

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallo
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
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarella
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda

Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waltz
Wasserman
Pocan
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young

Perry
Ratcliffe
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner

Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—31

Bishop (NC)
Blunt Rochester
Budd
Byrne
Cleave
Cox (CA)
Crenshaw
Foxy (NC)
Gabbard
Gaetz
Hudson
Kirkpatrick
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lewis
Lofgren
Marchant
McHenry
Meadows
Mulle
Murphy (NC)
Norman

□ 1212

Mr. MCCLINTOCK changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 54.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 52, “no” on rollcall No. 53, and “yea” on rollcall No. 54.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, on February 7, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 52, “nay” on rollcall No. 53, and “yea” on rollcall No. 54.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I regretfully missed rollcall votes 38 through 54 on February 6th and 7th of 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 38, “yea” on rollcall No. 39, “yea” on rollcall No. 40, “aye” on rollcall No. 41, “no” on rollcall No. 42, “no” on rollcall No. 43, “aye” on rollcall No. 44, “no” on rollcall No. 45, “no” on rollcall No. 46, “aye” on rollcall No. 47, “aye” on rollcall No. 48, “no” on rollcall No. 49, “yea” on rollcall No. 50, “yea” on rollcall No. 51, “aye” on rollcall No. 52, “no” on rollcall No. 53, and “yea” on rollcall No. 54.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I had to miss votes today because I am attending an event in Charlotte, NC, with the President of the United States. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 52 (Shalala amendment), “yea” on rollcall No. 53 (Motion to recommit), and “nay” on rollcall No. 54 (H.R. 5687).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Miss RICE of New York. Madam Speaker, I was necessarily absent from votes on Friday, February 7, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 52, “nay” on rollcall No. 53, and “yea” on rollcall No. 54.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 52, “yea” on rollcall No. 53, and “nay” on rollcall No. 54.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5687, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF AND PUERTO RICO DISASTER TAX RELIEF ACT, 2020

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 5687, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill, including the change I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the changes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 25, strike “Recovery Act” and all that follows through “U.S.C. 5122)” on page 28, line 1, and insert “Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)”.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1215

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, last night during Roll Call No. 51, I was inadvertently recorded as voting “no” on H. Res. 826, Expressing Disapproval of the Trump Administration’s Actions Towards Medicaid, when it was my intention to vote “yes.” I respectfully request this be officially reflected in the RECORD, and ask my full written statement be entered in the RECORD as well.

Madam Speaker, last night during a long series of votes, I was inadvertently recorded as voting “no” when it was my intention to vote “yes” on rollcall No. 51. H. Res. 826, a resolution “Expressing disapproval of the Trump Administration’s harmful actions towards Medicaid.” I rise today to correct the record and make it clear to my constituents and colleagues that I unequivocally oppose the Trump Administration’s proposal to block grant Medicaid and gutting a critically important piece of the Affordable Care Act.

The Trump Administration’s proposal which will cap federal funding and cut coverage and benefits, is exactly the opposite of what I’ve championed during my time in congress. The proposal will harm low-income parents and children, people with disabilities, and many older Americans. It would make it more difficult for states to finance their Medicaid programs which would ultimately and inevitably lead to reductions in benefits for our most vulnerable citizens.

The administration’s proposal also turns its back on the commitment Congress and the federal government made to states to cover 90 percent of the cost of Medicaid if those states agreed to expanding the program. As a steadfast supporter and defender of the Affordable Care Act, it is undeniable that the expansion of Medicaid under that law has provided us the greatest opportunity to provide

NAYS—161

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
LaHood
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence

tens of millions of uninsured Americans health coverage. This expansion has resulted in the lowest uninsured rate in our country's history leading to better coverage, access, and quality of care and I would never do anything to undermine this important law.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity to address the House and make clear my opposition to the Trump Administration's attacks on our critically important Medicaid programs.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY,
FEBRUARY 7, 2020, TO MONDAY,
FEBRUARY 10, 2020

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MALINOWSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(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 yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the House next week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority whip for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will say that the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. on Monday next.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes of the week expected no later than 3 p.m. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business today.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 2546, Protecting America's Wilderness Act. This bill is a package of lands bill out of the Committee on Natural Resources and would designate 1.3 million acres as wilderness or potential wilderness areas, preserving these public lands for the benefit of current and future generations.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.J. Res. 79, Removing the Deadline for the Ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. This bill would remove the deadline to ratify the ERA, paving the way for it to be added to the Constitution and taking a historic step forward for women's equality.

Mr. Speaker, I would add this is not an adoption of an assumption, that, in

fact, the 38 States who have ratified to date have not ratified within the framework of the Constitution, and, therefore, that amendment should in fact be judged to have been adopted.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding back and for going through those items that are going to be up on the House floor next week.

I would like to ask the majority leader with respect to some of the things that were discussed at the State of the Union—and I am sure we are going to be talking about a few things that happened during the State of the Union.

The President identified a number of items where he challenged us in Congress to work with him on addressing some of the challenges that are facing our country. And he identified some items by executive order that he is working on, but he also identified some items from infrastructure—where I noticed there was applause on both sides of the aisle—to some areas on educational opportunities, school choice—where unfortunately, the remarks weren't received as equally as maybe they should have been—but it also provides us some opportunities to find some areas where we can work and achieve some things that would benefit people all across this country.

I would ask the gentleman, first, starting with infrastructure, there is tremendous interest that I have heard from Members on both sides to try to work on a package that we can get agreement on.

I haven't seen the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure tasked directly with doing that, but I have heard there is interest from Chairman DEFAZIO and from Ranking Member SAM GRAVES in trying to reach that common ground.

Is there an emphasis that is placed from the leadership of the majority on tasking the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with actually going and working and going and finding that common ground, which we know is there, to try to put together an infrastructure package in these next few months?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the answer to the gentleman's question is yes. And indeed—as I think the gentleman probably knows—the leaders of the relevant committees, Mr. NEAL and Mr. DEFAZIO—Mr. NEAL on the funding side, Mr. DEFAZIO on the substantive side of the policy with respect to infrastructure and transportation and other items that we think need to be included in infrastructure.

We met with the President of the United States in April. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman, it is probably the most positive meeting that I have had with the President and that other members in the group had. This was Democrats and then the Secretary of Transportation was also there, Ms. Chao.

And we talked about our joint commitment to infrastructure investment. We had suggested, as the President suggested during his campaign, that our target be \$1 trillion over 10 years. In other words, a \$100 billion a year, or on average, investment in infrastructure so that we will not only create a lot of American jobs, but also assure ourselves of being competitive with our competitors around the world in the 21st century.

The President responded that he thought \$1 trillion was too little and suggested a \$2 trillion investment, i.e., doubling the \$100 billion to \$200 billion on average per year over 10 years. And we had discussion about that. We indicated that we agreed with the President that such an investment would be warranted, and productive and, frankly, grow the economy and therefore be an investment and not simply an expenditure.

Mr. NEAL made the point, Mr. Speaker, that the President—if we would give him some direction on what he could support in terms of funding that investment. And I made the observation, I said to him, “Mr. President, neither in the Senate nor the House will Republicans or Democrats support that big of an investment if you are not leading. To which he responded to me, Mr. Whip, “Steny, I agree with you.”

We then scheduled a meeting to be held—we thought—3 weeks, but it was some 5 or 6 weeks later. And unfortunately, for whatever reason—both sides have their thoughts as to why—the President came to the meeting and said he was not prepared to meet. And we have not had that meeting since.

But I will emphatically say to the gentleman, we want to work on infrastructure. We think it is critically important. The President said during the campaign he thought it was critically important. I think your side, both here and on the Senate side, believes infrastructure is important.

So certainly, as I said, yes, we want to see if we could work together to adopt a significant infrastructure package, which we think would be good for the country.

Secondly, let me say that the President also mentioned two other things—one of which was prescription drugs. We had passed a prescription drug bill, H.R. 3. The President sent down a message that he would veto it if it were passed as it was.

What I would suggest, following the regular order, the Senate ought to take it up, change it, amend it—do whatever they feel is appropriate to do—pass it, if they can, and then let us have a conference. Because we have all said that we want to bring down the prescription drug prices.

In fact, the President says he wants to negotiate. We included in H.R. 3 negotiation. The President said he wanted to key prices to our global competitors. In particular, we put six large nations, which are similar to ours, including Australia, Great Britain, Germany, Canada, France—and one other