President wants to talk about failed States. What he really means is blue States, Mr. Speaker. That is what he means—large States like New York; large States like California. By the way, Florida and Texas are in the same position. Now, Texas has a greater surplus. But failed States is a fake news item.

Mr. Speaker, what we should do is come together and have an agreement. Now, we can pass something here, and we did pass something here. The Republicans chose to join us, Mr. Speaker, on the first three bills. One was an \$8.3 billion bill responding to \$1.2 trillion or \$2.2 trillion that the President asked for. In other words, four times what the President asked for. In terms of what we have done, that seems like small potatoes, a lot of money.

But it was clear that the administration's response to this crisis was woefully inadequate, represented by that first bill that they sent to us, knowing full well that it would not even come close to meeting the needs. So we increased it about 400 percent. The Speaker then negotiated with Mr. Mnuchin and came up with two additional bills that were passed in a bipartisan fashion.

And, very frankly, the President told us this was about to go away. Not to worry. It is going to go away. It will go away tomorrow maybe or next week. It is going to go away when the weather gets warm. And Dr. Fauci said: No, Mr. President, that won't happen. So, essentially, the President dismissed Dr. Fauci as a principal adviser. Thankfully, Mr. Biden, President-elect Biden, is going to bring him back as the principal adviser, one of the great experts in the world on vaccines and on infectious diseases.

So I am somewhat frustrated that we focus on one facet. But I will tell you, if those 12 million people become unemployed without assistance, they won't have any money to spend on small businesses. If those States don't have the ability to operate properly, that will hurt small businesses. If the transportation system faltered, it will hurt small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, my point is that we are *e pluribus unum*: Out of many, one. We

are a nation reliant upon one another, and the harm to one results in the harm to the other. Therefore, we believe that there ought to be a comprehensive piece of legislation, as there was overwhelmingly supported.

But the Republicans, after CARES, and when we passed the Heroes Act in May, passed it on May 15, they thought everything was hunky-dory and they walked away.

Mr. MCCONNELL said the States can go bankrupt. Think of the consequence that would have had. And, yes, we gave them some money under CARES. Nobody, when we voted on CARES, thought we would be where we are today. Nobody, except Dr. Fauci, and some other experts, scientists, medical personnel, said: Look, this thing is going to come back, that is what happens with these pandemics. They have an original assault, and then they come back. And they came back with a vengeance, and people are losing their lives.

And the failure to pass a comprehensive bill—we agree, we want to help these small businesses. Heroes 1 helped small businesses. Heroes 2, you didn't vote for those. You said they were partisan. I am not sure what was partisan about them. They were no more partisan than the CARES Act was partisan. Mr. Speaker, the difference was, very frankly, the Republicans decided they were going to vote for CARES, and then they decided, we have done enough. And we have been twisting in the wind now for 6 months since we passed Heroes.

I don't want to make a speculation of how many hundreds of thousands or tens of thousands of lives may have been saved had we passed Heroes 1, or we acted much sooner out of the administration. But I am hopeful we can get rid of all this "who struck John, you did it, I did it, who did it," and come to grips in the next 7 days, maybe 14 days. There is no reason why we can't come to an agreement.

There is a bipartisan group in the United States Senate, Republicans and Democrats, who have come up with a bill, \$908 billion. Now, that is a lot of money. But what they try to do is deal with all of the issues that I have raised, and they do. Maybe not as much as I think we ought to do, maybe not as specifically targeted as I think, but it is a basis for agreement. And I hope the Senate passes it. I hope they pass it next week and send it over to us.

I guarantee you when they send it over to us, we will act on it. We won't leave it sitting, as Heroes 1 and Heroes 2 have sat in the Senate for 6 months, or 2½ months. We won't let it sit.

Why?

Because the country is at risk. Our people are at risk. Our children are at risk. Our families are at risk.

Mr. Speaker, as you so correctly point out, the whip points out that our businesses are at risk. He is absolutely right and we need to act. But if we only act on small businesses and we don't

take care of the other problems, the small businesses ultimately will not be able to survive either. We are in this together.

We do not have a policy on this side of the aisle saying: You are on your own, children; you are on your own, unemployed; you are on your own, States, localities, municipalities, small towns, small counties.

That is not our policy. We are in this together, and we want to help all of those in distress.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I will have anything more to say on this particular item, but I am appreciative of Mr. CHABOT's bill. I hope that his bill is included, and I hope that we can pass something next week to help all of those in deep distress. That would be good for our country. It is the right thing to do. It is the moral thing to do, and I hope we do it. I will facilitate it when we get to an agreement. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, too. In terms of our children, we know sending them back to school safely, the protocols are out there. Child nutrition programs are administered in our schools. That is not happening because the kids are in those systems where they are not safely reopened. Those kids aren't able to get the school lunch programs.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't know about your school system, but my school system is still providing meals for kids either as a pick-up at the school or delivery at some site, because that is a critical problem, but they need money to do that. We know that food banks are stretched, and we need to deal with that program. That is my point. It is not just small businesses. It is that nutrition program.

I just wanted to clarify that in my school districts, we are delivering meals, notwithstanding the fact that schools are shut down.

Let me say something else just as an aside. Three of my counties have a majority, if not unanimous, county commissioners who are all Republican. They have all voted to keep the school systems virtual, as have my other counties.

I represent five counties, essentially, or parts thereof. They have all voted. Hearing from parents and teachers, and perhaps some students, they are all virtual. They will need as much money to continue virtuality as they will to get kids back in school. They need extra resources to do that.

The \$908 billion bill that is agreed or proposed by a bipartisan group in the Senate has money in that bill for those programs.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, those schools already have access to the \$150 billion that we sent the States that they haven't even already spent. If I gave you money to do something and

you haven't even used all that money, you can't use that as an excuse for not doing it, and saying: I am waiting for you to give me more money, when you still have money remaining.

And I agree with the gentleman on the school lunch program. The thing there is that we don't give a supplement to schools in normal times. These are not normal times. But in normal times, schools feed kids at lunch with the existing budgets they have. They don't wait for us to send extra money to them to feed the kids.

If they are not educating the kids in the classroom, they are still taking that money. I haven't seen them rebate the money to those families in communities.

So what are they doing with that money?

If you bring the kids back and educate them safely in the classroom, which the protocols allow for in any community, high risk, low risk, if you have got a high outbreak, there are different ways to handle each community. The CDC has given them guidelines. The Academy of Pediatrics have given them guidelines. Some school systems have chosen not to follow them and leave the kids at home, but they are still taking the money.

□ 1400

There has never been a better argument for school choice and letting parents choose. If one school system is willing to educate your child safely and the other is not, why shouldn't you be able to take that money and send your child to the place that is willing to do it safely for you?

It is not a question of the money. It is a question of the will to do it.

But when we talk about those businesses and what was in the CARES Act and what wasn't, the CARES Act was not the Heroes Act. I think the gentleman knows some of the differences. I will tell the gentleman a few of the differences.

What is in the Heroes Act that is not in the CARES Act that we all voted for was letting thousands, an unknown number of thousands, of criminals out of prison. I have never gotten a straight answer on how many thousands of criminals would be let out of prison or why that even needs to be in a COVID relief package. But that is in the Heroes Act, which was not in the CARES Act, and we are completely in disagreement on that.

Why it hasn't been dropped out, who knows, but that is a choice the majority made. Again, sending direct checks, billions of dollars in direct checks, to people that are here illegally was not in the CARES Act; it is in the Heroes Act. If we wanted to make it bipartisan, drop those things out. But they haven't been dropped out by the majority, and here we have a program that we agree on.

But in terms of the small businesses, the small businesses are dying on the vine because some States are giving

mixed signals, changing rules, going backward, forward. In States like California, they are saying you can operate as a liquor store or as a strip club but not as a church. Even the Supreme Court stepped in and said that is ludicrous and that you can't keep doing it.

But you go to New York and so many of these States where they are saying for safety protocols you have to shut down and you can't go to a restaurant, and then you see the Governor of the State at a restaurant without a mask. But you can't go. You see mayors in communities telling businesses they can't stay open or it is not safe to have Thanksgiving with your family, and you find out they are flying to other States to have Thanksgiving with their family.

This blatant hypocrisy by some of these leaders who are telling you that you have to live your life one way and they are living their lives a different way, and hiding behind protocols that don't exist, that is driving people nuts. The businesses are dying because of it.

The trust in government gets depleted in those places because they are watching. And it is not isolated. I wish it was just once or twice. I wish it was never going on. But it is over and over again, yesterday and today another story comes out of a local leader or a governor telling you that you can't do something, and they are doing it. They didn't think they were going to get caught doing it. My God, that has to end. The hypocrisy has to end.

Let's get back to saying things that make sense, working with the protocols, working with the experts and the scientists. But don't use a scientist selectively and say something that is not really true and you, yourself, know it is not true because you are doing it. That is what some of those folks are doing. It is driving people nuts, and it is driving their businesses under. They will never come back.

Those families that are struggling and the kids that are going to have trouble eating are having that trouble because the businesses that their families work for are being bankrupted by crazy, radical policies that have to end. We can help them in the short term. We ought to help them in the short term.

Some of the stuff I mentioned that we are not in agreement on ought to get dropped out. But in the meantime, don't hold them hostage. Let's bring those things that we agree on to the floor and save the businesses that we can because every day we don't, more will never come back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, this business about illegals getting money, let me just give you an example. You have a husband and wife and three children living in an apartment. The husband does not have authorization to be here. What the bill provided for, that the gentleman talks about, is making sure we feed those

children even though somebody who is illegal is living in the household.

What they want to have done is nobody in that household got help. It is just a difference of perspective. And I get it.

But let me tell you something. What you can't get away from is, Mr. Speaker, they have not passed a bill through the United States Senate. Why? Because it would require compromise. Because you don't have the votes, Mr. Speaker, in the Republican Party to pass a bill without compromise. So they have sent us no bill.

Now, Mr. MCCONNELL can say all he wants: Well, we need 60 votes, and they won't give us 60 votes.

He is right. And he won't compromise.

Your side, on a regular basis when you were in charge, couldn't pass a lot of pieces of legislation that had to be passed, and what did John Boehner do? Walked over here and said: Madam Leader, Mr. Whip, can you help us?

And we did. President Bush asked for TARP. He couldn't get the votes on your side. Where did he come? To our side. We passed it, which saved the country from a depression.

So when you are talking about all this stuff, we sent two bills. You didn't like them, fine. Pass something through the Senate. But it would have required compromise, and Mr. MCCONNELL offered no such compromise.

I think, frankly, we ought to move on because I don't think we can beat this horse anymore. We are not going to agree. But pass a bill. Have a comprehensive bill that helps those children, that helps those unemployed, that helps those renters who can't pay their rent and are going to be evicted.

Do you think that helps small businesses? Do you think it helps grocery stores? Do you think it helps barber shops? Do you think it helps gasoline stations? It does not because they are going belly up, and they don't have any resources.

We are in this together. What I keep telling him, Mr. Speaker, and what I keep telling my side, as well, we are in this together, and we need to help everyone who is in such distress, not just small businesses. We need to help small businesses.

The airlines continue to say they are going to stop flying. This doesn't help them.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if we wanted to pass another CARES Act-type piece of legislation, as we have seen in both other CARES Act bills, you have a lot of willingness and interest on this side of the aisle, which was there on both of those votes. Clearly, there are things in Heroes that there is no bipartisan consensus on.

So, our party is willing and ready to go another round on those items we agree on, and not months from now, not months ago, as it should have been done. It should be done today. Hopefully, it will be done when we return. I would be happy to work with the gentleman on those items.

If the gentleman has nothing else, then I would be happy to yield back.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing else.

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

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDER of California) laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 7, 2020.

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

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: I hereby submit my resignation, effective Monday, December 7, 2020 at 12:00 p.m. EST, as the United States Representative of the 8th District of California. Attached is the letter I submitted to the California Secretary of State.

Sincerely,

PAUL COOK.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 7, 2020.

Hon. ALEX PADILLA,
Secretary of State, California Department of
State, Sacramento, CA.

DEAR SECRETARY PADILLA: I hereby submit my resignation, effective Monday, December 7, 2020 at 12:00 p.m. EST, as the United States Representative of the 8th District of California. Attached is the letter I submitted to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

PAUL COOK.

MARKING A VICTORY FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a long-overdue victory for our Vietnam veterans.

For decades, tens of thousands of Vietnam vets haven't got the benefits that they deserve. Even though diseases like Parkinson's, hyperthyroidism, and bladder cancer are scientifically linked to Agent Orange, they still aren't covered by the VA.

But, today, I am thrilled to say that veterans exposed to Agent Orange can finally stop fighting their own government because my bill, the Fair Care for Veterans Act, is on track to become the law of the land.

I want to dedicate this effort to Joshua Melendez of Modesto, California, and Lyle Ducheneaux of Turlock, California, two local veterans who will personally be impacted by this change.

Most of all, I want to dedicate this effort to my grandfather, First Sergeant Albert Z. Simmons, whose life was cut tragically short by Agent Orange. I wish he could be with us today to see this.

These veterans fought for us. It has been my honor to fight for them. God