

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker and my dear friend, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, from the great State of New York, I rise today to recognize the outgoing staff director of the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Russell Anello.

Russ became my trusted adviser and leader of our committee staff in May 2021. Before his promotion to staff director, Russ served under three of our distinguished colleagues: Chairman Henry Waxman, Chairman JIM CLYBURN, and Chairman Elijah Cummings.

Russ is a tireless leader who defended democracy when democracy needed defending the most. Under his leadership, the committee passed landmark legislation, held high-profile hearings, and skillfully navigated complex investigations to hold government and private actors to account.

Russ' sharp legal skills and political instincts have helped to make our government more effective and efficient and have improved the lives of Americans.

On behalf of the members of the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, and on behalf of the American people, I thank Russ for his selfless, dedicated service to our Nation.

#### RECOGNIZING JUDGE STEVE FLOYD

(Mr. PFLUGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tom Green County Judge Steve Floyd, a faithful leader of our community who is retiring from elected office at the end of this year.

Judge Floyd has dedicated his life to our community with more than 30 years of service as justice of the peace, county commissioner, and now as county judge.

Whether he was leading the county, handing down justice, or just mowing the courthouse lawn, he led with wisdom and kindness.

Judge Floyd had a monumental impact on the partnership between San Angelo and Goodfellow Air Force Base, where his community leadership and visionary ideas strengthened the bond and paved the way for San Angelo to receive three unprecedented Altus Award trophies for exceptional community partnership, more than any other base has received.

Judge Floyd's retirement is bittersweet today. If you are watching this morning, Judge, please know that we are not just saying farewell to a good friend and a good leader but someone who has been an incredible public servant for over 30 years.

We are grateful for the decades of service to our community, and we wish you the very best in your upcoming retirement. Congratulations on a job well done, Judge Floyd.

#### CELEBRATING KOONTZ ELECTRIC SIGNING DAY

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

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Koontz Electric signing day for students committing to the Koontz Promise.

The Koontz Promise provides Arkansas River Valley High School students with an immediate career following graduation from a Koontz-operated skilled trade program.

Trade programs available for students include construction technology, industrial mechanics, maintenance technology, and welding.

The Koontz Electric Company of Morrilton, Arkansas, is a diversified heavy industrial electrical contractor that has noticed a skills gap between the generations. Immediately, they saw an opportunity to set up and train the next generation of young leaders to lessen the skills gap and highlight the opportunities of skilled trades immediately upon high school graduation.

On top of guaranteeing prospective students a career, the Koontz Promise also guarantees coverage of all expenses not covered by another funding source.

To celebrate and welcome the students who committed to the Koontz Promise, a signing day was held this past September.

I applaud Koontz Electric for their initiative in educating the next generation of leaders in the skilled trades, and I look forward to seeing these students achieve great careers in the future.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8393, PUERTO RICO STATUS ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1519 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1519

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8393) to enable the people of Puerto Rico to choose a permanent, nonterritorial, fully self-governing political status for Puerto Rico and to provide for a transition to and the implementation of that permanent, nonterritorial, fully self-governing political status, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-74 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 Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), 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. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1519, providing for consideration of H.R. 8393, the Puerto Rico Status Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources and provides one motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, Puerto Ricans have been U.S. citizens since the Jones-Shafroth Act of 1917. That is over 100 years the Puerto Rican people have been Americans. Yet, for those 100 years and more—in fact, going all the way back to the United States' annexation of the island in 1898—the U.S. Government has not guaranteed our fellow citizens on Puerto Rico the full and equal rights of citizens on the mainland.

Puerto Rico has faced multilayered crises rooted in this century-long policy, crises that have been compounded in recent years by natural disasters, the COVID-19 pandemic, and migration.

Puerto Rico's current status prevents the island from enjoying full democracy at the national level. Puerto Rico's Delegate to Congress has limited voting rights, and the Puerto Rican people cannot vote in U.S. Presidential elections, even though the U.S. Government enacts and enforces their national laws and residents pay Federal taxes.

Puerto Rico also cannot set its own monetary trade or immigration policy. They are unable to join international organizations or enter into international agreements, highlighting the complicated implications of the island's current status as a territory.

Puerto Rico's status also limits the island economically. For example, in

granting Puerto Rico the ability to restructure its debt in 2016, Congress established an oversight and management board that had the power to override decisions of the Governor and legislature of Puerto Rico.

Look, it is time Congress recognizes that Puerto Rico has no interest in being a colony, just as we in the United States should have no interest in being a colonizing power in the year 2022.

We are here today to consider a rule that would bring H.R. 8393, the Puerto Rico Status Act, to the floor.

This bill details the transition to and the implementation of a nonterritory status for Puerto Rico, finally giving the people of Puerto Rico a choice to determine their own status. It tasks the Puerto Rico State Elections Commission to carry out a nonpartisan campaign to educate and inform voters before holding a referendum for Puerto Ricans to decide between statehood, independence, or independence followed by free association with the United States.

I am proud to represent a vibrant Puerto Rican community in central Massachusetts, and many of my Puerto Rican constituents have family members still living on the island. Their family members, just like Americans on the mainland, deserve the right to self-determination. They ought to have an opportunity to carve their own path and build the future that they want.

The Puerto Rico Status Act is the result of serious negotiation and careful compromise to clarify available status options and ensure a productive process.

I am grateful to Chairman GRIJALVA, Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ, and Congresswoman GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, for all the work that they have done to get us to this point.

Ultimately, the people of Puerto Rico must decide on the island status, and it is up to us in Congress to help facilitate that process.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman and my good friend from Massachusetts for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today provides for consideration of H.R. 8393, the Puerto Rico Status Act. This is a bill that received an emergency Rules hearing yesterday with just 3 hours' notice, 3 hours for an issue that deserves to be heard through regular order.

H.R. 8393 would authorize a federally sponsored, taxpayer-funded election to be held in Puerto Rico on 5 November 2023. This election would require the voters of Puerto Rico to choose between three status options: independence, sovereignty and free association, or U.S. statehood.

You might notice something missing here. This bill doesn't even give Puerto Ricans the option to preserve their current status as a territory of the United States. So not only do House Democrats want to control how the States run their elections, they now want to control how Puerto Rico runs their elections.

H.R. 8393 even takes things a step further than that. If Puerto Ricans vote to become a sovereign or independent nation, this legislation tells them what they have to include in their new constitution, how they have to ratify their constitution, and how elections for government officers should take place.

My friends across the aisle want to talk about colonial power. What does that sound like?

Further, this bill would completely circumvent congressional authority by not allowing Congress to ratify the option that Puerto Rico ultimately chooses.

The question of Puerto Rico's statehood is a serious topic, one that I am not necessarily opposed to, but it is a topic that deserves a deliberative process with careful consideration and expert input.

There have been numerous hearings on this issue, but there were no hearings on this specific bill. There has been no vetting of legal implications of using this unprecedented, self-executing process to statehood.

This is not a question that should be run through a lameduck Congress on the last day of a scheduled session with less than 24 hours' notice. That is unacceptable.

Again, I am not debating the merits of Puerto Rican statehood, but I am pointing out the glaring problems in this ill-conceived, half-baked legislation that leaves too many questions unanswered.

House Democrats are doing nothing more today than using Puerto Ricans as pawns to score cheap political points with a bill that has zero chance of becoming law.

Let's just be frank and honest about that. This bill has zero chance of becoming law this session of Congress. It is a joke that we are even considering it today.

We owe it to the voters of Puerto Rico to do better than this. They deserve more.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This shouldn't be controversial. We are not deciding the fate of Puerto Rico. We are setting a process in place so that the people who live on the island can make that decision.

Listening to my colleague's speech, as he mentions Democrat, Democrat, Democrat, Democrat, you would never know that this compromise was actually written in conjunction with the

Republican—let me repeat that—with the Republican Delegate from Puerto Rico.

□ 0930

So I don't understand what the big fuss is about.

But if my friend believes that the people of Puerto Rico should decide their future, then he should support this bill which will set in place a process so they can determine their future. If the gentleman doesn't, if he continues to believe that we should act like a colonizer, then vote "no" on the bill. But this is the commonsense thing to do.

One other thing we heard him say, they are taxpayer-funded elections. All of our elections proceed with the support of taxpayer funds. I don't understand what that is all about. But the bottom line is that people of Puerto Rico do pay taxes.

In any event, this really is about self-determination, and it is that simple. I hope that my colleagues will not only support the rule but also the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire as to whether my friend has any additional speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I will close.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I have already talked about the fact that this bill did not go through regular order. It is even questionable whether the committee that heard this hearing has jurisdiction to consider this bill.

I haven't even touched on the fact that the status options that are called for don't give Puerto Rico the chance to keep its current status. The status quo is totally off limits.

We have also talked about dictating to a sovereign nation what is in their constitution. It also, as I said before, abrogates constitutional authority. This has never been done before.

Also, there is no CBO score on this. We have zero idea how much this is going to cost. This also doesn't take into consideration PROMESA which is the financial oversight and management board that helps Puerto Rico.

A big glaring issue here is citizenship. We haven't had a single hearing on how this would affect citizenship.

So you are in Puerto Rico and born to two U.S. citizens, what happens to your status?

Are you a U.S. citizen or not?

That is not considered in this bill.

So, again, this bill is half-baked. It didn't go through regular order, and it didn't go through proper committees of jurisdiction, yet here we are considering it in a lameduck session.

I am incredibly disappointed by this. I am here just 1 day after this bill was

considered in a hearing that was held in the Rules Committee debating legislation scheduled on, again, the last day of the 117th Congress. Again, this bill has zero chance of becoming law. We are wasting the time of the American people.

I have said it repeatedly, but it requires saying again: we have real crises that this Nation is facing. Our southern border is one great example.

At no time has our southern border been more dangerous and more unstable than right now. This past fiscal year set the record for encounters of illegal immigrants, also a record for migrant deaths, a record for apprehension of suspected terrorists, and a record for seizure of fentanyl at the southern border.

The seizure of fentanyl might sound as if we are doing something good, but we only interdict less than 10 percent of the fentanyl. So if our fentanyl seizures are up, then the amount of fentanyl coming into the United States is, of course, up. Yet with all that, congressional Democrats won't even acknowledge that there is a problem at our southern border. Even the Biden administration won't admit the gravity of the situation.

Vice President KAMALA HARRIS, the so-called border czar, has said: "Our border is secure."

That is gaslighting. That is gaslighting the American people. President Biden himself has said: "There are more important things going on."

He refuses to even visit the southern border. That is gaslighting, and that is also dereliction of duty.

Further, House Democrats failed to meet the fundamental duty of funding the government, despite spending most of last year passing trillions of dollars in wasteful spending that has done nothing but driven up inflation, driven up our national debt, and has seen real wages decrease for working Americans.

So now we are letting two Senators who won't even be in office next year ram through a massive omnibus spending bill that was written behind closed doors and without the input of House Republicans.

So with today's rule, House Democrats are, once again, refusing to put forward solid legislation that has an actual chance of moving forward and bringing relief to the American people.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I don't even know where to start in response to all of that.

Let me, first of all, inform Members about what the legislative history of the bill that we want to bring to the floor is because if you listen to the gentleman, Madam Speaker, you would think that it just came out of nowhere.

On July 15, 2022, Chairman GRIJALVA introduced H.R. 8393, the Puerto Rico Status Act, with original cosponsors Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ, Resident Commissioner JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN—I will remind my friend, again, that she is a Republican Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico—and Representative DARREN SOTO of Florida.

The Natural Resources Committee held a hearing on April 14, 2021, titled: "Insular Affairs Legislative Hearing on Puerto Rico Political Status," and a hearing on June 16, 2021, titled: "Office of Insular Affairs Legislative Hearing."

On July 20, 2022, the full committee met and held a markup of the bill and favorably reported it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute by a vote of 25-20 with Resident Commissioner GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN joining the majority. So the idea that somehow nobody has been talking about this doesn't reflect what the legislative history is.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an AP article from June 4, 2022, titled: "Puerto Ricans speak out on U.S. territory's political status."

PUERTO RICANS SPEAK OUT ON US  
TERRITORY'S POLITICAL STATUS  
(By Danica Coto)

SAN JUAN, PR (AP).—Hundreds of Puerto Ricans crowded into a convention center Saturday where federal legislators held a public hearing to decide the future of the island's political status as the U.S. territory struggles to recover from hurricanes, earthquakes and a deep economic crisis.

One by one, dozens of people ranging from politicians to retirees to young people leaned into a microphone and spoke against the island's current territorial status, which recognizes its people as U.S. citizens but does not allow them to vote in presidential elections, denies them certain federal benefits and allows them one representative in Congress with limited voting powers.

The hearing comes two weeks after a group of Democratic congress members including the House majority leader and one Republican proposed what would be the first-ever binding plebiscite that would offer voters in Puerto Rico three options: statehood, independence or independence with free association, whose terms would be defined following negotiations.

Congress would have to accept Puerto Rico as the 51st state if voters so choose it, but the proposal is not expected to survive in the Senate, where Republicans have long opposed statehood.

"Everyone, even congress people themselves, know that the possibilities of this becoming law are minimal and maybe non-existent, but it doesn't stop being important," former Puerto Rico governor Anibal Acevedo Vilá told The Associated Press.

About an hour into the hearing, a small group of people including a former gubernatorial candidate who supports independence burst into the ballroom, pointed fingers at the panel of U.S. legislators and yelled, "120 years of colonialism!"

The majority of the audience booed the group and yelled at them to leave as U.S. lawmakers called for calm. "Democracy is not always pretty, but it's necessary," said Rep. Raul Grijalva of Arizona, chairman of the U.S. House of Natural Resources Committee, which oversees affairs in U.S. territories.

The proposal of a binding plebiscite—a measure that has not yet been introduced in

committee—has frustrated some on an island that already has held seven unilateral, non-binding referendums on its political status, with no overwhelming majority emerging. The last referendum was held in November 2020, with 53 percent of votes for statehood and 47 percent against, with only a little more than half of registered voters participating.

Luis Herrero, a political consultant, said during the hearing that even if enough people support statehood, there are not enough votes in the Senate to make Puerto Rico a state: "Not today, not yesterday, not tomorrow. Since 1898, Puerto Rican statehood has been a mirage, lip service to score cheap political points or to raise a few dollars for a campaign."

Saturday's hearing comes amid ongoing discontent with Puerto Rico's current political status, with the U.S. Supreme Court further angering many in April after upholding the differential treatment of residents of Puerto Rico. In an 8-1 vote, the court ruled that making Puerto Ricans ineligible for the Supplemental Security Income program, which offers benefits to blind, disabled and older Americans, did not unconstitutionally discriminate against them.

As a result, many of those who spoke at Saturday's public hearing welcomed the proposed binding plebiscite.

"We finally see the light at the end of the tunnel," said Víctor Pérez, a U.S. military veteran who lamented the current political status. "Even after all our service and sacrifice, we come back home and we are denied full voting rights and equality. . . . We cannot vote for our president, our commander in chief,

(but) they send us to war."

Grijalva said the testimonies given Saturday will help him and other legislators revise the proposed measure, which he said is a way to make amends. He said he hopes it will go to the House floor by August. If eventually approved, it would be held on Nov. 5, 2023.

Acevedo, the former governor, said he hasn't lost hope despite numerous attempts throughout the decades to change the political status of Puerto Rico, which became a U.S. territory in 1898 following the Spanish-American War.

"A solution to this problem of more than 120 years has to happen at some point," he said. "When will conditions allow for it? That's unpredictable."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, it is clear something needs to change. Puerto Ricans don't want to continue under the island's territorial status for many reasons—namely because while the status recognizes its people as U.S. citizens, it doesn't allow them to vote in Presidential elections, denies them certain crucial Federal benefits, and limits their congressional Representative's voting power.

The Puerto Rico Status Act is a good solution that will allow Puerto Ricans to decide themselves what the next steps should be. We should give them that opportunity.

The gentleman talked about process in terms of how this House is being operated. Let me remind the gentleman—and let me remind all my colleagues—that the last time the Republicans were in charge of the House, the Senate, and the White House—they controlled everything, and I mean everything—the last time they did that, do you know what they did?

They shut the government down and walked away. That is not responsible governing. That was unconscionable.

And leading up to that government shutdown in the Rules Committee we had an emergency meeting, on what? Cheese.

Don't even ask me to explain that, but that is what they did. They had an emergency meeting in the Rules Committee, and it was a meeting on cheese.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a HuffPost article titled: "House Republicans Called Emergency Meeting On Cheese As Shutdown Approached."

[From HuffPost, Dec. 22, 2018]

HOUSE REPUBLICANS CALLED EMERGENCY MEETING ON CHEESE AS SHUTDOWN APPROACHED

(By Amy Russo)

As the federal government was heading for a shutdown Friday night, House Republicans called an emergency meeting.

Plot twist: it was about cheese.

During her broadcast that evening, MSNBC's Rachel Maddow appeared astonished while reporting on the gathering, which was arranged so that lawmakers could discuss the Curd Act, a proposal to allow some cheeses to be advertised as "natural" despite having artificial ingredients.

Rep. Jim McGovern (D-Mass.) was clearly irked, feeling the timing was pretty inconvenient.

"This is an emergency meeting that we're having here and I've seen some surreal things around this place, but this is really something," McGovern said. "Vital parts of our government are about to shut down in just a few hours, and the Republicans have called an emergency meeting on cheese."

Venting his frustration with Republicans in the room, McGovern wondered whether his colleagues had thought about how the meeting would look to the public, which would soon be faced with the third shutdown of the year.

"I mean, has anybody considered how ridiculous this is or how bad the optics are as the American people are watching what's going on here?" he asked. "By all means, if you think the most important thing we have to discuss right now is cheese, I'll let you have at it."

Rep. Pete Sessions (R-Texas) eventually jumped in to defend the meeting, calling the cheese bill "important to small business," then eventually segueing into the issue of funding for the southern border wall, the key matter that prompted the shutdown.

"We are being overrun on our southern border," Sessions declared.

That's when McGovern piped up, appearing confused, asking, "There's no wall in this bill, right?"

"It is important," Sessions argued back, clarifying that he was "not talking about the wall of cheese."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, my Republican colleagues seem to be confused about why we are moving quickly here.

Let me explain that simply in the last few hours that they were in charge, as I said, they called an emergency meeting on cheese. Don't get me wrong. I love cheese just as much as everybody else in this Chamber does. But I think the systematic disenfranchisement of millions of American citizens is a little bit more important than cheese. Maybe my Republican colleagues disagree.

I also point out that this is not the last day of this Congress. We will be

here to complete our business on an omnibus appropriations bill. But I want the American people to understand how my Republican friends have acted in these last few days. We are still trying to work out the details of this government spending bill. We are working with Republicans and trying to come up with some sort of an accommodation. We need a little bit more time.

What we voted on yesterday was a continuing resolution to keep the government running a few more days so we don't have a shutdown and to work out the details. It is not the final package. Lots of stuff still remains to be figured out.

But what we said is that we need to pass a short-term continuing resolution for a few days so that we can work out those details and so we don't shut the government down and cause all kinds of chaos because we know what government shutdowns do.

I think it is really interesting for people to understand that 201 Republicans voted to shut the government down. If they succeeded, then the government would shut down tomorrow. They voted to shut the government down—

Who does that?

What are they thinking?

All because there is a small group of people here in the House whose allegiance to Trump and the hard-line rightwing fringe of the Republican Party say they don't want to have any kind of deal. They don't want to govern. They would rather shut the government down costing the economy billions and billions of dollars, causing all kinds of uncertainty, and hurting the American people.

They did that before. If they had their way, then the government would be shut down tomorrow. Talk about irresponsible.

So I also should point out that every Democrat—215 Democrats—who voted yesterday voted to keep the government running. So apparently, Members of the Republican Party do not think they are responsible for governing. They vote "no" on everything—on everything—and they criticize us for the way we do the job that they won't do.

We heard the gentleman criticize President Biden for dealing with the drug crisis at the border, for actually seizing fentanyl. He is getting criticized because we are seizing it at the border.

Really?

Madam Speaker, this is simple. The legislation that this rule will bring to the floor gives the people of Puerto Rico a choice—one that they deserve—to determine their status. It is past time we provide them this opportunity to decide for themselves what kind of relationship they want with the United States moving forward.

So that is what this rule will do. It will bring that bill to the floor.

Before I close, Madam Speaker, I would just, again, urge my Republican friends: stand up to the Freedom Caucus, stand up to the hard-line rightwing in your conference who says "no"

to everything. Put the American people first. Put people over politics.

That is something that I think is not an unreasonable request.

The idea that over 200 of my friends voted to shut the government down yesterday?

Give me a break.

So we are going to do our work, and we are going to pass this bill today. We are going to get to an agreement on an omnibus bill that will help the American people. That will be next week. And we are going to do our job because we believe our job is to govern. That is the responsible thing to do, not shut the government down. Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 201, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

YEAS—217

Adams	Cuellar	Kaptur
Aguilar	Davids (KS)	Keating
Allred	Davis, Danny K.	Kelly (IL)
Auchincloss	Dean	Khanna
Axne	DeFazio	Kildee
Barragán	DeGette	Kilmer
Beatty	DeLauro	Kim (NJ)
Bera	DelBene	Kind
Beyer	Demings	Kirkpatrick
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Krishnamoorthi
Blumenauer	Dingell	Kuster
Blunt Rochester	Doggett	Lamb
Bonamici	Doyle, Michael	Langevin
Bourdeaux	F.	Larsen (WA)
Bowman	Escobar	Larson (CT)
Boyle, Brendan	Eshoo	Lawrence
F.	Espallat	Lawson (FL)
Brown (MD)	Evans	Lee (CA)
Brown (OH)	Fletcher	Lee (NV)
Brownley	Foster	Leger Fernandez
Bush	Frankel, Lois	Levin (CA)
Bustos	Gallagher	Levin (MI)
Butterfield	Garamendi	Lieu
Carbajal	Garcia (IL)	Lofgren
Cárdenas	Garcia (TX)	Lowenthal
Carson	Golden	Luria
Carter (LA)	Gomez	Lynch
Cartwright	Gonzalez,	Malinowski
Case	Vicente	Maloney,
Casten	Gottheimer	Carolyn B.
Castor (FL)	Green, Al (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	Manning
Cherfilus-	Harder (CA)	Matsui
McCormick	Hayes	McBath
Chu	Higgins (NY)	McCollum
Cicilline	Himes	McGovern
Clark (MA)	Horsford	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Houlahan	Meeks
Cleaver	Hoyer	Meng
Clyburn	Huffman	Mfume
Cohen	Jackson Lee	Moore (WI)
Connolly	Jacobs (CA)	Morelle
Cooper	Jayapal	Moulton
Correa	Jeffries	Mrvan
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (FL)
Courtney	Johnson (TX)	Nadler
Craig	Jones	Napolitano
Crow	Kahele	Neal

Neguse  
Newman  
Norcross  
O'Halloran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Peltola  
Perlmutter  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger

Rush  
Ryan (NY)  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Suozi

## NAYS—201

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice (OK)  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carey  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Chabot  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Flores  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia (CA)

Swalwell  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Moore (AL)  
Moore (UT)  
Mullin  
Murphy (NC)  
Nehls  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Obernolte  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Salazar  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sempolinski  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Duyn  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (TX)  
Meijer  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—12

Buck  
Cheney  
Conway  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Hartzler  
Hinson  
Kelly (MS)  
Kinzinger  
Long  
McKinley

## □ 1023

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Auchincloss (Beyer)  
Axne (Pappas)  
Beatty (Neguse)  
Boebert (Gaetz)  
Brooks (Moore (AL))  
Brown (MD) (Evans)  
Bustos (Schneider)  
Carter (LA) (Horsford)  
Cawthorn (Gaetz)  
Cherfilus-McCormick (Brown (OH))  
Cicilline (Jayapal)  
Cleaver (Davids (KS))  
Cuellar (Correa)  
DeFazio (Pallone)  
DelBene (Schneider)  
Dingell (Pappas)  
Doyle, Michael F. (Evans)  
Duncan (Williams (TX))  
Dunn (Salazar)  
Escobar (Garcia (TX))  
Españal (Correa)  
Ferguson (Gonzales)  
Tony (TX)  
Gibbs (Smucker)  
Gosar (Weber (TX))  
Herrera Beutler (Valadao)  
Issa (Calvert)  
Jacobs (NY) (Sempolinski)  
Johnson (TX) (Pallone)  
Kelly (IL) (Horsford)  
Khanna (Pappas)  
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)  
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)  
Krishnamoorthi (Pappas)  
LaHood (Kustoff)  
Larson (CT) (Pappas)  
Lawrence (Garcia (TX))  
Lawson (FL) (Evans)  
Letlow (Moore (UT))  
Levin (CA) (Huffman)  
Malliotakis (Armstrong)  
Maloney, Sean P. (Beyer)  
Mfume (Evans)  
Moulton (Trone)  
Newman (Correa)  
Norcross (Pallone)  
O'Halloran (Pappas)  
Omar (Beyer)  
Palazzo (Fleischmann)  
Pascarell (Pallone)  
Payne (Pallone)  
Porter (Beyer)  
Pressley (Neguse)  
Rice (SC) (Weber (TX))  
Rush (Beyer)  
Sewell (Schneider)  
Sherrill (Beyer)  
Simpson (Fulcher)  
Sires (Pallone)  
Speier (Garcia (TX))  
Stevens (Craig)  
Stewart (Owens)  
Strickland (Correa)  
Suozi (Correa)  
Tiffany (Fitzgerald)  
Titus (Pallone)  
Trahan (Lynch)  
Welch (Pallone)  
Wilson (FL) (Evans)

## VA EMPLOYEE FAIRNESS ACT OF 2021

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1518, I call up the bill (H.R. 1948) to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1518, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-71 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

## H.R. 1948

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the “VA Employee Fairness Act of 2021”.*

## SEC. 2. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING OF EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7422 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—*

*(1) by striking subsections (b), (c), and (d); and*

*(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (b).*

*(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) may not be construed to affect the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs regarding incentive pay and expedited hiring under section 706 of title 38, United States Code, or other similar provisions of law.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 1948, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 1948, as amended, the bipartisan VA Employee Fairness Act. This legislation ensures important collective bargaining rights for all frontline healthcare workers who care for our veterans.

As chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have made veterans' healthcare one of my top priorities. I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle strongly support our veterans and the benefits they earn.

This bill presents an opportunity to match words with action. The VA Employee Fairness Act will ensure critical protections for the healthcare workers serving our veterans.

As a Nation, we must invest in these frontline workers at VA hospitals. Our veterans need modern, well-designed hospital and clinical buildings equipped with the latest, most advanced medical devices and equipment and stocked with adequate medical supplies.

## □ 1030

However, all this means little without a well-trained workforce ready to serve our veterans. That is why collective bargaining is vital.

Frontline healthcare workers deserve the right to organize themselves. They deserve to have a voice. VA nurses or technicians should be able to point out wrongdoing without fear of losing their job or other forms of retaliation.

All of this sounds like common sense, and it is, and this is what collective bargaining is all about.